

Syllabus & Schedule

Location: Stone 209

https://sakai.unc.edu/portal/site/plan704_sp16

Instructor: Nikhil Kaza

Teaching Assistant: Mary Wolfe

email: nkaza@unc.edu

mkwolfe@live.unc.edu

Office hours: T 10 - 11AM or by appt.

Thu 2 - 3 PM

Objective

Planning is usually conflated with collective action, collective choice, communication, centralisation and coordination. It is also common to conflate planning theory with urban theory. In this course, we explore how these concepts inform planning, however, are neither necessary for plans, nor are the issues they raise ameliorated by planning. We will explore various normative as well as positive theories of plans, institutions, ethics and governance at sufficient depth to provide grounds for understanding the nature and dilemmas of urban planning.

John Friedman, an influential planning academic, argued, “One of the ways to introduce students to what [planners] do, and to socialize them to the mysteries of our field, is to give them a strong dose of theory and history, along the way”. Thus, the point of the course is to provide concepts and reasonings that will help you make sense of planning practice. To this end, the learning objective of the class is not to write ‘theory papers’ but to apply theoretical concepts in evaluating plans, planning processes and attendant issues.

To sum up, the question we will attempt to answer in this course is, “What are good plans, planning practices and planners?” “What is a good place?” is left for other courses.

Student Responsibilities

This is a graduate class and, therefore, I won’t belabor on proper in-class and out-of-class etiquette and academic integrity. You are expected to be aware of these issues. If in doubt, please refer to university policies and ask for permission, rather than forgiveness.

I use powerpoint slides sparingly, so please be prepared to take notes in the discussion and lecture section.

There are no prerequisites for this class. However, this class will quickly cover ground and use concepts that you may not be familiar with. It is your responsibility to seek out additional background material to keep up.

We will read many classic readings from various fields as well as some case studies in planning. Thus, you may encounter novelties in both style and substance. Most of the readings have generated a lengthy trail of secondary literature. Use the resources on the World Wide Web as well as the library for secondary literature. It is your responsibility to seek clarifications for unfamiliar concepts and ideas.

The second part of the course consists (usually) of alternating lectures and discussion sections. Every student is expected to read all the readings for the particular week before the lecture. You

can, at times are expected to, disagree with the opinions and arguments presented in the class and in the readings. Your participation and papers will be evaluated on your competence in coherently and comprehensively framing your counterpoints to the issues raised by the lectures, readings and discussions.

You are to post reading responses about your readings for every class in the forum topic associated with the lesson. These forum postings will be evaluated and form the basis for your online participation. These responses need not be long, but should succinctly capture the essence of the readings, connections to specific examples that you are familiar with.

A randomly chosen pair of students will lead each week's discussion section (if there is one and is noted on the schedule). The discussion leads are expected to come prepared to discuss the main points of the week's readings, supplement them with particular case studies and activities in which rest of the students can participate. Skills for leading the discussion are similar to skills you will need to manage a meeting, frame the agenda, solicit and encourage participation and persuasively present different but illuminating view points. The discussions are evaluated as part of the in-class participation. Discussion leads will be posted on the wiki, once the roster stabilises. I strongly urge the leads to meet with me and/or the TA, the previous week to get some guidance and clarification on the real and hypothetical cases that might be used in the discussion for that week.

My calendar is at <http://nikhilkaza.youcanbook.me>. You can use the website to setup appointments for slots that are open and are mutually convenient.

Please use the "Messages" tool in Sakai to send emails to different groups including me and Mary. If you need to email to me outside the Sakai functionality, the email subject line should include "PLAN704", so as to enable automatic filtering by email clients. Messages might get lost if the subject line is not included as I implement aggressive SPAM filtering. It is your responsibility to make sure that you are receiving these emails, as email and Sakai are the primary modes of communication.

The course calendar is available at <http://tinyurl.com/plan704>. The course calendar rather than the following tentative schedule should be considered more definitive and up to date. You can subscribe to it in your calendar programs such as Outlook and Google. The course calendar not only lists the topics for the week, but also due dates for various assignments and any other extra guest lectures that fall outside the class schedule. I strongly urge you to keep an eye on it.

This class is set up so that you will learn much more from your peers than from lectures. Therefore, vigorous participation is not only encouraged, but also required. Initiative and creativity in articulating the main points are especially prized. You should bring in materials, concepts and cases from your professional experience and other classes. As an example, footnotes are provide in the schedule or readings, where some of the topics are either encountered in or are relevant to other courses in the department.

