

Syllabus & Schedule

Location: Stone 210

<https://sakai.unc.edu/portal/site/plan704-sp18>

Instructor: Nikhil Kaza

Teaching Assistant: Nora Schwaller

email: nkaza@unc.edu

nschwall@live.unc.edu

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

TBD

Objective

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

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

Student Responsibilities

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

This course forces students to think through various arguments, deeply held beliefs and ideas. Such thinking requires discipline as well as openness.

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

There are no prerequisites for this class. However, this class will quickly cover ground and use concepts that you may not be familiar with. It is your responsibility to seek out additional background material to keep up. You will read many classic readings from various fields as well as some case studies in planning. Thus, you may encounter novelties in both style and substance. Most of the readings have generated a lengthy trail of secondary literature. Use the resources on the World Wide Web as well as the library for secondary literature. It is your responsibility to seek clarifications for unfamiliar concepts and ideas.

Every student is expected to read all the readings for the particular week before the lecture. You can, at times are expected to, disagree with the opinions and arguments presented in the class and in the readings. Your participation and papers will be evaluated on your competence in coherently and comprehensively framing your counterpoints to the issues raised by the lectures, readings and discussions.

You are to post reading responses about your readings for every class in the forum topic associated with the lessons for the week. These responses need not be long, but should succinctly capture the essence of the readings, connections to specific examples that you are familiar with.

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

My calendar is at <http://nikhilkaza.youcanbook.me>. You can use the website to setup appointments for slots that are open and are mutually convenient. Of course, Nora and I will be available in our respective office hours without appointment.

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

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

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

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

Philip McDaniel has kindly created this library website dedicated to the course. <http://guides.lib.unc.edu/plan704>. This website is a repository of resources such as film clips, recommended books about cities, current planning news that should inform the discussions in the class. Please check back frequently, as we will be adding background materials that are publicly available. This page is also linked from the Sakai course website.

In addition to the regular class and discussion schedule, I will arrange guest lectures on various qualitative research techniques, such as archival research, participant observation and interview methods. The speakers and dates are yet to be determined and are likely to fall outside the class schedule. They will be posted on the course calendar. You should make every effort to attend these sessions.

Grading and Assignments

Performance will be evaluated on three papers, one video, quizzes and participation (forum posts, in-class participation and contribution to discussions).

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

Each set of readings has a lesson associated on Sakai, which includes the link to the forum topic for that week. You are expected to post a short (2-3 paragraphs) response to the readings by Friday 5 PM of the previous week. You can comment on others' responses but the comments are not a substitute for your own response. These posts and comments are considered part of ongoing out-of-class discussion and will be monitored throughout the semester by me and your TA. These forums are expected to serve as individual and collective notes for the class. Contribution to these intellectual commons is graded as part of your participation grade. You are excused from 3 weeks (of your choice) of forum posts. Please keep the discussion civil. Yet challenge each other to defend and articulate particular positions. These posts are graded.

You are expected to read all the assigned readings. The quizzes provide you with feedback on understanding of the material. The Sakai quizzes contribute to 15% of the grade. I will not count the lowest three scores towards the final grade. These quizzes are generally due on Wednesdays 5 PM (after the material is covered in class).

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

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

Students are welcome to choose their own partners, however, they should be members of two distinct groups for assignments 3 & 4. These assignments have to be submitted via Sakai site. For instructions on how to use the Sakai site assignment tool to submit documents, refer to <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bAAHf8PUApQ>. Interim submissions for Assignment 3 & 4 are to be posted on the wiki on the sakai site. For help with the wiki, refer to tutorial on <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mwi047CbXBw>.

All verbatim text and illustrations from other sources appearing in the assignments and weekly analyses are to be properly cited and documented. All help from websites, individuals, and other

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

materials should be properly acknowledged. There is no penalty for collaborative endeavours; however, severe penalties are imposed for non-attribution.

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

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

Page limits mentioned in the assignments are guides, and are not binding.

Double spacing is an anachronism. Presumably, you have moved on from the fixed font era of typewriters.

