

A Return to Master Planning in Dar es Salaam: A Misconception of the Theory of Paradigm Shifts?

Samson Elisha Kasala¹

¹ Ardhi University

Received: 11 September 2015 Accepted: 1 October 2015 Published: 15 October 2015

Abstract

Recent trends have shown that, cities of developing countries have been switching from one urban planning approach to another and this trend will continue. The methodology adopted involved a review of secondary data sources, interviews and analysis. The findings of this research present three areas of discourse. First, the demise and resurgence of conventional approaches is a worldwide recurring phenomena. Secondly, the switch/return to master planning approach in Dar es Salaam was premature and largely resulted from a misconception of the theory of paradigm shift. Thirdly, the claim that SUDP is ill-suited to guide the process of urban change, is more of a misleading generalization than a reality. The utility of SUDP has to be examined not only from practice but also from core theoretical and conceptual tenets, laws and procedures governing such an urban planning practice.

Index terms— master planning (MP), strategic urban development planning (SUDP), paradigm shift.

1 I. Introduction

Strategic Urban Development Planning (SUDP) is a stakeholder-based approach to urban planning. It was adopted in Tanzania in 1992 following criticisms against the "master planning approach". The SUDP approach, is situated within a wider discourse of urban planning and City Development Strategies-CDSs (UN-Habitat, 2004). Strategic urban development planning originated in the global North (the developed world) in the 1950s (Bryson & Roering, 1988; Gonzalez, 2005 and ??raaf, 2005). Since then, it has spread into many other parts of the world, including Tanzania. The spread to other parts of the world was possible through urban management efforts by UN-Habitat, Earth Summits on Human Settlements and Environment, and the World Bank-linked organization such as Cities Alliance (Watson, 2009; UN-Habitat, 2009).

In Tanzania, SUDP was introduced as an initiative of the Urban Management Programme (UMP) namely Environmental Planning and Management (EPM) in the early 1990s (UN-Habitat, 2009, p.66). The adoption of the SUDP approach was based on the assumption that it would be more effective in guiding urban development planning. It was also assumed that SUDP would be more responsive to the challenges of sustainable urban development than the technocratic master planning approach.

Surprisingly, after about seventeen years ??1990) ??1991) ??1992) ??1993) ??1994) ??1995) ??1996) ??1997) ??1998) ??1999) ??2000) ??2001) ??2002) ??2003) ??2004) ??2005) ??2006) ??2007) of SUDP introduction and implementation in Dar es Salaam, SUDP was abandoned, not by city stakeholders, but rather by only the Ministry of Lands Housing and Human Settlements Development ??Kasala, 2013, p.1).

The decision to abandon SUDP and hence return to master planning has left numerous unanswered questions among urban development planning scholars and stakeholders. Many are wondering: What has gone wrong with SUDP? Why has it been abandoned?. Could there be other issues beyond the SUDP process itself? Were our urban planning and management institutions adequately prepared to receive and implement SUDP? How has SUDP been or not been used in Dar es Salaam? These questions prompted indepth studies to answer. In contributing to that, the purpose of this paper was to examine the dynamics underlying shifts in urban planning

44 approaches in Dar es Salaam on the one hand, and the influence of theory on such shifts, on planning decisions
45 and practice, on the other.

46 **2 II. Methodology**

47 The following methodological approach was adopted in examining dynamics underlying the shifts in Urban
48 Planning approaches in Dar es Salaam.

49 **3 a) Review of secondary data sources**

50 A host of information exists regarding the implementation of conventional and alternative planning approaches in
51 Tanzania generally and Dar es Salaam in particular. In order to establish what transpired in both approaches,
52 the review of existing secondary data sources was necessary. A review was made on data sources to generate
53 information for answering questions related to (i) the shift from master planning to strategic planning, (ii) the
54 SUDP process in Dar es Salaam, (iii) Challenges of the SUDP process and (iv) the return to master planning.

