

PLANNING HISTORY AND THEORY

Fall 2015

EVDP 627 H(3-0)

MW 9:30-10:50, PF 3160, course website:
<https://d2l.ucalgary.ca/d2l/home/105230>

GREG MORROW email: gmorrow@ucalgary.ca
phone: 587-432-7539 (cell)
office: PF 3171, hours by appointment

TEACHING ASSISTANT
Rylan Graham (rylan.graham@ucalgary.ca)

“Historical knowledge is the material for making cogent arguments about the why and how of contemporary action.”

- Raphaël Fischler

INTRODUCTION

This course provides students with an introduction to the key planning theories and practices from the late nineteenth century to the present. We explore the forces that shaped cities and key ideas/models that were invented in response to these forces. Understanding the history of planning thought and action – from its progressive origins, its modernist machinations, the postmodern critique of top-down planning, to the re-assertion of form that has emerged more recently – is critical to making you a better planner today, for these ideas have not been substituted for one another over time, but rather are a palimpsest layered one upon the other. This course is meant to provide a foundation to understand the theoretical, legal, and ethical frameworks that have led to a wide range of roles for planners over time, and critically evaluate the role of planners and planning today. Our approach takes as its premise that “urbanism” is a socio-spatial dialectic – that is, space shapes society as much as society shapes space (as such, understanding both the social and physical is central to planning).

OBJECTIVES

Following this course, students should be able to:

1. Demonstrate your familiarity with the major debates, issues, and models in planning history and theory.
2. Understand the key forces that have shaped Canadian/U.S. cities and the changing role of planners over time.
3. Situate Canadian/U.S. planning theories and practices within the broader social, economic and political context.
4. Begin to understand the dilemmas (political, ethical, moral, etc) planners work to resolve in day-to-day practice.
5. Begin to establish your own values, ethics, and identity within the broad range studied in planning history and theory.
6. Understand how Canadian planning was influenced by American and British theories and practices.
7. Understand how history and theory can help inform and make sense of contemporary planning decisions.
8. Refine your written and oral communication skills by synthesizing new knowledge about planning and city form.
9. Demonstrate awareness about the relationship between planning, gender, race, ethnicity, and class.
10. Start to develop a sensibility about what constitutes good city form and good planning.

FRAMING QUESTIONS

Throughout the course, we will be faced with many broad questions that reflect changing political philosophies and social contexts. As an introductory course, we cannot address all of these issues at length, but the purpose here is raise awareness about the role of planning (and planners) within society. Among the questions to consider throughout the course are:

1. What role does the built environment play in shaping social relations and actions? public health? Inequality and justice? educational attainment? safety? economic growth? environmental health?
2. Why do we plan? What are the legal, economic, political or moral justifications for planning? Is planning effective?
3. What is the proper role of government in society? How does this relate to individual freedom and private property? What is the rationale for state intervention in markets?
4. What is the role of planners? technical advisors? mediators? consultants? enforcement? visioning? advocates? activists?
5. For whom do we plan? property owners? the least advantaged? everyone? What is the public interest? (Is there “a” public interest?) What is the role of participation? How do we deal with conflicts and/or different interests?

6. What constitutes “good” city form? Should cities be dense/compact or dispersed? Mono or polycentric? How dense?
7. At what scale should planning occur? national? provincial? regional? counties? watersheds? municipalities? neighbourhoods? individual parcels? How should these different scales be coordinated?
8. What is the relationship between past planning theories/models and today’s problems? e.g. sprawl – what is it? how did it come to be? Is it bad? Should planning promote growth? accommodate growth? constrain growth?
9. What relationship does planning have to race, ethnicity, gender, and class? To what extent do planning policies exacerbate segregation, displacement and/or disparities? Is gentrification good or bad? What can or should planning do in response?

TEACHING APPROACH

The course material will consist of small group discussions, formal lectures, in-class exercises, city walks, and student (PechaKucha) presentations. Students should be prepared for a relatively heavy reading load. Students are expected to do the assigned readings and complete 10 reading responses. To ground the broad theories and practices discussed in class to real-world planning, students will interview a planning professional and attend a public meeting (and submit a reflection/analysis). Students will also complete a term project, which includes dissecting a city plan or development proposal.

STRUCTURE + SCHEDULE

There are 23 sessions in this course. Following an introduction (4 sessions), we’ll trace the evolution of planning ideas through 6 eras (2 sessions each, 12 total), and conclude the course thinking about the future (4 sessions). We will also have three city walks to directly observe how city form has changed in relation to planning ideas.