Textbooks and Readings

The following textbook is required for this class:

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

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

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

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

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

Schedule (Subject to revision)

1/10(Wed) Introduction ²

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

²PLAN 651

- Moore, T. (1978). Why allow planners to do what they do? A justification from economic theory. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 44(4), 387–398
- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapters 1)
- Mintzberg, H. (1994, February). The Fall and Rise of Strategic Planning. *Harvard Business Review* 72(1), 107–114

1/15(Mon) No class (MLK day-Holiday).

Decision Making & Plans

1/17(Wed) Rational Fools & Moral Sentiments

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

- Allison, G. T. and P. Zelikow (1999). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Longman (Concise case study)
- McCartney, R. and P. Duggan (2016, April). Metro sank into crisis despite decades of warnings. *Washington Post*. 00000
- Alexander, E. R. (2000). Rationality Revisited: Planning Paradigms in a Post-Postmodernist Perspective. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 19(3), 242–256

1/22(Mon) Logic of Individual Action

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

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

1/24(Wed) Guest Lecture - Qualitative Methods

1/29(Mon) Organisational Decision-Making

- March, J. G. (1997). Understanding how decisions happen in organizations. In Z. Shapira (Ed.), *Organizational Decision Making*, Chapter 1, pp. 9–32. Cambridge University Press
- Pralle, S. (2006, 9). Timing and sequence in agenda-setting and policy change: A comparative study of lawn care pesticide politics in Canada and the US. *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(7), 987–1005
- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The logic of making plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press (Chapters 7)

1/31(Wed) Logic of Collective Action & Collective Choice ³

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

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

2/05(Mon) Making Plans ⁴

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

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

2/07(Wed) Implementing Plans ⁵

Why make plans when they are not implemented? How to implement plans? What does it mean to implement plans?

- Winter, S. C. (2011). Implementation. In *International Encyclopedia of Political Science*, pp. 1158–1170. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. DOI: 10.4135/9781412994163
- Mastop, H. and A. Faludi (1997). Evaluation of strategic plans: The performance principle. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 24, 815–832
- Kaza, N. (2017). Vain foresight: Against the idea of implementation in planning. *Unpublished*

2/12(Mon) Using Plans ⁶

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

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

³See PLAN 762/763

⁴See PLAN 741

⁵See PLAN 890

⁶See PLAN 741

2/14(Wed) Discussion on Assignment 2

Property Rights, Governance & Institutions

2/19(Mon) Planning & Markets: A False Dichotomy⁷

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

- Klosterman, R. E. (1985). Arguments for and against planning. *Town Planning Review* 56(1), 5–20
- Alexander, E. R. (2001). Why planning vs. markets is an oxymoron?: Asking the right question. *Planning and Markets* 4(1), 1–8

2/21(Wed) Planning & Markets: A False Dichotomy (Disc.)

2/26(Mon) Rights & Regulations⁸

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

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

2/28(Wed) Rights & Regulations (Disc.)

3/05(Mon) Common Pool Resources & Institutional Responses⁹

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

⁷See PLAN 710

⁸See PLAN 724

⁹See PLAN 710 and PLAN 724

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

3/07(Wed) Common Pool Resources & Institutional Responses (Disc.)

3/12(Mon) No Class. (Spring Break)

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

3/19(Mon) Social Contracts & Justifications for State

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

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

3/21(Wed) Social Contracts & Justifications for State (Disc.)

Normative Planning Methods and their Justifications

3/26(Mon) Comprehensive Rational Planning Model

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

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

3/28(Wed) Comprehensive Rational Planning Model (Disc.)

4/02(Mon) Feminist Critiques

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

- Fainstein, S. (2005). Feminism and planning: Theoretical issues. In S. Fainstein and L. Servon (Eds.), *Gender and planning: A reader*, Chapter 7, pp. 120–140. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press
- Fenster, T. (1999, April). Space for Gender: Cultural Roles of the Forbidden and the Permitted. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17(2), 227–246
- Frisch, M. (2002, March). Planning as a Heterosexist Project. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21(3), 254–266
- Ritzdorf, M. (2000). Sex, lies, and urban life: How municipal planning marginalizes african american women and their families. In K. B. Miranne and A. H. Young (Eds.), *Gendering the city: women, boundaries, and visions of urban life*, pp. 169–81. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc

4/04(Wed) Feminist Critiques (Disc.)

