

# PLANNING HISTORY, THEORY, AND ETHICS

## Fall 2014

EVDP 627 H(3-0)

TR 11-12:20, PF 2160, course website:  
<https://d2l.ucalgary.ca/d2l/home/52855>

GREG MORROW      email: [gmorrow@ucalgary.ca](mailto:gmorrow@ucalgary.ca)  
phone: 403-220-5671  
office: PF 3171, hours by appointment

TEACHING ASSISTANT  
Rylan Graham, [rylan.graham@ucalgary.ca](mailto: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 role for planners over time, and to 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 North American cities and the changing role of planners over time.
3. Situate North American 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 be covered by a combination of small group discussions, formal lectures, in-class exercises, short videos, city walks, and student presentations. Students should be prepared for a relatively heavy reading load. The TA will also run three bonus discussion sessions, to provide an opportunity for students to discuss and ask questions about the material covered in class. The content is divided into 3 eras, ordered chronologically, each with 3 topics (9 topics total). Each topic spans two 80-min classes and will be divided roughly as follows: 1<sup>st</sup> class: 20 min small group discussion + 20 min context + 40 min lecture; 2<sup>nd</sup> class: 20 min small group discussion + 40 min lecture + 20 min group case. We conclude each era with a city walk to directly observe city form. Students will develop a research paper on a topic related to the course material and give a brief presentation summarizing the paper’s key argument(s). 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.

## STRUCTURE + SCHEDULE

There are 23 sessions in this course. Following 2 introductory sessions, the course content is divided into 3 broad eras: early (pre-1945), post-war (1945-90), and contemporary (post-1990) planning theories and practices, each with 3 topics (9 topics total). The course concludes with a debate and 2 sessions for student presentations.

### Introduction

Tue Sep 9 – Urban Planning: an Introduction  
\*no reading response

Thu Sep 11 - What is Planning and Why do it?  
Paradigms, Justifications, Themes

## A. EARLY PLANNING THEORIES + PRACTICES (PRE-1945)

### 1 Origins of Modern City Planning (~1890s-1900s)

Tue Sep 16 – Context + Theories  
Positivism, Rationality, Progressivism,  
Democracy, Efficiency/Taylorism,  
Philanthropy, Municipal Reform

Thu Sep 18 – Practices + Case  
Parks & Playgrounds Movement, Settlement  
House Movement, Public Health/Sanitary  
Reform Movement

### 2 Social vs. Physical: The Birth of a Profession (~1910s-20s)

Tue Sep 23 – Context + Theories  
City Beautiful, Garden City, City Scientific,  
Regionalism, Public Ownership  
\*ANASTASIA LOUKAITOU-SIDERIS (Sep 24, 6pm)

Thu Sep 25 – Practices + Case  
Zoning, Master/Comprehensive Planning  
Neighbourhood Unit, Burnham, Radburn  
\*ANASTASIA LOUKAITOU-SIDERIS TALK (lunch)

### 3 The Rise of State Power (~1930s-40s)

Tue Sep 30 – Context + Theories  
Standardization, State Bureaucracy,  
Keynesianism, Regulation, Public Works  
\*CITYWALK #1: PRE-WAR URBAN FORM

Thu Oct 2 – Practices + Case  
La Ville Radieuse, Broadacre City, FHA, WPA  
TVA  
\*DISCUSSION SESSION #1 (afternoon)

## **B. POST-WAR PLANNING THEORIES + PRACTICES (1945-1990)**

### **4 Fordism, Suburbanization + Urban Renewal (~1950s-60s)**

Tue Oct 7 – Context + Theories  
Mass Production (Fordism), Decentralization  
Urban Design

Thu Oct 9 – Practices + Case  
Highways, suburbanization, urban renewal  
public housing, social segregation

note: no class Tue Oct 14 or Thu Oct 16 (block week)

### **5 Liberalism, Neo-Marxism + Justice (~1970s)**

Tue Oct 21 – Context + Theories  
Environmentalism, Liberalism, Justice, Civil  
Rights, Justice Neo-Marxist Geography  
Power, Socio-Spatial Dialectic

Thu Oct 23 – Practices + Case (Harper)  
Advocacy Planning, Equity Planning  
Activist Planning, Transactive Planning  
Everyday Urbanism, Bottom-up

### **6 Libertarianism, Neoliberalism + Neotraditionalism (~1980s)**

Tue Oct 28 – Context + Theories  
Neopragmatism, Neotraditionalism,  
Postmodernism, Preservation, Individualism,  
Decline of Social Capital  
\*CITYWALK #2: POST-WAR URBAN FORM

