

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT
POLICY FOR UNDER-UTILIZED SPACE IN BANGKOK,
THAILAND**

by

Ariya Aruninta

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Urban Environmental Management

Examination Committee: Dr. Edsel Sajor (Chairman)
Dr. Willi Zimmermann (Co-chair)
Dr. Vilas Nitivattananon
Dr. Soparth Pongquan
Dr. Banasopit Mekvichai

External Examiner: Prof Dr Peter Knoepfel
Swiss Graduate School of Public
Administration
Route de la Maladière 21
CH-1022 Chavannes-près-Renens
Switzerland

Nationality: Thai
Previous Degree: Master of Landscape Architecture
University of Colorado at Denver, USA

Scholarship Donor: AIT Fellowship

Asian Institute of Technology
School of Environment, Resources and Development
Thailand
December 2009

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank the dissertation committee ; chair person / supervisor: Dr Edsel Sajor / Dr Willi Zimmermann, Dr. Soparth Pongquan, Dr. Vilas Nitivattananon, and Dr. Banasopit Mekvichai ; for their kind attention and advice. I would like to express my deep gratitude and heartfelt thanks to Dr. Zimmermann, my supervisor, for his valuable and instructive comments. I do appreciate his supportive and patient encouragement throughout the period of my study. I would like to thanks Dr Sajor, my final stage supervisor who was my co-chair along with Dr Zimmermann for many years. And I can not forget the first advisor who so kind advised me at the very beginning of this dissertation: Dr Walter Jamieson. AIT is the place that has warmly given me the lessons of life, friendship and life-long memories. I will always maintain love, respect, and appreciation toward all the professors and staff there, especially Khun Vantana Pattanakul.

This research was followed by the first evaluation under the 2003-2004 Fulbright Junior Research Program of the author, with the kind hospitality of Dr Michael Pagano, head of the Public Administration Program, Dr. David Perry, director of Great Cities Institute, and Dr. Robin Hambleton, dean of College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs (CUPPA), University of Illinois at Chicago. That gave me the opportunity to present a paper extracted from the research entitled “Controversies In Public Land Management Decision –Makings : Case Study of Land Utilization In Bangkok, Thailand”; prepared for the City Futures - An International Conference on Globalism and Urban Change.” (July 8-10, 2004), by CUPPA. Therefore, I would like to convey my gratitude especially to Dr.Pagano who was so warm and cordial during both my two visits as a scholar to Chicago, when I returned to Bangkok, and even during the crucial stage of my thesis. His contribution is highly appreciated.

I would like to thank my colleagues at Chulalongkorn University. Especially, during my study at AIT which was strongly encouraged by Dr Sorawit Narupiti from Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Dr. Pongsak Vadhanasindhu, Dr. Angsana Boonyobhas former head of the department and head of the department of Landscape Architecture, Lersom Stapitananda dean of the faculty of Architecture, and Dr. Tipsuda Patumanon.

The dissertation has been assisted and supported by the administrative staff of the case study organizations, particularly, in providing all the necessary information and offering their valuable time for the interviews. Without their assistance and support, the dissertation would not have been possible. I would like to cordially thank:

- Mr. Montien Kulthamrong, Mr. Yeunyard Jaisamutr, Mr. Jirasak Pemasiri (ETA)
- Mr. Somchai Chinodom, Mrs Leena Charoensri, Mr Yuenyong Tassanasri (TRD)
- Mr. Yuthana Tapcharoen, Mrs Sirima Hirancharoenvej (SRT)
- Mr. Nikom Wairatpanich, Mrs Chanima Chakjai (BMA),

Finally, I would like to thanks my parents; Mr. Opars and Mrs. Yingkamol Aruninta ; for their moral support extended to me since early childhood and which seems to be endless. My success in life and in my profession would not have been as today without them. I owe them a lot and would like to share every moment of happiness with both of them.

Abstract

The urban land re-development policy is one of the most important issues in government decision-making. Controversy after announcing any urban land policy has occurred regularly. Most of them involve the diversity of needs and conflict in directions of utilization. The author uses the abbreviation ‘WiMBY’ (an antonym of ‘NiMBY’) as the analysis tool to compare the heterogeneity of interests in publicly owned land utilization. The study focuses on ‘the diversity of positive attitudes’ of urban land utilization that was analyzed using the rational statistical method in order to reduce its complexity. The key research question is: Are the preferences the same (or not) across the independent factors when comparing preferences residing in specific land-use nearby the plot and in other areas? The survey results show patterns of preference comparisons across districts to the six plots of three public landowner organizations in Bangkok, Thailand. The ultimate results assist in providing the possible factors involved for further consideration. The author reviewed the failures and successes of urban land utilization projects on all continents, especially cases of controversy. The six case studies lie in the most valuable area, near Bangkok’s CBD. Thailand’s government or state enterprises own the case study plots, so the purpose of land development policy should affect many stakeholders, the way other public policies do. Factors involved in decision-making are compared herein to find homogeneity/heterogeneity of patterns by partially using a quantitative analysis tool. The provided opportunities involve three major directions of the ‘land redevelopment tripod’: economic, social, and environmental. Finally, all three legs of the tripod must stand to keep land development balanced and sustainable. Implications of WiMBY CIA will be generalized for a further comparative policy study with multi-stakeholders, to understand the diversity of attitudes optimistically, and to deliver greater consensus in future decision-making.

