HOW CITIES ARE CHANGING
AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF THOSE CHANGES
FOR URBAN PLANNING[1]

Cliff Hague
Commonwealth Association of Planners

There is a need to "re-invent" urban planning. Rapid urbanization and the urbanization of poverty challenge traditional urban planning. Competitiveness, climate change and the search for more sustainable settlements are other drivers. The 2006 UN-Habitat World Urban Forum "placed a strong emphasis on planning as a tool for urban development and environmental management, and as a means of preventing future slum growth." A key theme in this approach is pro-active consensus-building in conditions of conflict over development. New Urban Planning requires new skills. The paper explores institutional opportunities and barriers to reinventing planning in an international context.

Key words: Governance; urbanization; urban planning; urban poverty; institutions; international networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern urban planning had its origins in Europe. It developed as a response to the industrialization and associated urban growth which swept across the continent from the early nineteenth century onwards. Legislation differed from country to country, and there are different traditions and approaches in different parts of Europe (see, for example, Newman and Thornley, 1996). Colonialism implanted such approaches, legislation and skills in other continents, though primarily only in major cities and, more specifically, the parts of those cities where the colonists lived and worked. Thus Spanish urbanism, with its roots in

architecture and engineering, was exported to Latin America, while garden suburbs from early 20th century England were transplanted to sub-Saharan Africa and other "distant" parts of the globe.

The paper argues that this colonial legacy is now deeply problematic. Not only was it insensitive to indigenous traditions of urban development, it is now outdated and impractical. The problems associated with these ex-colonial approaches to urban planning are most fundamental in situations of rapid urbanization. However, the mental models and institutions of urban planning are also flawed within Europe, for related, historical reasons. In a globalized world, urban planning is under-globalized and primarily local in its practice and outlook. Therefore it has become increasingly disconnected from debates about the management of urban and regional change, both at global and European levels.

Most of the academic writing about the relationship between planning and politics is also implicitly local. The organizations, the structures and power relations that are the focus of discussions of planning within a governance perspective are those of nation states and their component regions and local authorities and neighbourhoods. Such practices and discourses are shaped by, and reproduce, the "rules of the game", the implicit mental models that are shared by the community of planners, politicians, civil society organizations and planning academics that engage in any particular planning system.

This paper seeks to challenge "business as usual" perspectives in several ways. Its underlying assumptions are those of international political economy. That is to say the focus is on international relations of economic and political power as the prime shapers of events. However, these structures are not determinants: institutions influence responses. "Institutions" involve not just organizations, but also attitudes, rules and practices. From this perspective, the paper will argue that there is a need to re-invent urban planning for the 21st century. Furthermore, the re-invention involves explicitly thinking of planning in terms of governance, and implies a focus on skills that have often been neglected in the development of professional urban planners.

Re-inventing planning is a work in progress. The Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP) has become an engaged international advocate for "New Urban Planning". Thus the paper draws evidence from events and writings which the author as President of CAP from 2000 until 2006, and then its Secretary-General, has helped to shape. The research methods are thus an unconventional mix of critical commentary and participant observer, supplemented by advocacy: the paper is the outcome of a form of action research that uses and explores institutions. The theoretical underpinnings are a rather loose form of institutionalism: in other words the argument is that institutions matter in the way they interpret and respond to structural and material changes in the international political economy around them. Such institutions are moulded by their own histories and cultures, not least their cultures of professionalism and governance. They also establish structures and practices which *a priori* are likely to seek to stabilise and reproduce the institutions themselves. The core concerns of the paper are with the contradictions between such "path dependency" and its reproduction in a rapidly changing world. More specifically the central problem addressed is how to engineer institutional change in respect of urban planning – in Europe and globally.

II. INSTITUTIONS AND RULES OF THE GAME

1. Institutional analysis

In the real world, markets do not normally operate in the way they do in abstract neo-classical models. Government action can improve the efficiency of the market. These ideas are expressed in the academic field of institutional analysis. Joseph Stiglitz (2002), Nobel prize-winning economist and former Chief Economist at the World Bank, has argued that, contrary to free-market ideology, imperfect information and market failure are the norm, not the exception, especially in developing countries. In such circumstances government interventions become essential, and thus questions of governance become very important.

The contending schools and disciplines within institutionalist approaches need not concern us here. Rather, we need to highlight and then use some of the most powerful concepts. To begin, the argument is that institutions and organizations do influence outcomes. In a sense this has been accepted for some time – e.g. as evidenced by the importance attached in practice to public-private partnerships, or to establishing appropriate institutions for metropolitan governance. The "invention" of such organizational forms testifies to the need for, and potential of, institutions. An important question is what kind of institutions connect state, market and civil society in different countries and contexts? More specifically, in what kind of institutions is the practice of urban planning located, and how does this institutional specificity impact on the capacity of planners to respond to imperatives in today's globalized world? As global and local forces come together in urban areas, as the slums multiply and the threats from environmental hazards increase, what organizational forms are needed to counter such examples of market failure?

Jenkins and Smith (2001) argued that the essential ideas in institutional analysis go well beyond just identifying organizations. The institutional culture, mental models and "rules of the game" are crucial. Institutions – such as local governments, professional bodies, university departments or firms – socialize those who work within them and with them. They reproduce an institutional culture and way of looking at the world. What happens when that world changes in significant ways? The institutions either adapt or they become irrelevant.

2. Institutional analysis and planning

Institutional analysis guards against over-generalization. It provides a warning against casual notions of "best practice" and "frictionless" international transfers of ideas. Planning, while practiced in many different countries, is almost always nationally specific – or even specific to a Province or Region in a federal system. Thus a key starting point in any international comparison of planning practice is often an attempt to understand the agencies and instruments in their own context, rather than assuming that they can be "read off" a more familiar domestic set.

