

- Washburn, R.A. et al. (1999) 'The Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly (PASE): Evidence for Validity', *J Clin Epidemiol* 52 (7): 643–51.
- Washburn, R.A. (2015) 'Assessment of Physical Activity in Older Adults', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*.
- Washburn RA, F.J. (1999) 'Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly (PASE): The Relationship with Activity Measured by a Portable Accelerometer', *Sports Med Phys Fitness* 1999,.
- Welk, G.J. et al. (2000) 'Measurement Issues in the Assessment of Physical Activity in Children', *Res.Q.Exerc.Sport* 71 (0270–1367 SB–IM): S59–73.
- Welk, G.J. and C.B. Corbin (1995) 'The Validity of the Tritrac-R3D Activity Monitor for the Assessment of Physical Activity in Children', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 66 (3): 202–9.
- Wen, B. et al. (2007) 'System for Observing Play and Recreation in Communities (SOPARC): Reliability and Feasibility Measures', *October* 454 (1): 42–54.
- Werngren-Elgström, M. et al. (2009) 'A 10-Year Follow-up Study on Subjective Well-Being and Relationships to Person-Environment (P-E) Fit and Activity of Daily Living (ADL) Dependence of Older Swedish Adults', *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 49 (1): 16–22.
- Wilcox, S. et al. (2001) 'Physical Activity Patterns, Assessment and Motivation in Older Adults', *Gender, Physical Activity, and Aging*. CRC Press. URL (consulted April 2017): <http://www.crcnetbase.com/doi/10.1201/b14223-3>
- Woodcock, J. et al. (2011) 'Non-Vigorous Physical Activity and All-Cause Mortality: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies', *International Journal of Epidemiology* 40 (1): 121–38.

ID 1557 | LASTING COMMUNITY WELLBEING EMBRACING HEALTH AND LIVEABILITY: COMPARISON OF LISBON AND TOKYO

Yoichi Kumagai¹; Maria Partidario²
¹CEG-IST (U Lisboa)/SERS (U Waterloo); ²CEG-IST (U Lisboa)
ykumagai@uwaterloo.ca

1 INTRODUCTION

Planners in many major urban areas are facing challenges affecting lasting community wellbeing (LCW), which is a key foundation for overall sustainability. LCW involves people's immediate and long-term satisfaction with decent individual and socio-ecological daily lives mainly within the scales of the neighbourhood and city-region. Community recognizes the multiple and flexible relationships of people, typified by mutual commitment and support. While the concept of community does not entail living proximity and geographical organization (e.g. on-line community, professional community, etc.), we use the concept here with emphasis on the maintenance of community in neighbourhoods, which are geographically organized areas for people living close to each other, but in many cases do not have (or have lost) community characteristics. Neighbourhoods could be considered the base level for community characteristics that are desirable for lasting wellbeing, and that build up to the city-region's level of community cooperation towards sustainability. In these terms, community is a useful perspective for considering the sustainability of daily lives.

With this perspective, comparative study of city-regions with different sizes, such as Lisbon and Tokyo, becomes possible because what matters for decent individual and socio-ecological daily lives within community (and potential or visible progress towards sustainability through them) at neighbourhoodscale is more shared than different. With recognition of what is similar, difference will be presented as a fascination (thus respectful and enjoyable), rather than something impossible to comprehend (thus fearful and hopeless).

This paper presents key features of LCW as an analytical framework and reports on an evolving comparative study of LCW centred on two city-regions – Lisbon and Tokyo – that are very different in size, history, culture and other characteristics. The viability of this comparison rests on the common features of

LCW, which embrace notions of healthy and liveable cities. The research takes a bottom-up approach informed by literatures related to LCW, each city's own forward-looking planning documents, current and emerging initiatives, public discourse and direct experience. Similarities found demonstrate the value of common features, while differences suggest the key importance of understanding contextual factors. This research also attempts to understand changes in mind-sets and behaviours regarding health and liveability among people in these cities.

2 SIGNIFICANCE OF COMPARING LISBON AND TOKYO

Lisbon and Tokyo are in many ways very different city-regions. For example, downtown Tokyo (the 23 Special Ward Area, formerly City of Tokyo) has as big a population as the whole of Portugal (around 9 million). However, both cities share the following characteristics that make comparison possible and interesting:

- Long histories - History as a city began in Lisbon around the 800 BC and Tokyo started to form its urban area in late 12th century.
- Traditional values – Both cities possess valued cultural heritages but old values often endorse unwillingness to challenge established practices.
- Vulnerability to seismic disturbances - The most recent and destructive earthquake disaster happened in 1755 in Lisbon and in 1923 in Tokyo.
- Unrivalled domestic centres – Both cities are unrivalled socio-economic centres of their countries, though currently both face a no- or low-growth economic future.
- An assumption that the economy is a “bottomless-box” - Unjustifiable levels of public spending have been persistent, even though they have not demonstrated net benefit to the residents' lasting wellbeing in the city-region.
- Urban sprawl – Lenient controls on growth have resulted in unclear urban borders.
- Ageing population – People over 65 years old are expected to constitute about 40% of the urban population by 2050 in Tokyo city-region and 35% in Lisbon by 2060.
- Neighbourhood-scale functions and identities – Many neighbourhood-scale livelihood activities are accessed by walking or cycling, such as grocery shopping and schooling.