Keywords: under-utilized; urban voids; vacant land; publicly owned land; decision-making; preferences; interest; quantitative analysis; citizens

Table of Contents

Chapter	Title	Page
	Title Page	i
	Acknowledgements	ii
	Abstract	iii
	Table of Contents	iv
	List of Tables	vii
	List of figures	ix
	Abbreviations	xii
1	Introduction	1
	1.1 Background of the study	1
	1.2 Rationale	2
	1.3 Statement of the specific problem	4
	1.4 Study objectives	12
	1.5 Scope of the study	12
	1.6 Structure of the research	13
2	Literature Review	15
	2.1 Definition	15
	2.2 Causes and problems of under-utilized land	26
	2.3 Urban (re)development and urban land policy	27
	2.4 Land utilization schemes	29
	2.5 Decision-making in the public sphere	33
	2.6 Controversies in Land Redevelopment	38
	2.7 Situating the research among the reinvention of ‘socially environmental’ directions of urban public green space	42
	2.8 Tool for ‘urban land management policy’	43
	2.9 Policy planning and strategic environmental assessment	44
	2.10 Governance	45
	2.11 Urban green beyond immediate locality	46
	2.12 WiMBY : The key concept of heterogeneity comparative analysis	46
	2.13 Urban redevelopment and Public Land Management (PLM)	47
	2.14 Land management models	49
	2.15 The nature of the policy problem	50
	2.16 Failure of proper and efficient decision-making in urban land management policy	51
	2.17 Approaches in land management	53
	2.18 The implementation of the multiplism approach in PLM	57
3	Research Design	62
	3.1 Situating the research study	62
	3.2 Organization of the research design	67
	3.3 Methodology	70

4	Analysis of major public actors	89
	4.1 National level: Principles and approaches	89
	4.2 Local Level: Bangkok Metropolitan administrative system in Public Land Management	94
	4.3 State/State enterprise level: Major public land owner organizations	97
	4.4 Preferred directions of land utilization toward the two clusters/districts	123
	4.5 Findings from the policy dimension	139
5	Comparative Interest Analysis Results	141
	5.1 Understanding the situation	141
	5.2 Extracting the evidence of problems : specific plots	150
	5.3 Comparative analysis using WiMBY CIA	155
	5.4 WiMBY CIA conclusion	170
	5.5 Summary of the analysis result	174
6	Policy Implications	176
	6.1 Key issues	176
	6.2 Citizen, community and locality involvement	179
	6.3 Post-analysis in-depth interview	180
7	Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations	183
	7.1 Findings	183
	7.2 Conclusions	186
	7.3 Recommendations	187
	7.4 Review of the research objectives and accomplishments	190
	Appendix A	192
	Appendix B (in Thai)	226
	Appendix C	243
	References	255

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
2.1	Types of Vacant Land	17
2.2	Other similar terms of under-utilized land in ‘Recycling the City’ glossary	22
2.3	Land use Plan of Minato Mirai 21 Project	29
3.1	Research questions and methodology	68
3.2	Data and type of data	69
3.3	Case study selection matrix	71
3.4	Comparison of the plots selection criteria	74
3.5	Structure interviews sampling size – 137 samples	81
3.6	Sample size survey 700	88
4.1	Potential measures from the national policies.	91
4.2	PPD Green Space Master Plan.	95
4.3	ETA usage of usable ROW	115
4.4	ETA usable ROW	115
4.5	ETA PLM decision authority	117
4.6	Comparison across actors on informants’ preferences	124
4.7	Acceptance of utilization projects by all actors	130
5.1	Dissatisfaction regarding each type of under-utilized property	144
5.2	Reasons why the respondents do not use the land	144
5.3	Preferred policy directions which the responsible organizations should concern	147
5.4	Ranked preferred policy directions	147
5.5	The preferred stakeholders who should gain the benefits	148
5.6	Ranked preferred participation	150
5.7	The familiarity of the respondents to each plot	151
5.8	Dissatisfaction toward existing conditions of each plot	151
5.9	Preferred project types for each plot	153
5.10	Cross Tab-chi square table of Section I - General information (two districts)	156
5.11	Comparing two districts on their opinions regarding the underutilized land	158
5.12	Comparing across clusters on concerned directions (by the responsible organizations)	160
5.13	Comparing across clusters on preferred directions	161
5.14	Comparing the two districts on their familiarity with the case study plots	162
5.15	Ranking table comparing two clusters on preferred direction of TRD1	163
5.16	Ranking table comparing two districts for the preferred direction of TRD2	163
5.17	Ranking table comparing two districts on the preferred direction of SRT1	164

