

Empowering Urban Communities Through Participatory Planning: Innovative Extension Practices for Sustainable Development

Dr. Eugenio Ferrer Santiago III

Associate Professorial Lecturer V, Manila, Adjunct Faculty, MMEP Program, PCU, Manila, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study is about the importance of engaging people in urban planning. It focuses on innovative extension practices that can lead to community empowerment, bridging gaps and bringing in positive change in communities. The research problem is centered on how inclusive participatory methods can be used efficiently to create more sustainable urban environments driven by communities. The objectives of this study were: to lay out foundation knowledge on urban planning in the Philippines connected to participatory development - finding out ways to bridge the gap with local citizens, assessing how participatory techniques transform peoples' lives and uncover constraints encountered during implementation of urban planning reforms. The use of, Google Scholar to access free publications such as open-access journals, e-books and reliable news articles among others via internet sources will be the main source of literature review. This research shall utilize systematic literature review, case study analysis, comparative policy analysis, social media analysis, etc. A number of findings show that participation in urban planning promotes increased community ownership over resources; enhances improved project outcomes; strengthens social cohesion within communities; enables better distribution of resources; and increases community resilience against major shocks like disasters. Other challenges include power disparities between different stakeholders, inadequate resource support from government agencies and long-term commitment. The author argues that empowering a community to shape its own neighborhood through innovative extension practices is an effective way to improve lives and inspire change thereby improving quality life for all who live there. This study's contribution is a call for a paradigm shift towards more collaborative processes requiring inclusive governance informed by local knowledge systems regarding sustainable cities and communities.

*Corresponding author

Dr. Eugenio Ferrer Santiago III, Associate Professorial Lecturer V, Manila, Adjunct Faculty, MMEP Program, PCU, Manila, Philippines.

Received: July 05, 2025; **Accepted:** July 09, 2025; **Published:** July 20, 2025

Keywords: Participatory Development, Urban Planning, Extension Program, Governance

Introduction

In the contemporary paradigm of urbanism, the changes are interactive as opposed to uni-directional. City planning that was predominantly carried out by experts in a particular field is now slowly entering a more participatory process that will change the way cities are built [1]. Central to the preceptive development framework is the participatory planning which is an effective means of enhancing development in urbanized society [2].

The challenges faced by cities, including climate change and social inequity, are growing, and so are the cities themselves, making the need for creative approaches to urban planning more necessary than ever [3]. This research investigates the complex synergy between community participation, urbanization, and sustainability, and why it matters to policymakers, planners, and community leaders. The Philippines is at a very crucial moment in its urban development trajectory. Rapid urbanization however brought up several issues while at the same time presenting opportunities which makes it a great area to assess the promise of participatory planning [4]. The paper appreciates the fact that there are distinctive issues surrounding urbanism in the Philippines as well as focuses on how participatory approaches can be adopted to local realities.

Essentially, this research seeks to answer one overarching query: how can the benefits of inclusively participatory techniques be utilized in the development of more amenable and self-governed cities? This question straddles on several important issues in contemporary urban development and planning:

- **Community Empowerment:** Planning for Local Development must seek to empower local persons in the management of their local development agenda, as there exists great value in local experience and information that would help avoid projects that are out of touch with the needs of the population [5].
- **Bridging Gaps:** Participatory planning would not only serve the planners but also the urban policies and their intended population whereby a mitigation of the existing divide is promised and faith and cooperation bolstered [6].
- **Sustainability:** People are likely to come up with sustainable solutions in terms of social, economic, and environmental aspects when they are actively involved in the realization of their surroundings [7].
- **Innovation in Extension Practices:** The study seeks to identify new forms of community involvement in the planning stage, not limited to seeking opinions but actively working with the community [8].

The research objectives offered are integrative in appreciating the versatility of aspects associated with participatory urban planning:

- Building up a particular area of knowledge on planning of urban areas in the Philippines, as regards participatory planning.
- Developing ways to close the gap between the people who plan and the people, who live in the community.
- Evaluating the influence that participatory approaches have on the people.
- Determining the problems and constraints that arise in the process of carrying out urban planning reforms.