I will monitor in-class discussion, out-of-class participation, throughout the semester. Since participation is a substantial portion of the grade (25%), students are advised to take it very seriously.

Philip McDaniel has kindly created this library website dedicated to the course. <http://guides.lib.unc.edu/content.php?pid=367431>. This website is a repository of resources such as film clips, recommended books about cities, current planning news that should inform the discussions in the class. Please check back frequently, as we will be adding background materials that are publicly available. This page is also linked from the Sakai course website.

In addition to the regular class and discussion schedule, I will arrange guest lectures on various qualitative research techniques, such as archival research, participant observation and interview methods. The speakers and dates are yet to be determined and are likely to fall outside the class

schedule. They will be posted on the course calendar. You should make every effort to attend these sessions.

Grading and Assignments

Performance will be evaluated on one presentation, four papers, quizzes and participation (exemplified by forum postings, in-class participation and contribution to discussions).

This participation includes asking questions about unfamiliar concepts, challenging arguments and, in general, making the classroom experience lively. Participation, including the forum postings, comments and in-class discussion will account for 25 percent (15% for in-class, 10% online) of the grade.

Each set of readings has a lesson associated on Sakai, which includes the link to the forum topic for that week. You are expected to post a short (2-3 paragraphs) response to the readings by Friday 5 PM of the previous week (Forum postings for the first week and presentation week are optional). You can comment on others' responses but the comments are not a substitute for your own response. Comments are considered part of ongoing out-of-class discussion and will be monitored throughout the semester. These forums are expected to serve as individual and collective notes for the class. Contribution to these intellectual commons is graded as part of your participation grade.

You are expected to read all the assigned readings. The quizzes provide you with feedback on understanding of the material. The Sakai quizzes contribute to 15% of the grade. I will not count the lowest three scores towards the final grade. These quizzes are generally due on Wednesdays (after the material is covered in class).

Of the five assignments, four are short papers that tightly argue a particular case or a point drawn from readings and other ancillary materials. You are advised to refer to Strunk and White's *Elements of Style*, as well as the grading rubric provided on Sakai. All these papers are argumentative essays. "The argumentative essay is a genre of writing that requires the student to investigate a topic; collect, generate, and evaluate evidence; and establish a position on the topic in a concise manner. ... Regardless of the amount or type of research involved, argumentative essays must establish a clear thesis and follow sound reasoning"¹

- Assignment 1. Evaluate the rational and irrational motivations of actions of an organisation(s) in a planning case you are familiar with (10%).
- Assignment 2. Presentation only. Evaluate a key moment/persona/idea/movement in planning history (5%)
- Assignment 3. Critically evaluate a plan. Also, concurrently write an individual plan. (15%)
- Assignment 4. Analyse a planning legal case using theoretical concepts.(10%)
- Assignment 5. Critically analyse an ongoing/recent planning process. Account for whether and how the information generated in the process is being used in public and private decision making. This is a 2 person group project(20%)

These assignments have to be submitted via Sakai site. For instructions on how to use the Sakai site assignment tool to submit documents, refer to <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bAAHf8PUApQ>. Interim submissions for Assignment 5 are to be posted on the wiki on the sakai site. For help with the wiki, refer to video tutorial on <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mwi047CbXBw>.

¹<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/1/2/>

As with any document, remember that the submission may be printed in B&W. Be aware that, illustrations that look good in colour and on the screen, do not translate well into this format. It is a good habit, to use high contrast illustrations. Also, never refer to colours of an illustration, in the text.

All verbatim text and illustrations from other sources appearing in the assignments and weekly analyses are to be properly cited and documented. All help from websites, individuals, and other materials should be properly acknowledged. There is no penalty for collaborative endeavours; however, severe penalties are imposed for non-attribution.

Writing well is a necessary skill to develop. Your term papers and emails will be graded, not merely on their substantive merits, but also on style. You should take advantage of the excellent resources at UNC writing center (<http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/>). Please refer to the grading rubric handout as a guide.

All citations should follow the guidelines set forth by the **Chicago Manual of Style**. A quick and ready guide is available at http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html. Use the **author-date** format of the Chicago style. The course library webpage has information on citation formats. You will be penalized for not following these formatting instructions.

Page limits mentioned in the assignments are guides, and are not binding. Double spacing is an anachronism. Presumably, you have moved on from the fixed font era of typewriters.

Textbooks and Readings

The following textbook is required for this class:

- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press

The textbook is available at the University Bookstore and is on reserve at the Undergraduate library.