Both Lisbon and Tokyo city-regions have maintained characteristics as connections of neighbourhoodscale communities despite the history of uncontrolled urban growth. Such neighbourhoods are based on traditional values and have ageing populations. These city-regions also share large amount of conventional public spending (continuous large-scale urban redevelopment projects) that have not been significantly challenged by the local residents, even though this spending focus has often neglected neighbourhood-scale community activities and not demonstrated net benefit to residents' lasting wellbeing. The shared issues and characteristics will inform LCW framework generated in the section 4.

3 METHOD

We compare how planning for LCW has been approached in Lisbon and Tokyo through comparison, with particular attention to five illustrative and emerging features: vicinity, sense of place, urban (and suburban) farming, safety and learning. The comparison rests on the application of the five features as a framework that recognizes the noteworthy LCW-related issues facing the two city-regions. The five features have been generated as a synthesis that combines: (i) attention to the broad literature related to LCW, (ii) professional experience in a multiplicity of urban assessment and planning cases over the years, and (iii) implicit attention to generic requirements for progress towards sustainability, founded on sustainability assessment generic criteria by Gibson et al (2005). We have undertaken literature reviews and field research in both cities before starting dialog among the researchers. A visiting researcher walked with a local researcher through the neighbourhoods in both city-regions. The literature reviewed focused on forward-looking planning documents from government organizations in both the cityregions, and journal articles relating to LCW. The researchers had a dialog based on the three kinds of information (first-hand knowledge from the professional experience and field research, issues recognized by the local planners, and LCW considerations) in order to narrow down the focus with insights. A framework based on emerging features and sub features was created and applied to describe situations and issues of LCW in

neighbourhoods and city-regions in Lisbon and Tokyo in an attempt to illustrate changes in mind-sets and behaviours regarding health and liveability among people in these cities. Then the results are compared to identify similarities and differences, strengths and gaps, and implications for future planning in Lisbon and Tokyo. This serves as a test to turn the LCW framework more generally applicable in other cities facing similar challenges.

This study does not highly prioritize quantified data analysis, although descriptive stats may be used to show general past trends. In contrast, many studies in neighbourhood indicators seek precise and unbiased predictions of neighbourhoods' future through quantified data analyses (for example, Kingsley et al 2014), which requires precise boundaries of neighbourhoods. As discussed in the following sections, this study addresses neighbourhoods as areas that have flexible and dynamic boundaries depending on personal capacity and preference in distance to walk and cycle to obtain goods, services and activities on daily basis, and build up to city-region. It does not require rigid setting of neighbourhood boundaries.

However, there are administratively defined areas with fixed boundaries, such as municipality and city, which may or may not fit to neighbourhood and city-region. In this sense, a municipality could also be a unit for community if it offers organizations or relationships for mutual help among people. Thus, the results of the study would inform not only individual residents, their groups and interactions between them, but also those who work for government bodies that administer municipality or wider areas.

4 FRAMEWORK

4.1 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE KEY WORDS

In this section we develop an analytical framework to discuss how planning for LCW is approached in Lisbon and Tokyo through comparison, which recognizes the noteworthy LCW-related issues facing the two city-regions. In order to do so, key words such as lasting, community, neighbourhood, city-region, and wellbeing require careful operational definitions, to understand what LCW means for this study. The operational definition of LCW combined with the insight to issues and characteristics shared in both Lisbon and Tokyo (see section 2) will help to consolidate the framework.

4.1.1 NEIGHBOURHOOD, CITY-REGION AND COMMUNITY

In this paper community is understood as a relationship of people linked by individual participation, interaction and cooperation to support development of personal capacities for resilience and strengthen connections with other individuals and bodies who participate in groups such as families, schools, corporations, neighbourhoods, other organizations and collaborations of those (Murphy 1985 cited by Dangi and Jamal 2016, Buffel et al 2014, Khanlou and Wray 2014). Communities do not require living proximity and physical boundaries, and an individual may take part in multiple communities. Thus communities can overlap to form complex relationships of people. Most of the relationships, however, would stay within neighbourhood and city-region scale, where most of individual daily lives would go on physically and geographically.