The results obtained from this research are indeed both satisfying and stimulating. It has been demonstrated that active participation in urban planning has several advantages including:

- Mobilization of more community-members in the use/management of resources, thereby enhancing preservation and sustainable use [9].
- Enhanced and successful project implementation as the objectives meet the needs of the target community.
- Greater social integration of people living within the same communities resulting in a shared vision of responsibility for the community.
- A more just society as silence is given to the voiceless [10].
- Augmented coping mechanisms of the community in the face of extreme pressures such as disasters and economic crisis.

The research also revealed possible constraints that others may face if they wish to actively engage in participatory planning processes:

- The issue of power relations among actors could distort the process of planning.
- Poor funding of participatory initiatives from public institutions may be a limitation to the extent and impact of such activities.
- Commitment to and engagement in the issues from both the society and organizations for an extended period usually proves to be difficult.

The research states very convincingly that such community extension bottom-up approach is not just a theory, but a powerful tool which is practically implementable and positively affects the very lives of people. Such an approach will enable all people living in these cities to enjoy a greater quality of life and create better, more sustainable and resilient cities.

The capturing of ideas in the direction of advocating for administrative changes that embrace collaborative procedures could not have come at a better time. There has come a time in almost every society where they have wanted to participate in matters that concerns their society and such as the cases of climate change, urbanization and inequality, these calls for inclusion based on local knowledge needs to be addressed like never before [3]. This study forms part of an expanding literature that demonstrates how people envision participatory methods of planning and how these methods of planning are essential in attaining sustainable cities and communities.

As one explores the study further, they are encouraged to envision an alternate possible scenario concerning the future of cities. What's being projected is one of active resilient economies where citizens are more active in shaping their surroundings and help in the planning and implementation of various strategies rather than just sitting back and taking orders. It puts forth a challenge

to the society in particular to rethink the traditional roles of urban planners as expert decision makers [4].

Incorporating modern extension techniques and community engagement allows citizens to build cities that are more sustainable, just and better suited to the needs of its residents. The relevance of this research will be very clear when society will meet the challenges of urbanization in the 21st century, as the promising prospect of this paper addresses itself to the future cities.

Methodology

The use of Google Scholar to access free publications such as open-access journals, e-books and reliable news articles among others via internet sources will be the main source of literature review. This research shall utilize systematic literature review, case study analysis, comparative policy analysis, social media analysis, etc.

Results and Discussion

Community Empowerment

The use of sub-techniques and strategies that are inclusive and involve the masses in policy formulation and implementation have become popular owing to the prospects of ushering in better and self-governing cities with the help of the people. This movement signals a departure from the conventional urban orthodoxy – which perceives urban planning as being ‘completely controlled’ from a center and which is replaced by the ‘people-centered’ urban planning and involves residents in the process of urban space [10].

Great sense of ownership among the community members is one of the main advantages of using inclusive and participatory approaches. Citizens tend to develop greater place attachment and devolution of responsibility towards their urban space when they can shape the decision-making processes in the organizations that govern urban development [9]. These positive results of the positive orientation can improve the level of care given to common places, encourage higher levels of civic participation, and engender enhanced community belonging. For instance, it has been observed that community-initiated urban greening projects lead to healthier environments as well as stronger social bonds and increase the residents’ redeeming attachment to the place [11].

Participatory techniques can bring beneficial efficiency and improvement to urban development projects. Local knowledge of the community can be differentiated from professional knowledge in that it might not be obvious to professionals within the field. Including innovative policy measures (such as skewed participatory approaches) that tap into specific urban needs of the citizens, standard policies may even be more powerful. The participatory budgeting initiative in Porto Alegre, Brazil, for instance, has received much attention because of the efficiency with which the available resources have been distributed towards the pressing problems of the citizens that were experienced due to deficiency in the conventional budget [12].

