Submitted manuscripts
Manuscripts are to be sent to Madeleine Granvik (Madeleine.Granvik@slu.se) and Claus Bech-Danielsen (cbd@sbi.aau.dk) as a text file in Word, using Times New Roman font. Submitted papers should not exceed 8 000 words exclusive abstract, references and figures. The recommended length of contributions is 5 000–8 000 words. Deviations from this must be agreed with the editors in chief.
See Author's Guideline (http://arkitekturforskning.net/na/information/authors) for further information.

Subscription
Students/graduate students
Prize: 27.5 Euro.
Individuals (teachers, researchers, employees, professionals)
Prize: 38.5 Euro.
Institutions (libraries, companies, universities)
Prize: 423 Euro.

Membership for the association
5.5 Euro (for individuals who get access to the journal through institutions).

Students and individual subscribers must inform about their e-mail address in order to get access to the journal. After payment, send the e-mail address to Trond Haug, trond.haug@sintef.no.

Institutional subscribers must inform about their IP-address/IP-range in order to get access to the journal. After payment, send the IP-address/IP-range to Trond Haug, trond.haug@sintef.no.

Payment
Sweden, pay to: postgirokonto 419 03 25–3
Denmark, pay to: Danske Bank 16780995, reg.nr. 3409
Finland, pay to: Danske Bank 800013–70633795, IBAN code FI30 8000 1370 6337 95
Norway, pay to: Den Norske Bank 7877.08.13769

Outside the Nordic countries pay in Euro to SWIFT-address: PGS ISESS Account no: 4190325–3, Postgirot Bank Sweden, SE 105 06 Stockholm.

CONTENTS

Photo on the front cover: "Urban Bike Scapes, New York: Architectural analysis for a new urban typology".
Photographer: Line Marie Bruun Jespersen

ARCHITECTURAL POLICY PROGRAMMES IN FINLAND – PERSPECTIVES ON LOCAL LEVEL

PETRI TUORMALA

Abstract

Architectural policy has emphasized issues regarding the quality of the built environment in decision-making since 1990 in several European countries. In 1998, the Finnish government approved an architectural policy for Finland that has later been adopted as a model for many policies on regional and local levels. Although architectural policy has established itself in several municipalities, few studies have discussed ways in which these policies seek to influence public decision-making locally.

Through architectural policy programmes, a number of EU countries have sought to promote the significance of architecture and integrated the concept of architecture into the public debate. General objectives recorded in the national programmes are concretized in municipal policies and strategies. In Finland, several cities have defined quality principles regarding the built environment in their local architectural policy programmes. In municipal planning, there has been a strong emphasis on the interactive approach since the beginning of the 21st century. Active communication and open planning also play a key role in architectural policy. The established structures and planning culture of municipalities have, however, often been seen as obstacles to genuine interaction.

This paper explores the mechanisms through which the local architectural policy programmes aim to promote the significance of architecture in municipalities. The frame of reference is the theory of communicative planning, which emphasizes understanding of the diverse values and backgrounds of the different parties in the planning process. The research method has been to employ material-based qualitative content analysis to explore the objectives written into the programme texts. The analysis has been restricted to 13 local architectural policy programmes published in Finland in 2002–2015.

The study shows that architectural policy opens new interactive channels alongside the established practices. On the other hand, it also meets the challenges of communicative planning in practical measures.

Architectural policy facilitates interaction both within a municipality's internal organization and with external interest groups by broadening the knowledge base, developing operating practices, and diversifying communication.

1. Introduction

Architectural policy promotes quality of the built environment by highlighting architecture on the political agenda. Several European countries have defined objectives regarding the physical environment that have been recorded in architectural policy programmes both at national and local levels. The role of the architectural policy varies considerably from country to country. In Finland, architectural policy has been adopted as part of local and regional policies and strategies. Finnish cities and municipalities have predominantly implemented architectural policy by local level actions since the beginning of the 21st century. With these documents, cities have aimed to establish the concept of architecture and quality principles with a part of the local planning culture and political decision-making.

1.1 Development of architectural policy

The background of architectural policy can be linked to modern European urban policy. Growing urban areas have caused a number of challenges related to segregation, housing shortage and health problems throughout history. Since the early 20th century, efforts have been put to respond to these challenges by political measures. Various policies were intended mainly to improve the conditions of the poorest sections of the congested urban areas (Cochrane, 2007). After the 1970s, what changed in Europe was the focus in urban policy and cities began to intensify land use, improve physical environment and boost economy by urban policy actions. Before that, the question was more about urban social policy, aimed at influencing living conditions in cities (Aronen and Hartikainen, 1995).

In connection with policy measures, the concept of architecture arose for the first time on the EU level in 1985 when the European Commission adopted Council Directive (85/384/EEC) regarding the education of architects (Bento, 2012). France, the Netherlands, Ireland, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom, Italy and Belgium were the first countries to draw up architectural policy programmes in the 1990s (Archinfo, 2015a). Since the 21st century, architectural policy has consolidated its position in several European countries. In 2012, an official document related to government policy on architecture was adopted in 16 EU member states and another 12 were planning to develop one (Bento, 2012).

Themes considered important in Finnish and European urban policy in the 21st century include urban competitiveness, social cohesion, com-

munity structure and challenges posed by climate change. In addition, a variety of policy measures have been put forward to increase the attractiveness of urban areas. With these policies, the meaning of architecture and quality of physical environment has been recognized at both the EU and national levels. Architecture is presently seen as an integral part of the urban policy and recognized as an important resource for increasing national identity and competitiveness of cities.

Practices related to the architectural policy at the national level vary in the EU countries. Depending on local circumstances, the member states promote national architecture and quality of the built environment by means of legislation, comprehensive policy and sectorial policy. In France and Sweden, the architectural policy is controlled through national legislation. The Swedish parliament approved an act regarding architecture in 1998, entitled *Forms for the Future – An Action Plan for Architecture and Design*. The French law of architecture (1977) proclaimed the public interest of architecture and reinforced the status of profession of architect.

On the other hand, the vast majority of the European countries outline objectives related to architecture, cultural heritage and urban design by general policy. The policy documents include objectives and measures regarding public administration and ministries such as the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Environment. Architectural policy documents in both Finland (1999) and Denmark (2014) have a general policy. Furthermore, Cyprus, England and Wales do not have one single architectural policy document. Architecture and quality of the built environment are promoted in separate sectors. In several EU countries, the responsibility for architectural policy is assigned to the ministry of environment or ministry of culture. Nevertheless, the form of national architectural policy is largely affected by the cultural, political, legal and historical context (Bento, 2012.)