Neighbourhood is a socially organized area with geographic location in which residents to go about their daily lives, living in reasonably close proximity but not necessarily being close friends or relatives (Elliot et al 2014, Kingsley et al 2014). Neighbourhood in this definition emphasizes a place where people have ability to obtain goods, services and activities on daily basis. Litman (2003, cited by Roseland 2012) calls this "accessibility", which assumes automobile and truck, transit, cycling and walking as modes, with focus on increasing transport system efficiency and safety through land use. Neighbourhood in this study advocates accessibility particularly by walking and cycling, considering that Lisbon and Tokyo have maintained vicinity of communities with ageing populations, as have many other city-regions. Such neighbourhoods would have flexible and dynamic boundaries depending on personal capacity and preference to walk and cycle some distance. In this sense, rigidly fixing and determining neighbourhood boundaries is not necessary, and probably impractical at least for this study. However, it is important to be clear about what neighbourhood means to inform creation of an analytical framework of LCW.

While the concept of neighbourhood does not necessarily entail functioning mutual support, having community characteristics is desirable for lasting wellbeing at the appropriate scale (e.g. mutual support among neighbours and people from local schools, etc). Many neighbourhoods of that sort build up to city-region (co-workers, school mates from city-regional high school or university, etc.) level within which community characteristics can also be found. City-regions can be grasped as structures of direct and indirect interdependence of people's activities, with context-dependent shifting boundaries over time, hopefully giving rise to diverse entrepreneurial and innovative outcomes (Scott, 2006, Collin et al 2003). With these notions, this study addresses the city-region as a flexible and dynamic area based on direct and indirect interdependence of people's activities for diverse entrepreneurial and innovative outcomes, connecting neighbourhoods with accessibility by transit as well as by foot and bicycle.

Overall, this study considers space of neighbourhoods as special areas with community characteristics building up to the city-region (also with community characteristics). The key organizational concepts are: - A neighbourhood as a socially organized area with flexible and dynamic geographic location to where people live in close proximity but not necessarily being close friends or relatives, and go about daily life with accessibility by foot and bicycle;

- A city-region as a flexible and dynamic geographic location based on direct and indirect interdependence of people's activities for diverse entrepreneurial and innovative outcomes, connecting neighbourhoods with accessibility by transit as well as by foot and bicycle; and
- A community as a relationship of people linked by individual participation, interaction and cooperation to support development of personal capacities for resilience and strengthen connections with other individuals and bodies who participate in groups such as families, schools, corporations, neighbourhoods, other organizations and collaborations of those.

4.1.2 WELLBEING

Wellbeing in a neighbourhood and city-region with community characteristics is satisfaction with individual life based on subjective evaluation of hedonic (looking for maximization of pleasure and minimization of pain) and eudaimonic (looking for realization of one's potential pursued through self-motivated, self-disciplined and prudent efforts) richness of human wellness and happiness (Elliot et al 2014, Boniwell 2016). It is also the collective evaluation of equitable and healthy access to good quality of goods, activities and essential community assets and services (such as food and housing; working, learning and recreation; transportation, parks, natural area and public space; and healthcare) (Merric and Martin 2014, Litman 2003) backed by interpersonal relationships for mutual help.

Community wellbeing can be significantly affected by global issues, such as climate change, globalized economic activities, immigration and refugee. In many cases, however, communities have limited capacity to directly counteract such issues by mitigating climate change (Gibson 2017), influencing decisions of multi-national corporations, ending the conflict happening somewhere far, and so on. Therefore, important factors of community wellbeing are not only creativity for providing personal and social satisfaction, but also resilience as capacity to respond to and accommodate change and disturbances. These capacities are obtained by community's characteristics to support development of personal capacity for resilience and strengthening relationships with others in the collaborative groups.

4.1.3 LASTING

The term "lasting" covers both immediate and long-term time frames. The specific time lengths of the "immediate" and "long-term" periods vary depending on the context. Thus it is difficult and probably insignificant to precisely define the time frames of "lasting". However, when an operational definition is demanded, it is useful to look into implications for future generations who are powerless at the point of decision making, which implies more than 100 years ahead. Prolonging community wellbeing is based on the maintaining the integrity of socio-ecological systems (Ostrom, 2009) and maintenance of their life support functions, while paying attention to intra- and intergenerational equity (Kumagai et al, 2010). In this study, "lasting" implies the idea of embracing benefits of both current and future generations, and celebrating creativity and resilience of community for providing wellbeing. It entails behavior change and acknowledgement of culture including policy and governance. Culture as "that complex whole which

includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.’ (Tyler 1870: 1 cited by Avruch 1998: 6). A policy is like a road-map with defined objectives, priorities, rules and mechanisms to implement the objectives that provide guidance to subsequent activities, while governance can be understood as ‘the totality of interactions, in which government, other public bodies, private sector and civil society participate, aiming at solving societal problems or creating societal opportunities’ (Meuleman 2008: 11).