However, in an age of globalization uniqueness is a weakness as well as a strength. In respect of planning, we have no universal term that defines the practice. We speak of "town and country planning", "urbanism", "city building", "resource planning" etc. The strength is that this diversity provides a set of different models and practices that can provide inspiration

and options. However, the weakness is that there is no international currency for the planning concept – compared with words like "engineering" or "architecture" which are in global usage. The political implications of this weakness are compounded by the fact that there is really no effective and visible global organization for planners. The International Society of City and Regional Planners is an organization of individuals. The International Federation for Housing and Planning, though long established, has been perceived to be Euro-centric, as is evident by the formation of the Eastern Regional Organization for Planning and Housing that covers East Asia. Within Europe different traditions have come together under the European Council of Spatial Planners, and in the European Biennial of Towns and Town Planning, but co-operation between national bodies is limited, and integration of efforts to achieve political impacts has been negligible.

To understand the implications of the national (rather than international) mentality and organizations of planners, we need to appreciate the frightening situation created by rapid urbanization and the urbanization of poverty that the world faces. While it is not necessary to be a planner to have a concern for the urban condition, planners more than any other professional grouping, with the possible exception of public health professionals, have the potential to grasp that in the city, everything affects everything else, and that proactive and practical interventions are needed to make things better. The lack of global planning institutions has marginalized this discourse. One consequence, for example, is that many national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers lack an urban dimension (Mullard and McLeod, 2005).

The unfolding tragedy of the cities, which is discussed below, constitutes a threat to global stability that is related to, and of a similar order to, that of climate change. However, the escalation of slums is almost invisible in global politics and certainly in the politics of the richer, more urbanized countries. The rules of the game and mental models of the planning professionals (with their largely parochial focus) are so strong, that there is little awareness amongst European planners of what is happening in the urban areas of Africa, Latin America, Asia or Oceania. Planning schools in the rich countries aim to prepare their students for local practice, and so give them little, if any, exposure to what is happening in cities elsewhere.

The dominant institutional form of planning remains rooted in the world of the 1950s. It is confined by national boundaries; the work is done in ministries and the town hall, by professionals acting in "the public interest" whose technical expertise and standards allow them to know best what a largely homogeneous society needs. Local politicians take the decisions. It is a model of government not governance.

However, Friedmann (2005) has argued that, things may be changing. He noted that planning is still closely linked to the political culture of a country or a city, but globalization is indeed beginning to re-shape institutional structures and the scope of planning. He looked at planning in Japan, China, India, South Africa, Russia, the UK, Europe and the USA and found some common current traits. There was a general sense that all these planning systems and planning cultures are, in his words, "in movement". New institutions are being created and the institutional settings within which planning is practiced are being changed. Other important tendencies that Friedmann noted were: a shift from planning as a restraint to planning as an entrepreneurial activity; and an increasing role for civil society within planning.

146

These shifts observed by Friedmann reflect the double crisis that traditional approaches to planning have met. The shifts towards entrepreneurialism and civic involvement are necessary attempts to re-engineer the continuing close association of planning with government, upon which modernist planning mental models and practices were built. Thus planning agencies are mainly local authorities. The practices of these agencies typically involve the preparation of a masterplan that primarily expresses the priorities of the council: it is <u>the council's</u> plan. Such planning has been insensitive to the private sector, and especially to the informal sector of the economy and to aspirations of NGOs. Therefore, when such plans became discredited, whether through high intensity of development outstripping the plan (rapid urbanization) or lack of demand for development undermining the plan's aspirations (in de-industrialized regions of the rich world, for example), entrepreneurs and civil society simply ignored the plan. The world changed much faster than the instruments and practices of orthodox planning systems and agencies.

In contrast, Friedmann (2005:213) took a view of planning "that goes beyond narrow professionalism and public institutions". He called for planners to be innovative, and argued that "Global planning principles are needed simply because the problems confronting the world's large cities are coalescing, increasingly resembling each other". However he recognized that global principles will always need to be adapted to the specific local situation. Similarly, a wide-ranging international review of skills and approaches for "Making Planning Work", a key document in the attempts to "re-invent planning", concluded:

> *Thus urban planning cannot be separated from the management of urban development or the administration of urban services. It is ironic, however, that urban planning as a profession is still often demarcated by a concern only with the location and distribution of land uses and the control of development, and is seen as almost exclusively based in the public sector. The double irony is that this marginalization of planning means that an integrated and practical approach to human settlements has also been marginalized. There are signs that this is beginning to change.* (Hague, Wakely, Crespin and Jasko, 2006: 83).

III. DRIVERS OF CHANGE

1. Global drivers

Never before has there been so much urban development taking place. Globally, towns and cities are growing by around 65M people a year, or put another way, each day around 200,000 more people are living in urban areas every day. There are three components to this surge of urbanization. The first is natural increase within the cities – fast growing cities tend to have a young demographic structure. The second is rural to urban migration. Despite the higher living costs of city life, the urban areas offer opportunities – for jobs, for education, and to women – that rural areas simply cannot match. The third is the reclassification of areas on and beyond the urban fringe as "urban" once they have absorbed development.

It is difficult to overstate the scale of the transformation that we are living through. Not only has the world shifted from being mainly rural to mainly urban, but there are more and

bigger cities. Furthermore, the staggering rates of urban growth are in the global regions that are still predominantly rural – for example in 2003 the urban population in Africa and Asia was only 39% of their total population (Jenkins, Smith and Wang, 2006: 14).

Just as important is the fact that this is an urbanization of poverty. "Slums in many cities are no longer just marginalized neighbourhoods housing a relatively small proportion of the urban population; in many cities, they are the dominant type of human settlement, carving their way into the fabric of modern-day cities, and making their mark as a distinct category of human settlement that now characterizes so many cities in the developing world" (UN-Habitat, 2006).