Most of the other readings are derived from journal articles and book chapters. A binder that comprises of the all the readings excluding the chapters from the textbook is available in the reading room. This binder is not monitored. As a class you are expected to setup a mechanism of mutual monitoring, if you plan to borrow it.

The links to the readings (excluding the chapters from the required textbook) are posted on Sakai website on the respective lessons pages. The lessons pages should be considered more definitive and up to date rather than the tentative schedule posted on this syllabus.

Some of the books, whose chapters are mentioned in the schedule, are on physical reserve at the Undergraduate Library. Additionally, electronic versions of the some of the articles and books can be found through the library website through various article databases and e-book collections. I will endeavour to put all the links for the book chapters and articles on the lessons pages of the Sakai. Please let me or the TA know of any broken links right away. No links to the chapters in the assigned textbook will be posted.

Schedule (Subject to revision)

1/11(Mon) Introduction ²

Why do we need to plan? Who plans? For what purpose?

- Basta, C. (2014). Siting risky facilities: Probabilism, determinism and beyond. *Planning Theory* 13(1), 44–64
- Moore, T. (1978). Why allow planners to do what they do? A justification from economic theory. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 44(4), 387–398
- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapters 1)

Decision Making & Plans

1/13(Wed) Logic of Individual Action

I will argue for planning as a method of thinking before acting. As such plans are made by various entities including private groups, to convince larger public. It is in this cacophony of intersecting plans and intentions and goals, that we must individually act.

- Friend, J. K. and A. Hickling (2005). *Planning under Pressure: The Strategic Choice Approach* (third ed.). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann (Chapters 1)
- Etzioni, A. (1967, December). Mixed-Scanning: A ‘Third’ Approach to Decision-Making. *Public Administration Review* 27(5), 385–392
- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapters 2 & 4)

1/18(Mon) No class (MLK day-Holiday).

1/20(Wed) Rational Fools & Moral Sentiments

Rationality has fallen out of favour. In this class, we will examine whether or not there could be such a thing as irrational/non-rational planning. We will dissect the notions of rationality and how they inform our understanding of motivations of different organisations to act.

- Alexander, E. R. (2000). Rationality Revisited: Planning Paradigms in a Post-Postmodernist Perspective. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 19(3), 242–256
- Allison, G. T. and P. Zelikow (1999). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Longman (Concise case study)

²PLAN 651

1/25(Mon) Logic of Collective Action & Collective Choice ³

Collective action and Collective choice are central to ‘public’ planning in large societies. Collective action is the action that needs to be taken as a group, about goals agreed upon by a group. Collective choice are mechanisms through which groups decide. These two are rather distinct from, though related to, one another and planning. I will discuss these notions in detail and argue about when and why wide participation in planning process, makes sense and when it does not. We will return to these topics in the communicative action class.

- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapter 8)
- Kaza, N. and L. D. Hopkins (2009). In What Circumstances Should Plans Be Public? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 28(4), 491–502

1/27(Wed) Making Plans ⁴

How can we make plans that will be used? How to make them well?

- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapters 3, 5 & 7)
- Pollack, M. E. and J. F. Harty (1999). There’s more to life than making plans: Plan management in dynamic, Multi-Agent environments. *AI Magazine* 20(4), 71–84

2/01(Mon) Presentations about planning practices, watershed moments and norms

Vignettes by each student on various planning cultures that come to define the field of planning. The topics range from historical processes in different places, institutional settings, important events, planning disasters and the like.

- Peterson, J. A. (1979). The impact of sanitary reform upon American urban planning, 1840 - 1890. *Journal of Social History* 13(1), 83–103. also reprinted in Introduction to Planning History in the United States, edited by Donald Krueckeberg
- Sandercock, L. (1998). Introduction: Framing the insurgent historiographies for planning. In L. Sandercock (Ed.), *Making the invisible visible: A multicultural planning history*, pp. 1–35. Berkeley, CA: Univ of California Press

2/03(Wed) Presentations about planning practices etc. (contd.)

- Sies, M. C. and C. Silver (1996). *Planning the Twentieth-century American City*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press (Introduction)
- Jackson, K. T. (1985). *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of United States*. New York: Oxford University Press (Chapters 11⁵ & 12)

³See PLAN 762/763

⁴See PLAN 741

⁵Also in PLAN 714

2/08(Mon) Using Plans ⁶

Once plans are constructed, they have to be used in decision-making. We will explore how they might be used and what kinds of arguments are generally made about both rational and rhetorical function of plans as well as planning.

- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapters 9 & 10)
- Schon, D. A. (1984). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think In Action* (1 ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books (Chapter 7)

2/10(Wed) Discussion on Assignment 3

Property Rights, Governance & Institutions

2/15(Mon) Planning & Markets: A False Dichotomy⁷

Central to many arguments about justification for planning, are that markets fail either because of externalities or because they cannot provide common goods and planning is meant to remedy them. I will dissect these notions and show that fallacy of conflating government with planning. I will also argue that planning is not limited to governments; firms, individuals and voluntary groups plan within markets and without.

- Klosterman, R. E. (1985). Arguments for and against planning. *Town Planning Review* 56(1), 5–20
- Alexander, E. R. (2001). Why planning vs. markets is an oxymoron?: Asking the right question. *Planning and Markets* 4(1), 1–8
- Kaza, N. and G. Knaap (2011). Principles of planning for economists. In N. Brooks, G. Knaap, and K. Donaghy (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Urban Economics and Planning*, Chapter 2, pp. 29–50. New York NY: Oxford University Press (selected non-technical sections)

2/17(Wed) Planning & Markets: A False Dichotomy (Disc.)

2/22(Mon) Rights & Regulations⁸

For markets to function, a well-defined, and an evolving system of property rights need to be established. I will argue for a social construction of bundles of rights that account for changing circumstances. Construction of *de facto* and *de jure* rights are contingent on transaction costs, peoples and historical practises and are backed by the police power of the state through regulations. Planning sometimes provide justifications for these regulations, but is neither sufficient nor necessary for them. Furthermore, planning is rarely exclusively about regulatory action.

- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapter 6)
- Bancroft, A. (2000). ‘No interest in land’: Legal and spatial enclosure of Gypsy-Travellers in Britain. *Space & Polity* 4(1), 41–56
- Coase, R. H. (1960). The problem of social cost. *The journal of Law and Economics* 3(1), 1–44

⁶See PLAN 741

⁷See PLAN 710

⁸See PLAN 724

2/24(Wed) Rights & Regulations (Disc.)

2/29(Mon) Common Pool Resources & Institutional Responses ⁹

Hardin's classic article on how common pool resources (CPR) are degraded when no well-defined system of property rights exists. However, as Ostrom forcefully argues private property rights are only one type of institutional response to CPRs and there could be many others. These rights are also negotiated over time and are in constant flux, contrary to popular perception. We will examine how planning might or might not be useful, necessary and sufficient to care for these CPRs.

- Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science* 162, 1243–1248
- Heller, M. A. (1998, January). The Tragedy of the Anticommons: Property in the Transition from Marx to Markets. *Harvard Law Review* 111(3), 621–688
- Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *American Economic Review* 100(3), 641–672

3/02(Wed) Common Pool Resources & Institutional Responses (Disc.)

3/07(Mon) Social Contracts & Justifications for State

State is one of the most visible actors engaged in planning. Justifications for the State need to be critically examined. However, the justifications for planning are different from that of the State and we will explore the connotations and distinctions. We will also consider the arguments of abuses of authoritarianism that are ever present in the notion of the State.

- Farrelly, C. (Ed.) (2004). *Contemporary Political Theory: A Reader* (First ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd (pgs 3-12, 53-60, 109-112)
- Stein, S. M. and T. L. Harper (2005). Rawls's "justice as fairness": A moral basis for contemporary planning theory. *Planning Theory* 4(2), 147–172
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. Yale Agrarian Studies/Yale ISPS. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press (Chapter 2)

3/09(Wed) Social Contracts & Justifications for State (Disc.)

3/14(Mon) No Class. (Spring Break)

3/16(Wed) No Class. (Spring Break)

Normative Planning Methods and their Justifications

3/21(Mon) Comprehensive Rational Planning Model

Traditional comprehensive planning has been the hallmark of planning in many countries, including welfare states, statist regimes, and neo populist states. We will identify the rational model of comprehensive planning and argue about its strengths and limitations.

⁹See PLAN 710 and PLAN 724

- Hammond, J. S., R. L. Keeney, and H. Raiffa (1999). *Smart choices: A practical guide to making better decisions*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press (Chapters 4, 5 & 6)
- Rittel, H. and M. Webber (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy sciences* 4(2), 155–169
- Goetz, A. R. and J. S. Szyliowicz (1997). Revisiting transportation planning and decision making theory: The case of Denver International Airport. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 31(4), 263 – 280

3/23(Wed) Comprehensive Rational Planning Model (Disc.)