4.2 HOW EXISTING LITERATURES ADDRESS LCW-RELATED MATTERS

The literatures precisely addressing lasting community wellbeing have not been found, but there are articles providing insights about community wellbeing and related lasting values (see Table 1 for summarized contents). Both of the reports from Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2015) and Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW 2016) are based on their original indicators, which provide strictly parallel data sets to measure the current status of national-level wellbeing (member countries for OECD and Canada for CIW). Baldwin and King (2017) focused on social sustainability realized through public built environment promoting behaviors and mindsets that are good for community. Reviewing the literatures has revealed that this study shares many features with OECD (2015) approaches, which pay attention to such factors as housing, community (as support network), life satisfaction, recreation, health and safety. Also, Baldwin and King (2017) support our notion that sense of place is important for wellbeing.

This study recognizes the following possible issues relating to the approaches taken by the existing literatures. They inform framework creation for this study. The possible issues are:

- If the indicators were set too rigidly to obtain strictly parallel data sets, it would be difficult to pay particular attention to illustrative and emerging features of the case-specific situation of LCW.
- If the domains and indicators were too many, it would be difficult for wide variety of participants to understand the wellbeing situation in shared manner for deliberation.
- If the premise of the framework presents norms too rigidly (e.g. study and work for income to access to goods and services, behave well for community towards sustainability, etc.), similar problems as described above could occur.

Source	Lasting	Community	Wellbeing
OECD Better Life Index (2015)	The purposes are measuring the current status of wellbeing in the member countries, and encourage citizens' involvement in policy debate. Time scale behind the research is not clarified.	The “social connections” dimension is translated as “community”, and defined as strong social network that provides emotional support and access to jobs, services and other material opportunities.	The 11 dimensions are: income and wealth; jobs and earnings; work-life balance; housing; environmental quality; health status; education and skills; social connections; civic engagement and governance; personal security; and subjective wellbeing.
Canadian Index of Wellbeing (2016)	The purposes are to identify core Canadian values (wellbeing) and provide a comprehensive portrait of quality of life in Canada. Time scale behind the research is not clarified.	Focus is on “vital community” as a domain of wellbeing. Community seems understood as relationships among people, private, public and non-governmental organizations that foster individual and collective wellbeing.	The presence of the highest possible quality of life in its full breadth of expression focused on but not necessarily exclusive to: good living standards; robust health; a sustainable environment; vital communities; an educated populace; balance time use; high levels of democratic participation; and access to and participation in leisure and culture.
Baldwin and King (2017)	Social sustainability as people's quality of life now and in the future is sought. The premise is that planning and design of our public built environment should promote “pro-community behaviours” (behaviours and psychological responses that are good for community, as associated with social capital and cohesion).	Community is a group or networks of people who share a common sense of belonging based on shared connections such as geographic proximity, interests, socio-demographic characteristics, experience, emotional links or other common purposes.	A pro-community outcome that socially sustainable urban communities can achieve. Same as quality of life and health.

Table 1 – How existing studies address lasting community wellbeing

4.3 FRAMEWORK FOR LASTING COMMUNITY WELLBEING

4.3.1 LASTING COMMUNITY WELLBEING

Based on operational definitions and in face of the current state of the art above, this study describes LCW as satisfaction with individual life based on subjective evaluation of hedonic and eudaimonic richness of human wellness and happiness. It also includes collective evaluation of equitable and healthy access to good quality of goods, activities and essential community assets and services (such as food and housing; working, learning and recreation; transportation, parks, natural area and public space; and healthcare). The LCW is supported by interpersonal relationships for mutual help, which embraces benefits of both current and future generations, and celebrates creativity and resilience to prolong wellbeing at neighbourhoods connected by walking, biking and transit to build up to a city-region. It requires behavior change and acknowledgement of culture.

4.3.2 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR LCW

The operational definitions of LCW provide a foundation for generating the analytical framework of this study. Issues recognized both in Lisbon and Tokyo (vulnerability to seismic disturbances, urban sprawl, ageing population, and unjustifiable levels of public spending), and common characteristics based on traditional values (unwillingness to challenge established practices and resilient neighbourhood-scale communities) also inform the framework creation.

Similarities shared by Lisbon and Tokyo revealed the value of the neighbourhood-scale communities, wherein people can feel sense of place and belonging, moving by foot and bicycle, connected by transit or other kinds of soft transportation to build up to city-region. Neighbourhood in this sense emphasizes human-scale setting, which is highly relevant for discussions of planning for embracing health and liveability. Vicinity as physical and mental accessibility by foot, bicycle, trams and other soft transportation provides people the feeling that desired wellbeing-related objectives are close by. It allows people to move based on their capacity and preference, providing sense of place as individual feeling of autonomy, belonging, and social-ecological integration. Such feelings are linked to livelihood activities such as local commerce, artisan production, local public amenities and life support services, and inclusive activities. These features are valuable for neighbourhood and city-region with ageing population.