Already there are 1 billion people living in slums. Slum development is a boom industry with strong growth prospects and a potential global impact – on present trends one person in three on this planet will be living in a slum in 25 years time. Slum living has serious impacts: under-five mortality rates in the slums in Nairobi are 151 per 1000 live births, compared to an average of 62 for Nairobi as a whole, or of 13 for rural Kenya (African Population and Health Research Center, 2002: xvi).

Table 1

TOTAL, URBAN AND RURAL POPULATIONS BY DEVELOPMENT GROUP, SELECTED PERIODS 1950-2030 (SOURCE: UNITED NATIONS DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS, POPULATION DIVISION, 2004)

DEVELOPMENT GROUP	**POPULATION (BILLIONS)**				
	1950	**1975**	**2000**	**2003**	**2030**
TOTAL POPULATION					
World	2.52	4.07	6.07	6.30	8.13
More developed regions	0.81	1.05	1.19	1.20	1.24
Less developed regions	1.71	3.02	4.88	5.10	6.89
URBAN POPULATION					
World	0.73	1.52	2.86	3.04	4.94
More developed regions	0.43	0.70	0.88	0.90	1.01
Less developed regions	0.31	0.81	1.97	2.15	3.93
RURAL POPULATION					
World	1.79	2.55	3.21	3.26	3.19
More developed regions	0.39	0.34	0.31	0.31	0.23
Less developed regions	1.40	2.21	2.90	2.95	2.96

Under the "rules of the game" this accelerating dystopia is not a concern to most of the world's professional planners, because they work in the more developed regions where rates of urbanization and slum growth peaked long ago. However, we live in one world and while

urban experiences and situations may be fragmented, they are also deeply inter-connected. Connections include international migration, dependency on the cities as the engines of the economy, a developing "hour-glass" labour market that sees a widening rich-poor gap within urban areas in rich countries too, and increasing insecurity and risk.

Part of the risk comes from the consequences of climate change, and how we handle urban growth is fundamental to how we manage those risks. As urban development tends to be disproportionately on coasts or in flood plains, there is an urban dimension to impacts of climate change as well as to its causes. Similarly, there is a poverty dimension to climate change, as it is the poor who live in the most hazardous locations, yet contribute least to the emissions that are believed to be causing the climate to change. The Stern Review (2006: 56) refers to one estimate that by the middle of the century another 200 million people could be permanently displaced due to rising sea levels, heavier floods and increasing droughts. While planning professionals, and in some cases planning systems and legislation, have been sensitised to climate change in recent years, the emphasis has been on the environmental aspects, e.g. through attempts to increase urban densities to reduce car dependency and consequent CO_2 emissions. The slums and poverty aspects of the equation are typically ignored, not only globally but also in Europe, where planning remains locked in a physical and functional mindset.

2. European Drivers

Within Europe, the EU is committed to sustainable development, but also to competitiveness and to cohesion. Again the urban areas are the places where the success or failure of these aspirations will be decided. The EU itself has no legal competence in urban planning matters, though it has given tacit support to the notion of "spatial planning" in the past (Faludi and Waterhout, 2002). This was notable in the preparation of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) (Commission of the European Communities, 1999). Similarly, a European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) was set up to provide an evidence base in the light of the ESDP. ESPON ran from 2002 until 2006, and then a second ESPON programme began at the start of 2008 which will last until 2013. However, it is no longer described as the European Spatial Planning Observation Network, but rather as the European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion. This reflects an attempt to distance ESPON from the concept of "spatial planning".

"Spatial planning" had itself been built on the institutional foundations of urban and regional planning. This is evident by another change of name: what was the European Council of Town Planners (a grouping of the professional planning institutes across Europe) now calls itself the European Council of Spatial Planners. So there is continuity and change here. Urban land-use planning is dead, long live spatial planning! Spatial planning is dead, long live territorial cohesion!

The emergence of territorial cohesion as an important European policy narrative is complex and has been discussed by eminent contributors to Faludi (ed.) (2007). However, for purposes of the current paper, there are a few key points. Firstly, the notion of "spatial planning", with its linkages into traditional land-use regulation and urban and regional planning, has been found to be inadequate to 21st century European policy agendas. In part this reflects hostility towards

past traditions of a "planned economy" amongst many of the states that joined the EU in 2004. But even in states such as the UK and the Netherlands, the regulatory land-use tradition is perceived to be largely ignorant of, and even a barrier to, the enhancement of competitiveness.

Intellectually the notion of territorial cohesion owes much to institutional economics, and opposition to the premises of neo-classical economics that drove neo-liberal politics to international dominance from the 1980s. Thus imperfect information and market failure are argued to be central, practical problems that necessitate political interventions. In the case of territorial development, there are numerous blockages and impediments to the realisation of the territorial capital of an area. These would include a failure by the market to appreciate the potential value of assets such as historic buildings, landscape, environment etc. Similarly, markets fail to provide the kind of transport networks that can unlock a region's potential. Even more, markets may not overcome attitudes and institutional behaviours that close thinking to new possibilities. Some of these propositions resonate positively with traditional approaches to urban planning: there is indeed some continuity. However, the fundamental point of this argument is that at the level of the EU, and in response to global imperatives, there is evidence of some re-invention of urban planning, but with a changed set of priorities and a shift in its disciplinary base – away from architecture and engineering and towards social science.