Thu Oct 30 – Practices + Case (guest)  
Townscape/New Urbanism,  
Corporate Downtowns, Preservation,  
Growth Machine  
\*DISCUSSION SESSION #2 (afternoon)

## **C. CONTEMPORARY THEORIES + PRACTICES (POST-1990)**

### **7 Plurality, Difference + the Communicative Turn (~1990s)**

Tue Nov 4 – Context + Theories  
Communicative Action, Incrementalism,  
“Radical” Planning, Difference/Otherness,  
Participation, Negotiation

Thu Nov 6 – Practices + Case  
Collaborative Planning, Participatory  
Planning, Dialogical Planning, NIMBYism  
Environmental Justice, Cultural Planning

note: no class Tue Nov 11 (Remembrance Day)

### **8 Globalization, Restructuring + the Spatial Turn (~2000s)**

Thu Nov 13 – Context + Theories  
Globalization, Competitive Advantage, City-  
Regions, Gentrification, Spatial Justice

Tue Nov 18 – Practices + Case  
Smart Growth/TOD, Shrinking Cities,  
Chinese Urbanism

### **9 Climate Change, Health + Sustainable Urbanism (~2010s)**

Thu Nov 20 – Context + Theories  
Sustainability, Rising Inequality  
Climate Adaptation

Tue Nov 25 – Practices + Case  
Landscape/Ecological Urbanism,  
Walkability, Density

\*CITYWALK #3: POST-MODERN URBAN FORM

**Debate: Good City Form**

Thu Nov 27

Form, Growth, Resiliency, Equity

\*DISCUSSION SESSION #3 (afternoon)

**Student Presentations (2 days)**

Tue Dec 2 (may run longer than normal)

Thu Dec 4 (may run longer than normal)

**READINGS**

Specific readings will be assigned for each session and are indicated on the course D2L website. There are no required texts. All readings are PDFs, available on the class website. Readings for the session indicated on the website are to be done before that session, and a response uploaded by 11:30pm the night before that class.

**SMALL GROUP (COHORT) DISCUSSIONS**

To begin each class, we will break into 4 smaller groups (cohorts) of roughly 10 people each to discuss the assigned readings. These discussions will take the first 20 minutes of class. Each student will sign up to lead two of these cohort discussions during the term. Discussion leaders have three tasks: (1) begin by providing a brief (no more than a minute per reading, so about 3-4 minutes total) summary of the “big ideas” in the readings, (2) pose a couple provocative questions to elicit discussion, and (3) manage the discussion by calling on people to discuss and keeping the discussion on track. The instructor and TA will rotate around the room, joining each cohort’s discussion for about 5 minutes.

**LECTURES**

The instructor will give a lecture for about half of the class time (40 minutes). These lectures are meant to provide an overview of key theories and practices within each period.

**IN-CLASS EXERCISES**

Within each topic, we will engage in a 20-minute in-class exercise. 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. Presentations will be submitted in Powerpoint format, unless other arrangements (e.g. Prezi, videos) are made with the instructor. All work will be uploaded to the course D2L website (see folders in the Dropbox). Please name all work AssignmentTitle\_Lastname (e.g. ProjectSubject\_Morrow.pdf). 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 due dates into your calendars):

1. Research Project (Individual or Pairs)		<u>DUE DATE</u>
Project Subject	2%	Thu Sep 25
Bibliography/Lit Review/Thesis	3%	Thu Oct 23
Detailed Outline	5%	Tue Nov 18
PechaKucha Presentation	5%	Tue Dec 2
Final Written Paper	30%	Tue Dec 9
Total Term Project	45%	
2. Reading Responses/Participation	20%	11:30pm night before
3. Planning Practice Reflection	20%	Thu Nov 27
4. Group Case Presentation (one per topic)	15%	varies (see handout)
Course Total	100%	

Note: a passing grade (B-) on all 4 deliverables is required to pass the course. Two progress reports will be emailed to each student – one roughly at mid-term, and one roughly a week before the last class.

### 1. Research Project

Each student or pair of students (encouraged) will prepare a 10- to 12-page (doubled-spaced, 1” margin, 12-pt font, not including graphics, notes, or bibliography) – 2,500 to 3,000 words – on a topic that examines, describes, and critically evaluates an aspect of the history and theory of planning. A series of benchmarks has been established to ensure you make progress throughout the term. See Research Project handout for more details.