A. INTRODUCTION TO PLANNING

1 Introduction

Wed Sep 9
Overview and introduction

Mon Sep 14 (response #1 for Sep 9-14)
What is planning and why do it?

2 Framework + Process of Planning

Wed Sep 16
The legal framework of planning

Mon Sep 21 (response #2 for Sep 16-21)
The development process

B. EVOLUTION OF PLANNING IDEAS

Wed Sep 23 - **CITYWALK #1 (The Traditional City)** – meet 9am, Tomkins Park (17 Av + 8 St SW)

3 Origins of Modern City Planning (~1880s-1910s)

Mon Sep 28 (response #3 for Sep 28-30)
Positivism, Rationality, Progressivism,
Democracy, Efficiency/Taylorism
City Beautiful, Garden City

Wed Sep 30 (PechaKucha #1)
Parks Movement, Settlement House
Movement, Zoning, Burham,
Master/Comprehensive Planning

4 The Rise of State Power (~1920s-40s)

Mon Oct 5 (response #4 for Oct 5-7)
Standardization, State Bureaucracy,
Keynesianism, Regulation, Public Works

Wed Oct 7 (PechaKucha #2)
La Ville Radieuse, Broadacre City, FHA, WPA
TVA

note: no class Mon Oct 12 or Wed Oct 14 (block week)

Mon Oct 19 - **CITYWALK #2 (The Modern City)** – meet 9am, Brentwood LRT Station

5 Fordism + Suburbanization (~1940s-60s)

Wed Oct 21 (response #5 for Oct 21-26)
Mass Production (Fordism), Decentralization
Urban Design

Mon Oct 26 (PechaKucha #3)
Highways, suburbanization, urban renewal
public housing, social segregation

6 Justice + the Communicative Turn (~1970-80s)

Wed Oct 28 (response #6 for Oct 28-Nov 2)
Environmentalism, Justice, Civil Rights,
Communication Action, “Radical” Planning
Power, Differences/Otherness

Mon Nov 2 (PechaKucha #4)
Advocacy Planning, Equity Planning
Participatory Planning, Everyday Urbanism
Environmental Justice

Wed Nov 4 - **CITYWALK #3 (The Contemporary City)** – meet 9am, Tuscany LRT Station

7 Neoliberalism + Growth Machines (~1980-90s)

Mon Nov 9 (response #7 for Nov 9-16)
Neopragmatism, Neotraditionalism,
Postmodernism, Preservation, Individualism,
Decline of Social Capital

Mon Nov 16 (PechaKucha #5)
Townscape/New Urbanism,
Corporate Downtowns, Preservation,
Growth Machines

note: no class Wed Oct 11 (Remembrance Day)

8 Globalization + the Spatial Turn (~1990-2000s)

Wed Nov 18 (response #8 for Nov 18-23)
Globalization, Competitive Advantage, City-
Regions, Gentrification, Spatial Justice

Mon Nov 23 (PechaKucha #6)
Smart Growth/TOD, Shrinking Cities,
Chinese Urbanism

C. THINKING ABOUT THE FUTURE

9 Health + Sustainable Urbanism

Wed Nov 25 (response #9 for Nov 25-30)
Sustainability, Rising Inequality
Climate Adaptation

Mon Nov 30 (PechaKucha #7)
Landscape/Ecological Urbanism,
Walkability, Density

10 Future Directions

Wed Dec 2 (response #10 for Dec 2)
Where planning is going

Mon Dec 7
Debate: Good Planning / Good City Form

READINGS

See attached reading list. There are no required texts. All readings are PDFs, available on the class website. Readings for the module (each pair of sessions) must be done before the first session, and a response uploaded by 9pm the night before the first session.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

To begin the first class of each module, we will break into 7 groups of 5 people each to discuss the assigned readings. These discussions will take the first 10-15 minutes of class. Each student will lead two of these group discussions during the semester. Discussion leaders have two tasks: (1) pose a key provocative question to start the discussion, and (2) manage the discussion by calling on people to participate. The instructor and TA will rotate around the room to observe.

LECTURES

The instructor will give a one hour (or so) lecture; these lectures are meant to provide an overview of key theories and practices within each module. Students are encouraged to participate during lectures – ask questions and engage in debate.