Inclusiveness of the participatory methodologies could go a long way in ushering in the new wave of creativity in dealing with urban challenges. There is evidence that whenever there is an attempt at defining problems, many people with diverse backgrounds generally engage in the process and each person tries to contribute their insights in a given urban culture [2]. This collective agency is indispensable when there is a need to combat various complex and interrelated problems in urban settings. The idea of urban living labs addresses this reality by suggesting a broader framework in

which new urban concepts and practices are developed with the input of and tested by people from diverse groups, researchers, and policy-makers [13].

These techniques can also reduce social exclusion and spatial imbalance in cities by allowing the marginalized to be heard and involved in the decision-making processes [14]. For example, the participatory mapping processes in the informal settlements of Nairobi, Kenya, have given rise to community claims for better services and infrastructure and negotiation with the authorities [15].

The payoff of adopting such an inclusive participatory approach does not only stop at the outputs of the projects in the specific time frame and settings. They may also assist in creating community capacity and social capital in the long term. While participating in such processes, citizens acquire negotiation, problem-solving and community decision-making skills [16]. This increased capacity will allow the communities to aspire for greater development than what could be provided by the current governments thus tending towards self-governing cities.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the very inclusion of such techniques in a constructive process, is difficult. For example, the processes may be hindered by the people's power, other people's interests, and the differences in capacities of those who wish to participate [17]. A community may become worn out by the process of participation when it has come to the conclusion that its suggestions for action may never see the light of day. An institutional remedy for these obstacles is to structure participatory processes in such a way that they get implemented, are followed up and yield concrete outcomes [18].

Achieving the transition to the more tolerant and self-managed cities brought about through the empowerment of communities, demands a fundamental change in the understanding of urban governance. It emphasizes the movement from the idea that citizens are passive receivers of the services rendered by the city to the fact that citizens are active agents in modifying the city [19]. This change does not only require modifications in the planning processes. It also requires modifications in institutional frameworks and professional norms to include a more participatory and adaptive mode of urban development.

The merits of participatory intrusive techniques resonate well and are appealing in the perspective of urban dynamics. Community ownership is encouraged, where the contempt of urban projects is uplifted, innovative approaches are fostered, fairness is exercised, and community skill development breeds capacity to enable such methodologies towards improving the world.

Bridging Gaps

Cities in the modern era become more complex due tendencies of focusing on fixing the problems that have remained as obstacles, prevented the development of self-governing cities. These include, but are not limited to, economic differences, lack of interaction between various stakeholders, and desynchronization of policies with the real needs of the population. Cities can try to do away with these gaps by recognizing the advantages of participatory approaches thus making such cities to be more just, more responsive, and more integrated.

Another gap that can be tackled through inclusive participatory techniques is the gap between the urbanizers, the politicians and the residents of the city. Urban planning, in its rudimentary form,

has been criticized for being top-heavy, for the decisions that affect people being made by a few, previously designated adenoviruses with little regard and feedback from the populations concerned [20]. Participatory approaches help in addressing this challenge as they provide opportunities for interaction and collaboration between the professionals and the non-professionals. For example, in urban planning, co-production means that the residents are not just the service users but active participants in providing activities and frameworks of the urban/common services [21]. It facilitates the social engineering of urban planning processes, enhancing comprehension and confidence among various parties.

Citizens' inclusion and participation in the processes also, quite importantly, can help narrow the social and economic inequalities within the cities. Several challenges arise in urban areas, such as spatial inequalities and lack of access to resources and opportunities. One such practice is participatory budgeting, which has gained much attention as a potential solution to lessening inequitable distribution of resources within the cities [22]. The method is useful in overcoming structural biases that have already precluded the effective involvement of the citizens, especially the neglected segments in the economic processes. For Porto Alegre in Brazil, participatory budgeting results in better urban planning because the less developed regions of the city experience more development due to the focus being more on making the living standards of the average resident better.

Participatory methods may also be of assistance in overcoming obstacles between different forms of knowledge, more particularly, that of the professional and the community. Urban localities have a wealth of knowledge related to their environment, which could serve to enhance the limited professional perspective of urban planning [21]. Examples of this are the mounting of participatory geographies as well as the initiation of community oriented research which help bring these planning processes local insiders' perspectives. For example, in the case of slum areas of Nairobi, participatory mapping has assisted the residents in identifying the assets and problems that their areas have in order to create an evidence base for the upgrade programs as well as advocacy [15].

