

## **UPP500 History and Theory of Planning**

**Instructor Professor Charles Hoch**

**Wednesday 6-9PM**

### **Purpose**

This core course provides students with knowledge about the origins of urban planning and the ideas that justify its practice. The history will be thematic and heruistic rather than detailed and critical. Ideas about planning will be organized as narratives and arguments that students can and should use to justify planning activity.

### **Assignments**

Students will prepare three written reports.

History report reviewing ideas about a planning event, episode or institution (25% grade)

Interview report comparing two planning practitioner interviews (25% grade)

Theory report uses planning ideas to analyze or interpret plans or planning (30% grade)

Students will actively participate in class discussions

Students demonstrate active leadership in discussion:

Prepare article briefing and discussion for one class (10% grade)

In class or on line discussion questions and comments (10% grade)

### **Textbook**

Hall, Peter. 2004. Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century. Blackwell. ISBN 0-631-23252-4 pbk

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1. Why teach planning theory?

How did planners give advice over the last century?

Why do we trust rational advice over competitors like mysticism, intuition, will, desire,..?

If we agree to give rational advice, why do we give such different kinds?

Why give advice? Why plan? What evil might it diminish or good accomplish?

Forester, John. 2004. Reflections on trying to teach planning theory.

## II. HISTORY

### 2. From History to Theory and Back Again

The history of events and interpretations about the past and future

Using narrative and argument to make sense of uncertainty

The industrial city generates incredible earth shaping effects and grave social suffering

Urbanization and industrialization accompany one another

Conceiving of the city as the crucible for social reform

If we change urban organization and form we can change how people live

Hall, Chapter 1: Cities of Imagination

Hall, Chapter 2: City of Dreadful Night

### 3. Beauty and Civic Improvement

What is the relationship between physical environment and moral character?

Does aesthetic experience shape moral outlook and social character?

How do organic and aesthetic conceptions converge in urban plans?

Hall, Chapter 4: City in the Garden

Hall, Chapter 6: City of Monuments

### 4. Progress and Science

How does the idea of progress inform planning ideas in progressive reform?

How do scientific rationality and comprehensiveness get connected in planning?

What ideas were used to justify planning as a professional activity?

Professions and reform

How did planning proponents connect scientific method and public reform?

Zoning, subdivision, traffic engineering and master plans

Hall, Chapter 3: City of By-Pass

### 5. Efficiency and Order

What is the role of government in the organization of the planning ideal?

How does legibility of authority connect with clarity of plan?

What is the relationship between local land markets and local government plans?

Hall, Chapter 5: City in the Region  
Hall, Chapter 7: City of Towers

6. Urban problems as National Problems: The New Deal (History Report Due)  
The Great Depression raises serious doubts about free market capitalism.  
How might planning guide national institutions and even national economies?  
    Regional Planning ideas as government programs  
    City planning ideas as government policies  
What role should the national government play in shaping market institutions?  
    Socialist planning ideals and the contradiction of state power  
    Laissez faire liberalism and the consequences of exploitative inequality  
    State organized liberalism seeks to tame exploitation but avoid repression

Hall, Chapter 8: City of Sweat Equity  
Hall, Chapter 9: City on the Highway

7. Postwar Boom and the Planning Explosion: Institutions for Rational Planning  
Planning gains institutional legitimacy as government activity.  
Profession grows in number, but not in standing. Quest for expertise intensifies.  
What is the relationship between expertise and government authority?  
How do we justify the imposition of planning standards in a democratic society?  
What forms of organized activity should we use to pursue planning objectives?  
The relationship between the powers of technological change and social effects  
    Progress and its unexpected consequences

Hall, Chapter 11: City of Enterprise  
Hall, Chapter 12: City of Tarnished Belle Epoque  
Hall, Chapter 13: City of Permanent Underclass

### **III. THEORY**

8. Rational Comprehensive Planning  
Planning expertise imposes forms of social control. How do we justify control?  
The complexity of cities escapes our expertise. How do we cope with the limits?  
How do we pursue predictability without imposing undemocratic control?  
There are multiple forms of rationality. Which do we choose? How do we choose?

Hall, Chapter 10: City of Theory

Hoch, Charles. 1994. Chapter 2: Planning and Professional Authority” *What Planners Do*  
Chicago: Planners Press.

Hoch, Charles. 1994. Values and Planning.

Dehaene, Michiel. 1992. Survey and the assimilation of a modernist narrative in urbanism *Journal of Architecture* (UK) 7(1):33-55.

Abbott, John. 2005. Understanding and Managing the Unknown: The Nature of Uncertainty in *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24:237-251

Hostovsky, Charles. 2006. The Paradox of the Rational Comprehensive Model of Planning: Tales from Waste Management Planning in Ontario, *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25:382-395.

