Transnational Network of Integrated Planning Labs: co-creating knowledge on forward-looking transdisciplinary planning perspectives addressing climate change and urban life in the post-pandemic city.

Co-funded by the European Union

Annotating key concepts of integrated spatial planning

Inclusive Planning

Authors: Nadia Charalambous, Mariam Shulqamy, Frixos Petrou, Rafaela Christodoulou

Mainstream/Conventional Definition

Inclusive planning refers to urban and spatial planning processes that actively seek to involve diverse stakeholders to ensure decisions reflect all perspectives, prioritizing equity and social justice while promoting accessibility and participation. It emphasizes cultural sensitivity, transparency, and accountability throughout the process. Collaboration and trust-building are central, empowering marginalized groups and fostering community ownership. Ultimately, it leads to more equitable and sustainable outcomes, embodying democratic principles by ensuring inclusivity in decision-making.

An approach to urban planning that seeks to include diverse voices and address the needs of all community members, particularly marginalized groups. Inclusive planning promotes social equity and justice in urban development, ensuring that all community members benefit from urban growth and improvements.

Contested Meanings / Debates in the Literature

While Inclusive Urban Planning is widely celebrated as a progressive and equitable model of urban development—emphasizing equitable access to resources, participatory processes, and environmental and social justice—its conceptual clarity and practical application have been the subject of considerable academic scrutiny. At its core, inclusive planning seeks to shape urban environments that are responsive to all residents, regardless of socioeconomic status, age, ethnicity, or ability, through active community engagement and collaborative decision-making. It has become a cornerstone in contemporary sustainability discourse, advocating for context-specific, culturally relevant, and socially just urban transformations.

However, scholars have noted that despite its normative appeal, inclusive planning often suffers from **conceptual vagueness and operational inconsistencies**, especially when appropriated within technocratic or institutional frameworks. Critics such as Susan Fainstein (2010) and Patsy Healey (1997) argue that inclusive rhetoric frequently masks superficial or tokenistic engagement, particularly when used to legitimize pre-defined planning agendas. This phenomenon—referred to in some critiques as "inclusion-washing"—raises concerns about the **depth of participation**, the **distribution of power**, and **the authenticity of deliberative processes**. In many cases, inclusion becomes procedural rather than transformative, failing to address the structural conditions that perpetuate spatial inequality.

Another significant debate concerns **who is included, and on what terms**. Inclusion is not neutral; it often privileges certain forms of knowledge and participation while excluding others. In postcolonial and feminist planning literature, scholars question whether current practices genuinely engage diverse epistemologies or simply broaden consultation to a narrowly defined "community." The stakes of how inclusive planning is defined and deployed vary significantly across geographic and political contexts. For example, in the **Global North**, inclusive planning is often framed within institutionalized participatory frameworks, where engagement is mediated through formalized channels such as public consultations or advisory boards. While these mechanisms aim to democratize planning, they are frequently critiqued for privileging **expert knowledge and middle-class voices**,

thereby marginalizing dissenting or non-conforming perspectives. In contrast, in the **Global South**, inclusive planning is entangled with legacies of colonialism, informality, and socio-spatial exclusion. Here, formal participation mechanisms may be ill-suited to local realities, and **grassroots or insurgent planning practices**— that call for restructuring planning institutions themselves, rather than adapting them to include "others" as articulated by Miraftab (2009) and Holston (2008)—offer alternative models that resist state authority and foreground the knowledge and agency of marginalized communities. This points to the need for deeper transformations in how planning is conceptualized, resisting technocratic or tokenistic forms of engagement.

The etymology of the term also reflects its evolving meaning. While "***inclusive***" derives from the Latin *includere* (meaning to enclose or contain), its contemporary connotation implies the opposite—to **open up, embrace, and incorporate diversity**. The notion of ***planning***—from the Old French *plan*, meaning a method or scheme worked out beforehand for the accomplishment of an objective—suggests a structured process, one that must now grapple with dynamic and contested urban realities. Thus, **"Inclusive Planning"** linguistically implies a structured approach to decision-making that actively seeks to incorporate a wide range of participants. As the term has evolved, it has become embedded in **sustainability frameworks**, where it is often invoked to justify compact, mixed-use, and equitable urban forms that reduce transportation needs and carbon emissions. Yet, the integration of inclusion into sustainability planning remains uneven and, at times, symbolic—raising critical questions about **who defines inclusion, who benefits, and whose knowledge counts**.

Ultimately, debates around inclusive planning underscore a broader tension between **normative aspirations and institutional realities**. While it remains a vital concept for achieving socially just and sustainable urban futures, its effectiveness depends on whether it can move beyond symbolic inclusion to support redistributive, epistemically diverse, and **politically transformative planning practices**.

Applications in Practice

Inclusive planning manifests in a range of practical applications across spatial scales, sectors, and geographies. At the **urban development level**, it is employed in the design of **affordable housing strategies** in high-cost cities, the implementation of **accessible public transport systems** for persons with disabilities, and the establishment of **community-based food systems**, such as gardens in underserved neighborhoods. These initiatives aim to redress spatial inequalities by embedding equity considerations into everyday planning practices. Inclusive planning is also operationalized through **participatory planning processes**, where residents are actively involved in shaping the outcomes of urban interventions—from neighborhood regeneration to mobility plans—ensuring that diverse voices are integrated into spatial decision-making.

In sustainability-oriented urban governance, inclusive planning has been central to **green infrastructure design**, where community consultations influence the siting and form of parks, greenways, and public spaces. In the realm of **natural resource management**, inclusive planning principles underpin **co-management practices** for forests, water systems, and protected areas, particularly in contexts where local ecological knowledge is vital to

conservation. At broader institutional levels, **national and regional climate action plans** are increasingly incorporating stakeholder engagement frameworks, reflecting a shift toward more inclusive and deliberative policymaking. Beyond the public sector, **corporate sustainability strategies** have adopted inclusive planning to involve employees, suppliers, and local communities in shaping ethical supply chains and responsible business practices. These examples collectively illustrate how inclusive planning functions as a **multi-scalar, cross-sectoral approach** that aligns procedural participation with the substantive goal of spatial justice.

Selected References & Key Readings

Chu E, Anguelovski I and Carmin J (2016) Inclusive approaches to urban climate adaptation planning and implementation in the Global South. Climate Policy 16(3): 372–392.

Gerometta J, Häussermann H and Longo G (2005) Social innovation and civil society in urban governance: Strategies for an inclusive city. Urban Studies 42(11): 2007–2021.

Haase D, Kabisch S, Haase A, et al. (2017) Greening cities – To be socially inclusive? About the alleged paradox of society and ecology in cities. Habitat International 64: 41–48.

Jaine A (2014) Integrated Urban Design & Planning for inclusive Public Space and City-Region connectivity and efficiency. UN-Habitat Thematic Issue Paper. Epub ahead of print 2014.

Elias, P. (2020). Inclusive City, Perspectives, Challenges, and Pathways. In: Leal Filho, W., Marisa Azul, A., Brandli, L., Gökçin Özuyar, P., Wall, T. (eds) Sustainable Cities and Communities. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95717-3_32

Closely Related Concepts (if any)

- **Co-creation in Urban Planning**– Inclusive planning is fundamentally about who participates, how knowledge is produced, and whose voices count. Co-creation operationalizes inclusion through shared problem framing, joint knowledge production, and collaborative decision-making..
- **Justice and the City: Spatial, Climate, and Mobility Justice** – Inclusive planning is normatively anchored in justice claims—addressing structural inequalities, historical exclusion, and uneven exposure to risks and opportunities.