1.2 General principles of architectural policy

This study demonstrates that architectural policy programmes consider issues regarding quality of the built environment on various scale levels. Strategically important functions, practices and strengths are identified and brought forward through everyday experience of parties responsible for programme work.

Measures on the local level are essential for the effectiveness of architectural policy. In addition to general principles, programmes at the local level include tangible measures to improving the physical environment. Local level policies steer the action, but also bring forward required measures and define the responsible parties. In municipalities, examples of results of architectural policy programmes include quality objectives regarding the construction, practices and cooperation between sepa-

rate administrative sectors (Ylinen and Pahkasalo, 2011). Architectural policy programmes can also promote public identity of cities in which a new urban image or local bases are highlighted (Äikäs, 2004). The available resources, local practices and key actors have a significant effect on the way architectural policy is implemented in single cases.

In the public sector and municipalities, a number of researchers have criticized the meaningfulness of municipal strategies. The real meaning of the strategy work is not understood and it has been seen as a routine activity in municipalities (Möttönen, 2012). Furthermore, the architectural policy can be seen as a superficial proclamation that conveys a false impression of the political reality (Nyman, 2008). Although architectural policy has established itself among other municipal strategies, only a few studies have explored the motives behind such policy actions. What is not yet clear is the role of the architectural policy among all the other strategies.

Since the 1980s, strategic planning in Finnish municipalities has been based on a classical model that represents rational methodology. However, the municipal organization and its operating environment have become increasingly complex in the 21st century, which is why communication during the process and between different parties has been increasingly emphasized in municipal planning (Strandman, 2009; Möttönen, 2012; Jalonen, 2007). Municipal strategies and programmes, such as architectural policy, also accentuate active interaction that is an operational requirement in a network-like operating environment.

1.3 Aims of this paper

This paper outlines the ways in which measures written into architectural policy programmes promote interaction between different participants. The paper discusses relationships both within the municipality's internal organization and with external reference groups.

The frame of reference in the study is the ideal of communicative planning. It is based on open interaction and democratic decision-making that takes into account people's different backgrounds (e.g. Healey, 1997; Forester, 1993; Sager, 1994). The research method applied is material-based qualitative content analysis, which the study adopts to identify common characteristics between objectives written into programme texts. The study highlights measures in the programme texts, the aim of which is to increase interaction both within the internal city organization and with external interest groups. The project examines local-level architectural policy programme texts that have been published in Finland between 2002 and 2015.

The paper examines ways in which the measures documented into the programmes facilitate open interaction in accordance with the com-

municative planning ideal. The paper analyses the possible discussion forums and arenas that architectural policy programmes exploit and means through which they support an understanding and a common language between the participants. In addition, the paper reveals the key challenges that architectural policy poses.

To sum up, the paper outlines the limitations that the municipal organization imposes on the targets of architectural policy. The project puts forth methodology needed for enhancing the effectiveness of the programme texts. The research also suggests ways in which architectural policy programmes support open interaction in accordance with the communicative planning ideal.

2 Architectural policy in Europe

The architectural policy at the European level dates back to 1985 when the European Commission adopted a directive on the training of architects. The directive defined certificates, diplomas and other evidence of formal qualifications in architecture that are adopted in EU member states (Bento, 2012). The goal of the directive was to standardize the minimum requirements of education in the field of architecture. For the first time, the issue concerning the profession of architects was raised on the political agenda. By this directive, qualitative and quantitative criteria were set for the profession of architects in order to ensure the quality of planning regarding the physical environment.

2.1 Architecture on the EU political agenda

The importance of architectural policy was strengthened under the Dutch EU Presidency in 1997, when representatives from various governments, cultural institutions and organizations were gathered to exchange views of European architectural policy. As a result, the European Forum for Architectural Policies (EFAP) was originated (Bento, 2012). The Forum aims to promote cooperation between EU member states, disseminate information and foster architectural policies in Europe (EFAP, 2015). EFAP raises various political statements and objectives related to architectural policy in order to influence the EU key ministries and bodies. The cooperation is encouraged by various seminars and public events regarding architecture. EFAP conferences have been organized as part of the formal and informal programme of EU presidencies (Archinfo, 2015b).

In addition to EFAP, Architects' Council of Europe (ACE) is an example of an organization that boosts cooperation between European architects. The Council was founded in 1990 in order to promote architecture and foster the professional status of architects in the EU. A recent example of public events organized by ACE and EFAP was the international conference entitled *EU Cities Reloading on Strategies and Policies for Urban*

Regeneration. The conference was organized during the 2014 Triennale di Milano. It brought together various parties, such as political leaders and urban planners to discuss the economic, social and environmental challenges of urban areas.

In addition to various public events, architectural policy is highlighted in several EU resolutions. Architectural policy was raised on to the political agenda in 2000, after EFAP drafted a proposal for a resolution on the quality of architecture. The final Council resolution (2001/C73/04) was adopted by the European Council in February 2001. It can be considered the first comprehensive architectural policy document at the European level (Bento, 2012). In addition to the quality of public spaces, the resolution highlights social cohesion, urban diversity and continuity of the built environment. The resolution aims to inspire cooperation and networking in the field of architecture and it calls to promote architecture in policies regarding construction and the physical environment. It also encourages students and professionals to mobility, cooperation and exchange of good practices (2001/C73/04). In short, this resolution placed architecture on the political agenda by highlighting its impacts on everyday life in both urban and rural areas.

Several political statements between the EU politics have promoted architectural policies. In the 2000s, the political document named Leipzig Charter was aimed to improve urban living conditions and promote sustainable development. The Charter, approved in 2007, outlined large-scale urban policy principles and strategies concerning the development of regions in terms of economic, social and physical environment. The Charter emphasizes the meaning of urban design, architecture and environment as a part of holistic strategy to respond to urban problems (2007/2190(INI)). The results of the Leipzig Charter have been monitored in the resolution on the *Follow-up of the Territorial Agenda and the Leipzig* Charter that was adopted in the European Parliament in 2008 (2009/C184E/15). It concluded that the objectives of the Leipzig Charter could only be achieved by cross-sectoral strategies, which are implemented on separate administrative levels.

2.2 Impacts of the EU resolutions

Since then, the importance of the quality of architecture as an integral part of sustainable urban development has been recognized in various policies such as *Culture's contribution to sustainable development* (Council Conclusions, 2008/C319/05) which was adopted by European Council in 2008. The conclusion accentuates the cultural, economic and social dimensions of architecture and calls on member states for cross-sectorial cooperation in order to foster the quality of the built environment. According to the conclusion (2008/C319/05), architecture plays a key role in fostering sustainable urban development. It clearly indicates, the concept of architecture had been permanently adopted on

the political agenda and architectural policy has established itself as an explicit public policy on the European level.