3/28(Mon) Feminist Critiques

Continuing from the earlier week on how different groups are marginalised, this week explores how gender norms undergird assumptions about what constitutes good cities and the proper domain on planning. We will explore norms about gender, sexual orientation and other expectations

- Fainstein, S. (2005). Feminism and planning: Theoretical issues. In S. Fainstein and L. Servon (Eds.), *Gender and planning: A reader*, Chapter 7, pp. 120–140. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press
- Valentine, G. (1996, September). (re)negotiating the heterosexual street: Lesbian productions of space. In *BodySpace: Destabilising Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*, pp. 146–55. Routledge
- Ritzdorf, M. (2000). Sex, lies, and urban life: How municipal planning marginalizes african american women and their families. In K. B. Miranne and A. H. Young (Eds.), *Gendering the city: women, boundaries, and visions of urban life*, pp. 169–81. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc

3/30(Wed) Feminist Critiques (Disc.)

4/04(Mon) Race & Multiculturalism ¹⁰

One of the issues that defined the cultural, social and physical landscape of the US is race. We will examine this issue closely in how it relates to planning, and the construction of space and communities. We will also reexamine the readings from the *Crabgrass Frontier*.

- Charles, C. Z. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29(1), 167–207
- Baum, H. (2004). Smart growth and school reform: What if we talked seriously about race and took community seriously? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70, 14–25
- Young, I. M. (2002, June). *Inclusion and Democracy* (First ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press (Chapter 6)

4/06(Wed) Race & Multiculturalism (Disc.)

4/11(Mon) Marxist Critiques

It has been argued that as an instrument of the State, planning regimes are necessarily conservative, in that they entrench existing power structures and maintain *status quo*. Traditional critiques of

¹⁰See PLAN 762

this model of planning have relied on the fact that certain groups (either through class, gender etc.) are privileged over others, sometimes deliberately and at other times unintentionally. We will examine these claims and see if these critiques will still hold water when we move away from conflating planning with regulation.

- Blomley, N. (2008). Enclosure, Common Right and the Property of the Poor. *Social & Legal Studies* 17(3), 311–331
- Harvey, D. (1992). Social justice, postmodernism and the city. *International journal of urban and regional research* 16(4), 588–601
- Soja, E. W. (1980). The socio-spatial dialectic. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70(2), 207–225

4/13(Wed) Marxist Critiques (Disc.)

4/18(Mon) Advocacy & Activist Planning (Disc.)

The notion of ‘public interest’ is central to many arguments for planning and informs the ethical prescriptions of the profession. However, Davidoff famously argued that planners should act on the behalf of the marginalised groups because they do not have the capacity to plan for themselves. Taking this line of reasoning we will examine in this class as well as the next, whether planners should perform roles similar to lawyers. If so, who would the client be?

- Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31(4), 331–338
- Krumholz, N. (1982). A retrospective view of equity planning: Cleveland 1969-1979. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48(2), 163–174
- Comments by Jerome Kaufman, Paul Davidoff, and Lawrence Susskind, *ibid* 175-183

4/20(Wed) Communicative Action & Deliberative Democracy ¹¹

As a reaction to the rational model of planning, Healey, Innes and Forester argued for a more nuanced approach of public engagement as the main focus of planning. Their argument takes the form that community building and capacity building are central to the exercise of planning, not just making plans. We will critically examine these claims and the prescribed processes.

- Forester, J. (2009). *Dealing with differences: dramas of mediating public disputes*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press (Introduction & Chapter 2)
- Tauxe, C. (1995). Marginalizing Public Participation in Local Planning: An Ethnographic Account. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 61(4), 471–481
- Innes, J. E. (1996). Planning through consensus building: A new view of the comprehensive planning ideal. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62(4), 460–472

4/25(Mon) Professional Ethics (Disc.)

Every profession prescribes a set of professional ethics that it requires its practitioners to follow. We will engage the AICP code of ethics and see how your examination of the planning process (Assignment 5) had brought forth some ethical issues that need to be confronted.

¹¹See PLAN 725

- Lucy, W. (1988). APA's ethical principles include simplistic planning theories. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54(2), 147–148
- Rubin, H. J. (1988). The Danada farm: Land acquisition, planning, and politics in the suburbs. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54(1), 79–90
- Feld, M. M. (1989). The Yonkers case and its implications for the teaching and practice of planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 8(3), 169–175

4/27(Wed) Recap & Retrospection