3. A summary

In summary, the world urgently needs solutions to the problems posed by a new scale and type of urban growth, the escalation of slums and the threats posed by climate change. In Europe, concerns with global competitiveness and sustainable development are also driving change in perceptions of the nature and practice of urban planning. The modern planning profession came into being in the Northern hemisphere as part of an inter-professional movement that sought to find remedies to the slum problem. Better amenity and built environment were key concerns, and action by local government was seen as the means to deliver improvements. However, the "rules of the game" embedded in this model of urban planning (e.g. urban containment, a presumption that there is only a formal economy, high uniform standards to be imposed through development control) are quite inappropriate in situations of rapid urbanization today. Meanwhile in Europe, the restrictions of local land use planning traditions are increasingly being challenged. A form of action is developing around integration of policy across different spatial scales to achieve competitiveness and territorial cohesion.

As the Commonwealth Association of Planners has argued, there can be no sustainable development without sustainable urbanization and no sustainable urbanization without effective urban planning. To create effective urban planning for the 21st century, in and beyond Europe, it is necessary to re-invent planning.

IV. THE GLOBAL POLITICS OF PLANNING

1. The rejection of urban planning

In many of the regions now experiencing rapid urbanization, planning was a colonial implantation. The tools and mental models that had been developed to contain the industrial cities of the North were enacted in very different situations, with scant regard for local cultures and traditions (King, 1980, 1990; Home, 1997; Jenkins, Smith and Wang, 2006). As Jenkins, Smith and Wang (2006: 62) observe, the nature of this planning was inherently unsustainable.

By the 1980s the rise of neo-liberal politics, accompanied by the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) created an environment that was hostile to many of the assumptions and practices of traditional town planning. The basic principles of SAPs were privatizations, market liberalization and public sector reform. The economic development models that identified with planning (Keynesianism and traditional regional policy in which governments subsidised jobs in "problem regions") were discredited, as was the concern for public provision of housing, another cause with which planning was also associated.

More positively, the rise of environmental politics went some way to providing some political support internationally for the conservationist and regulatory aspects of the work of planners. This was bolstered by the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987, with its advocacy of sustainable development. The Earth Summit in Rio in 1992 was another landmark. However, planning was never in the forefront of these international events. While the meetings and declarations went some way to rehabilitating the case that some government action was desirable, the global community concerned with environment did not necessarily subscribe to anything like the still dominant model of "town planning". Thus when the UN held Habitat II (the global summit on human settlements) in 1996, planning was much less visible in the deliberations and outputs than had been the case in the first Habitat in Vancouver twenty years earlier. Nevertheless, Habitat II was another important stepping stone, for it recognized the international nature of the challenge to achieve "adequate shelter for all and sustainable human settlements".

Traditional urban planning has been substantially rejected in practice over the last generation in many poorer countries that are unable to afford or unwilling to prioritize practices that seek to implement outdated master plans. There are many countries that are experiencing rapid urbanization but where little or no political priority is given to planning. One example is Zambia:

> *…only two cities (Ndola and Livingstone)… have up to date city development plans. There are several reasons why development plans are not prepared despite the provisions made for their preparation in Section 16 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Act 283). There has been little or no commitment to their preparation by the ministry tasked with urban planning, The Ministry of Local Government and Housing.* (Mwimba, 2006: 2-3).

Mwimba notes that the current development plan for Lusaka, a city of over a million people, dates from 1978. This situation is not unusual. El-Shaks, (1997: 505-506) observed:

> *Governments' ability to enforce rules and regulations is generally very weak in Africa, particularly when they relate to unrealistic standards or activities that go against the grain of market forces. Plans are often not respected even by those government bureaucrats and politicians who approved them in the first place. In addition, projects are frequently abandoned before they are given a chance to mature.*

However the problems with the traditional planning paradigm run deeper than just bureaucratic neglect. They were articulated by the Executive Director of UN-Habitat when she said:

> *The poor are untidy, their settlements are unplanned, and their houses are often vectors of disease, and, it is often claimed, are harbours of criminality… The 'Planned City' requires that the poor should be at best hidden, or at worst, swept away.* (Quoted in CAP News, 16, 2007: 2).

Similarly Kamete (2007) reviewed the use of planning legislation in Zimbabwe under "Operation Murambatsvina / Restore Order". The result was the forced eviction of some 700,000 poor people, in the name of cleaning up "filth". Kamete describes the role played by the planning professionals in this clearance as "cold-hearted, negligent and spineless".

A contempt for plans was also evident in the early 1990s in the countries which escaped from the planned economies of the former Warsaw Pact states. Inherited statutory urban development plans were seen as the products of illegitimate political structures. In future the market would decide the scale, intensity and location of future urban growth.

While weak states largely opted to ignore the modernization of planning through this period, there was a concerted effort in others to deliver a reform of planning that reflected the New Right politics that underpinned public choice theory (Buchanan and Tullock, 1962; Poulton and Begg, 1988). Public choice theory seeks to apply the pre-conceptions of neo-classical economics to decisions about public goods and services. Thus in the UK during the 1990s planning became tightly focused as a regulatory procedure to address externalities, by applying centrally defined policies at local level. A further key change in line with public choice theory, was the imposition of performance monitoring and league tables, enabling "customers" such as taxpayers and central government to make judgments about how well their investment in local authority planning was being spent.

2. Challenges to market supremacy

More recently there are signs that the global political drivers have come to recognize that simply "freeing" markets does not solve all the problems. The paper has already argued that emerging European policies for territorial cohesion have their roots in the challenge of institutional economics to neo-classical perceptions that markets are inherently efficient.

Many of the most successful stories of development during the period of ascendancy of neo-liberalism have come from Asian countries that resisted IMF conditions (e.g. South Korea and Malaysia) or, in the case of China, had not looked to the IMF. Sir Nicolas Stern (2006), another former Chief Economist at the World Bank, has depicted global warming as being caused by market failure.