4/09(Mon) Race & Multiculturalism ¹⁰

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

- Charles, C. Z. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29(1), 167–207
- Young, I. M. (2002, June). *Inclusion and Democracy* (First ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press (Chapter 6)
- Watson, V. (2003, December). Conflicting rationalities: implications for planning theory and ethics. *Planning Theory & Practice* 4(4), 395–407

4/11(Wed) Race & Multiculturalism (Disc.)

4/16(Mon) Marxist Critiques

It has been argued that as an instrument of the State, planning regimes are necessarily conservative, in that they entrench existing power structures and maintain *status quo*. Traditional critiques of this model of planning have relied on the fact that certain groups (either through class, gender etc.) are privileged over others, sometimes deliberately and at other times unintentionally. We will examine these claims and see if these critiques will still hold water when we move away from conflating planning with regulation.

¹⁰See PLAN 762

- Harvey, D. (1992). Social justice, postmodernism and the city. *International journal of urban and regional research* 16(4), 588–601
- Blomley, N. (2008). Enclosure, Common Right and the Property of the Poor. *Social & Legal Studies* 17(3), 311–331
- Soja, E. W. (1980). The socio-spatial dialectic. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70(2), 207–225
- Smith, N. (1982, April). Gentrification and Uneven Development. *Economic Geography* 58(2), 139

4/18(Wed) Marxist Critiques (Disc.)

4/23(Mon) Advocacy & Activist Planning

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

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

4/25(Wed) Advocacy & Activist Planning (Disc.)

4/30(Mon) Communicative Action & Deliberative Democracy ¹¹

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

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

5/02(Wed) Communicative Action & Deliberative Democracy (Disc.)

5/07(Mon) Professional Ethics

Every profession prescribes a set of professional ethics that it requires its practitioners to follow. We will engage the AICP code of ethics and see how your examination of the planning process (Assignment 4) had brought forth some ethical issues that need to be confronted.

¹¹See PLAN 725

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

Analyse decision making in a planning context (Assignment 1)

Task

The task in this assignment is to critically analyse a decision (or set of them) in a planning case you are familiar with. You have to examine the different notions of rationality and motivated irrationality that is present in the public and private decision making of the organisations and in particular decision-makers within the organisations.

We have come a long way from Max Weber who understood bureaucracies, public and private, as rational methods by which organisations formulate and solve problems and assign responsibilities. For example, Herbert Simon had argued that organisations make decisions, by accounting for the cost of making those decisions (e.g. gathering information, building coalitions) as well the cost of the decision. Similarly, March and Cohen posited that solutions (e.g. BRT, govt. stimulus, tax cuts, body cameras, stream buffers and TIFs) and problems (e.g. congestion, air quality, discrimination) are independent of one another and solutions get adopted because there are internal and external champions. Decision opportunities are created by internal and external events and participants come and go as do the advocates. The solution that gets adopted by the organisation is likely to be a result of the confluence of these random processes rather than a strictly rational problem solving process. Others have argued that organisations use heuristic models to make decisions, and adapt the heuristics when they are increasingly untenable to use. We have discussed in class about disjointed incrementalism, information asymmetries and mixed scanning. You would probably do well to skim through the fascinating book by Daniel Kahneman, 'Thinking fast and slow' that summarises availability heuristic, temporal inconsistencies and prospect theory.

For example, you can try to explain why light rail is preferred to buses in the Triangle by the regional transit agency. You can attempt to understand why profit maximising real estate developers seem to be unable to abandon a project that they have invested in. You can choose to explain how economic development organisations choose to structure their incentives in attracting businesses.

Taking the influential Allison's article on the Cuban Missile crisis as a potential template for examining the motivations of an organisational decision making you are familiar with, use the various theoretical models to understand them. Your task in this assignment is to bring to bear these models to understand a particular decision that supposedly rational people and organisations make.