55 The secondary data sources reviewed and analysed included: the 1979 Dar es Salaam master plan; the 1999
56 Dar es Salaam City's profile, Strategic Urban Development Planning (SUDP) reports (volumes I to VII) covering
57 stages of initiation, implementation, and evaluation in Tanzania. It also included: the 2006 guidelines for
58 preparation of planning schemes, the S Abstract-Recent trends have shown that, cities of developing countries
59 have been switching from one urban planning approach to another and this trend will continue. The methodology
60 adopted involved a review of secondary data sources, interviews and analysis. The findings of this research present
61 three areas of discourse. First, the demise and resurgence of conventional approaches is a worldwide recurring
62 phenomena. Secondly, the switch/return to master planning approach in Dar es Salaam was premature and
63 largely resulted from a misconception of the theory of paradigm shift. Thirdly, the claim that SUDP is ill-
64 suited to guide the process of urban change, is more of a misleading generalization than a reality. The utility of
65 SUDP has to be examined not only from practice but also from core theoretical and conceptual tenets, laws and
66 procedures governing such an urban planning practice.

67 **4 Global Journal of Human Social Science**

68 **5 III. Findings a) From master planning (MP) to strategic
69 urban development planning (SUDP)**

70 The history of master planning in Dar es Salaam City, is traceable way back to the colonial era. During that
71 time, the Arabs, Germans and British used master planning to guide mainly the physical development of Dar
72 es Salaam. The first master plan namely "physical development plan for Dar es Salaam" was prepared by the
73 Arabs, under Said Majid, then the Sultan of Zanzibar (Kironde, 1994) The chronology of events in Table 1
74 shows that the first master plan started to be implemented in 1866. It was stopped after the Sultan's death in
75 1870 ??Halla 1997, p. 14). Taking over from the Arabs, the Germans in 1891, started to implement the Arabs'
76 physical development plan with some improvements. Based on the improvements made on the Dar es Salaam's
77 physical development plan, the Germans developed Dar es Salaam as the capital of their colonial administration
78 of then German East Africa, which included Tanganyika (the today's Tanzania mainland), Rwanda and Burundi.
79 Growth challenges of Dar es Salaam city spurred the preparation of the 1949, 1968 and 1979 Dar es Salaam master
80 plans.(see for example Kironde 1994, Halla 1997, and Kasala 2013). However, implementation processes of these
81 plans were not smooth. At some point plans implementation were considered as non priority. Consequently they
82 were ignored or completely abandoned. Table 2 summarises the implementation status of the Dar es Salaam
83 City's Plans from 1930s to 1990s.

84 The failures in implementing the Dar es Salaam master plans over time, relates to what writers in urban
85 planning have termed as "evolution process in planning thoughts" that began way back in the 1950s (Todes,
86 2009; Watson 2009, Kasala 2013). Through these thoughts, it has been argued that master planning, as an
87 approach and tool for urban management, cannot be applied across the board to guide urban development.
88 This is derived from the varying spatial, social, economic and political contexts in which urban planning is
89 conceptualised and practised. In this case, Dar es Salaam is not exceptional.

90 **6 (B)**

91 Following the failures in implementing master plans in Dar es Salaam coupled with the evolution in planning
92 thoughts, Tanzania adopted SUDP as an alternative approach to planning and managing the urban environment.
93 SUDP was adopted in preference to master planning approach based on grounds, inter alia that, issues that
94 needed to be addressed in cities, were beyond the competence of conventional (master) planning approaches
95 ??UNCHS, 1993 ??UNCHS, , 1994). The key aim was therefore to address the weaknesses of master planning
96 (UN-Habitat, 2009, p.64; 67) in a manner that enhances the capacity of stakeholders to effectively plan and
97 manage the urban environment (UN-Habitat, 2004; Samson, 2004).