5.18	Ranking table comparing two districts on the preferred direction of SRT2	164
5.19	Ranking table comparing two districts on the preferred direction of ETA1	164
5.20	Ranking table comparing two districts on the preferred direction of ETA2	165
5.21	Comparing of districts on potential projects on TRD2	167
5.22	Ranking table comparing the two districts respondents on the preferred direction of TRD1 in Chatujak	172
5.23	Ranking table comparing the two districts respondents on the preferred direction of TRD2 in Rachatewee	172
5.24	CIA tests of others independent variables	173
5.25	CIA comparing genders in utilization direction	173
5.26	CIA comparing home/work places in utilization directions	174
1	Coordination Schema	192
2	Sample of questionnaire structure for non-decision-makers – citizen respondents	198
3	Cross organizations analysis on esthetic purposes of both clusters	201
4	Cross organizations analysis on transportation purposes of both clusters	201
5	Cross organizations analysis on passive recreation purposes of both clusters	202
6	Cross organizations analysis on active recreation purposes of both clusters	202
7	Cross organizations analysis on commercial purposes of both clusters	203
8	Cross organizations analysis on environmental purposes of both clusters	203
9	Cross organizations analysis on social welfare purposes of both clusters	204
10	WiMBY CIA summarized table on general information of the respondents	208
11	WiMBY CIA summarized table on the issue of leisure and life styles	209
12	WiMBY CIA summarized table on the issue of under-utilized land in general	211
13	WiMBY CIA summarized table on the case studies plots	215
14	WiMBY CIA summarized table on the issue of preferred purposes and potential appearances	220
15	WiMBY CIA summarized table on the issue of policy makings	224

List of figures

Figure	Title	Page
1.1	Shows the estimated population	6
1.2	Shows the urbanization pattern of Bangkok	7
1.3	Under-utilized land under elevated expressway	10
1.4	Under-utilized land under the elevated road/bridge and under and along the Hopewell / rail line	10
1.5	Under-utilized land adjacent to the old fortress conservation site and its recent land redevelopment	11
1.6	Under-utilized land on state enterprise property and its un-built proposals	11
1.7	Dissertation structure	13
2.1	Examples of the utilization of vacant land under elevated structures by public artists : project in Sidney	31
2.2	Examples of the utilization of vacant land under elevated structures as an urban space in Overtown project in Miami	32
2.3	Examples of the utilization of vacant land under elevated structures as commercial space : Paris Viaduct	33
2.4	Patton & Sawicki's model of a basic policy analysis process	36
2.5	The classical rational problem-solving process	37
2.6	Land use change management as a three-legged stool	49
2.7	The land management tripod	49
2.8	Participants and relationships in Environmental Planning and Management	51
2.9	The Land planning game : stakeholders, planners, rules, and the discourse model of exchange among players	51
2.10	A Tripartite Approach conceptual diagram	56
2.11	Levels of citizen participation	57
2.12	The four services of local government	59
3.1	Three kinds of influence / causality	64
3.2	The policy dimension of the decision-making process	65
3.3	Shows selected clusters concerning transportation network	72
3.4	Aerial photographs of the selected TRD plots	74
3.5	Aerial photographs of the selected SRT plots	75
3.6	Aerial photographs of the selected ETA plots	76
3.7	Plot TRD1 (Chatujak) Old north bound bus terminal	77
3.8	Plot TRD2 (Rachatewee) Department of Livestock Development, Rachatewee	77
3.9	SRT 1 (Chatujak) Railway Engineering School, Pahonyothin	78
3.10	SRT2 (Rachatewee) Railway Factory, Makasan	78
3.11	ETA 1 (Chatujak) 2nd Stage Express way, Pahonyothin	79
3.12	ETA 2 (Rachatewee) 2nd Stage Expressway, Urupong	79
3.13	Sampling locations of both clusters – stratified according to land use type	86
4.1	BMA organization chart	96