However, this is also the case where the general interest is directed to the effectiveness of policy measures. In 2005 and 2012, the European Forum for Architectural Policies examined the impacts of the resolutions on the national architecture policies in the EU member states. A survey regarding national architecture policies (2012) concluded that the resolution no. 2001/C73/04 and conclusion no. 2008/C 319/05 have supported and encouraged architectural policies at the national level in separate EU member states. Above all, the resolutions have stimulated those countries which are at the beginning of the process regarding architectural policy. Bento (2012) notes that EU resolutions regarding architecture can be considered soft policy that is not mandatory for the member states. Nevertheless, the survey revealed that there is no need for a more direct approach by the European Union. Still, some countries called for more European research regarding the effectiveness of architectural policy on the local level.

2.3 Architectural policy in Finland

In 1998, the Finnish government approved an architectural policy programme prepared by a workgroup set by the Ministry of Education. The national programme has later been adopted as a model for many policies on regional and local levels. The Finnish architectural policy programme included 24 measures, the implementation of which has been the responsibility of several different sectors, such as cultural and environmental administration and operators responsible for construction. The monitoring report published in 2002 emphasizes that programmes drafted on regional and municipal level are the key to the effectiveness of architectural policy. Their objectives can be fleshed out and made part of practical operations (Working Group on the follow-up to the Architectural Policy Program, 2002). Many national themes, such as ones related to architectural education, the quality level of public construction and communication, are repeated in architectural policy programmes on regional and municipal levels. A key goal of the Finnish architectural policy has been the utilization of architectural education in supporting citizens' ability to understand architecture and improve their opportunities to participate in discussion and decision-making related to the built environment. This goal was also supported by the *Land Use and Building Act* passed in the early 21st century, which emphasized interaction, communication and transparent decision-making.

In Finland, architectural policy has been actively promoted on both the regional and local level since the beginning of the 21st century. Responsibility for national-level architectural policy was transferred to the Ministry of the Environment in 2010. An architecture information centre supported by the Ministry of Education and Culture started operating in

2013 with the promotion of architectural policy in Finland as one of its operating principles. Architecture Information Centre Finland has actively promoted exchange of information on architectural policy through various seminars and excursions. Collaboration between municipalities and international participation in the promotion of architectural policy have played a key part in its operation (Valpola, 2015.)

Local and regional level policies and strategies have strongly contributed the role of architecture policy in Finland. Objectives related to city identity, public space, landscape, urban art and architectural heritage are examples of themes that aim to direct public attention to the features of the physical environment. By the end of 2015, there have been six published regional and thirteen local programmes. These programmes include general objectives and measures seeking to support and guide practices related to land use and construction on a regional level. In addition to general objectives, these regional programmes include recommendations and objectives related to municipal operating practices, such as the maintenance of building legacy, building control and interaction.

Responsibility for the preparation of regional programmes rests mainly on regional councils and regional art committees, but in many cases, a large number of experts from different fields and regional operators have also participated in the preparatory work. Decision-making related to the built environment and land use in Finland is mainly left to the municipalities. In many cases, regional programmes represent a statement about the state of the built environment, and their objectives can be interpreted as recommendations, meaning that practical measures will be decided on during municipal-level planning and decision-making.

2.4 Finnish architectural policy on the local level

On the local level, the role of the architectural policy varies greatly from municipality to municipality. The available recourse, local practices and key actors have a significant effect on architectural policy implementations in single cases. The programme texts guide the action, but they also bring forward the required measures and define the parties responsible for implementation. While operating environments and organizations vary in municipalities, the architectural policy programmes are formed in policy processes that are similar.

In most cases, strategically important functions, practices and strengths of organization are identified through the everyday experience of parties responsible for programme work. Office holders in urban planning and zoning departments are typically responsible for the preparation of architectural policy programmes. Strategic objectives and "the red thread" are created through a bottom-up process, in which a particular

sector, such as the urban planning department, manages work and the municipal decision-making body, such as the board or the council, finally approves the programme.

Although the initial starting points and objectives are typically formulated by one administrative sector, the actual programming includes diverse interactions between separate municipal sectors, decision-makers and external stakeholders. Information is transmitted through a variety of seminars, workshops and websites. The aim is also to enable residents to communicate their point of view related to the built environment and local architecture. In addition to the local residents, the events and seminars aim to involve specific groups of people, such as representatives of business and construction. Various reference groups and administrative sectors have been included prominently in the preparation of the architectural policy. In this way, the architectural policy is formed as a shared public strategy that everyone has opportunity to influence.

In 2011, the Finnish Ministry of the Environment commissioned a study of experiences from cultural environment and architectural policy programmes. Based on the interviews of the office holders, the report states that the architectural policy is realized only partially via programme texts. The objectives that are recorded in the programmes provide guidelines and good examples promoting the quality of the built environment. In addition, architectural policy has brought about several events and awards regarding the quality of construction and other quality-governing bodies such as cityscape advisory boards. According to the office-holders, architectural policy can be seen as a continuous process that requires constant interaction between various parties, such as politicians, administrative sectors, builders, investors and residents. A wider context enables to process complex questions with which the established design practices or sector limits do not allow to interfere. As a result of active interaction, programmes have increased co-operation between different administrative sectors and reformed municipal practices. The office holders responsible for the architectural policy emphasize that the preparation of the policy is a learning process that enables discussion of the meaning of the quality in built environment (Ylinen and Pahkasalo, 2011.)

Municipal strategies and programmes for architectural policy can be seen as programme-based actions by which separate administrative sectors are influenced. Texts outline choices and measures improving the quality of the built environment. In architectural policy programmes, we can identify the standard structure of a strategy text: description of the operating environment (current situation), vision, objectives (strategic aims) and means by which the objectives can be reached (Sorsa, et al., 2010). Although architectural policy programmes represent a classical strategy model based on a rational planning culture, the programme texts also include objectives and measures that support communicative planning principles.

