

1023-PLAN-563 PLANNING THEORY
Fall Quarter 2009-2010

Prepared September 7, 2009

School of Planning
College of Design, Art, Architecture and Planning
University of Cincinnati

Tuesday, Thursday 2:00 to 3:20PM
3410 DAAP

Instructor: Dr. David Varady
david.varady@uc.edu

Office Hours: T, Th 12:30 to 1:50 by appointment, Room 6203 DAAP

UC Blackboard questions: Dr. Varady's GA Per Jansen" jansenpd@email.uc.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course provides an overview of the literature on planning theory and is divided into four parts (1) the need for planning theories, (2) the theory of comprehensive rationality (which has provided the bedrock for the profession), (3) newer theoretical approaches (decentralized rationality, theories of communicative action) and (4) ways planners can become more effective (political feedback strategies, the "new" comprehensive plans).

COURSE OBJECTIVES

By reviewing recent thinking about planning theory, the course should make you more self-critical about the planning profession and should provide you with an understanding of the political, organizational and personality variables that contribute to effective planning. A second aim of the course is to prepare you to think about the political and ethical ramifications of your own decisions as a professional planner.

As we proceed through the course I will present you with a series of dilemmas facing planners today. These are problems for which there is no simple solution. For example, as planners try to be more comprehensive they tend to move into areas for which they lack expertise. Given this situation, should they still try to be as comprehensive or should they specialize in relatively narrow areas like land use planning? I will not offer simple solutions to these dilemmas. Hopefully, as a result of this course, you will be able to articulate your own position with respect to these difficult and complex issues.

COURSE FORMAT

Laptops are not permitted in class!

This will be a student-run seminar so it is crucial that you do the assigned readings prior to class. I will assign one or more students to run each class beginning with the September 29th class. Since there will be several students per powerpoint group it will be necessary to divide the work among group members. *Each member of the group needs to give his/her own presentation and assignments must be clearly indicated in the electronic file and in the handout.*

I will expect the assigned students to do a powerpoint presentation that goes beyond a summary of the materials (since everyone in class will be reading the same articles and books). The powerpoint should also encompass supplementary materials available on the web and should indicate your reactions to the readings. The student presenter should also be prepared to ask questions to the rest of the class to stimulate discussion. **IF ALL YOU DO IS SUMMARIZE THE READINGS AND/OR READ TEXT (RATHER THAN TALK FROM BULLET POINTS) FROM THE SCREEN YOU WILL RECEIVE NO HIGHER THAN A “C” FOR YOUR POWERPOINT PRESENTATION.** Each individual presentation should be no longer than 20 minutes so that everyone in the group has time and so there is enough time for discussion. Everyone in the class will be expected to participate in these discussions.

Powerpoint presentations should be submitted via Blackboard no later than 11:59PM the evening prior to class and a hardcopy “handout” should be given to me at the time of the presentation.. My GA will insert the powerpoints into course documents so that you can look them over in preparation for the final exam.

It is important that the group presentation be cohesive and include a beginning and an end; It should not simply be several individual presentations strung together with a common format. Nevertheless, you should submit your individual presentation to me via Blackboard no later than 11:59 PM the evening preceding the class so that I can assign you a grade and provide you with comments on your verbal presentation. Hardcopies of the powerpoint should be submitted to me the day of the class clearly indicating the order of student presenters.

Starting with the September 29th class students will be expected to submit a memo by 11:59 PM, the evening prior to class covering the readings due that day. (See below for a listing of the memo assignments and the due dates indicated by an asterisk *.) The five page double spaced memo should cover:

- (1) the key points in the assigned readings, e.g., the author’s insights into the nature the planning process,
- (2) the implications that you draw from the readings for planning efforts in mid-sized cities like Cincinnati. I expect you to use Web resources (including but not limited to newspaper and journal articles) to discuss these implications. For example, it should be fairly easy for you to indicate how politics influences the planning process in the

Cincinnati area or how planners in this area have sometimes tried to act more strategically. I have provided you with a “memo question” to help you reflect on the readings.

Make sure to edit these memos because the final product—the memos for the entire quarter---will be evaluated based on stylistic as well as substantive considerations. Missed submissions will be penalized severely.