4.2	BMA organization chart (before 2005)	97
4.3	Shows the existing TRD PLM	99
4.4	TRD old organization chart	102
4.5	TRD new organization chart	103
4.6	Shown the existing SRT PLM	106
4.7	SRT old organization chart	109
4.8	SRT organization chart	110
4.9	Shown the existing ETA PLM	113
4.10	Expressway system map	116
4.11	ETA Organization chart	118
4.12	Sports corner for basketball and street soccer	122
4.13	Food and drink kiosks and a tot-lot	122
4.14	Comparison of informants' preference for esthetic direction	125
4.15	Comparison of informants' preference for transportation direction	125
4.16	Comparison of informants' preference for the passive recreation direction	126
4.17	Comparison of informants' preference for the active recreation direction	126
4.18	Comparison of informants' preference for commercial direction	127
4.19	Comparison of informants' preference for environmental direction	127
4.20	Comparison of informants' preference for social welfare direction	128
4.21	Preferred activities direction on each plot by percentage	131
4.22	Preferred projects direction by each actor	133
4.23	Preferred projects for each organization's plots by percentages	134
4.24	Show of support for the national policy#1-Securitization	134
4.25	Show of support for the national policy#2-Against drugs	136
4.26	Show of support for the national policy#3-Life long learning	136
4.27	Show of support for the national policy#4-A new parliament	137
4.28	Show of support for the national policy#5-Infrastructure Dev.	137
4.29	Show of support for the national policy#6-Env conservation	138
4.30	Show of support for the national policy#7-Tourism	138
4.31	Show of support for the national policy#8-counter corruption	139
4.32	Show of support for the national policy#9-Bereaucratic reform.	139
5.1	Actual and preferred leisure activities	143
5.2	The preferred policy directions	148
5.3	The preferred participation	150
5.4	The preferred activity directions for each plot	152
5.5	Preferred project directions for plots in the Chatujak cluster	154
5.6	Preferred project directions for plots in the Rachatewee cluster	154
5.7	Comparison across clusters on leisure behavior (actually do/prefer)	157
5.8	Comparison across clusters on concerned directions	159
5.9	Comparison across clusters on preferred directions	161
5.10	Comparison across clusters on their familiarity with case study plots	162
5.11	Comparing across clusters on the preferred directions for each plot	166
5.12	WiMBY test on the preferred projects on each plot	168
5.13	NiMBY test on the 'not to any plot'	169
5.14	WiMBY test on the most familiar plots :TRD1,TRD2	171

6.1	PLM Decision-making process	179
1	Comparative across clusters on preferred direction of TRD1	205
2	Comparative across clusters on preferred direction of TRD2	205
3	Comparative across clusters on preferred direction of SRT1	205
4	Comparison across clusters on preferred direction of SRT2	205
5	Comparison across clusters on preferred direction of ETA1	206
6	Comparison across clusters on preferred direction of ETA2	206
7	Comparison across clusters on preferred projects on TRD2	206
8	Comparison across clusters on policy directions	206
9	Comparison across clusters on participation	207

Abbreviations

BBM	Benefit Based Management
BMA	Bangkok Metropolitan Administration
BOT	Build – Operate - Transfer
CBO	Community Based Organization
CDC	Community Development Corporations
CIA	Comparative Interest Analysis
CPA	Comparative Policy Analysis
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DCP	Department of City Planning
ETA	Expressway and Rapid Transit Authority
FES	The First Stage Expressway System
FY	Fiscal Year
GIS	Geographic Information System
ISO	Industrial Standard
L/R	Land Readjustment
MCDM	Multiple Criteria Decision-making
MOSTE	Ministry of Science, Technology, and Environment
MS	Management science
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NiMBY	Not in My Back Yard
NSEDB	National Social and Economic Development Board
NSEDP	National Social and Economic Development Plan
OCMLT	The Office of the Commission for the Management of Land Traffic(old)
OTP	The Office of Transport and Traffic Policy and Planning (new)
OR	Operation research
PPD	Policy and Planning Department
PPS	Projects for Public Space
PLM	Public Land Management
PWD	Public Works Department
RAE	Ram Intra – At Narong Expressway
ROW	Right Of Way
SES	The Second Stage Expressway System
SMART	Simple Multi-Attribute Rating Techniques
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SRT	State Railway of Thailand
TAT	Tourist Authority of Thailand
TEI	Thailand Environment Institute
TPS	Tanarak Pattana Sinsap / Treasury Property Development
TSP	Total Suspended Particulates
TRD	Treasury Department
UEM	Urban Environmental Management
WiMBY	Welcome into My Back Yard

Departments in the BMA

BD	Budget Department
CDD	Community Development Department
CLD	City Law Enforcement Department
CPD	City Planning Department
CTD	Culture Sports and Tourism Department
DMD	Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Department
DSD	Drainage and Sewerage Department
EDD	Education Department
EVD	Environment Department
FND	Finance Department
HD	Health Department
MSD	Medical Services Department
PCD	Public Cleansing and Park Department
PPD	Policy and Planning Department
PWD	Public Works Department
SDD	Social Development Department
SED	Strategy and Evaluation Department
SWD	Social Welfare Department
TTD	Traffic and Transportation Department