In terms of resilience, recreating and maintaining urban (and suburban) farming are particularly important for city-regions with a history of urban sprawl to absorb shocks from future socio-ecological disturbances (Kumagai et al 2014), such as outgoing enterprises, incoming immigrants, and natural disasters. Urban (and suburban) farming also provides bases for local food production, ecological services, local public amenities, and learning about socio-ecological integration. Vicinity, sense of place, and urban (and suburban) farming together provide important basis for LCW, but they must come with safety particularly in terms of transportation safety, crime prevention, and reduction of disaster damages. Lisbon and Tokyo share significant vulnerability to seismic and flooding risks, which are at least partially multiplied with uncontrolled sprawl and continuous large-scale urban physical development that have not demonstrated net benefit to neighbourhood-scale wellbeing. This failure may be a result of public unwillingness to challenge established practices often coupled with inertia in adopting new routines to respond to new challenges. There is a positive side of being based on traditional values that has contributed to the maintenance of neighbourhood-scale communities in Lisbon and Tokyo. However, LCW requires behaviour change and acknowledgement of culture in order to embrace benefits of both current and future generations, and celebrate creativity and resilience of community to prolong wellbeing. People who favour traditional values need to learn for developing their capacities and engaging in meaningful deliberation about responding to new challenges (Kumagai 2016).

Based on the argument above, the following five key features and related sub features were identified, drawing on the literature and field research:

- Vicinity– physical and mental accessibility by walking, bicycling, trams and other soft transportation (less car-dependent), feeling that desired wellbeing-related objectives are close by and that collective social relationships are relevant to individual liveability

- Sense of place – individual feeling of autonomy, belonging, and socio-ecological integration (linked to livelihood activities such as local commerce, artisan production, local public amenities and life support services, inclusive activities)
- Urban and suburban farming – food production (local agriculture and aquaculture), ecological services (retaining permeable surfaces, biodiversity, improved air quality), absorbing shocks from socio-ecological disturbances, local public amenities, learning about socio-ecological integration (connectivity to the land)
- Safety – reduction of disaster damages (especially seismic and flooding), crime prevention, transportation safety
- Learning – capacity building for personal resilience and strengthened collaborations, realizing meaningful community deliberation.

The list of sustainability-related emerging features and sub features provides a framework as a new entity.

It was applied to the reviewed plans from both cities to obtain implications throughout comparison.

5 CASE COMPARISON

5.1 LISBON

The shift to prioritizing lasting wellbeing is recent in Lisbon municipal planning and perhaps often undertaken on other premises, while it is not consciously perceived as contributing to LCW. However a number of actions, including measures in the latest master plan, adopted in 2014, as well as the municipal strategy for climate change and the increased space for cycling and walking reveals increasing focus of concern, attention and investment on the quality of public space, green infrastructures, slow mobility, solutions of urban proximity and increased public engagement. In addition municipal programmes such as the BipZip that promotes local partnerships, are contributing to creating LCW. The five features of the LCW framework can be illustrated in Lisbon as follows:

VICINITY

- Neighbourhood regeneration and improving quality of life, for example by improving the proximity of services, facilitating soft mobility (walking and bicycling), creating walkable streets with no traffic, promoting local commerce and the sense of community
- Higher quality public space, with shaded resting areas, major urban riverfront restoration, reduction of traffic lanes and introduction of more street trees and green road dividers, to enable walkability and liveability, as well as the possibility of enjoying the public place.

SENSE OF PLACE

- Promotion of space multi-functionality, including day care centres, residential housing, nursing homes and multifunctional spaces for seniors, sport facilities and activities (open runs, marathons, etc.), encouraging a healthy lifestyle, and adoption of legislation to protect the local commerce
- Increased walkability and cyclability of the city, together with improved cafes and esplanades, also delivers an improved sense of place through a greater enjoyment of the city, which however is increasingly affected by exponential tourism in the city that starts to keep citizens away from the most popular places that feature Lisbon

URBAN AND SUBURBAN FARMING

- At least in the last 10 years urban and suburban farming has been promoted in municipal land, including abandoned farmlands in Lisbon city and region (in Lisbon municipality and other municipalities in the city-region) to help less resourced families compensate for their low family economic income

- Originally to promote urban farming and recreational activities, such green spaces are now accounted as means to increase ecological services (namely by allowing better water infiltration through increased permeable surfaces) and serving as adaptation measures to climate change, with a general approach to green infrastructures.

SAFETY

- Increased seismic resistance of buildings and the capacity of city run-off, namely linked to green infrastructures as adaption measures to climate change, with benefits to reducing exposure to flooding events.

LEARNING

- Innovative forms of public engagement, including participative budget design, programs for social innovation and start-ups to enable community learning processes, and attempts to mitigate unemployment, but also to engage the youth in creative activities

This is happening at the same time that tourism is exploding with levels of demand never seen before. Historical built heritage is being rehabilitated and conserved and new business development conditions are created to attract people and promote wealth generation activities. But no doubt there are also visible signs of the emergence of the five features listed above.