98 7 b) The implementation of SUDP approach in Dar es Salaam

99 Salaam Since its introduction, strategic urban development planning has been implemented through various
100 urban development strategies. They include: Solid waste management (Majani, 2000, Samson 2004), improving
101 unplanned settlements (Sakijege, 2006), community infrastructure upgrading, and guiding urban growth (Kasala,
102 2013), managing urban expansion (Halla, 1997) to mention but a few. The implementation of SUDP was met
103 with a number of challenges as elaborated in the sections that follow: i. It was not possible to implement all
104 the priority projects and strategies due to limited financial resources. Consequently some projects and strategies
105 were left unattended by stakeholders. At city level some critical environmental issues or problems have not
106 been addressed to date. They include: construction of municipal and city sanitary landfills, construction of the
107 proposed city-wide sewerage system, air quality management and urban transport, managing coastal resources
108 and urban renewal. ii. Until 2007, the SUDP process had not been integrated into the current set-up of urban
109 development planning. In this regard, its sustainability as an alternative approach to urban development planning
110 could not be guaranteed. iii. SUDP lacked legislative and institutional mandate to practice urban planning. This
111 derived from the fact that then the planning law (the ??2007). The time and resource concerns created confusion in the
112 the Ministry of Lands for Housing and Human Settlements Development (MLHHSD). There was confusion in the
113 sense that while there were no financial resources to continually fund SUDP activities on the one hand; the city
114 was rapidly growing with inadequate guidance, on the other. This situation compelled the MLHHSD to find ways
115 to return to master planning. One of the first steps of a return to master planning was to formulate guidelines
116 that could assist urban planners, related practitioners and other stakeholders to plan, approve, implement, and
117 monitor development in their respective areas of jurisdiction (URT, 2007).

118 The situation in Dar es Salaam is similar to situations in other countries. In the United Kingdom (UK) for
119 example, strategic urban planning approaches were dropped on resource-use efficiency grounds. That is, they
120 were considered as unnecessarily lengthy, time consuming and, too expensive to afford (see for example Healey
121 2003;Giddings and Hopwood 2006).

122 Based on these issues, strategic approaches have been construed as inappropriate in producing immediate
123 results, urgently needed to address issues in fast growing cities (Healey, 2003). c. The third weakness of SUDP
124 is related to stakeholders' capacity to implement proposals. The Dar es Salaam experience has shown that,
125 stakeholders generate strategies and projects to address critical issues but end up being unable to implement
126 them. This situation was found to be caused by stakeholders' limited financial resources; lack of legislative
127 mandate to practice SUDP, and lack of visible commitment and perseverance in support of the functioning of
128 working groups. This weakness dominates to date. For example, the state of inadequate financial resources has
129 continued to constrain implementation of projects that require heavy initial capital investment. They include:
130 the construction of Sanitary landfills and sewerage systems in Dar es Salaam.

131 d) Issues beyond the SUDP i. Issues beyond the SUDP were several. However, the most critical ones were
132 identified as: institutional efforts and training background of professionals. One of institutional efforts was the
133 Ministry's (MLHHSD) directive to return to traditional master planning approach(See for example Kasala, 2013).
134 The directive resulted from the MLHHSD's Annual General Meeting conducted in Mbeya Municipal Council from
135 23rd to 24th February 2006. The meeting resolved that: "Master plans should be the official urban planning and
136 management tool and that, guidelines for their preparation should urgently be put in place URT(2007, p 5)". That
137 being the case, the decision to return to master planning and the formulation of the 2007 guidelines for urban
138 planning were part of institutional efforts coordinated by the MLHHSD. ii. Regarding training background, this
139 study has found that, the majority of professionals charged with the responsibility to coordinate and implement
140 the SUDP process were simply mainstream landuse planners. These were trained not as strategic planners, but
141 rather as master planners. These considered themselves incompetent to practice SUDP. In this regard, they
142 perhaps found an easy way to do planning by moving from practicing SUDP to master planning, where they are
143 not only qualified but also experienced and comfortable.