Of course it is foolhardy to generalize about global politics in a short paper like this, but nevertheless it is important for geographers interested in urban planning to realize two things. Firstly, the depth of the international political rejection of the traditional, state-centered model of planning during the last 25 years; and secondly, the window of opportunity that is now opening up in which planning might be re-invented as a form of governance. Not only is there a general realization that market-only solutions have limitations, but five factors have emerged which can sensitize politicians and other policy makers to the need for planning. These are:

- The recognition that new slum formation is outstripping the rate of slum upgrading (and so some orientation to the future is necessary);
- The increased awareness of risks from disasters and the need for post-disaster reconstruction (following, in particular, the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 and the flooding in New Orleans in 2005);
- The more general recognition of climate change and its connections to transport and urban development;
- Recognition that competitiveness is linked to cities and their attractiveness;
- The fear of urban crime and terrorism, and that cities could become "un-governable".

There is a division in priorities between the richer countries and the poorer countries. The former, with some important exceptions, tend to prioritize the "green agenda" within the idea of sustainable development – i.e. they equate sustainable development with environmental protection. In contrast the poorer countries focus on the need for economic growth to drive an escape from poverty, and so give more emphasis to the "brown agenda" around issues of sanitation, water and shelter. The management of cities is fundamental to reconciling these conflicting perspectives. That is why re-inventing planning is so important.

V. RE-INVENTING PLANNING

1. The Commonwealth Association of Planners

So far the paper has argued that an institutional approach, set within an international political economy perspective provides a way of analyzing critically the challenges facing urban planning at the start of the 21st century, and of identifying drivers of change and locating the politics of planning internationally. This section now takes the argument further, by exploring how one international organization, the Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP) has been able to develop and advocate an agenda for re-inventing planning.

Over two decades following the end of World War II, the United Kingdom undertook extensive de-colonisation. The Commonwealth developed during this period as a voluntary political grouping of states that had historic, largely colonial ties to Britain. Britain's entry into the European Union in 1972 created a major political and economic re-orientation, away from its former empire and towards the continent of Europe. In turn this provoked the establishment of a range of Commonwealth organisations in an attempt to sustain and reproduce networks and ties within the Commonwealth. Thus the CAP was formed in 1971, and its member organizations were, and continue to be, the professional planning institutes representing town / urban and rural / physical planners (the name varies from country to country). CAP held conferences about every four years, and was held together at various times by influential individuals who sometimes were employed in the UK's ministerial department concerned with international development.

Many people regard the Commonwealth as a post-imperial anachronism, an attempt to reproduce the structures of the British Empire. However, this negative perception is actually a contradiction, for it reflects the mental models of the mid-twentieth 20th century anti-colonial struggles. Of course colonialism and post-colonialism remain hugely disruptive and problematic forces, but today they need to be reassessed within a realist perception of globalization. The Commonwealth today is a voluntary association of 53 countries, 2 billion citizens, and 30% of the world's population. It connects people in all the main global regions, yet it also has a common institutional legacy, not least in terms of planning legislation and planning education. The Commonwealth is not the only institutional option for those seeking to raise awareness of the international connections and importance of urbanization, urban poverty and climate change, and so to re-position planning globally. However it does offer significant, even unique, potential in relation to these aims. The growth of CAP since 2000 demonstrates that some of that latent institutional potential can be unlocked.

By the mid-1990s CAP had changed little from when it was first set up and it had dwindled to irrelevance. Contact between members was still primarily by surface mail; not much happened between the conferences; there was no activity so no subscriptions were collected. Within CAP's Constitution, planning was seen as being about "the well-being of society and the creation of a satisfactory environment", and the main focus of CAP was to advance the planning profession. In other words, there was strong continuity with a traditional form of professionalism and a traditional perception of the scope and purpose of planning.

2. Re-inventing CAP

In 2000 CAP was re-launched. The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), its largest member, decided that it would only continue to subscribe to CAP if the organization could demonstrate relevance and efficiency. The UK-based RTPI was itself embarking on a period of significant institutional change, triggered by a perception that the status quo was no longer an option, in the face of UK government intentions to re-position planning around a more strategic role with stronger priority to issues of competitiveness. As building blocks for the re-launch of CAP, the RTPI provided some administrative support to CAP and the author of this paper (who had been RTPI President in 1996) became CAP President.

In assessing what CAP has done since 2000, it is important to focus on the rules of the game and the mental models. Like many professional bodies, CAP had been essentially inward-looking, seeking to address the concerns of the professionals, such as how to protect their title in the labour market. Planners, as a relatively new and small profession, planners have been prone to anxiety, even to an inferiority complex, about their relation to the larger, long-established construction professions such as architecture and engineering. From the revival of CAP in 2000, the change agenda within CAP was explicit, and it was directly connected to the global dimension of planning in relation to rapid urbanization. The first issue of CAP News made this clear:

> *"We need to change CAP for two reasons. First there is the global significance of urbanization; second is the need to support member organisations and the planners who belong to them… professional planners have an important role to play, but that they need to rethink the scope and nature of their practice. Rapid urbanization has rendered obsolete the techniques, policies and instruments of much traditional town planning. Planners have been slow to recognise the imperatives of poverty alleviation, community empowerment, and to create opportunities for women in development. Nor has planning practice been sufficiently involved in the knowledge economy and informed by research. CAP by itself cannot deliver a transformation, but it should be a focus for ideas, innovations and mutual learning."* (Hague, 2000).

New channels of communication were needed to carry such messages. A web-site was set up (www.commonwealth-planners.org), a Newsletter was produced, and e-mail was used to begin to form an international network of sympathetic people and organizations. Meetings were held in Kenya (2001), Australia (2001), the UK (2002), and Trinidad (2002). CAP also got engaged in the "Habitat+5" review of progress on the implementation of the 1996 Habitat Agenda, culminating in the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly in 2001. In 2002 CAP assisted in the formation of an African Planners Association, and took an active part in civil society events at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg.