5.2 TOKYO

The latest annual planning reports issued by Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT) on development of the Capital Region (MLIT 2017) is analysed here as the main information source through the lens of the LCW framework. The Capital Region consists of Tokyo's city region and its hinterlands. The plans for Tokyo still retain the long-standing assumption that economic growth can and should continue forever and will automatically deliver wellbeing (e.g., development of a more efficient road system including three ring-road expressways overarching the region for the 2020 Olympics and engineering-centred disaster prevention). However, the plan promotes and recognizes changes in mind-sets and behaviours regarding LCW embracing health and liveability among people living in the city region. These changes are illustrated according to the framework as follows:

VICINITY

- Promoting municipal plans to concentrate public facilities for elderly- and child-care services around train stations and networking them throughout redevelopment projects.

SENSE OF PLACE

- Encouraging remote working and/or fewer work hours to improve system modularity of businesses, and let people spend more time off work.
- Improving landscape, schools and other cultural facilities, urban parks, healthcare and welfare (elderly and child-care) capacities (these items are recognized separately, but can be integrated in terms of sense of place).

URBAN AND SUBURBAN FARMING

- Putting abandoned farmlands back in production, promoting community farmlands, and recognizing multi-facet benefits (food production, ecological services, disaster evacuation, local amenity) of urban farmlands.
- Applying more biodiversity-friendly methods in public (shore protection) works.

SAFETY

- Prioritizing improvement of overall counter-disaster (especially against earthquake and flooding) capability (hard infrastructure, rescue plans and self help).

LEARNING

- Promoting government-led programs to build the capacities of NPOs (non-profit organizations) and individuals (MLIT 2014, TMG 2014).

It is evident that the official plans recognize changes in mind-sets and behaviours regarding LCW embracing health and liveability. However, the focus of the plans is still large-scale growth-oriented construction projects and the plans lack attention to their possible impacts on lasting wellbeing in communities. For example, the plans emphasize significance in developing more efficient road system (particularly for freight traffic of goods and industrial wastes), but they do not deal with consequent safety and environmental (e.g. noise, vibration and exhaust) issues for residents in the neighbourhoods. Also, urban and suburban farming is encouraged in the plans, but possible land contamination (due to industrial use in the past and 2011 disaster) is not clearly addressed. These characteristics imply unwillingness to challenge established practices as general mindsets of people in Tokyo. However, changes in mind-sets and behaviours towards more sustainable lifestyles is increasingly crucial, as it is highly questionable that such large-scale development projects are appropriate for a city with an ageing and declining population. Attention to changes regarding LCW embracing health and livability have just emerged in the plans for Tokyo.

5.3 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

The plans for Lisbon and Tokyo commonly recognize that conditions are being created that translate into a benefit of attention to matters related to LCW, and show some intention to promote actions such as small-scale farming on community lands with improved physical accessibility as well as a sense of belonging to a place. However, in both cities, unwillingness to challenge established practices coupled with inertia in adopting new routines to respond to new challenges is still visible in preserved overconfidence on engineering solutions and over-spending of public money relating to them. Also due to the same attitude, community learning has been largely government driven rather than community-based and independent. Overall, governments in both cities, rather than community organizations, have so far led initiatives to strengthen LCW-related characteristics. Even as if, like in the BipZip programme in Lisbon, the municipality aims to promote the programme through local partnerships with citizens, local organizations and the local commerce. But there are clearly insufficient bottom-up initiatives that start from citizens' initiative directly.

The differences include particular distinctions between the existing transportation systems in the two cities, as well as people's overall degree of passiveness to government initiatives. For example, Tokyo is planning for concentration of public facilities around existing train stations that are accessible by walking, bicycling or bus links, thus creating a vicinity space, while Lisbon addresses streets and districts for placing multi-functional facilities close to people. On the other hand, the residents in Lisbon have better chance to participate in urban decision making, for example through participative budgeting, better access to information on municipal planning and strategies, while those in Tokyo seem to demand less on such crucial means to engage more actively and effectively in urban decision making.

Features	Similarities	Differences
Vicinity	Improved physical accessibility and belonging are sought.	Solutions are different (Tokyo utilizes existing train station networks, while Lisbon takes street and district as unit).
Sense of place	Unwillingness to challenge established practices is evident.	Changing work style (for shorter work hours) is promoted in Tokyo. Lisbon encourages street community initiatives and small local commerce to create sense of place.
Urban/suburban farming	Small-scale farming on community lands is promoted.	Possible contamination must be addressed in Tokyo.
Safety	Over-confidence on engineering solutions is evident.	Information (maps etc.) is more accessible in Lisbon.
Learning	Government-driven community learning is leading changes.	The government-led programs are campaign for volunteer work in Tokyo.