Table 1
Architectural policy programmes published in Finland between 1998 and 2015

Level	Published	Publisher	Pages
National level			
The Finnish Arhitectural Policy	1999	Arts Council of Finland and Ministry of Education	28
Regional level			
Our Shared Metropolis – The Architecture Policy Objectives 2014-2020 for the Helsinki-Uusimaa Region	2014	Helsinki-Uusimaa Regional Council, Architecture Information Center Finland and Uusimaa ELY Center	44
			42
Our Common Metropolis – An Architectural Policy for the Uusimaa and Itä-Uusimaa Regions	2009	Uusimaa Regional Environment Center Uusimaa Regional Council Regional Council of Itä-Uusimaa	
The Architectural Policy Programme of Satakunta	2012	The Arts Council of Satakunta	64
The Architectural Programme of Häme	2007	Hämeen arkkitehdit, SAFA	40
The Architectural Policy Programme of Southwest Finland	2006	Regional Council of Southwest Finland and The Arts Council of Southwest Finland	23
The Architectural Policy of Eastern Finland The Architectural Policy Programme of Eastern Finland Province	2000	The Arts Council of South Savo The Arts Council of North Savo The Arts Council of North Karelia	27
Local level			
The City of Vantaa Architectural Programme The City of Vantaa Architectural Strategy	2015 2005	City of Vantaa	60 52
Tyrnävä´s Cultural Environment and Architectural Policy Programme	2012	Municipality of Tyrnävä	48
The City of Lohja Architectural Policy Programme	2009	City of Lohja	39
The City of Helsinki Architectural Policy Programme Helsinki Architecture Now!	2010 2006	City of Helsinki	144 58
The City of Lahti Architectural Policy Programme	2010	City of Lahti	14
The City of Turku Architectural Policy Programme	2009	City of Turku	28
The City of Kuopio Architectural Policy Programme	2007	City of Kuopio	44
The City of Lappeenranta Architectural Programme	2007	City of Lappeenranta	30
The City of Tampere Architectural Programme	2004	City of Tampere	
The City of Oulu Architectural Policy	2002	City of Oulu	23
Jyväskylä Architectural Policy The City of Jyväskylä´s Architectural Policy Programme	2002	City of Jyväskylä	30

3   Theoretical framework

3.1 Communicative approach

In the 1990s, the most famous proponents of the communicative plan-
ning theory were Tore Sager (1994), John Forester (1993) and Patsy Hea-
ley (1997). The communicative approach emphasizes the importance
of diverse values in the planning process. According to communicative
theorists, the solution is not found through a top-down strategy, but
the strategy must take into account the views of different parties. The
search for a solution begins in interactive forums enabling learning and
understanding. According to social constructivism, information is seen
as socially constructed. The communicative approach also highlights
the political nature of the planning process. The task of the planner is to
direct the interaction and recognize the various backgrounds and values
influencing the planning process (Healey, 1997).

Healey calls for the formulation of strategy that gives room for different
views. It may not be a predefined technical process in which operating
environment has been defined in advance. It is important to recognize
that people operate within different frames of reference where the back-
grounds and needs of individuals are different from each other. In the
planning process, information and understanding emerge through mu-
tual interaction and collaboration. New solutions are available to quest-
ions dealt with during the strategic process, if one is able to recognize
the different ways in which individuals operate and form information.
In addition, a shared understanding that the arguments used by various
participants are based on different viewpoints and appreciations (Hea-
ley, 1997).

According to the ideal of communicative planning, the political commu-
nity should also maintain constant criticism of the strategy. This way,
different operators will have an opportunity to challenge the dominant
view and introduce new perspectives to the discussion. At the same
time, the political community should also constantly create principles
that allow the conciliation of conflicting goals and interests (Healey,
1995). The communicative theory emphasizes the role of the planner in
the process. The planner acts as an organizer whose responsibility is to
persuade different groups to participate and enable new perspectives.
According to the communicative ideal, the actual problem is solved
through in a transparently democratic process in which the planner's
task is to highlight issues and direct the discussion (Forester, 1993).

3.2 Criticism of communicative planning ideal

The communicative planning theory has recently been heavily criticised.
In practice, the political-administrative system sets many restrictions
to communicative planning in which the values and goals of all parties
are equally represented. A model based on Habermas' (1984) theory of

communicative action, participation enabling a neutral and value-free environment, has been seen as unrealistic especially from the perspective of power relations. Practical action has been viewed as often being too far from the ideals and rhetoric of communicative theory. The communicative ideal model does not take into account the power relations, historical context, economic power factors or individual motives that form the real frame of reference for interaction and decision-making (Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002; Hillier, 2002; Flyvbjerg, 1998; Fainstain, 2000).

The selection of information formed during the planning process has also been regarded as one of the challenges of the communicative approach. Through direct popular participation, for example, it is possible to obtain much local information to support the planning process. However, it is the municipal office holders who largely determine what information is relevant to the political-administrative. The information received through direct participation can be applied more efficiently if there is active discussion between the planners and the participants already during the early stages of the process (Bäcklund, 2007).

On the other hand, the communicative approach has been criticized for endless interaction that leaves the actual content-related questions unanswered. According to Fainstain (2000), the communicative approach does not address the actual solution and concentrates too much on the process itself and the role of the planner in it. If too much faith is put in consensus-oriented interaction, actual content-related questions fall in the background and the process forms an endless circle (Sotarauta, 1996). A key question is how matters are discussed and how they are finally brought to the political agenda. From the perspective of strategy formation, programmed responses are pointless if common understanding of the nature of the problem cannot be determined or interpretation is inconsistent (Dunn, 1994).

The structures of Finnish municipalities are still influenced by the comprehensive-rational planning model and the operating practices of representative democracy. In the municipal operating environment, office holders, elected officials and residents assume established roles. In the operation of municipalities, the rights and responsibilities of different operators also largely define the ways of interaction and formation of information. In order for communicative theoretical approaches to be able to genuinely support and clarify practical planning, the limitations and established practices of the municipal operating environment should first be studied empirically (Bäcklund and Mäntysalo, 2009).

4 Methods for communication in architectural policy (results)

This section examines architectural policy programmes from the point of view of communicative planning theory. The content analysis includes 13 local level programmes that have been published in Finland since 2000. First, the paper introduces measures by which cities seek to promote the communicative planning culture. Second, the measures repeated in the programme texts are classified under three key themes (A, B and C). Based on the results of the content analysis, the paper highlights the relationship between the key themes and communicative planning ideal and discusses the themes from the point of view of communicative planning theory.

4.1 A: Broadening the knowledge base

The importance of architectural education and research has been identified in many architectural policy programmes as an important channel of interaction. The objectives related to education include increased expertise within the organization, reforms and stimuli and improving awareness of external interest groups. Measures in several programmes include organizing lectures and discussions and field trips aimed at decision-makers and different branches of administration. Environmental education and clubs for children are also mentioned in several programmes. The aim is to utilize schools from kindergartens and pre-schooling all the way to universities and research institutions.

Increasing understanding between different parties is listed as the main objective of education. There are plans to include architecture in the environmental education and increase the number of school visits of urban planners (City of Lohja, 2009). The urban environment will also be included in teaching materials at kindergartens and schools (e.g. City of Tampere, 2004). The objective of the city of Kuopio programme (2007) is to include the basics of the history of construction and architecture in education in the fields of construction and the environment. In the city of Lappeenranta (2007), children and youths are introduced to their own living environment with the help of an architectural education programme. Architectural education is targeted at schools and kindergartens as well as all residents, including planners and decision-makers.