Deliverables & Grading

You should critically use the readings and other materials to analyse the case. This is not a descriptive paper. A short (2-3 pgs) paper that applies the readings and other materials to make an argumentative case for a thesis that is defined early on in the paper. You will be graded on the content, succinctness and critical description. Comprehensiveness is not a goal.

The paper counts for 10% of the grade.

Analyse a Plan (Assignment 2)

Task

The purpose of this assignment is to get you familiar with the types of plans and content of the plans that are prevalent. This is an individual assignment. There are two parts to the assignment, one is analysis of an existing plan and other is a short write up of a plan about a large investment you wish to undertake in the next two years.

This short writeup, should enable you analyse the interdependencies of various decisions you have to take, and the uncertainties involved. The choice of the decision is left to you. This part of the assignment carries 15% of the grade.

For the other 85%, you are to choose a plan that is written for (or by) an organisation and critically analyse whether the information within the plan is useful. You should attempt to answer the questions (not limited to): Why is this plan made? Who benefits from making it?, What kinds of information does it provide to various parties? Does it address interdependency? Does it address uncertainty? What does it mean to implement the plan and how do we know? How else is the plan useful? In what situations? To whom?

Your personal plan, provides a foil for the public plan. You should bring the insights you gain from writing your own plan to analyse how and whether the public plan could be better written. You are to analyse the substantive content, the rhetorical devices, and the information in the plans. You are to analyse the plan's significance in subsequent decision making and deliberations by various groups and organisations. By using background knowledge, you should analyse what information is part of the plan and what is deliberately left out and why. You are also required to analyse the connections between the plan and other decisions and plans that are affected by it, but not explicitly addressed in the plan. The audience for the plan, crucially influences the purpose of the plan.

The choice of plan is entirely left to you, however, you should clear your choice with me ahead of time. Examples of bold plans can be the 1909 Burnham's Plan of Chicago, Metropolis 2020, RPA's or Bloomberg's plans for New York. On the other end of the spatial spectrum, you can choose plans like Chapel Hill's Comprehensive Plan, University's Facilities plan. Different functional plans include neighbourhood revitalisation plans in New Orleans, long range transportation plans of various MPOs, sanitary district's plans, park district's plans, climate change plans, habitat protection plans. You can also choose plans that are made by private organisation for private purposes that, nonetheless, have wider public ramifications. You should also note that even though some documents do not have the word 'plan' in their title, they function as plans.

You are advised to choose a plan, that fits your substantive interests, and for an area that you are familiar with. You should bring to bear your background knowledge, news reports, informal knowledge and engage the plan.

Deliverables & Grading

Densely, but elegantly, written paper (4-5 pgs excluding references and exhibits) is required for analysing an existing plan. The plan for yourself should run no more than 2 pgs. Mere recounting

of the material in the public plan is not the purpose of this assignment. You should engage the material critically.

The combined submission is graded and counts for 15% of the total grade. Your grade will reflect the depth at which you engaged the course materials and apply the discussed concepts, in evaluating and writing the plans.

Analyse a Planning Case (Assignment 3)

Task

The purpose of this assignment is to get you started thinking about planning law cases and the rationale for the decisions. While the emphasis is mostly on the United States, you could consider the broader applications of the arguments made in the case for planning around the world. This is a group assignment.

Most of the landmark planning law cases such as *Euclid v. Ambler* and *Kelo v. New London* are about government regulations and their interactions with private property rights. Other cases, such as *Just v. Marinette County*, are about balancing rights of various parties and using political justice principles to determine how to achieve the balance. Some cases such as *HUD v. Rucker* affirms responsibility for other's (family members, care givers etc.) actions which then attenuated public housing rights of the tenants. There are other cases, such as *Secretary of Interior v. Southern Utah wilderness Alliance*, that enable planning and separate planning from regulations.