Significant changes were made to the Constitution in 2002. Amongst them was a formal emphasis on using planning to create "more sustainable settlements and adequate shelter for all", which were key aims of the Habitat Agenda. The vision of a "new" CAP was sold hard to member institutes who had withdrawn from the inactive CAP during the 1990s. A key part of the narrative was that the Commonwealth had the potential to link the Global North and the Global South and, as "the world in miniature", was a valuable institutional resource in which to develop and apply new approaches to tackling the global challenges of unsustainable urbanization.

In 2004 an opportunity arose to take this perspective forward on a new scale. UN-Habitat had followed the 2001 General Assembly Special Session on the Habitat Agenda by establishing a biennial World Urban Forum (WUF) at which stakeholders in settlement and habitat issues would come together, share ideas and shape agendas. The second such Forum, in Barcelona in 2004, paid relatively little attention to planning. This reflected the continuing

marginalization of planning in the eyes of governments, many NGOs and some people within UN-Habitat. However, UN-Habitat did put on a Networking Event at the WUF on "Urban planning revisited". CAP was invited to speak at this and to contribute an article to an issue of *Habitat Debate* on the same theme (Hague 2004).

3. The 2006 UN-Habitat World Urban Forum

The 2006 WUF was to be held in Vancouver. Vancouver has an iconic status, because the first Habitat meeting was there in 1976 when planning had been much more central to the discourses on settlements. So this historical legacy provided leverage to edge planning back into the picture. Even more importantly the Canadian Institute of Planning, a member organization of CAP, was keen to collaborate with CAP to take advantage of this opportunity to influence agendas. It was agreed that instead of a CAP conference in 2006, there would be a World Planners Congress in Vancouver that would be held immediately prior to the WUF, so that it could serve as something like a "caucus meeting" for planners, a launch pad to hone and target messages for the WUF. To make this a reality, a lot of global networking was necessary.

The work to create a planning presence at WUF and to build a Global Planning Network was done over 2005-06. A Vancouver Declaration was drafted, connecting planning to the challenges posed by rapid urbanization, the urbanization of poverty, hazards from climate change, and the Millennium Development Goals, notably MDG 7 which is concerned with environmental sustainability. Professional planning institutes were invited to sign up to the Declaration, which states, amongst other things, that "Planning, and its values and ethics, are fundamental to good governance and a means to deliver more equal access to the benefits cities have to offer". The Declaration also commits signatories to take action to "share and develop the knowledge and skills of planners to build the capacity for creating safe, healthy and sustainable settlements".

A position paper was also written to set out the thinking behind the Declaration and to provoke debate. It was to be the focal point for discussion at the World Planners Congress and then for the WUF. The paper, "Re-inventing Planning: A new governance paradigm for managing human settlements" was signed by the Presidents and/or senior officers of CAP, the Royal Town Planning Institute, the Canadian Institute of Planners, the American Planning Association, the European Council of Town Planners and UN-Habitat. It advocated "New Urban Planning". It argued that the crisis of urbanization "is global, systematic and already discernable. Yet much policy-making remains reactive, and presumes that urban development is only a local matter, and that natural disasters and outbreaks of urban unrest are random events. Practices built on these foundations are programmed to fail. In contrast, *New Urban Planning* **means being proactive, focused on sustainability, and making the connections between people, economic opportunity and the environment**. That is why planning is central to a new paradigm for governance of human settlements" (Farmer, et.al. 2006, original emphasis).

The "Re-inventing Planning" paper referred to the Habitat Agenda, the UN General Assembly Special Session in 2001, and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development. The paper argued that "The principles embedded in these documents provide the **ethical basis**

of the *New Urban Planning* – **explicitly pro-poor and supportive of social, environmental and economic sustainability**. However, too few administrations have made the necessary step change in their capacity to plan and manage change in human settlements" (Farmer, et.al., 2006, original emphasis).

Continuing this normative tone it set out ten key principles of New Urban Planning, elaborating briefly on each of them. These have also been outlined in Hague (2008). In summary form these were:

1. *Sustainability*: New Urban Planning is a practical means of integrating the social, economic and environmental components of sustainable human settlements.
2. *Integrated Planning and Budgeting:* New Urban Planning is integrated planning, and to ensure integration, plans need to make effective linkages to private and public budgetary processes. Neither plans by themselves, nor unregulated market processes, can deliver more sustainable settlements.
3. *Planning with Partners*: New Urban Planning is a means of negotiating where and how development happens. It is about planning with all sectors of the community with a stake in the place – not only governments, but also private sector organisations, voluntary agencies and civil society.
4. *Transparent and Accountable Planning*: New Urban Planning is less an instrument of government, and more a process of good governance, making city development more participatory. Planning must be made accountable to the public, with all activities open to public scrutiny through oversight by mechanisms such as public hearings, integrity pacts, etc.
5. *Subsidiarity*: The subsidiarity principle should be paramount in deciding where roles and responsibilities are lodged. National governments have important roles in setting national urban development policies and fostering national (and international) infrastructure networks that will guide development patterns. However, there needs to be decentralisation, with local governments playing a leading role, and empowerment of community-based organisations on matters that can be determined at neighbourhood level. Integration of policy across scales creates efficiency and effectiveness.
6. *Market Responsiveness*: New Urban Planning understands market demand, particularly in land and property markets, and is aware of the dynamics and potential of the informal sectors. It is responsive, but not reactive.
7. *Access to Land*: A supply of land in safe and accessible locations to meet the needs of all sectors of society, is fundamental to achieving efficient and equitable settlements. Traditional town planning too often under-estimated needs, particularly those of the poor. Consequently the least advantaged sectors of urban society lack security, and often live in hazardous locations. Equitable systems of land ownership and land management need to underpin New Urban Planning. Plans must recognize the reality of existing slums and informal settlements, and the rights of their residents, and foster strategies that facilitate upgrading and/or negotiated relocation.
8. *Appropriate Tools*: Control of development should be strategic, affordable and effective, sensitive to the needs of the poor while conserving essential ecological resources, rather than attempting to micro-manage land use change and small-scale

development. Thoroughgoing land use control is probably only affordable in wealthy economies with highly developed legal systems and a plentiful supply of trained professionals, or in situations of especially pressing need, such as areas of high risk from natural disasters.