You will receive feedback to your memos and powerpoint presentations through UC Blackboard.

It is very important that you bring to class the assigned readings (either the assigned book or printouts of articles located on UC BlackBoard).

TEXTS

Brooks, Michael P. 2002. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chicago: American Planning Association.

Mandelbaum, Seymour J.; Luigi Mazza; and Robert W. Burchell. 1996. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR).

Saidal, Jonathan et al. *Philadelphia: A New Direction*. Second Edition. Philadelphia: St. Joseph’s University Press.

NOTE: UC Bookstore staff do not order books for all students who preregister. They assume that some students will access the books another way. Therefore I strongly encourage you to purchase the books as soon as possible to make sure that you are not disappointed.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Weekly memos	30 percent
Student powerpoint presentation	30 percent
Final examination	30 percent
Class participation	10 percent

The final examination will take place at the time assigned by the university in its exam schedule. Put this time and date on your schedule. I WILL NOT ALLOW STUDENTS TO TAKE THE EXAM EARLY.

Students who simply attend class but who do not participate will receive a maximum of 6 points out of 10. This often makes a difference between a “C” and a “B” or between a “B” and an “A.”

ASSIGNED READINGS Except where indicated, the assigned readings are from the required texts or are accessible through UC Blackboard. * **Indicates that the memos are due the night preceding that class.**

1. September 24. OVERVIEW OF COURSE, no assigned readings, no student powerpoint.

2. September 29. THE NEED FOR PLANNING THEORY, RATIONALE FOR LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING, EVOLUTION OF THE PLANNING PROFESSION.

Brooks. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chapters 1-2.

2. October 1, 6, PLANNING ORIENTATIONS.

Brooks. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chapters 3-5.

Bolan, Richard. Community Decision Behavior: The Culture of Planning. In Andreas Faludi. *A Reader in Planning Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 371-394.

Friedmann, J. Two Centuries of Planning Theory in Mandelbaum. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. 10-29.

Memo questions:

Which planning tradition do you think has been most important in formulating planning theories? Why? To what extent do you agree with Brooks assertion regarding a gap between planning academics and planning practitioners? Why? Which hypotheses offered by Richard Bolan will you be most interested in testing this quarter?

3. October 8, 13. CENTRALIZED RATIONALITY AND CENTRALIZED NON-RATIONALITY.

Brooks. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chapters 6-7.

Faludi, A. Rationality, Critical Rationalism and Planning Doctrine. in Mandelbaum. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. 65-82.

Memo question:

What role if any should theories of comprehensive rationality play in formulating a theory of comprehensive planning? In other words, to what extent do you agree with Faludi that theories of comprehensive rationality are still relevant? Why?

4. October 15, 20. DECENTRALIZED RATIONALITY: PLANNERS AND VALUES

Brooks. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chapter 8.

Reiner, J.S.; Reimer, E. and Reiner T. Client Analysis and the Planning of Public Programs. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. November, 1963, 270-282. (Blackboard)

Schubert, Glendon. Is There a Public Interest Theory? In *The Public Interest* (ed.) Carl Friedrich. NY: Atherton Press. 198-224. (Blackboard)

Davidoff, P. Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning. in Faludi. *Reader*. 277-296. (Blackboard)

Krumholz, N. A Retrospective View of Equity Planning: Cleveland, 1969-1979. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Spring, 1982, 163-183. (Blackboard)

Memo Questions:

How can the shift from client analysis to advocacy planning to equity planning be related to Schubert's three conceptions of the public interest? Describe the strengths and weaknesses of advocacy planning based on your coop experiences – or if you have not had any, case studies from newspaper, magazine or journal articles.

Powerpoint Suggestions:

Someone ought to show how the three now planning models (advocacy planning, equity planning, client analysis) represent particular conceptions of the public interest (idealist, rationalist, realist) and why.

5. October 22, 27. PLANNER AS COMMUNICATOR.

Brooks. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chapter 9.

Glazer, Sarah. 2000. Postmodern Nursing. *The Public Interest*. 140 (Summer), pp. 3-16. (Blackboard)

Hoch, C. What Do Planners Do in the United States? in Mandelbaum. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. 225-240.