#### 9. Planning Politics: Advocacy and More

Planning has historical and social roots. Should knowledge flow from custom?

Do powerful and feasible plans make good plans?

When planners take sides do they betray the pursuit of larger public goods?

Does the claim for social justice trump other claims about the environment or efficiency?

Clavel, Pierre. 1994. The Evolution of Advocacy Planning, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60(2):146-150.

Marris, Peter. 1994. Advocacy Planning as a Bridge Between the Professional and the Political, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60(2):

Forester, John. 1994. Bridging Interests and Community: Advocacy Planning and the Challenges of Deliberate Democracy, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60(2):

Peattie, Lisa. 1994. Communities and the Interests in Advocacy Planning, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60(2):

Albrechts, Louis. 2002. The Planning Community Reflects on Enhancing Public Involvement. Views from Academics and Reflective Practitioners, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3(3): 331-347.

Foley, John & Mickey Lauria. 2000. Plans, Planning and Tragic Choices, *Planning Theory & Practice* 1(2):219- 233.

Forester, John. 1999. Reflections on the Future Understanding of Planning Practice, *International Planning Studies* 4(2):175-193.

#### 10. Taking the Interpretive Turn: Plans as Arguments (Planner Interview Report Due)

How do truth and rhetoric shape our taken for granted knowledge about plans?

How can we make strong truth claims when uncertainty remains?

How does pragmatic planning differ from rational planning?

Healey, P. 1996. The argumentative turn in planning theory and its implications for strategic spatial planning. *Environ & Plan B* 23: 217-234.

Bickerstaff, Karen and Gordon Walker 2005. Shared Visions, Unholy Alliances: Power, Governance and Deliberative Processes in Local Transport Planning *Urban Studies* 42(12): 2123–2144.

Throgmorton, James A. Planning as Persuasive Storytelling in a Global-Scale Web of Relationships *Planning Theory* 2, no. 2 (2003): 125-151

Hoch, Charles. 2006. Emotions and Planning. *Planning Theory and Practice*. 7(4):

Proctor, Wendy & Martin Drechsler. 2006. Deliberative multicriteria evaluation, Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy 24:169-190.

Sandercock, Leonie. 2003. Out of the Closet: The Importance of Stories and Storytelling in Planning Practice, *Planning Theory & Practice*, (4)1: 11–28.

#### 11. Advice and Institutional Design

What role do organizations play structuring planning knowledge and activity?

What devices, organizations, etc... do we use to put purposes into practice?

What do we mean by democracy and how might this shape our knowledge of planning?

How do we distinguish fair and efficient plans? How would we judge their power?

Alexander, Ernest. Institutional transformation and Planning: From Institutionalization Theory to Institutional Design *Planning Theory* 4(3): 209-223.

Innes, Judith and David Booher. 2004. Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, *Planning Theory & Practice* 5(4):419-436.

Richardson T. 2002. Freedom and control in planning: using discourse in the pursuit of reflexive practice. *Plan Theory Practice* 3(3):353 –61.

Sanyal, Bish. 2005. Planning as Anticipation of Resistance, *Planning Theory* 4(3): 225–245.

Van Driesche, Jason and Marcus Lane. 2002. Conservation through Conversation: Collaborative Planning for Reuse of a Former Military Property in Sauk County, Wisconsin, USA *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3(2): 133-153.

#### 12. Practical Judgment and Pragmatism

How might theory, that ivory tower talk, help us improve planning judgments?

How do we use theory to give better advice?

Hoch, Charles. 2002. Evaluating Plans Pragmatically. *Planning Theory* 1(1):53-75.

Judith E. Innes and Judith Gruber. 2005. Planning Styles in Conflict: The Metropolitan Transportation Commission, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71(2):177-188.

Watson, Vanessa. 2002. Do We Learn from Planning Practice? The Contribution of the Practice Movement to Planning Theory, *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22:178-187.

Connick, Sarah and Judith Innes. 2003. Outcomes of Collaborative Water Policy Making: Applying Complexity Thinking to Evaluation, *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 46(2), 177–197.

### 13. The Dark Side of Planning: Deep Skepticism and Cynicism

What about plans serving the interests of the powerful?

Do planning ideas harbor the seeds of destruction and control?

Allmendinger, Phil. 2005. Applying Lacanian Insight and a Dash of Derridian Deconstruction to Planning's Dark Side, *Planning Theory* 4(1): 87–112.

Mc-Guirk, P. M. 2001. Situating communicative planning theory: context, power, and knowledge, *Environment and Planning A* 33: 195- 217.