Table 2 - Similarities and differences between Lisbon and Tokyo over the emerging features

5.4 STRENGTHS AND GAPS

An evident strength of both Lisbon and Tokyo is that neighbourhood-scale livelihood activities still remain there, so people in these cities maintain a sense of place and would well understand the notion of a city region as a collection of neighbourhoods. Another strength is that governments have started to initiate projects and programs that feature sustainability-related characteristics at the neighbourhood scale. But people are not willing to challenge government initiatives. Because the government decisions in both cities have predominantly engaged engineering-centred solutions, it is crucial to change the thinking, behaviour and understanding of development, to encourage learning to appreciate and apply non-engineering solutions, and to engage people effectively in dealing with complex issues and options. It is important also to encourage people to develop and apply their capacity to engage with the government decision-makers even when that engagement may challenge the established practices. The challenge is how to encourage such behavioural changes for lasting community wellbeing both among the government decision-makers and non-government people living there.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Throughout the study, we have observed signs of change in Lisbon and Tokyo, particularly in terms of promoting community farming and improving the quality of public space and physical accessibility to public service facilities. These changes suggest a shift in values from basic economic priorities to more LCW-related initiatives. But such actions have not been mainstreamed yet. Thus, as implications for future planning in Lisbon and Tokyo (and for other cities facing similar challenges), our study also suggests continuing challenges that call for needs to encourage:

- People's confidence and sense of independence to participate in community deliberations;
- More innovative behaviour by decision-makers, planners and community residents; and
- Greater emphasis on initiatives and public engagement at the neighbourhood scale.

LCW-related initiatives are promising and often attractive but also challenging. If LCW is assumed it may increase the sense of ownership of the community in relation to its living place with benefits to the urban management capacity that will then be shared with the community. However adopting LCW involve matters of great complexity and require significant changes in thinking and behaviour. In Lisbon and Tokyo, and probably in many other cities, mainstreaming LCW-related initiatives requires mutual willingness of the community residents and government decision makers to work together, to agree on common grounds and share a common vision to the development of the city, even if it controverts past conducts. The neighbourhood with community characteristics, highlighting human-scale setting, offers an attractive base for innovative initiatives.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Avruch, K. 1998. Culture and Conflict Resolution. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press. in *What is Culture? A Compilation of quotations compiled by Helen Spencer-Oatey* https://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/globalpad/openhouse/interculturalskills/global_pad_-_what_is_culture.pdf
- Baldwin, C and King, R (2017) *What about the people? The socially sustainable, resilient community and urban development*. Report. Oxford: Oxford Brookes University
- Boniwell, Ilona. 2016. The concept of eudaimonic well-being. London: Positive Psychology UK. Available at <http://positivepsychology.org.uk/the-concept-of-eudaimonic-well-being> [Accessed November 26, 2016]
- Buffel, Tine, Free De Backer, Jeltzen Peeters, Chris Phillipson, Veronique Romero Reina, Ankelien Kindekens, Liesbeth De Donder, and Koen Lombaerts. 2014. Promoting sustainable communities through intergenerational practices. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 116, pp. 1785 – 1791.
- CIW, Canadian Index of Wellbeing. (2016) *How are Canadians Really Doing? The 2016 CIW National Report*. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Index of Wellbeing and University of Waterloo.
- CML (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa), 2009. *Relatório de Estado do Ordenamento do Território*. Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, Lisboa http://www.cmlisboa.pt/fileadmin/VIVER/Urbanismo/urbanismo/planeamento/pdm/docs/revisao/estudos/01_REOT.pdf
- CML (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa), 2009. *Memorandum Dinâmicas residenciais de/para a Cidade de Lisboa Inquiridos a residentes e a não residents*. Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, Lisboa http://www.cmlisboa.pt/fileadmin/VIVER/Urbanismo/urbanismo/planeamento/pdm/docs/revisao/estudos/1_Relatorio_Resultados_ViverLisboa.pdf
- CML (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa), 2012. *Plano Local de Habitação de Lisboa – 3ª fase (Concretizar)*. Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, Lisboa. <http://habitacao.cmlisboa.pt/index.htm?no =4010001>
- CML (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa), 2015. *Plano Diretor Municipal de Lisboa*. Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, Lisboa <http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planodiretor-municipal>
- Collin, J.P., M. Dagenais, and C. Poitras. (2003). "From city to city-region: Historical perspective on the contentious definitions of the Montreal Metropolitan Area." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 12(1): 16-34.
- Gibson, R.B. with Hassan, S., Holtz, S., Tansey, J and Whitelaw, G., 2005. *Sustainability Assessment: Criteria and Processes*, London: Earthscan.
- Gibson, R.B. 2017. *Sustainability assessment, climate change and lasting community wellbeing*. presented at International Association of Impact Assessment Annual Conference, Montreal, Quebec, Canada: IAIA.
- Khanlou, Nazilla & Ron Wray. 2014. A whole community approach toward child and youth resilience promotion: A review of resilience literature. *Int J Ment Health Addiction* 12:64–79 DOI 10.1007/s11469-013-9470-1
- Kingsley, G. Thomas, Claudia J. Coulton and Kathryn L. S. Pettit. 2014. *Strengthening communities with neighborhood data*. Urban Institute. Washington DC, USA.
- Kumagai, Y., R.B.Gibson, and P. Filion. 2010. Translating resilience into the urban context: Past successes and future uncertainties in Tokyo. *Critical Planning* vol. 17: 66-87. UCLA School of Public Affairs. CA, USA.
- Kumagai, Y., R.B.Gibson, and P. Filion. 2014. Evaluating long-term urban resilience through an examination of the history of green spaces in Tokyo. *Local Environment* vol. 20 no. 9: 1018-1039.
- Kumagai, Y. 2016. Applying a sustainability assessment framework to recovery plans in eastern Tohoku, Japan. in Gibson R.B. ed. 2016. *Sustainability Assessment -Applications and opportunities-*. Routledge. Abingdon, UK.
- Litman, Todd. 2003. *Measuring transportation: Traffic, mobility and accessibility*. Institute of Transportation Engineers, *ITE Journal*; Washington 73.10: 28-32.
- Merrick, Meg and Sheila Martin. 2014. *Creating and Using Neighborhood Data to Shape a More Equitable Regional Greenspace Policy*. in Kingsley, G. Thomas, Claudia J. Coulton and Kathryn L. S. Pettit. 2014. *Strengthening communities with neighborhood data*. Urban Institute. Washington DC, USA. p. 249-264.
- Meuleman L. 2008. *Public management and the metagovernance of hierarchies, networks and markets: the feasibility of designing and management governance styles*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