IN-CLASS EXERCISES

Periodically, we will do in-class exercises. These exercises are meant to be fun ways of engaging with the topics and may include drawing (don't worry if you can't draw!), role playing, challenges, short videos, etc.

EVALUATION + DELIVERABLES

Note: all work will be submitted electronically in Word or PDF format, uploaded to the course D2L website (Assessments > Dropbox). The course grade will be determined by an evaluation of the following deliverables – the percentages reflect the weight of the total grade for each (please put dates into your calendars):

1. Term Paper		<u>DUE DATE</u>
Proposed Topic + Sources	2%	Fri Sep 25
Annotated Bibliography + Thesis	3%	Fri Oct 23
Detailed Outline	5%	Fri Nov 20
Final Written Paper	30%	Mon Dec 14
Total Term Paper	40%	
2. Reading Responses	3% ea. x 10 = 30%	(see schedule above)
3. Planner Reflection	20%	Fri Nov 6
4. Group PechaKucha	10%	(see schedule above)
Course Total	100%	

Handouts with details on assignments will be distributed in class, but below is a brief description of each.

1. Term Paper (40 points)

Each student or pair of students (encouraged) will prepare a 2,500 to 3,000-word paper that critically evaluates a plan or development proposal. Interim benchmarks have been established to ensure you make progress throughout the term. See Term Paper handout for more details.

2. Reading Responses (30 points)

Students are expected to complete assigned readings and a reading response (3 points each) prior to each of the 10 modules (with the exception of modules 1 and 2, which are due prior to the second session in each module), with framing questions posed to help students approach the readings analytically. See reading response handout for more details.

3. Planner Reflection (20 points)

To connect our broad discussions of planning theories and practices to real world planning, you will do 2 things: (1) attend a public planning meeting (wide latitude of what type) and (2) interview a planner involved with this meeting about their experiences. You will reflect upon these experiences and address some of the above framing questions in light of your observations. See Planner Reflection handout for more details.

4. Group PechaKucha (10 points)

During the Introduction section, each student will sign up for one of the 7 PechaKucha presentations (groups of 5 students) on a Canadian case related to each module. PechaKucha presentations are a particular format – 20 slides, shown for 20 seconds each (6 mins, 40 secs total). See PechaKucha handout for more details.

GRADING SCALE

Grade	Grade Point Value	4-Point Range	Percent	Description
A+	4.00	4.00	95-100	Outstanding - evaluated by instructor
A	4.00	3.85-4.00	90-94.9	Excellent - superior performance showing comprehensive understanding of the subject matter
A-	3.70	3.50-3.84	85-89.9	Very good performance
B+	3.30	3.15-3.49	80-84.9	Good performance
B	3.00	2.85-3.14	75-79.9	Satisfactory performance
B-	2.70	2.50-2.84	70-74.9	Minimum pass for students in the Faculty of Graduate Studies
C+	2.30	2.15-2.49	65-69.9	All final grades below B- are indicative of failure at the graduate level and cannot be counted toward Faculty of Graduate Studies course requirements.
C	2.00	1.85-2.14	60-64.9	
C-	1.70	1.50-1.84	55-59.9	
D+	1.30	1.15-1.49	50-54.9	
D	1.00	0.50-1.14	45-49.9	
F	0.00	0-0.49	0-44.9	

All work will be evaluated using the rubric provided with each assignment. All work must be submitted on time; late work will be penalized by one grade for each day it is late (e.g. A-quality work submitted 3 days late would receive a B). Late reading responses will not be accepted (since they are meant to prepare students for class/group discussions).

Note: A student who receives a "C+" or lower in any one course will be required to withdraw regardless of their grade point average (GPA) unless the program recommends otherwise. If the program permits the student to retake a failed course, the second grade will replace the initial grade in the calculation of the GPA, and both grades will appear on the transcript.

SPECIAL BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS

Student might expect to incur some nominal expenses in order to make copies of materials for their term paper. Any site visits necessary to observe the built environment should be possible by LRT/bus and foot. Alternatively, students will arrange transportation among themselves.

CLASS POLICIES

1. It is expected that students and instructors will foster an environment of mutual respect. As such, any behaviour that is rude, violent, or disrespectful of others will be grounds for removal from the class and/or disciplinary action.
2. Please turn your cellphones to airplane mode during class. The use of laptops for taking notes is encouraged. However, texting, doing email and checking social media during class is prohibited.
3. The assumption is that group work has been done equitably and all students will receive the same grade. If, however, it is apparent to the instructors that group work has not been done fairly (i.e. that someone did not pull his/her weight), a lower grade will be given to that person(s).