Stanley M. Stein & Thomas L. Harper. 2003. Power, Trust, and Planning, *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23:125-139.

Watson, Vanessa. 2003. Conflicting Rationalities: Implications for Planning Theory and Ethics, *Planning Theory & Practice* 4(4): 395-407.

### 14. Imagining the Future: Scenarios and Hope

How do we justify plans when folks may not focus on rational argument?

How do we create ideas that will motivate advice and foster commitments to specific actions?

Bloom, Michael J. & Mary K. Menefee. 1994. Scenario Planning and Contingency Planning, *Changing Government: Pressures, Reality, Responses: Proceedings of the Sixth National Public Sector Productivity Conference* 17(3): 223-230.

Morrison, James and Ian Wilson. 1996. The Strategic Management Response to the Challenge of Global Change in H. Didsbury (Ed.), *Future Vision, Ideas, Insights, and Strategies*. Bethesda, MD: The World Future Society.

Carr Adrian, Rita Durant and Alexis Downs. 2004. Emergent strategy development, abduction, and pragmatism: New lessons for corporations, *Human Systems Management*

23: 79–91

Shearer, Allen W. 2005. Approaching scenario-based studies: three perceptions about the future and considerations for landscape planning, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 32: 67-87.

**UPP500 Course Schedule  
Fall 2006**

- 8/30 Why Teach Planning Theory?
- 9/ 6 From History to Theory
- 9/13 Beauty and Civic Improvement
- 9/20 Progress and Science
- 9//27 Efficiency and Order
- 10/ 4 Urban Problems and New Deal (History Report Due 10/3)
- 10/11 Postwar Boom and Planning Explosion
- 10/18 Critical Disenchantment and Revisions of Rational Model
- 10/25 Making Planning Political
- 11/ 1 Interpretive Planning (Interview Report Due 10/31)
- 11/07 No Class (ACSP)
- 11//15 Advice and Institutional Design
- 11/22 Practical Pragmatic Judgment
- 11/29 The Darkside of Planning (Theory Report Due 11/28)
- 12/ 6 Imagining the Future: Scenarios and Hope

## **Assignment #1 Interviews with Professional Planners**

*Purpose:* Learn about the importance and meaning of planning ideas between two practitioners.

*Product:* A written essay of no more than 10 double spaced printed pages [minimum one inch margins and at least 12 point type]. Post the essay to the courseinfo discussion page.

*Content:* I want you to ask each planner to describe what they do and then ask them why they do it? You should ask them to describe actual cases or stories before you ask the why question.

*Strategy?* First, ask your interviewees about their professional history. Second, ask to hear a story or episode in which they did planning. Probe for enough details so you can see for yourself how events unfolded. Third, referring to some of the actions the interviewee described ask what sort of planning ideas informed or justified a particular action.

If you ask the why question without a specific tale you get rather abstract ideological ideas. If you ask them why they took specific actions (e.g., We skipped the public hearing... I worked up a quick and dirty financial assessment... We were sure to meet with the alderman before...) you will learn a great deal more about the meaning of the reasons they give for taking that action. Sometimes when you ask why the planners will offer moral rationale=s, thinking you want to know their ethical views. That=s ok, but ask them what their planning rationale was. It may be that the person you interview will offer no planning rationale for what they do. Then ask them why we call what they do planning?

Interviewing two planners provides you with an opportunity to draw comparisons between them. Your paper should focus on the relationship between planning activity and the rationales the planners offered. I do not want to read planning biographies.

*Process and Deadline:* I expect you to identify and contact planners for an interview by the third week of the semester.

## **Assignment #2: Thinking and Writing Theory**

*Purpose:* Learn to read, describe, compare and evaluate the ideas of two planning theorists; or theorists who write about planning.

*Product:* A written essay of no more than 20 double spaced printed pages [minimum one inch margins and at least 12 point type]. Post the essay to the courseinfo discussion page.

*Content:* I am not interested in a detailed or comprehensive review of the work you read. I want you to select and compare ideas between two thinkers. They may focus on the same topic, for instance consensus, but treat the topic differently (majority rule vs. acclamation). They might use the same idea, but in very different ways, for instance, the concept rationality (logical vs. practical). Your essay should make the comparison using benchmarks or criteria relevant to the purpose and context the respective authors set for themselves. You may use criteria other than those explicitly or implicitly anticipated by the authors. Finally, I want you to answer the following question after you draw your comparison: ADo these theories justify practical planning activity? How well do they do so?@

*Process and Deadline:* I expect you to propose two books to me no later than the second week of the semester. Simply email your choices to me with a brief rationale for your choice. Why did ;you pick those two?