Increasing urban studies is also seen as a means of emphasizing the importance of architecture. For large cities, collaboration with universities is part of architectural policy. The aim is to lower the boundaries between architecture-related research and practical work through various collaborative projects. Research is viewed most importantly as a resource, the utilization of which enables the creation of innovations. Know-how and application of resources at architectural schools has been listed as an objective in the programme texts of city of Helsinki (2006; 2010), city of Tampere (2004) and city of Oulu (2002). Student

projects and research collaboration are examples of measures related to architectural schools.

Key measures for broadening the knowledge base:
- Education
- Field trips
- Research
- Discussion events
- Articles

4.2 B: Developing the operating practices

One of the key aims in architectural policy programmes is to influence current operating practices. Improving both the organizations´ internal and external collaboration are highlighted in many programme texts as an important measure. Measures for internal collaboration include new task groups, cityscape commissions and cross-administrative project work.

There have also been efforts to develop the internal operating practices of organizations through new job positions and expert groups (e.g. City of Helsinki, 2010; City of Jyväskylä, 2002; City of Lahti, 2010; City of Turku, 2009; City of Lohja, 2009). Other aims include reserving sufficient resources for planning and ensuring the competence of planners (e.g. City of Lohja, 2009; City of Oulu, 2002). There have been efforts to specify the direction of construction and common rules with various environmental guidelines and quality certifications. The main objective of the measures has been the improvement of communication within the organization. Collaboration has been sought mainly with sectors responsible for construction, such as construction supervision, property and measurement, premises services, municipal technology, and land use. In many cases, these parties have also participated in the preparation of the programme.

The development of external planning collaboration with partners has taken the form of clarification of processes and improvement of direction. The measures include making services smoother through collaboration between different sectors in customer service (City of Vantaa, 2015). In city of Tampere (2004), city of Oulu (2002) and city of Lohja (2009), for example, one measure written into the programme is the improvement of interaction at the kick-off meetings of construction projects. The objective is to complement these meetings with an expanded steering committee, including representatives from land use and museum, for example. In this way, all parties will be aware of the project objectives and its conditions from the very beginning.

Programme texts address architectural competitions as a method to promote external collaboration. Through architectural competitions,

cities seek to diversify their acquisition practices and improve the quality of planning. In accordance with the objectives written into the programmes, another aim of architectural competitions is to increase dialogue about architecture and the exposure and appreciation of quality construction.

For measures related to operating practices, the focus is mainly on general communication between various administrative sectors and practices related to the direction of construction. In order to support quality assurance, architectural policy programmes encourage drafting various environmental and construction method guidelines. However, architectural policy does not comment on established interactive practices, such as hearings during the planning process, evaluation of the effects of projects, or negotiations between the land use planners and the participants. Efforts are made to open up discussion on a general level through various communication channels such as Internet forums. Interaction is based on proactive participation, which architectural policy seeks to promote through open communication that transcends administrative boundaries.

Key measures for developing operating practices:
- Cross-administrative collaboration groups, internal communication
- More efficient direction of construction projects
- Different competitive tendering practices
- New technological platforms
- New job positions

4.3 C: Improving external communication

When communication about current projects is at issue, architectural policy programme texts emphasize the application of various media, such as printed newspapers and the city website. External communication is seen in the programmes as a common goal for the organization. According to local architectural policy, communication and discussion about urban planning must constantly take place on a general level, not just in conjunction with individual projects. The importance of the municipality's website is highlighted in many programmes: many cities plan to use their websites to present architectural events and local sites (e.g. City of Helsinki, 2010; City of Tampere, 2004; City of Turku, 2009; City of Lohja, 2009).

Cities seek to increase residents' interest in architecture through surveys, architectural guides and web-based interactive tools. In the city of Lahti (2010) one measure listed is the built environment feedback system on the Internet. In the city of Helsinki (2010), the aim is to develop web-based interaction tools and share information based on spatial data.

In addition, cities have put effort to improving collaboration with inter-

est groups through various advisory centres and forums. The objectives in the city of Turku programme (2009) include the founding of the Bryggman Institute. The purpose of the institute is further education in the field of construction and the organization of various events, seminars and conferences. The recommended measures in the city of Helsinki (2006) include the founding of an information centre for architecture and urban planning. The meeting centre Laituri, which introduces current projects, opened in the city of Helsinki in 2008. The objectives in the city of Tampere (2004) and city of Kuopio (2007) programmes also included the founding of a centre of excellence suitable for communication and for an exhibition and discussion forum.

Various architecture and building heritage days, exhibitions and architectural awards have also been adopted to facilitate communication. The measures listed in the city of Tampere (2004) include an annual international architectural event and a building heritage day. The city of Helsinki (2010) also has a recommendation to increase the appreciation of architecture through thematic events, an architecture week and an annual architecture seminar. In the city of Turku (2009), a key objective of the Bryggman Institute is communication of information about architecture and construction as well as organization of annual events. In many cases, increasing the exposure of architecture and intensifying interaction through active communication have been listed as key objectives in architectural policy.

Key measures for improving external communication:
- Founding of communication and advisory centres
- Active utilization of media
- Rewarding

5   Discussion

5.1 Common language
The key objectives in architectural policy programmes increase resident interest in the built environment, the organization's internal know-how and mutual understanding between different branches of administration. Various seminars provide more stimuli, support cross-administrative discussion and increase the appreciation of architecture. Architectural education offers an opportunity to involve new groups in the discussion and support their ability to participate in the discussion as equals.

Several programme texts include the objective of improving literacy related to architecture and the built environment. In this regard, the objectives related to education support the ideal of communicative planning – of finding a common language and removing obstacles to interac-

tion (e.g. Healey, 1995). Besides engaging decision-makers and different branches of administration, learning makes it possible to activate interactive processes with residents and make them more efficient. Through learning, participants will be able to adopt new communication skills. Residents of the municipality will have an opportunity to develop from a participant to an active agent in urban planning (Staffans, 2004).

In the public debate, the definitions regarding the quality of the living environment are strongly contextual. Aspects related to the classical values of durability, functionality and beauty are not represented equally in the public debate on architecture. The architect profession has well-established concepts to determine the features of the built environment. The architects have sought to define the quality principles of architecture for centuries in order to control uncertainty and disorder (Till, 2009). On the other hand, in public debate, the quality concepts related to architecture include various meanings, individual values and preferences. However, it can be noted that aspects related to form and beauty are highlighted in several cases. The concept of architecture becomes occasionally superficial or even elitist aspects in public debate. Architectural policy aims to take part in this debate. It points out that architecture is more than design or additional cost in construction.