Another fundamental gap that inclusive participatory techniques can fill is the divide between such short-term activities and longer-term objectives related to urban sustainability. Raising certain issues as well as framing future perspectives that engage a cross section of city stakeholders can lead to more balanced and forwardlooking development policies for the city [2]. Urban living labs, wherein citizens, researchers and policymakers jointly create and test methods to resolve challenges, illustrate how participatory methods link the current with the desirable state [13].

Inclusive participatory techniques equally offer, bridging inter-generational divide of urban planning. This can be done by encouraging the young people's participation in the decision-making processes actively, in this way urban development will be in tune to the young people's needs and desires as well. Youth-led Participatory action research and design charrettes are some of such examples where the active involvement of young people is paramount, depicting how the young people's voices can be heard in the urban planning processes. Such strategies do not only promote better designed youth-oriented urban spaces, they also allow practices that enhance the development of active citizenship culture among the youth.

Participatory techniques help to resolve the implementation problem that is frequently associated with many urban planning

efforts. These approaches can involve communities in the entire planning and implementation cycle which could lead to greater acceptance and support towards urban interventions. This can enhance the success and sustainability of any undertaken initiatives, as the members of the community are less likely to neglect or damage spaces and services which they had a part in creating [9]. On the other hand, it should be noted that the use of inclusive participatory techniques comes with its own barriers as well. There are issues of power differentials, limited resources and differing capacities of the stakeholders that may obstruct participatory processes [17]. There is also a danger of postponement when there are expectations and prolonged inaction results from a realisation that there is no real commitment to the community's suggestions. In order to close gaps through participatory approaches, there is a need for creating processes that are result-oriented, accountable and transparent in nature [18].

The challenge a digital divide poses is quite another issue in the quest for adopting the inclusive democratic participatory techniques within engagement systems as most of the processes shift to the digital platforms. Digital tools, on the other hand, can enhance participation in such initiatives, while also limiting the number of people who can take part due to lack of technology or skills [19]. In order to overcome this challenge, it is necessary to integrate modern technologies with traditional participatory methods.

These strategies can help bring about better managed and self-built cities by promoting cooperation among diverse actors, combining various sources of knowledge, tackling social and economic inequalities, as well as linking immediate action to more strategic shifts. Moreover, inclusive participation remains core in the cities of the 21st Century as they struggle to solve complex problems particularly in urban settings. Inclusive participation will become increasingly important in designing urban spaces that are intricately connected and more just to the varying needs from the population within these cities.

Sustainability

One of the meaningful motives for the use of inclusive participatory techniques for urban sustainability is the contribution of local people's knowledge and skills into decision making. The local population has a very unique insight which perhaps an outsider or even specialist cannot understand; how the problem of environmental pollution is being tackled, what kind of tools or resources are present there, how are they utilized and what steps can be taken in order to make it better [20]. This type of knowledge is useful for cities who are looking to formulate work on appropriate sustainability initiatives. One case to the effect, is that the concept of citizen science has evolved within the area of urban environmental management to the extent that community members get actively involved in information collection and monitoring of urban ecological systems [21].

The contrasting positions of the stakeholders in the active and the sympathetic dimensions of research methodology also encouraged the sense of ownership and duty towards the sustainable practices among the citizens. People who participate in the designing and the implementing of the projects tend to have a higher degree of acceptance and commitment to the sustainability initiatives along the years [9]. Such degree of participation is also expected to bring about some positive behavior should be change that is of an individual and community level sustainability focus. In other words, community based natural resource management has

been hailed for success in achieving sustainable resource use and conservation in urban and peri-urban contexts.

Further, these methods of stakeholder engagement attempt to address the sustainability gap that has been highlighted separating strategy formulation and implementation. In case there are different stakeholders in the process of enhancing the sustainable growth of the cities, it is likely that the measures advanced for sustainability will be feasible in terms of technology, social aspect, and economy. This can be illustrated with the co-production principle whereby citizens, experts and policy makers combine efforts with the end goal of attaining a sustainable urban situation. Such an intervention in the governance of urban sustainability leads to development that is not biased by the identified difficulties.