Forester, J. Argument, Power, and Passion in Planning Practice. in Mandelbaum. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. 241-262.

Allen, Judith. Our town: Foucault and knowledge-based politics in London. in Mandelbaum. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. 328-344.

Throgmorton, J.A. "Impeaching" Research: Planning as Persuasive and Constitutive Discourse. in Mandelbaum. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. 345-364.

Healey, P. The Communicative Work of Development Plans. in Mandelbaum. *Explorations in Planning Theory*. 263-288.

Memo Question:

Overall to what extent does post-modern thinking help comprehensive planners? In what sense is post-modern theory a “theory”? Be as specific as possible.

Powerpoint Suggestions:

Someone should indicate clearly the extent to which Sarah Glazer’s article is relevant to city planning? If you don’t think it is relevant explain why it isn’t.

Members of the group (or members of the class) should read verbatim selections from Throgmorton’s chapter in class. Members of the class should indicate what they learn from this chapter.

6. October 29, November 3. EFFECTIVE PLANNING IN THE POLITICAL MILLIEU/TRIAL BALLOONING

Meyerson and Banfield. *Politics, Planning and the Public Interest*. 253-302.

Brooks. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chapter 10, 11. 12

Memo Question:

- How did Chicago’s political, social and economic system constrain planners in Meyerson and Banfield’s case study of public housing planning in Chicago in the 1950s?
- Provide an example of where a local planning agency used political savvy – or failed to use it – in connection with an important local problem.
- Provide an example of how a city like Cincinnati could use trial ballooning to address a serious problem facing the city. Be as specific as possible in showing how you would use demonstration programs. Overall to what extent do you find trial ballooning useful? Why?

Powerpoint Suggestions:

The group (through) one person should respond to the third bullet above. That is the powerpoint should suggest a real life example of how the City of Cincinnati could use trial balloons and demonstration programs.

7. November 5, 10. STRATEGIC PLANNING

Silver, H. and Burton, D. 1986. The Politics of State-level Industrial Policy: Lessons from Rhode Island's Greenhouse Compact. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 52, 3 (Summer, 1986), 277-289. (Blackboard)

Mier, R.; Moe, K.J.; and Sherr, I. Strategic Planning and the Pursuit of Reform. Economic Development and Equity. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 52, 3, Summer, 1986, 299-309.
(Blackboard)

Saidal, Jonathan et al. *Philadelphia: A New Urban Direction*. Second edition. Read all of the introductory chapters as well as at least one that focuses on your own planning specialty (e.g., housing, transportation). (Blackboard).

I have put both the first and second editions of this book on reserve to aid you in completing your memo and powerpoint (if relevant).

Memo questions: Drawing from the three examples (Rhode Island, Chicago, Philadelphia) comment on the assertion that strategic planning is “old wine in new models.” Why would you say that? What new insights did the Philadelphia plan provide you in your own planning specialization?

Powerpoint Suggestions

Use a debate format – one student argues the affirmative and another the negative – to handle the following position, “Strategic Planning is nothing new, it represents ‘old wine in new bottles’”.

Someone should discuss a substantive chapter from the Philadelphia strategic plan book. He/she should indicate the strengths and weaknesses of this chapter, how it represents strategic planning, and the implications of the chapter for the Philadelphia Planning Department.

8. February November 12, 17. The New Comprehensive Plans I. Laying a framework, New York City’s attempt.

Brooks. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chapter 13.

New York City Planning Commission. 1969. *Plan for New York City, 1969*, volumes 1 and 3, (Critical Issues, and Brooklyn). These books should be for in-library use only.

Review Forum: Plan for New York City by New York City Department of City Planning, 1969. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, November 1970, 436-449. (Blackboard)

NOTE: To get a B or higher on the memo and powerpoint it will be necessary to look at the NYC Plan which is available in the DAAP Library.