In architectural policy, literacy related to the built environment is seen as a key objective especially in architectural and environmental education targeted at children and youths. The aim is to improve architectural literacy among non-professionals. In this regard, the handprint of the authors – architects and planners – can be seen in architectural policy programmes. Planning of the built environment, however, addresses the interests of different groups. In order for the community planner to be able to act as a neutral intermediary in accordance with the ideal of communicative planning, the planner should be able to identify different groups and their needs. Proper planning of the living environment, for example, can meet the needs of several population groups, such as the opportunity to live at home for the ageing population (Kondo, 2015). Multiculturalism and the needs of immigrants are also questions that have barely been explored in Finnish urban planning, which is based on the traditions of functionalism. Architectural policy programmes emphasize the meaning of common goals and local identity related to the built environment. However, tangible measures are still missing on the practical planning. It may be noted that there is not a single word about multiculturalism in the city or zoning plans of the key urban areas of Helsinki, for example (Lapintie, 2014.)

According to the communicative ideal, the planner's task is to identify different facts, values and rights during the planning process, so that even the quieter participant groups have their voices heard (Healey, 1995). Because of this, the established practices and values that direct

planning should also be recognized among planners. The choices related to the built environment require a sensitive ear for different participant groups, broad education and invest in topical phenomena of the times. In this regard, municipal planners and decision-makers are also an important target group for architectural and environmental education.

Architecture can also be seen purely as an *image factor* or an industrial policy *success factor*, which causes discussion to emphasize one-sided objectives. According to Äikäs (2004), architectural policy programmes are examples of documents that intend to promote the city image. He states that the city organization consciously creates its own image and describes it as a process in which the intended image develops and acquires its final form based on an individual's knowledge base, experience and interpretation. Because of this, it is important to discuss how architectural policy directs discussion about the built environment. The question is largely related to how architectural policy highlights questions about the built environment and what is considered important. In interaction, one should recognize and understand what was said during the discussion and why; who benefits from it and whom it ignores (Healey, 1995).

5.2 Strategy for collaboration

In the Finnish political-administrative system, municipal residents participate in and influence local decision-making through elected representatives. It should be noted, however, that decisions about the built environment are also made outside public forums and arenas of democratic decision-making. Public goods can also be produced and maintained by the private sector. Therefore, it is not always a question of a public entity, such as municipality or city (Paloheimo and Wiberg, 1996). One should recognize the difference between public and private actions. For example Sorsa, et al. (2010) stated that urban strategies are complex to interpret, because the relationship between the organization of a city and its inhabitants cannot be thought of the same way as the relationship between a private company and its customers. Urban strategy belongs to the administrative organization and the city residents at the same time (Sorsa, et al. 2010).

Architectural policy programmes are not merely about established arenas of decision-making. The programmes seek to open new interactive channels alongside the familiar practices of participation. In many cases, the aim of architectural policy is to attract the interest of the largest possible number of reference groups. Various online forums and feedback systems offer a fast way of collecting information from residents for both municipal planners and elected officials. However, from the perspective of the communicative planning ideal, one may ask whether the participants are truly able to challenge and question the current consensus at these forums. Open interaction does not necessarily guarantee true participation. The online forums may support participation,

but their ability to bring new perspectives to the discussion is limited (Staffans, 2004).

Architectural policy represents the ideal model of communicative planning; in which external interest groups proactively participate in discussion about the built environment. Interaction allows the collection of local data, opening of new perspectives and promotion of open democracy. Architectural policy invites participation through social media and various web-based interactive channels. Adding new interactive channels will not improve the quality of discussion in all cases, however. One could even argue that a broad array of participants, opinions and objectives in some cases may make the choices related to decision-making more difficult. This emphasizes the role of the planners as coordinators of information, networks and interaction. It should also be noted in which way different arenas of discussion function. Information centres, web-based communication and active utilization of media, for example, lead to largely one-way communication. They help increase awareness of architecture, but offer only limited opportunities for two-way interaction, where different participants have the right to challenge and question the consensus and introduce new topics to the discussion.

From the point of view of the criticism of communicative planning theory (e.g. Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002; Fainstain, 2000; Hillier, 2002) it can be noted that architectural policy programmes are based on an ideal world, without institutional structures or power relations. As Bäcklund and Mäntysalo (2009) note, the established roles, responsibilities and rights of officeholders, elected officials and residents may be obstacles to operations based on genuine interaction. In that sense, it should be noted that municipal architectural policy does not seek to directly influence established structures. The main goal of architectural policy is not to define political platforms or draw attention to problems or juxtapositions related to the built environment. It attempts to promote an architecture-friendly climate in a consensus-oriented fashion.

6   Conclusion

Finnish architectural policy started with a national programme approved by the Finnish government in 1998. The national programme has been a model for many regional and local programmes that Finnish municipalities and cities have been making actively since the beginning of the 21st century. On the local level, programmes have been drafted individually, with an emphasis on the unique circumstances of each municipality. A common characteristic of national, regional and local programmes is a desire to promote collaboration between different participants and branches of administration. The importance of interactive planning, communication and open decision-making was also highlighted in Finland with the new *Land Use and Building Act* in the early 21st century.

A key objective in architectural policy programmes is making various reference groups participate, as well as increasing the amount of communication and information about the built environment. The programme texts describe an ideal model allowing all those involved to participate in discussion and influence the built environment. A common objective in architectural policy programmes is improving understanding between different parties by broadening the knowledge base, developing operating practices and diversifying communication.

In Finnish municipalities, strategies have been adopted to direct operation for many decades. Classical strategic trends based on the rational planning tradition have been influencing strategic practices since the 1980s. Later in the 1990s and in the 21st century, communicative planning practices established their position alongside the rational model of thought. In architectural policy programmes, we can identify characteristics of both classical strategy and the objectives of communicative planning.

Architectural policy programmes describe the status quo, set the objectives for change, and allocate resources to a limited number of measures. The programme texts guide the action, but they also highlight the required measures and define the parties responsible for implementation. On the other hand, in many cases, strategic trends have been defined on a general level and the objective of the actual measures is to support interaction between different interest groups and branches of administration.