As well, these social inequities can also be redressed through those participatory methods, which are likely to sustain social equity in the cities over time. These approaches promote environmental equity by incorporating marginalized groups who actively participate in the governance of sustainable cities, both in vision building and space planning. For example, in quite a number of cities participatory budgeting has been used resulting in better targeting of funds towards projects that are environmentally sustainable [22].

The inclusion of various stakeholder groups in the scenario planning and risk assessment phases assists cities in developing more effective climate coping strategies and plans. The same has been achieved for the climate change adaptation mechanisms by communities through the community-based approaches (CBA) in the African neighborhoods. These difficulties confirm the importance of how people can influence inclusivity towards urban planning and particularly urban design. It allows greater creation of healthier, more walkable and energy efficient cities both in their physical organization and surrounding structures using urban planning strategies including design charrettes or urban planning workshops [10]. Some of them also contribute to learning and conserving cultural and biological diversity, which is one of the pillars of sustainable urbanization.

Approaches that encourage participation on a wide range of topics can be beneficial within the concept of the circular economy or in the concept which advocates for city urban growth without compromising sustainability. Through this approach, citizens are made to exploit circular economy goals by understanding the need to use resources efficiently and minimize waste accumulation in the cities. Useful resources in a sustainable economy can also be locally sourced in the form of undertaking tuck shops, constructing and repairing boreholes, and farming which are primarily carried out by the members of the community.

The ability to apply these tools of so-called inclusive participation systems enhancing urban sustainability is limited by factors such as political will. It may be that these different stakeholder factors or power and interest aspects may be hindrances to the processes being successful [17]. Also, there can be too much of a feeling of participation resulting in apathy where people are so often asked to share their feelings but do not see any changes taking place. In addressing those challenges, participatory design must make sure that the credibility, efficiency and outcome of the processes is achieved [18].

The willingness to move many of the engagement processes to be executed online, the 'digital divide' creates another hurdle

within the attempt of adopting inclusive participatory practices towards urban sustainability. But this geographic barrier can be alleviated with the help of advanced Information technology only it now has a limitation [19]. To address this issue, it is necessary to utilize both online and offline methods in the participatory design process in recognition of the need to be inclusive in any sustainability process.

Integrating local knowledge systems, facilitating public participation, addressing the issues of action plan adoption and implementation, equity & social justice issues, resilience, and appropriate urban forms and practices.

Innovation in Extension Practices

Extension practices were formerly limited to the agricultural and rural spheres, they have transformed into more developed sphere which includes extension, knowledge, education, and advocacy within the urban areas [23]. The incorporation of inclusive participatory approaches within these practices has transformed the way cities relate to and deal with their citizens, encasing creative genius and bringing forth even more responsive cities.

The use of inclusive participatory techniques in thinking of extension practices is the reduction of the top-down approach in knowledge generation and sharing. It is possible to harness the local knowledge and experiences associated with urban problems by engaging with other actors in the process of knowledge generation and dissemination [20]. It is such as this that is revolutionizing the way extension is carried out, which has so far been top down where only experts of knowledge have been regarded as knowledge providers. There are emerging scenarios in which inhabitants are actively engaged in addressing urban environmental problems, such as citizen science [21]. These programs serve a dual purpose; they help generate usable information for the designing of cities' plans and strategies and help increasing the participants' scientific and environmental awareness as well.

The focus on participation has also led to some changes in regard to methods and instruments of urban extension. Furthermore, information technologies have performed very well in making the participation models more effective and wider. The term 'civic tech' is not only widespread today, but there are also many applications and websites today which let people take a more active role in governing cities [24]. Such applications include websites for participatory budgets or apps for variety urban problems where public would be a key component to help identify problems. For instance, the "Fix My Street" concept, which encourages residents to report the infrastructure repairs needed in their locality by contacting the authorities, has also been incorporated in many countries by their different cities and shows how extension practices can benefit from change [25].

