



Editorial from the Editor-in-Chief

The Canterbury earthquakes will dominate life in the Christchurch area, including Lincoln, for some time. It will also add a significant new element to planning research, education and practice in New Zealand generally. Lincoln University will be at the forefront of this and has already hosted well-attended forums bringing together local and international expertise on how to address the impacts of the earthquake in the short and long term. Planning students and staff have been actively involved in a variety of projects, some reported in this issue, contributing to the recovery. That we are still producing the *Lincoln Planning Review*, albeit a little late, is an example of the resilience and determination of our students and other contributors to the publication and we continue to look ahead.

In that context, 2011 saw the passage of the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act and the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Bill is on its way through the system. The implementation of both these pieces of legislation will pose interesting challenges for coastal and marine planners. The Canterbury Water Management Strategy has been advancing steadily with the first Zonal Implementation Plans being approved by their zonal committees, one of which is the Waihora Selwyn Zone in which our University sits. These, and amendments proposed for the Rakaia Water Conservation Order, will enable controversial intensified farming in the region while not leading to further *net* environmental degradation.

But perhaps the most significant feature of 2011 that is continuing into 2012, is the 'occupy movement'. Unlike many critics, I visited the occupied site in Auckland's Aotea Square (twice). For the record, I felt quite comfortable walking throughout the site, which took up a very small fraction of the Square. The site was not dirty and did not smell. Those occupiers I spoke with were predominantly people fully employed or with their own businesses. The message was quite clear: there is something seriously wrong if the disparities and inequities seen throughout the developed world continue to grow.

The occupiers come from many persuasions and causes and do not propose a single solution, but are united in their concern that what we are doing now is not sustainable, socially or environmentally. They are reminiscent of a grimmer 'hippie' movement, concerned about the future for themselves, their children and the world, and not distracted by circuses that entertain the masses.

I think they are right, and hope that planners can be similarly bold and subversive. Planning has provided public open spaces that enable peaceful demonstrations of this kind. Occupation is an appropriate use of such space, but the provision of open space has often been opposed by commercial interests and its occupation, by anything except commercial markets, demonised. Conventional planning, however, may be failing to adequately address the bigger picture through an over-emphasis on pseudo 'neutrality' and 'objectivity'. A

viable solution to the issues that gave rise to the 'occupy movement' is not obvious, but these issues are at the heart of planning. If we do not implement solutions fast, the future is much more bleak than the ongoing impacts of earthquakes.

Editor-in-Chief

Hamish G. Renwick