Architectural policy aims to highlight issues related to the built environment and promote the exposure of architecture through various events, exhibitions and active communication. In this sense, architectural policy seems to be an accessible and encouraging platform for public participation. For different parties, it provides a variety of objectives related to the beautiful, sustainable and viable living environment that the participants unanimously agree on. On the other hand, this may also be the weakness of architectural policy. Although architectural policy raises significant themes in public discussion, such as community structure or sustainable development, programmes do not directly transmit controversial issues or differences in opinion. From the perspective of genuine communication, the problem of architectural policy is its generality. Activating participants for genuine interaction and discussion about the state of the built environment is challenging, because the objectives written into the programme texts are not tied to a specific place or period of time, and the political confrontation involved in policy making is missing.

As the local level examples reveal, programme texts address processes

affecting the built environment on a very general level. In that sense, they represent the ideal of the communicative planning model, which is independent of limitations set by established structures, such as the municipal organization or power relations. The objectives of the programmes encourage various parties and policy sectors to take responsibility for the built environment. Municipal programmes do not seek to promote architecture as the exclusive right of a strictly limited group. Architectural policy seeks to open new interactive channels alongside the established practices. It is more of a general statement or a soft policy that seeks to influence public attitudes and increase collaboration between various parties through communication, education, rewards and encouragement.

Increasing interaction cannot be the only purpose of architectural policy, however. The study suggests that municipalities should openly discuss the motives and goals of architectural policy. Drawing up programmes requires time-wise investments. One should decide which parties the strategy is aimed at and clarify the political mandate of the policy. Architectural policy can be targeted exclusively at the internal operation of the organization. On the other hand, it can constitute an integral part of the image work or general political statement that serves various purposes simultaneously. In any case, the motives behind the strategy should be transparent to both authors and recipients. It is possible to open new interactive channels through architectural policy. As a public strategy, it supports cross-administrative collaboration and collaboration-based planning. In that regard, it is possible to create a positive current even with small resources. A strategy text is not everything, however. Maintaining the quality of architecture and the built environment requires strong leadership and determined choices in favour of the built environment in the municipalities.

Acknowledgements

Archinfo, Architecture Information Centre Finland, 2015a. *Architectural policy programs in Europe*. [online] Available at: http://archinfo.fi/arkkitehtuuripolitiikka/kansainvalinen-toiminta/ohjelmat-euroopassa/ [Accessed 15 July 2015].

Archinfo, Architecture Information Centre Finland, 2015b. *International co-operation*. [online] Available at: http://archinfo.fi/arkkitehtuuripolitiikka/kansainvalinen-toiminta/ [Accessed 15 July 2015].

Aronen, K. and Hartikainen J., 1995. *Kaupunkipolitiikan perusteet*. Helsinki: Suomen kuntaliitto. pp.14–15.

Bento, J.F., 2012. *Survey on architectural policies in Europe*. pp. 19–39, 72–74. [online] European Forum for Architectural Policies. Available at: ‹http://www.efap-fepa.org/docs/EFAP_Survey_Book_2012.pdf› [Accessed 20 July 2015].

Bäcklund, P., 2007. Tietämisen politiikka. *Kokemuksellinen tieto kunnan hallinnassa*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino. p.193.

Bäcklund, P. and Mäntysalo, R., 2009. Yhdyskuntasuunnittelun teorioiden kehitys ja asukkaiden osallistumisen paikka. *Terra*, 121(1), p.21.

Cochrane, A., 2007. *Understanding urban policy. A critical approach*. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing. pp.5–7.

Council Conclusions 2008/C319/05 of 13 December 2008 on architecture: culture's contribution to sustainable development. [Online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=OJ:C:2008:319:FULL&from=FI [Accessed 10 June 2015].

Council Directive 85/384/EEC of 10 June 1985 on the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications in architecture, including measures to facilitate the effective exercise of the right of establishment and freedom to provide services.

Council resolution 2001/C 73/04 of 12 February 2001 on architectural quality in urban and rural environments [Online] Available at: ‹http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.2001.073.01.0006.01.ENG&toc=OJ:C:2001:073:TOC› [Accessed 10 June 2015].

City of Helsinki, 2006. *Helsingin arkkitehtuuri nyt!, Helsingin arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma*. Helsingin rakennusvalvontavirasto.

City of Helsinki, 2010. *Helsingin arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma, 2010*. Helsingin kaupungin rakennusvalvontavirasto.

City of Jyväskylä, 2002. *Jyväskylän arkkitehtuuripolitiikka, Jyväskylän kaupungin arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma*. Jyväskylän kaupunki.

City of Lahti, 2010. *Lahden arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma, 2010*. Lahden kaupunki.

City of Lappeenranta, 2007. *Lappeenrannan arkkitehtuuriohjelma*. Lappeenrannan kaupunki.

City of Lohja, 2009. *Lohjan arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma*. Lohjan kaupunki.

City of Kuopio, 2007. *Kuopion arkkitehtuuri ja rakennustaide*. Kuopion kaupunki.

City of Oulu, 2002. *Oulun arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma*. Oulun kaupunki.

City of Tampere, 2004. *Tampereen arkkitehtuuriohjelma*. Tampereen kaupunki.

City of Turku, 2009. *Turun arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma, 2009*. [pdf] Available at: ‹https://www.turku.fi/sites/default/files/atoms/files//turun_arkkitehtuuripoliittinen_ohjelma.pdf›.

City of Vantaa, 2005. *Vantaan arkkitehtuuristrategia*. Vantaan kaupunki.

City of Vantaa, 2015. *Vantaan arkkitehtuuriohjelma*. Vantaan kaupunki. Dunn, W.N., 1994. *Public policy analysis. An introduction*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. pp.147–149.

European Forum for Architectural Policies, 2015. [Online] Available at: http://www.efap-fepa.org/ [Accessed 1 June 2015].

European Parliament resolution 2009/C 184 E/15 of 21 February 2008 on the follow-up of the Territorial Agenda and the Leipzig Charter: Towards a European Action Programme for Spatial Development and Territorial Cohesion. [Online] Available at: ‹http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1457521798620&uri=CELEX:52008IP0069› [Accessed 1 June 2015].

Enqvist, E., Karttunen, O., Manninen, R., Merenmies, J., Tegelman, H. and Vähäkangas, P., 2000. *Itä-Suomen arkkitehtuuripolitiikka*. Mikkeli: AO–Paino.

Fainstain, S., 2000. New directions in planning theory. *Urban affairs review*, 35(4). pp.453–461.

Finnish Architectural policy, 1998, *The Government´s architectural policy programme.* Helsinki: Arts Council of Finland and Ministry of Education.

Flyvbjerg, B., 1998. *Rationality and power.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. and Richardson, T. 2002. Planning and Foucault: In search of the dark side of planning theory. In: P. Allmendinger and M. Tewdwr-Jones, eds., 2002. *Planning futures: New directions for planning theory*, [online] London and New York: Routledge. pp. 44–62. Available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2278389 [Accessed 8 January 2016].