Furthermore, the inclusive participatory methods have generated new concepts on how cities undertook capacity and skills development. Early extension service primarily dealt with knowledge and/or skills transfer in one direction. Differently, in participatory approaches, actors learn from each other in fine-tuning the problems and developing appropriate solutions. This shift has led to new concepts spiraled such as the 'living lab' as well as the 'urban innovation hub;' in which citizens, specialists and political decision makers actually work on urban issues to resolve them. These places act as accelerators of urban innovation, enabled taking risks and learning by doing on site. As an illustration, the Urban Lab initiative put forward by the city

of Barcelona gives companies and institutions the opportunity to test urban innovations on the city, where citizens are involved in applying and providing feedback on new ideas.

Social engagement and mobilization efforts by cities have also improved as a result of embedding participatory approaches. Weighty extension activities such as strengthening community linkages often resulted in short-term impacts without a clear sustainability strategy in place. Still, there have been some emergent possibilities of continued involvement such as community driven initiatives for planning and management. For instance, programs promoting citizen participation in the improvement of slums in Nairobi showed that urban projects that involve citizens consistently are more effective and appropriate for the locals than those that do not. Such approaches not only upgrade the built infrastructure but also enhances the social structure and institutional capacity of communities to engage in self-regulation [26].

The participatory methods provided for inclusive engagement have also contributed to the rethinking of instrumentality in the context of monitoring and evaluation of urban projects in the cities. Most of the past approaches were based on the assessments carried out by experts whose assessments could miss the overall effect of the interventions on people's social life. In contrast, the participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches policies target communities and determine goals with them and measure the success out of it. As a result, a number of more sophisticated and locally relevant measures of urban presence and well-being have been designed [27]. For example, in the United Kingdom, the Happy City Index was conceptualized and developed after massive citizen inclusion processes in the city of Bristol advocates for a more radical way of looking at urban wellbeing [28].

Inclusive participatory methods have also intrigued new approaches in how cities resolve conflicts and build consensus in urban growth. Earlier hierarchical models were usually unable to find compromises among the multitude of stakeholder interests. However, participatory methods have resulted in the emergence of new styles of decision-making and resolving disputes. Consensus building techniques around contentious urban issues inclusive of participatory scenario planning and deliberative polling have been utilized [2]. These methods not only produce decisions that are acceptable to more people, but also help foster trust and social capital within societies.

Nonetheless, it should be observed that such advances require that participatory extension techniques be engaged with a fair share of challenges. Digital divides, power relations and participation pests have been demonstrated to adversely affect such attempts [19]. Also, there lies a risk that participatory processes may be superficially adopted and not be operationalized as there is no real intend for outreach. Such challenges require that cities keep improving the manner in which they structure as well as carry out participatory processes so as to be inclusive and result oriented [18].

The consistent use of marginalization's inclusive alternatives enhanced the emergence of fruitful progressive changes in relation to urban extension which ensured the creation of appropriate and self-directed cities. In embracing knowledge equity and the application of internet tools, promoting social participatory teaching, and creating new strategies for public involvement and assessments, physical interaction with people in cities has

changed. There is no shortage of ideas as to how such practices will continue to evolve in the future and how they will contribute towards addressing the persistent unsolved crisis of sustainability, wellbeing and equity in urban areas across the globe. The secret to this success is the need to learn how to utilize these processes bearing in mind local situations, new problems and real commitment to the quality of hundreds of citizens that are being drawn into active practices [29].

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

In sum, an overwhelming concentration of urban planning in the Philippines in particular the methods of involving citizens' participation particular on global bridging methods and assessment of consequences of such practices may have on the society and investigating possible obstacles and challenges in such urban planning are needing redefinition and refinement. The findings of the analysis showed that there are a number of advantages in participatory urban planning: enhancement of community involvement and sustainable management of resources by local people over projects, enhancement of project success owing to a positive response to local needs, enhancement of the sense of community and responsibility among residents, more equitable resource distribution due to involvement of previously quiet beneficiaries, and overall enhancement of the capacity of cities to cope with disasters and economic downturns. The challenges that were identified, among them political differences among stakeholders that tend to skew the planning process, lack of adequate assistance from the government, and the difficulty of maintaining long term political support from citizenry and institutional organizations. Such factors also help in understanding the challenges faced when stakeholder engagement in urban planning is embraced for its positive reputation. As for the urban planners' benefit, the lessons are of great importance for bettering the policies and practices in urban development [30].