NOTES

1. Written work, term assignments and other course related work may only be submitted by e-mail if prior permission to do so has been obtained from the course instructor. Submissions must come from an official University of Calgary (ucalgary) email account.
2. Academic Accommodations. Students who require an accommodation in relation to their coursework or to fulfill requirements for a graduate degree, based on a protected ground other than disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to their Instructor or the designated contact person in EVDS, Jennifer Taillefer (jtaillef@ucalgary.ca). Students who require an accommodation unrelated to their coursework or the requirements for a graduate degree, based on a protected ground other than disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to the Vice-Provost (Student Experience). For additional information on support services and accommodations for students with disabilities, visit www.ucalgary.ca/access/
3. Plagiarism - Plagiarism involves submitting or presenting work in a course as if it were the student's own work done expressly for that particular course when, in fact, it is not. Most commonly plagiarism exists when: (a) the work submitted or presented was done, in whole or in part, by an individual other than the one submitting or presenting the work (this includes having another impersonate the student or otherwise substituting the work of another for one's own in an examination or test), (b) parts of the work are taken from another source without reference to the original author, (c) the whole work (e.g., an essay) is copied from another source, and/or, (d) a student submits or presents work in one course which has also been submitted in another course (although it may be completely original with that student) without the knowledge of or prior agreement of the instructor involved. While it is recognized that scholarly work often involves reference to the ideas, data and conclusions of other scholars, intellectual honesty requires that such references be explicitly and clearly noted. Plagiarism is an extremely serious academic offence. It is recognized that clause (d) does not prevent a graduate student incorporating work previously done by him or her in a thesis. Any suspicion of plagiarism will be reported to the Dean, and dealt with as per the regulations in the University of Calgary Graduate Calendar.
4. Information regarding the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (<http://www.ucalgary.ca/secretariat/privacy>) and how this impacts the receipt and delivery of course material
5. Emergency Evacuation/Assembly Points (<http://www.ucalgary.ca/emergencyplan/assemblypoints>)
6. Safewalk information (<http://www.ucalgary.ca/security/safewalk>)
7. Contact Info for: Student Union (<http://www.su.ucalgary.ca/page/affordability-accessibility/contact>); Graduate Student representative (<http://www.ucalgary.ca/gsa/>) and Student Ombudsman's Office (<http://www.su.ucalgary.ca/page/quality-education/academic-services/student-rights>).

PRESENTATION TIPS

Excerpts from Andy Goodman's "Why Bad Presentations Happen to Good Causes." (10-11)

Don't do the following:

1. **Reading the slides.** More respondents complained about this behaviour than anything else – and by a wide margin. Many indignantly asked why a presenter would read slides aloud when audience members were entirely capable of reading them for themselves. . . . "Watching someone read PowerPoint slides is a form of torture that should be banned under the Geneva Convention," wrote one respondent.

2. **Too long, too much information.** How long is too long? If a presentation is boring, respondents told us, even 10 minutes can seem too long. And boring presentations appear to be rampant across the sector. . . . "Too many slides with too many words, too many points, too much data, too long, too didactic."

3. **Lack of interaction.** The problem that first appeared when we asked respondents to describe the typical presentation resurfaced strongly in subsequent answers to open-ended questions. Many complained about being "talked at" for 30, 40, even 60 minutes at a time. . . .

4. **Lifeless presenters.** Presenters who speak in a monotone, who seem to lack interest in their own material, or who appear to have wandered in from the set of "Night of the Living Dead" were also reported by many in the survey. . . .

5. **Room/technical problems.** LCD projectors that don't work, sound systems that are either too soft, too loud, or have too much hiss – just about every room or technical problem you can imagine showed up in survey answers. . . many are preventable, and even those that cannot be avoided do not have to ruin a talk. . . have a back-up plan.

Do the following:

In another open-ended question, we asked, "What one or two key things make a presentation excellent?" Again, respondents provided a wide range of answers, although a few unhappy campers claimed they had never seen an excellent presentation. A consensus emerged around three characteristics, and unsurprisingly each is a direct opposite of a common problem cited above.

1. **Interaction.** Nearly one out of every four respondents mentioned interaction – with the speaker, with other audience members, or both – as a hallmark of excellent presentations. "Interactive presentations that create opportunities for the audience members to work together and with the presenter are almost always top notch," one respondent told us.