Forester, J., 1993. *Critical theory, public policy and planning practice. Toward a critical pragmatism.* Albany: State University of New York Press. pp.24–30.

Habermas, J., 1984. *The theory of communicative action. Volume I. Reason and the rationalisation of society.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Healey, P., 1995. The argumentative turn in planning theory and its implication for spatial strategy formation. In: T. Pakarinen and H. Ylinen, eds. 1995. *Are local strategies possible? Scrutinising sustainability.* Urban planning publications 29. Tampere: Tampere University of Technology, Department of Architecture. pp.53–54.

Healey, P., 1997. *Collaborative planning.* Houndmills: Macmillian Press. pp. 248–268.

Hillier, J., 2002. *Shadows of power. An allegory of prudence in land-use planning.* London: Routledge.

Hämeen arkkitehtuuriohjelma, 2007. Hämeen arkkitehdit SAFA

Jalonen, H., 2007. *Kompleksisuusteoreettinen tulkinta hallinnollisen tehokkuuden ja luovuuden yhteensovittamisesta kunnallisen päätöksenteon valmistelutyössä.* Ph.D. Tampere University of Technology.

Kondo, S., 2015. *Ageing in place: Potentials and restrictions. A case study of the living environment for older people in Oulu.* Ph.D. University of Oulu. Available at: ‹http://jultika.oulu.fi/Record/isbn978-952-62-1013-1› [Accessed 3 January 2016].

Lapintie, K., 2014. Miksi monikulttuurisuus ei mahdu suunnittelijan suuhun – eikä päähän? *Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu*, 52(3).

Leipzig Charter 2007/2190(INI) on Sustainable European Cities, 2007. [Online] Available at: ‹http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/themes/urban/leipzig_charter.pdf› [Accessed 1 June 2015].

Municipality of Tyrnävä, 2012. *Tyrnävän kulttuuriympäristöohjelma ja arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma.* Tyrnävän kunta.

Möttönen, S., 2012. Onko kuntastrategioilla merkitystä? In: H. Helin and S. Möttönen, eds. 2012. *Kohti aurinkoista tulevaisuutta – Suurten kaupunkien strategiat.* Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus. pp.124–127.

Nyman, K., 2008. *Arkkitehtuurin kadotettu kieli.* Vaajakoski: Multikustannus Oy. p.267.

Paloheimo, H. and Wiberg, M., 1996. *Politiikan perusteet.* Helsinki: WSOY. p.23.

Satakunnan arkkitehtuuripolitiikka, Kauas katse kantaa, 2012. Satakunnan taidetoimikunta.

Sager, T., 1994. *Communicative planning theory.* Aldershot: Avebury. Savisalo, A., Palaste-Eerola, T. and Mäkinen, S., 2009. *Yhteinen metropolimme, Uudenmaan ja Itä-Uudenmaan arkkitehtuuripoliittiset tavoitteet.* Helsinki: Uudenmaan liitto, Itä-Uudenmaan liitto & Uudenmaan ympäristökeskus.

Savisalo, A., Palaste-Eerola, T. and Mäkinen, S., 2014. *Yhteinen metropolimme, Uudenmaan arkkitehtuuripoliittiset tavoitteet.* Helsinki: Uudenmaan liitto ja Uudenmaan ELY – keskus.

Sorsa, V., Pälli, P., Vaara, E. and Peltola, K., 2010. *Strategia mahdollisuutena ja rajoitteena kuntaorganisaatioissa, Kielestä kommunikaatioista ja vallasta.* [pdf] pp.18–21. Helsinki: Svenska Handelshögskolan. Available at: http://www.kaks.fi/sites/default/files/Strategia%20mahdollisuutena%20ja%20ongelma-na%20kuntaorganisaatiossa.pdf [Accessed 20 July 2015].

Sotarauta, M., 1996. *Suunnittelun ansat ja pehmeä strategia.* [pdf] Available at: ‹http://www.uta.fi/jkk/sente/netlibrary/lectio.pdf› [Accessed 20 November 2015].

Staffans, A., 2004. *Vaikuttavat asukkaat, Vuorovaikutus ja paikallinen tieto kaupunkisuunnittelun haasteina.* Helsinki: Yliopistopaino Oy. pp.248–259.

Strandman, K., 2009. *"Se vain ilmestyi" – Vuorovaikutukseen perustuva strategian viestintä kuntaorganisaatioissa.* Ph.D. University of Lapland. pp.208–210. Available at: ‹http://lauda.ulapland.fi/handle/10024/59345/

browse?value=dialogi&type=subject› [Accessed 20 July 2015].

Till, J., 2009. *Architecture depends*. London: The MIT Press. pp.35–40.

Varsinais-Suomen arkkitehtuuripoliittinen ohjelma, Hetken työ tuhatvuosihin vaikuttaa, 2006. Varsinais-Suomen liitto ja Varsinais-Suomen taidetoimikunta.

Valpola T., 2015. Interview with the Director of Architecture Information Centre Finland. Interviewed by Petri Tuormala in Helsinki, 3 November 2015.

Working Group on the follow-up to the Architectural Policy Program, 2002. Valtioneuvoston arkkitehtuuripoliittisen ohjelman toteutumisen seuranta ja jatkotoimenpiteet. [pdf] Available at: ‹http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2002/liitteet/opm_477_apoli-seuranta.pdf?lang=fi› [Accessed 20 July 2015].

Ylinen, H. and Pahkasalo, K., 2011. *Kokemuksia kulttuuriympäristö- ja arkkitehtuuripoliittisista ohjelmista*. [pdf] pp.26–29. Available at: ‹http://www.ymparisto.fi/download/noname/%7BE96BEB8C-46A2-413E-8A8E-1467FAC66BE3%7D/77861› [Accessed 20 July 2015].

Äikäs, T.A., 2004. *Imagoa etsimässä – Kaupunki- ja aluemarkkinoinnin haasteista mielikuvien mahdollisuuksiin*, Acta no.166. [e-book] Available at: http://shop.kunnat.net/product_details.php?p=130 [Accessed 20 July 2015].

Biographical information

Petri Tuormala
PhD Student, Aalto University, School of
Arts, Design and Architecture,
Place of work:
Ramboll Finland Oy
Address:
Säterinkatu 6, 02601 Espoo
Phone: +358 41 806 2978
E-mail: petri.tuormala@aalto.fi

Petri Tuormala is Master of Science in Architecture and PhD Candidate at the Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture. He works as an architect in Ramboll Finland Oy in Espoo and undertakes research on local level architectural policies