9. *Pro-poor and Inclusive*: New Urban Planning recognizes diversity and promotes equality. Particular attention needs to be given to those whose voice has often not been heard in conventional public policy-making – e.g. the old, children, those with disabilities, women, ethnic minorities, the homeless, those with low incomes etc. All have an equal right to the city and a right to be consulted, especially about developments that will affect them.

10. *Cultural Variation*: Cultures of governance and the resources that can be invested in governance vary between different countries. Interpretation of the principles of New Urban Planning will inevitably be influenced by such difference: this contrasts with the uniformity imposed by the old master planning model. Outdated legal regimes and traditional bureaucratic cultures, as well as shortages of skilled personnel and of responsive institutions, are barriers to realizing the benefits from the practice of New Urban Planning.

These principles were aired at the World Planners Congress and then were explained at the CAP Networking Event at WUF. They were the focus of the presentation that CAP was invited to make in the Dialogue Session at the WUF. The result was that, to quote the official record of the WUF, the Forum "placed a strong emphasis on planning as a tool for urban development and environmental management, and as a means of preventing future slum growth. This view was accepted not just by government officials and urban planners themselves, but also by civil society groups that wanted planning to be more inclusive, transparent and ethical." Some 10,000 people had attended the WUF in Vancouver.

These efforts were complemented by the publication of a book that was launched at the WUF by the Executive-Director of UN-Habitat. The book showed through case studies the kind at attitudes and skills that underpin New Urban Planning. It noted some of the continuities with traditional planning skills, but argued that "the novelty really lies in the extent to which active engagement and networking with very diverse groups and individuals, and pro-active consensus-building amid conditions where conflict is often deep rooted, are seen as fundamental to achieving more equitable and sustainable development and to everything planners do" (Hague, Wakely, Crespin and Jasko, 2006:83). This book was funded by the UK government and endorsed by UN-Habitat, the RTPI and, of course, CAP.

All these documents can be accessed on the web site www.globalplanningnetwork. org, which has been set up by the institutes who developed and signed the Declaration. Collaboration continues as they aim to realize the ambitions set out in an Action Plan to build capacity globally to meet today's challenges for sustainable urbanization.

4. Building on Vancouver

Fourteen professional planning institutes that are members of CAP signed the Vancouver Declaration. The countries concerned are Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Canada, Ghana,

Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Jamaica, Kenya, Nigeria, Singapore, South Africa, Uganda and the United Kingdom. In addition the American Planning Association and the European Council of Spatial Planners have signed, as have three of their member institutes, the Hungarian Society of Urban Planners, the Société Française des Urbanistes (SFU) and the Italian Associazione Nazionale degli Urbanisti e dei Pianificatore Territoriale e Ambientali . In November 2007, liaison between CAP, the SFU, the African Planning Association and the Ordre National des Urbanistes du Cameroun led to six Francophone African associations also signing. They represent the planners in Algeria, Benin, Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Togo and Tunisia. An Anglophone/Francophone joint meeting is planned in West Africa for early 2009 – a significant bridging of a colonial divide. The fact that there are gaps in the global map of signatories, notably in the Spanish-speaking world and in East Asia, merely emphasises the significance of institutions and networks – and the points on the map where such networks break down for historic and cultural reasons.

CAP took its "re-inventing planning" message around the Commonwealth in 2007, with regional meetings in Fiji, Uganda and Barbados. All of these resulted in strengthened commitment. The Fiji event led to the formation of the Pacific Islands Planning Association, to bring together the planners in the numerous small island developing states in that region. Similarly, an East African Association of Planners was formed. CAP also addressed the Ministerial-level Commonwealth Consultative Group on Human Settlements in 2007 and made its case for quantitative and qualitative change in the capacity of planners across the Commonwealth. Furthermore financial support has been obtained to undertake research during 2008 on capacity needs. CAP also led a successful campaign at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Kampala in 2007 to advocate the preparation of a State of the Commonwealth Cities Report. At the time of writing steps are being taken to undertake such a study.

Networking with UN-Habitat has also been strengthened. CAP's Women in Planning network was able to respond to an invitation from UN-Habitat to provide speakers at a Habitat Day event in Mexico in 2007, and similar collaboration is anticipated in the 2008 WUF. In addition CAP has been in dialogue with UN-Habitat about the preparation of the 2009 Global Report on Human Settlements that will have planning as its key theme, and which will include examples of the practice of "New Urban Planning". CAP and UN-Habitat are also drafting "Re-inventing Planning II" for the 2008 WUF.

VI. INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY, INSTITUTIONS AND RE-INVENTING PLANNING

The paper has argued that international forces entwined in the processes of globalization have presented a fundamental challenge to traditional institutions, attitudes and practices of urban planning. However, globalization is not the "simple" process of change remorselessly sweeping all before it that some critics imagine it to be. What we see in respect of planning systems and practices, and the state-based legislation and administrative structures in which they sit, is a substantial friction against change. However, neither resistance nor neglect has left such planning institutions unchanged. Instead the effect of the failure by planning institutions to engage with imperatives emerging through globalization (whether the spread of slums or the bureaucratic planning delays that bewilder and infuriate entrepreneurs) is

that urban planning became seriously marginalized after the 1970s. It is a great irony that the attention and powers attached to urban planning decreased just as the significance of cities globally increased.