### 2. Reading Responses/Participation

Students are expected to complete assigned readings prior to each of the sessions. For each set of readings, several questions will be posed to help students approach the readings analytically. Students are required to post a short response to these questions to the class website by 11:30pm the night before class. These responses are graded pass/fail. A passing response will demonstrate clear understanding of the material and, most importantly, critical thinking about the questions posed. These responses should be not more than one page of double-spaced text (about 150-200 words).

### 3. Planning Practice Reflection

To connect our broad discussions of planning theories and practices to real world planning, you will contact a planner and conduct an interview about their experiences. You will also attend a public planning hearing. You will reflect upon these experiences and address some of the above framing questions in light of your observations. See Planning Practice Reflection handout for more details.

### 4. Group Case Presentation

On the first day of class, each student will sign up for one of the 9 group presentations (groups ~ 5 students). These are 20-minute presentations on a Canadian case related to each of the 9 topic areas (the cases will be presented at the end of each of the 9 topics). See Group Case Presentation handout for more details.

#### SAMPLE GRADE CALCULATION

Term Paper			
Paper Subject	A	4.00/4.00 x 2	= 2.000/2
Bibliography/Lit Review/Thesis	B	3.00/4.00 x 3	= 2.250/3
Detailed Outline	B	3.00/4.00 x 5	= 3.750/5
PechaKucha Presentation	B+	3.30/4.00 x 5	= 4.125/5
Final Written Paper	B+	3.30/4.00 x 30	= 24.75/30
Total Term Paper			= 36.875/45
Planning Practice Reflection	B+	3.30/4.00 x 20	= 16.500/20
Reading Responses/Participation		(16/20 passed)	= 16.000/20
Group Case Presentation	A-	3.70/4.00 x 15	= 13.875/15
Course Total			= 83.250/100 (A-)

#### GRADING SCALE

All work will be evaluated by letter grade (reading responses are pass/fail). Each grade will be converted to grade point (as per column 2 below) and multiplied by the weight as indicated under “evaluation” above. All work must be submitted on time; late work will be penalized by one grade for each day it is late (e.g. A work submitted 3 days late would receive a B).

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.

Grade	Grade Point Value	4-Point Range	Percent	Description
A+	4.00	4.00	92.5-100	Outstanding - evaluated by instructor
A	4.00	3.85-4.00	85-92.49	Excellent - superior performance showing comprehensive understanding of the subject matter
A-	3.70	3.50-3.84	80-84.99	Very good performance
B+	3.30	3.15-3.49	76-79.99	Good performance
B	3.00	2.85-3.14	73-75.99	Satisfactory performance
B-	2.70	2.50-2.84	70-72.99	Minimum pass for students in the Faculty of Graduate Studies
C+	2.30	2.15-2.49	66-69.99	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	63-65.99	
C-	1.70	1.50-1.84	60-62.99	
D+	1.30	1.15-1.49	56-59.99	
D	1.00	0.50-1.14	50-55.99	
F	0.00	0-0.49	0-49.99	

### SPECIAL BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS

Student might expect to incur some nominal expenses in order to make copies of materials for their research paper and/or group case presentations. Any site visits necessary to observe the built environment should be possible by LRT/bus and foot.

### CLASS POLICIES

1. It is expected that students and instructors will foster an environment of mutual respect. As such, any behaviour that is explicitly rude, violent, or otherwise 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, doing email and checking social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc) during class is prohibited. If you are caught doing so, your laptop will be held until the conclusion of class.
3. If students need to miss a class session, as a courtesy, please email the instructor beforehand. Students are responsible for getting caught up on missed sessions. Excessive missed class time will result in deduction to your participation grade.
4. Some of the deliverables for this class involve group work (the presentation is done in groups of 4-5 and the research project can be done in pairs). Groups only function in the presence of strong leadership to divide up the work fairly. Group work depends on each person taking responsibility for a portion of the work and being accountable to his/her team members. The assumption is that group work has been done fairly 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. The Academic Accommodations Policy can be found at: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/access/accommodations/policy>. It is the students' responsibility to request academic accommodations. If you are a student with a documented disability who may require academic accommodations and have not registered with Student Accessibility Services, please contact them at 403.220.6019. Students who have not registered with Student Accessibility Services are not eligible for formal academic accommodations. More information about academic accommodations can be found at [www.ucalgary.ca/access](http://www.ucalgary.ca/access). You are also required to discuss your needs with your instructor no later than fourteen (14) days after the start of this course.
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.