9. November 19, 24, The New Comprehensive Plans II. Visioning, using the plan to market the city.

Neuman, Michael. 1998. Does planning need the plan? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 64, 2: 208-220. (Blackboard)

Neuman, Michael. 2003. Do plans and zoning matter? *Planning* 69, 11 (December): 28-31. (Blackboard)

Gomez, Maria V. 1998. Reflective Images: The case of urban regeneration in Glasgow and Bilbao. *International Urban Research*. March, 106-121. (Blackboard)

Glasgow City Plan. <http://www.glasgow.gov.uk/en/Business/City+Plan/Part+1+-+Development+Strategy/> You should focus on the Introduction, the section dealing with downtown Glasgow and other parts of interest to you. You need not read the final technical sections in depth.

NOTE: It is important that you obtain more up to date information on Bilbao and Glasgow to assess the effectiveness of these two plans. If the memo or powerpoint uses Gomez's article exclusively it will receive a grade of C or less.

Memo Question:

Given the experiences of New York, Glasgow, and Bilbao, to what extent is it worth it for medium and large cities to prepare comprehensive plans? In preparing this memo keep in mind the date of the Gomez article; you should search the web for more recent information on the regeneration of Glasgow, both its downtown and the city as a whole.

Powerpoint Suggestions:

A good powerpoint would incorporate images of Glasgow and Bilbao.

As part of the class you should bring the Glasgow Comprehensive plan on-line and indicate how it reflects key themes discussed earlier in the course: centralized rationality, decentralized rationality, planning communication, political effectiveness, and strategic planning. It is especially important that you specify the audiences for the plan.

10. December 1, 3. PLANNING AS A PROFESSION/ETHICAL ISSUES

Marcuse, P. Professional Ethics and Beyond. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 42, 1, 1976, 264-274. (Blackboard)

Baum, Howell S. Ethical Behavior is Extraordinary Behavior; It's the as All Other Behavior. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Autumn, 1998, 411-423. (Blackboard)

Symposium on the Yonkers Case. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 8,3 (Summer, 1989), 167-196. (Blackboard)

Memo Question:

To what extent do you think that planners acted ethically in Yonkers and Baltimore? What more could they have done to act ethically? To what extent has scattered site public housing in Yonkers been successful? To answer this question, I suggest you take a look at two journal articles one by George Galster (*JAPA*, Spring, 1993), and the other by Xav Briggs (*Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1998) as well as Lisa Belkin's book, *Show Me A Hero*

Submissions via UC Blackboard

In order to save you from printing fees, and me from stacks of papers, we will use Blackboard to submit each week's memo. This will be done by:

- ◆ Going to this course's Blackboard page
- ◆ Clicking on the "Assignments tab"
- ◆ Clicking on the name of the assignment you are submitting
- ◆ Attaching your Word document (whose name should be in the format "Lastname_Due Date".doc.)
- ◆ Entering your name in the Comments section
- ◆ Clicking on Submit

When I retrieve your memos, Blackboard will show the time and date of your submittal. *** Please note that memos must be submitted prior to the time of the class in order to be considered for a grade.

Student Powerpoint Presentation Groups. It will be the student's responsibility to decide how to divide the powerpoint over two (or three) sessions. If two students are assigned to the same topic, they are responsible for dividing the work into separate presentations. To repeat, each student is expected to do a powerpoint presentation.

Assignments of students to powerpoint presentation groups will occur during first week of class. Please look out for emails from me on this subject. * Memos are due before midnight, the day before this class.

Powerpoint Presentation Groups			
Number	Date	Subject	Names
1	September 29*	The need for planning theory	Bleggi, Clark
2	Oct 1*, Oct 6	Orientations	Combs, Dawson
3	Oct 8*, 13	Centralized Rationality	Deacock, Fromme
4	Oct 15*, 20	Decentralized Rationality	Hancock, Hayes
5	Oct 22*, 27	Communicator	Henry, Hershner
6	Oct 29*, Nov 3	Politics	Kearns, Lai
7	Nov 5*, 10	Strategic Planning	Neutzling, Nicak, Peppers
8	November 12*, 17	Comprehensive Plans I	Peet, Rosen
9	November 19*, 24	Comprehensive Plans II	Rummelhoff, Sanchez,
10	Dec 1*, 3	Planning Profession	Schumacher, Zellebrow