In this assignment, you should select a legal case (preferably within the US) that interests you and analyse the arguments presented, using the theoretical concepts described in the class. You should analyse the implications of the arguments, judgements, and dissents of the case, on planning practise. Much, though not all, of arguments can be analysed through various concepts that you have studied in the class about role of plans, rights allocation, justification, management of commons, externalities, institutional design. You should also evaluate whether these arguments are valid and if counter arguments can be presented from the concepts you have learned. Throughout your analysis, you should consider the importance of the historical legal framework that conditions these arguments.

If you have already taken a planning law class (PLAN 724 or equivalent), you can choose a case from the syllabus. Alternatively, I will post examples of important cases to choose from, on the Wiki. You are not restricted to these cases, but you should clear your choice with me.

Deliverables & Grading

Instead of an traditional critical written essay, the deliverable for this assignment is a video essay. While I do not expect polished production values and tight editing from many of you, you should strive to create a logical argument that is well-supported visually. This includes using clips, voice overs, interviews, static pictures and weaving a narrative that is visually and intellectually compelling. Video essays are more intensive than paper essays as they require creating raw footage as well as sampling. The Media Resources Center at the Undergraduate library will be a resource. See <http://guides.lib.unc.edu/mrcguides/home>

3-4 min video essay is expected. This is a group assignment with teams of two working on a topic. The submission counts for 15% of the grade.

Analyse a Planning Process (Assignment 4)

Task

The purpose of this assignment is to observe a real and ongoing urban planning process and apply the normative theories of planning processes. It also gives you a first hand account of the ideals and realities of participatory planning processes. This is a group assignment, done in groups of two. You are free to choose your partner and the case study. This is likely to be a semester long project.

Since an in-depth paper requires getting familiar with the area, institutions, history and dynamics of the place, you should start early to do archival research, interviewing local planners and stake holders. Bear in mind that these people have busy professional and personal lives, so please give them ample notice and wide latitude. You are advised to use the extensive library resources and getting familiar with resources such as LexisNexis. At various points during the semester, I will invite experts to talk about specific methods (archival research, interview techniques, participant observation) and may be scheduled outside class hours, depending on availability. You are strongly encouraged to attend these.

The process of planning generates and reveals information about behaviours, preferences of various individuals, groups, and organisations. The task is to analyse how this information was *used* in the process. You should critically analyse which groups (e.g. based on race, gender, class, and political orientation or government or non government organisations, but not limited to these) dominated the process and whose voices were left out and how the history of the place conditioned these participation. You should also analyse the political logrolling, as well as, rhetorical devices these groups used in deliberation and in influencing the collective choice. In addition, you should analyse the legal context that provides jurisdiction over or cultural context that provides justifications for actions of these groups. You should also analyse earlier plans and planning processes that informed the current process. In short, you cannot analyse a planning process in isolation, but can only do so in the context of intersecting and overlapping claims, shifting coalitions, changing power relations and socio-economic context, agenda setting and framing by different groups that bring particular issues to salience and advocate for specific solutions.

Some excellent examples that you can model your research are

Flyvbjerg, B. (1998). *Rationality and Power : Democracy in Practice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Caro, R. A. (1974). *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf

Davis, M. (1992, March). *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* (1st, First Edition ed.). Vintage

You should seek assistance from various people and observe first hand planning meetings (broadly defined). You should try and select a project that is local, so that you get familiar with the towns and communities you live in, but also get mentoring opportunities from practising planners. However, you are not restricted to the Triangle area.

Deliverables & Grading

A densely, but elegantly, written paper (8-10 pgs excluding exhibits) is required. Particular attention should be paid to the historical decision making processes, stakeholder groups, ancillary planning issues, relationships with already existing plans and regulations and the processes of negotiations and collective group formations.

The assignment is graded and counts for 20% of the total grade. The grade depends on the depth of the critique and understanding of the issues involved and application of the course material.

Important Interim Milestones

Jan 19 - Finalise groups

Jan 26 - Select case study

Feb 9 - 1 pg summary of proposal on the wiki

Mar 2 - 1 pg summary of archival research

Apr 6 - 1 pg interim summary of interview and observation research

Apr 26 - Final paper