2. **Clarity.** Some used the words "well organized," and some wrote "concise," but if you were to scan the verbatim responses to this question, you would see a long run of answers that begin with "clarity." One such response: "Clarity of three to four well-framed key points the speaker wanted the audience to take away, coupled with smart use of metaphors/anecdotes that helped speaker drive them home."

3. **Enthusiasm.** Whether respondents used the words energy, passion, charisma, engaging, dynamic or lively, they all wanted the same thing: presenters who were enthusiastic about their topic and conveyed that interest to the audience.

4. **Humour.** Makes presentations more lively.

5. **Use of stories.** Gives concrete examples.

6. **Well-produced visuals.** A picture is worth a thousand words.

READING LIST

note: all readings are available for download on the D2L course website (under Content by date)

A. INTRODUCTION TO PLANNING

1 Introduction to Planning (response #1 for Sep 9-14 due [Sep 13 by 9pm](#))

Framing Questions: in reflecting upon these readings, what do you think the role of planners is (or should be) – are we technical advisors? mediators? consultants? enforcement? visioning? advocates? activists? for whom do (or should) we plan? property owners? the least advantaged? everyone? what is the public interest? (is there a single public interest?) What role should residents have in planning? How do we deal with conflicts and/or different interests?

[6 pp] Allan B. Jacobs, “The state of city planning today and its relation to city planning education”, in *Places*, vol. 18, no. 2 (2007), 60-65.

[23 pp] Jeanne Wolfe, “Our Common Past: An Interpretation of Canadian Planning History,” *Plan Canada Special Edition*, 12-34 (1994).

[8 pp] Raphael Fischler, “Fifty Thesis on Urban Planning and Urban Planners,” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* vol 32 (2012), 107-114.

[16 pp] Richard E. Klosterman, “Arguments for and against Planning,” *The Town Planning Review* vol 56, no 1 (January 1985), 5-20.

[37 pp] Charles Hoch, “Planning and Professional Authority in a Liberal Society,” in *What Planners Do: Power, Politics, and Persuasion*, 7-43 (Chicago: Planners Press, 1994)
(<http://www.scribd.com/read/206098554/What-Planners-Do-Power-Politics-and-Persuasion>)

2 Framework + Process of Planning (response #2 for Sep 16-21 due [Sep 20 by 9pm](#))

Framing Questions: what are your impressions of how planning works in Calgary? Are some things emphasized too much or not enough? Do certain people/groups have too much or too little influence? Is it too bureaucratic? Would you say it is more process-driven or outcome-driven? If you could change how it works, what would you change?

[52 pp] Federation of Calgary Communities, “Planning in Calgary,” (Chapter 2) and “Roles of Stakeholders in the Planning System,” (Chapter 3) in *The Community Guide to the Planning Process*, 5th edition, 3-54 (2014).

[57 pp] Federation of Calgary Communities, “Implementation Planning,” (Chapter 5) and “Subdivision & Development Appeals,” (Chapter 6) in *The Community Guide to the Planning Process*, 5th edition, 73-130 (2014).

B. EVOLUTION OF PLANNING IDEAS

3 Origins of Modern City Planning (~1890s-1910s) (response #3 for Sep 28-30 due [Sep 27 by 9pm](#))

Framing Questions: What problems was modern city planning originally meant to solve? How do these differ from problems that planning addresses today? How do you think planning today is different from how it was in the “Progressive Era” from the late nineteenth/early twentieth century?

- [33 pp] John A. Fairfield, "An Urban Republic: Frederick Olmsted, Henry George, and the City Building Debate," in *The Mysteries of the Great City: The Politics of Urban Design, 1877-1937*, 15-47 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993).
- [25 pp] Lawrence Veiller, "The Housing Problem in American Cities," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25 (March 1905), 46-70.
- [31 pp] Daphne Spain, "Men Build Chicago's Skyline, Women Redeem the City," in *How Women Saved the City*, 205-235 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001).

4 The Rise of State Power (~1920s-40s) (response #4 for Oct 5-7 due Oct 4 by 9pm)

Framing Questions: what distinguishes the thinking and approach of "High Modernism" from the Progressive Era before it? What assumptions were made about the State in the High Modernist approach? What particular techniques/strategies did the State adopt to advance its program? In what way were these techniques/strategies successful? In what way were they problematic?