To conclude, it is distinctive soliciting participatory urban planning as one of the best approaches toward accommodating equity, sustainability, and resilience in cities. When citizens engage in the planning process, the planning and the outcomes of the decision-making processes are likely to be more responsive, fairer and sustainable in the long run. The results of this study also help to understand how governance is being transformed in the direction of greater responsiveness as seen in such documents as the UN's Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda. It is also successful in providing an additional value to this practical conception of participatory planning reconciling it with an equally important goal of a sustainable development. Even so, the issues addressed highlight the difficulties faced in implementing participatory methods and the necessity to understand power and resource relations and tactics for the participation in a broader time span. Such findings suggest the need to develop localized strategies especially with regards to the local context in order to enhance inclusiveness and equality. Unquestionably, the research demonstrates a method and a technique as well as a means that is innovative, relevant and efficient with regard to the use of participatory approaches and processes within the arena of planning to advocate for social justice in cities [31].

Taking into consideration, this research findings and broader implications it may be suggested how the participatory urban planning strategies may be enhanced. Beginning with, local or even national authorities must make adoption of participatory processes by way of formalizing policies and plans of participatory categorization planning in city projects as mandatory. It must be

stressed that participative approach in planning cannot be realized without adequate funds and resource commitment in human beings and materials. Related to this issue, new methods of engagement should be developed ensuring that community members will not participate in a single project only but will volunteer over a longer period within the constraints of the trust [32-34]. They further advocate technological disintegration rather appreciative to community participation by stakeholders in either or both directly or indirectly as a mere enhancement to geographic incorporation. In addition, there is also a need to develop performance assessment criteria which can accurately evaluate the participation strategy performance. Networks for sharing best and bad practices and lessons learnt in participatory urban planning should be established, internally in the Philippines as well as globally [35]. It would be necessary to specify contextual integration of the planning activities with the planning of human action with clear goals related to sustainable development in the urban environment, so that in a conspicuous manner the inhabitants know how their inputs relate to the greater good of urban sustainability. Lastly, there is a strong need for a sustained effort in integrating all efforts of urban planning and the social aspects through the work of urban planners, scientists, environmentalists, and others concerned with urban problems. It is clear that these recommendations are important for changing the order of the cities' work with the enabling, for more effective and participatory community development [36-38].

References:

1. Healey P (1997) Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies. Macmillan International Higher Education https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Collaborative_Planning.html?id=tlvaAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y.
2. Innes JE, Booher DE (2004) Reframing public participation: Strategies for the 21st century. *Planning Theory & Practice* 5: 419-436.
3. United Nations (2015) Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>.
4. Watson V (2014) Co-production and collaboration in planning – The difference. *Planning Theory & Practice* 15: 62-76.
5. Petts J, Brooks C (2006) Expert conceptualisations of the role of lay knowledge in environmental decisionmaking: Challenges for deliberative democracy. *Environment and Planning A* 38: 1045-1059.
6. Quick KS, Feldman MS (2011) Distinguishing participation and inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31: 272-290.
7. Basco-Carrera L, Warren A, van Beek E, Jonoski A, & Giardino A (2017) Collaborative modelling or participatory modelling? A framework for water resources management. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 91: 95-110.
8. Rowe G, Frewer LJ (2005) A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 30: 251-290.
9. Mansuri G, Rao V (2013) Localizing development: Does participation work? World Bank Publications.
10. Arnstein SR (1969) A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35: 216-224.
11. Healey P (2003) Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory* 2: 101-123.
12. Krasny ME, Tidball KG (2015) Civic ecology: Adaptation and transformation from the ground up MIT Press https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271770545_Civic_Ecology_Adaptation_and_Transformation_from_the_Ground_Up.