MLIT, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transportation and Tourism, 2014. White paper on development of the Capital Region [Shutoken hakusho]. Tokyo: Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transportation and Tourism, In Japanese.

MLIT, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transportation and Tourism, 2017. White paper on development of the Capital Region [Shutoken hakusho]. Tokyo: Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transportation and Tourism, In Japanese.

OECD. 2015. How's Life? 2015: Measuring Well-being, OECD Publishing, Paris (2015) Ostrom, E. A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems, Science 325, 419 (2009): 419-422.

Roseland, Mark. 2012. Toward sustainable communities: Solutions for citizens and their governments. New Society Publishers. Gabriola Island, BC, Canada.

Scott, A. J. (2006). "Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Industrial Development: Geography and the Creative Field Revisited." Small Business Economics 26(1): 1-24.

TMG, Tokyo Metropolitan Government, 2014. Tokyo Metropolitan long-term vision [Tokyo-to chouki vision]. Tokyo: Tokyo Metropolitan Government, In Japanese.

ID 1577 | CONNECTING FOOD WITH PLANNING PROFESSION: A REVIEW PAPER ON THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVOLUTION OF URBAN FOOD PLANNING, EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Hsiu Tzu Betty Chang¹; Chi Yun Lee¹

¹Department of Urban Planning, National Cheng Kung University
hsiutzuchang@mail.ncku.edu.tw ; fanchuntzu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The food system has been noticed by planning profession since the World Health Organization launched the Healthy Cities movement in the 1980s. As the result, countries gradually started to focus on the health, agricultural and urban food security issue and make efforts to create healthier and more liveable cities ever since. Food system has been regarded as production and consumption of food in general and could be divided into the policy and planning dimensions. Food policies are about agriculture, economic development, logistics and education can cooperate with each other in policy actions or how non-governmental organisations, farmers and other different stakeholders can work with the government. The spatial planning of urban food is related to how we can improve the access for people to get the healthy food and how to implement the sustainable urban food planning. In addition, urban design concerning the application of productive landscape and other tools are also parts of spatial interventions to urban agriculture and food city. Although food planning has gradually been discussed in recent years, there has been a lack of systematic review about this planning trend. In this paper, we reviewed the literature related to the subject of urban food planning since 1980. Through analysing articles in planning related journals, we created the literature maps and descriptive statistics that document the current development of food planning literature and organise them by the definition, themes, history, typology, evolution and future direction of food in connection with the planning research, practice and education. We wish to contribute to this emerging planning and design paradigm that concerning about food, public health, sustainability and the new rural-urban relationship.

KEYWORDS: healthy cities, food planning, urban agriculture, literature review, planning trend

1 INTRODUCTION

The food system has been noticed by planning profession since the World Health Organization launched the Healthy Cities movement in the 1980s. This reflects the increasing public concern on the food safety, food security and its relationship to toward a healthy and liveable environment. Food system contains two parts, including production and consumption, and could be considered by its policy and planning dimensions. In the policy dimension, it is about the cooperation between agriculture, economic