- [38 pp] John A. Fairfield, "The Professionalization of City Planning and the Scientific Management of Urban Space," In *The Mysteries of the Great City: The Politics of Urban Design, 1877-1937*, 119-156 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993).
- [12 pp] Nicolas Patricios, "Urban Design Principles of the Original Neighborhood Concepts," *Urban Morphology*, vol 6, no 1 (2002), 21-32.
- [16 pp] James Scott, "Authoritarian High Modernism," in *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, 87-102 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998).
- [17 pp] Le Corbusier, "Forward," and "Conclusions – Main Points of Doctrine," *The Athens Charter*, xii-x, 93-105 (New York: Grossmann Publishers, 1973 [1942]).

5 Fordism + Suburbanization (~1950s-60s) (response #5 for Oct 21-26 due Oct 20 by 9pm)

Framing questions: what do you think were the rationales for post-war suburbanization and its inner-city corollary (urban renewal and public housing)? What do you think were the main catalysts for these new ways of building cities? In what ways did the new suburban forms differ from pre-war cities? In what ways did these new suburban forms shape North American culture?

- [40 pp] Kenneth T. Jackson, "Federal Subsidy and the Suburban Dream," and "The Cost of Good Intentions," in *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*, 190-230 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).
- [26 pp] Dolores Hayden, "Sitcom Suburbs," in *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1820-2000*, 128-153 (New York: Vintage, 2004).
- [35 pp] Timothy Mennel, "Victor Gruen and the Construction of Cold War Utopias," *Journal of Urban History* vol 3, no 2 (May 2004), 116-150.
- Video: "To New Horizons" (1940): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1cRoAPLvQx0>. A film by General Motors as part of the "Futurama" Exhibit at the 1939 New York World's Fair (the first 8 mins are background that might interest you but the focus is minutes 8 through 23). It is a fly-through of a detailed model designed by Norman Bel Geddes for General Motors (visitors to the 1939 World's Fair would take a ride through the model).

Video: "The Master Builder" (1977) – see link below

<http://www.pbs.org/wnet/blueprintamerica/reports/the-next-american-system/video-the-master-builder-1977/925/> (watch the first 3 minutes, then minute 13 to 18)

6 Justice + the Communicative Turn (~1970s-80s) (response #6 for Oct 28-Nov 2 due Oct 27 by 9pm)

Framing questions: what does Jacobs think are the fundamental flaws of post-WWII city planning? Are these criticisms valid today or have we (as planners) learned their lessons? How does the “communicative” approach to planning differ from the previous era of post-WWII planning? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this approach? How does this approach address questions of class, race, gender?

- [44 pp] Jane Jacobs, “Introduction,” and “The kind of problem a city is,” in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 3-25 and 428-448 (New York: Random House, 1961). Note: skim 428-432 to “Now let us see what this has to do with cities”
- [13 pp] Manuel Castells, “Dimensions and Processes of the US Urban Crisis in the 1970s,” in *The Urban Question: a Marxist Approach*, 402-414 (London: Edward Arnold, 1977).
- [15 pp] Horst W. J. Rittel and Melvin M. Webber, “Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning.” *Policy Sciences* vol 4, no 2 (1973): 155-169.
- [13 pp] John Forester, “Planning in the Face of Power,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* vol 48, no 1 (1982), 67-80.
- [19 pp] Bent Flyvberg and Tim Richardson, “In Search of the Dark Side in Planning Theory,” in Philip Allmendinger and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, eds., *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*, 44-62 (London and New York: Routledge, 2002).
- [17 pp] Susan S. Fainstein, “Cities and Diversity: Should We Want it? Can We Plan for it?” *Urban Affairs Review* vol 41, no 1 (September 2005), 3-19.
- [8 pp] Paul Davidoff, “Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning,” *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* vol 31, no 4 (November 1965), 331-338.

7 Neoliberalism + Growth Machines (~1980s-90s) (response #7 for Nov 9-16 due Nov 8 by 9pm)

Framing questions: is intervention into the market (via public planning) justified? (if yes, why? If no, why not?) Should we adopt more people- or place-based approaches to planning? What do you think the consequences have been as a result of the more “neoliberal” approach to cities that emerged in the 1980s?