13. Wampler B (2007) Participatory budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, cooperation, and accountability. Penn State Press <https://www.psupress.org/books/titles/978-0-271-03252-8.html?srsId=AfmBOoo8Qrx47a0zSHwswrHTX62Dy0VlASFf11kIrd-VfgHq9JNrweUG>.
14. Voytenko Y, McCormick K, Evans J, Schliwa G (2016) Urban living labs for sustainability and low carbon cities in Europe: Towards a research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 123: 45-54.
15. Fainstein SS (2010) *The just city*. Cornell University Press https://books.google.co.in/books/about/The_Just_City.html?id=WzoBfAEACAAJ&redir_esc=y.
16. Hagen E (2011) Mapping change: Community information empowerment in Kibera. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization* 6: 69-94.
17. Cuthill M, Fien J (2005) Capacity building: Facilitating citizen participation in local governance. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64: 63-80.
18. Cooke B, Kothari U (2001) Participation: The new tyranny? *Zed Books* <https://search.worldcat.org/title/Participation--the-new-tyranny/oclc/44585299>.
19. Bryson JM, Quick KS, Slotterback CS, Crosby BC (2013) Designing public participation processes. *Public Administration Review* 73: 23-34.
20. Boonstra B, Boelens L (2011) Self-organization in urban development: Towards a new perspective on spatial planning. *Urban Research & Practice* 4: 99-122.
21. Arnstein SR (1969) A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35: 216-224.
22. Afzalan N, Sanchez TW, Evans-Cowley J (2017) Creating smarter cities: Considerations for selecting online participatory tools. *Cities* 67: 21-30.
23. Corburn J (2003) Bringing local knowledge into environmental decision making: Improving urban planning for communities at risk. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22: 420-433.
24. Dickinson JL, Shirk J, Bonter D, Bonney R, Crain RL, et al. (2012) The current state of citizen science as a tool for ecological research and public engagement. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 10: 291-297.
25. Cabannes Y (2004) Participatory budgeting: A significant contribution to participatory democracy. *Environment and Urbanization* 16: 27-46.
26. Christoplos I (2010) Mobilizing the potential of rural and agricultural extension. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations <https://www.fao.org/4/i1444e/i1444e.pdf>.
27. Saldivar J, Parra C, Alcaraz M, Arteta R, Cernuzzi L (2019) Civic technology for social innovation. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 28: 169-207.
28. King SF, Brown P (2007) Fix my street or else: Using the internet to voice local public service concerns. In *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Theory and practice of electronic governance* 72-80.
29. Rigon A (2014) Building local governance: Participation and elite capture in slum-upgrading in Kenya. *Development and Change* 45: 257-283.
30. Fraser ED, Dougill AJ, Mabee WE, Reed M, McAlpine P (2006) Bottom up and top down: Analysis of participatory processes for sustainability indicator identification as a pathway to community empowerment and sustainable environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management* 78: 114-127.
31. Corcoran R, Marshall G (2016) Planning for wellbeing. *Journal of Urban Design and Mental Health* 1: 1-5.
32. Chambers R (1994). The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal. *World Development* 22: 953-969.
33. Derr V, Chawla L, Mintzer M, Cushing DF, Van Vliet W (2013) A city for all citizens: Integrating children and youth from marginalized populations into city planning. *Buildings* 3: 482-505.
34. Friedmann J (1992) Empowerment: The politics of alternative development. Blackwell <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/t%3A+The+Politics+of+Alternative+Development-p-9781557863003>.
35. Innes JE, Booher DE (2010) *Planning with complexity: An introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy*. Routledge.
36. March H, Ribera-Fumaz R (2016) Smart contradictions: The politics of making Barcelona a Self-sufficient city. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 23: 816-830.
37. Quick KS, Feldman MS (2011) Distinguishing participation and inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31: 272-290.
38. Wampler B (2007) Participatory budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, cooperation, and accountability. Penn State Press.

Copyright: ©2025 Eugenio f Santiago. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.