Thus the international political economy sets directions and parameters but does not determine the way that institutions respond. It opens new opportunities and closes off other options, but all institutions are to some degree or other "path dependent": their future is shaped by their past, and not just by global economic factors. The example of the CAP has been explored, drawing on the personal experience of the author over a period of almost 8 years involvement in leadership of the organization. It demonstrates that there are obstacles of numerous types that circumscribe what can be achieved. CAP's successes have been in networking globally and in advocacy: it has not able to deliver material change on the ground in the cities. Both globalization and past colonial relationships provide opportunities but also constraints. CAP's collaboration with the SFU in West Africa, its rising profile through collaboration with UN-Habitat, and publication about its activities in journals such as this one or the USA's Planners' Network journal "Progressive Planning" demonstrate that it is possible to cross divides.

So is New Urban Planning, the route to and outcome of "Re-inventing Planning", achievable? The *Making Planning Work* book highlighted a range of practices are real, though they may not always be called "urban planning". Hague, Wakely, Crespin and Jasco (2006) argued that such approaches are better ways to tackle 21st century urban development than the technocratic, top-town master plans of municipal power that defined 20th century urban planning practice. This shift represents a fundamental challenge to traditional professional bodies. Their "rules of the game" are typically based on developing mechanisms of exclusion, reaffirming elitism, and operating in isolation from one another within national boundaries. Frequently there are close and uncritical links with political power and state bodies. CAP has shown that it is possible to use aspects of globalization to construct and spread counter-narratives.

Of course, talking and journal articles are not enough. Of course, it is vanity to imagine that planners can save the planet. Yet we know how to prevent slum living conditions: Europe spent a century learning how to do it. There is no technical reason why today's children in the slums of Nairobi should be so much more at risk of mortality than those in other parts of Kenya. "Business as usual" has failed the urban poor. In a globalized world the consequences of that failure are no longer local. Institutional resources need to be mobilised, as quickly as possible, to try to make a difference, and to steer a path towards more equitable and sustainable settlements. Isn't that what urban planning should be about?

REFERENCES

AFRICAN POPULATION AND HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER. (2002): *Population and Health Dynamics in Nairobi's Informal Settlements*, Report of the Nairobi Cross-Sectional Slums Survey 2002, Nairobi, African Population and Health Research Center.

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES. (1999): *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards balanced and sustainable development of the*

European Union. Luxembourg: Office for the Official Publications of the European Communities.

El-SHAKS, S. (1997): "Towards appropriate urban development policy in emerging megacities in Africa", in C.Rakodi (Ed.), *The Urban Challenge in Africa,* United Nations University, Tokyo, 497–526.

FALUDI, A. (ED). (2007): *Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

FALUDI, A., AND B. WATERHOUT. (2002): *The making of the European Spatial Development Perspective: No masterplan*. London: Routledge.

FARMER, P., FROJMOVIC, M., HAGUE, C., HARRIDGE, C., NARANG, S., SHISHIDO, R., SIEGEL, D., TAYLOR P. and VOGELIJ, J. (2006) *Re-inventing Planning: A new governance paradigm for managing human settlements*, available on www. globalplanningnetwork.org

FRIEDMANN, J. 2005, "Globalization and the Emerging Culture of Planning" in *Progress in Planning*, 64, pp.183-234.

HAGUE, C. (2000): "President's Piece", *CAP News,* 1, 3.

HAGUE C. (2004): "A Commonwealth perspective" *Habitat Debate* 10 (4), 6.

HAGUE, C. (2008): "Can we re-invent planning?", *Progressive Planning,* 174, Winter 2008, 34-38.

HAGUE, C; WAKELY P; CRESPIN J. and JASKO C. (2006): *Making Planning Work: A guide to approaches and skills*, Rugby, ITDG Publishing.

HOME, R. (1997): *On Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities*, London, E. and F.N.Spon.

JENKINS, P. AND SMITH, H. (2001): "The State, The Market and Community: An analytical framework for community self-development" in Carley M. Jenkins P and Smith H (editors), *Urban Development and Civil Society: The role of communities in sustainable cities*, London, Earthscan, 16-30.

JENKINS P, SMITH H. AND WANG Y.P. (2006): *Planning and Housing in the Rapidly Urbanising World*, London and New York, Routledge.

KAMETE, A.Y. (2007): "Cold-Hearted, Negligent and Spineless? Planning, Planners and the (R)Ejection of 'Filth' in Zimbabwe", *International Planning Studies*, 12 (2), 153-171.

KING, A.D. (1980): "Exporting planning: the colonial and neo-colonial experience" in Cherry, G.E. (ed) *Shaping an urban world: Planning in the twentieth century*, London, Mansell.

KING, A.D. (1990): *Urbanism, Colonialism and the World-economy: Cultural and spatial Foundations of the World Urban System*, London and New York, Routledge.

MULLARD K. AND McLEOD, R. (2005) *PRSPs, human settlements and urban poverty*, paper to the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Meeting, FMM(05)(INF)1, Commonwealth Secretariat, London, August 2005, www.comhabitat.org.

MWIMBA, C. (2006): "'We will develop without urban planning': How Zambia's urban planning practice is removing value from the development process" unpublished paper presented to the *Planning Africa 2006* conference, Cape Town.

NEWMAN, P. AND THORNLEY, A. (1996): *Urban Planning in Europe*. London: Routledge.

STERN N. (2006): *Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change*, London, H.M. Treasury.

STIGLITZ, J. (2002): *Globalization and its Discontents*, W.W. Norton.

UN-HABITAT. (2006): *State of the World's Cities Report 2006/07*, London, Earthscan.