- [8 pp] Friedrich A. Hayek, *Road to Serfdom*, condensed version, 31-38 (Reader’s Digest, 1945).
- [10 pp] Alice O’Connor, “Swimming Against the Tide: A Brief History of Federal Policy in Poor Communities,” in *Urban Problems and Community Development*, edited by Ronald F. Ferguson and Williams T. Dickens, 108-117 (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 1999).
- [33 pp] John R. Logan and Harvey L. Molotch, “Places as Commodities,” in *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*, 17-49 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987).
- [27 pp] Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris and Tridib Banerjee, “Corporate Production of Downtown Space,” in *Urban Design Downtown: Poetics and Politics of Form*, 73-99 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998).
- [6 pp] Randall Crane and Mike Manville, “People of Place? Revisiting the Who Versus the Where of Urban Development,” *Land Lines* (July 2008), 2-7.

8 Globalization + the Spatial Turn (~1990s-2000s) (response #8 for Nov 18-23 due Nov 17 by 9pm)

Framing questions: how did globalization change the role of cities in the global economy? How was/is city form under globalization different the post-war "modernist" city? How did a renewed emphasis on space impact the theories of planning during this period? what do we get from this kind of spatial thinking that we didn't from the "communicative turn" in planning? why is space important to consider when thinking about social justice?

[5 pp] Edward W. Soja, "The city and spatial justice," paper prepared for the conference *Spatial Justice*, Nanterre, Paris, 12-14 March 2008, 1-5.

[21 pp] Neil Brenner, "Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-Scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union," *Urban Studies* vol 36, no 3 (1999), 431-451.

[16 pp] Peter Calthorpe and William Fulton, "Living in the Regional World," in *The Regional City* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2001), 15-30.

[31 pp] Cliff Ellis, "The New Urbanism: Critiques and Rebuttals," *Journal of Urban Design* vol 7, no 3 (2002), 261-291.

[21 pp] Brent D. Ryan, "Rightsizing Shrinking Cities: The urban design dimension," in *The City After Abandonment*, edited by Margaret Dewar and June Manning Thomas (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 268-288.

C. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

9 Health + Sustainable Urbanism (response #9 for Nov 25-30 due Nov 24 by 9pm)

Framing questions: while reducing our consumption of fossil fuels is about "climate mitigation", Kahn argues that climate change is upon us and that cities must also adapt to this new reality - what would this mean for cities? Should planners discourage "sprawl"? If so, how? If not, why not?

[17 pp] Scott Campbell, "Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities?" *Journal of the American Planning Association* vol 62, no 3 (1996), 296-312.

[17 pp] Matthew E. Kahn, "Urban Growth and Climate Change," *The Annual Review of Resource Economics* (2009), 16.1-16.17. doi 10.1146/annurev.resource.050708.144249.

[19 pp] Howard Frumkin, Lawrence Frank, and Richard Joseph Jackson, "Physical Activity, Sprawl, and Health," in *Urban Sprawl and Public Health: Designing, Planning, and Building for Healthy Communities*, 90-108 (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2004).

[26 pp] Peter Newman, Timothy Beatley, and Heather Boyer, "Hope for Resilient Cities: Transport," in *Resilient Cities: Responding to Peak Oil and Climate Change*, 86-111 (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2009).

Video: Ellen Dunham-Jones, "Retrofitting Suburbia," TED Atlanta (June 2010). Duration: 19 min, 23 seconds. http://www.ted.com/talks/ellen_dunham_jones_retrofitting_suburbia

10 Future Directions (response #10 for Dec 2-7 due Dec 1 by 9pm)

Framing questions: in your opinion, what is "good" planning? what is "good" city form? How dense should cities be? Should they be monocentric? polycentric? Should they be car-oriented? Bike/pedestrian-oriented? What form of housing is appropriate? (obviously these questions have no right answer – the purpose here is to articulate your own normative view of how we should build our cities going forward)

- [12 pp] Kevin Lynch, "Prologue," and "But is a General Normative Theory Possible?" in *Good City Form*, 1-2 and 99-108 (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981).
- [13 pp] John Friedmann, "The Good City: in Defense of Utopian Thinking," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* vol 24, no 2 (June 2000): 460-472.
- [10 pp] Peter Marcuse, "Critical Planning: an Interview with Peter Marcuse," *Critical Planning: the UCLA Journal of Planning* vol 15 (summer 2008), 111-120.
- [website] Thomas Campanella, "Jane Jacobs and the Death and Life of American Planning," *Places Journal*, April 2011. <https://placesjournal.org/article/jane-jacobs-and-the-death-and-life-of-american-planning/>