144 These factors coupled with the dominance of master planning in the SUDP process, have certainly paved a
145 way for the return to master planning.

146 8 IV. Discussion a) Theory as a foundation for Practice

147 Scholars have argued that urban planning practice is informed by certain thinking commonly expressed by theories
148 (see for example: McConnell, 1981 and Taylor 1998). Taylor (1998) concurs with the wide spread assumption
149 that urban planning practice is influenced by common and dominant urban planning paradigms. These scholarly
150 views are reiterated by Friedmann's (2003) position that "there is no planning practice without a theory about
151 how it has to be practiced". He continues "that theory may or may not be named or present in consciousness,
152 but it is there all the same" ??Friedmann 2003, p.8). In this context, when we debate about master planning or
153 alternative urban planning approaches, as a state policy instruments designated to protect the public interest,
154 we have in mind a theory of planning that informs respective planning practices.

155 Evidence of doing urban planning without proper reference to concrete theoretical base and paradigm shift
156 exist. Proponents of this way of doing planning take advantage of the question raised by Friedmann (2003) "why
157 do planning theory?" Advocates of planning theory (Watson 2002, Innes 1995) point out the danger of ignoring
158 theory, they warn that" planning runs the risk of embracing changes without an appreciation of the knowledge
159 (paradigms and theories) that inform such changes".

160 This means an understanding of planning paradigms and/ or the theories on which planning practice is based,
161 is crucial.

162 **9 b) The Theory of Paradigm shifts**

163 Scholars have attempted to explain the planning process and the time factor in relation to paradigm shifts
164 (Tugwell 1974; Friedmann 1993; ??ombe and Kreibich 1997; and Watson 2009). Scholars argue that it takes time
165 and sometimes a century for a new paradigm to be understood and correctly applied such that it replaces a
166 previously dominant paradigm.

167 Referring to the time factor, until 2007 when it was abandoned, the SUDP process was in Dar es Salaam
168 for seventeen years only. This time is less than two decades. According to the scholarly views, seventeen years
169 is a very short period to allow for a complete paradigm shift process to occur, taking stock of experiments,
170 research and knowledge dissemination works involved. Far more, time was needed to influence acceptance of
171 a new paradigm by the academic circles, the general public, the political system, economic concerns, pressure
172 groups and overall citizens.

173 In such a short period (17 years), the SUDP as a new approach, may have become popular among certain
174 groups of stakeholders, but not dominant enough to replace the older one (the master planning) and render it
175 ineffective. This means, instead of abandoning SUDP, more time was needed to allow for a complete paradigm
176 shift to occur. This would have involved: continued rounds of research, knowledge dissemination, and acceptance
177 by the scientific and consumer communities.

178 The practice of abandoning one planning approach and switching on to another is not new. ??riedmann2003)
179 warn against the risk of practising urban planning without reference to theory, the situation obtaining in Dar
180 es Salaam presents a complete disregard of the same. When time factor for example is used as a criteria for
181 judgement, the Dar es Salaam Paradigm shift in terms of a "Return to Master planning" would be classified
182 as premature. It is in the sense that, the Dar es Salaam SUDP hadn't attained the minimum requirements to
183 dominate theory and practice to the extent of creating an impact in 17 years of its existence. In that context,
184 the impact of SUDP cannot be compared with that of Master Planning approach that has dominated planning
185 theory and practice for over100 years in Tanzania. In this case, the conclusion arrived at by some writers and
186 recently Namangaya (2013, p.1) on SUDP's Merits, and Suitability in guiding urban change is also premature
187 and misleading. The conclusion: (i) is based on short term outcomes of SUDP, (ii) leaves out the core conceptual
188 and theoretical tenets of SUDP which are central in determining and sustaining its long term outcomes.

189 V.

190 **10 Conclusion**

191 The findings of this research have demonstrated that, the abandonment of the Dar es Salaam SUDP process and
192 the resulting return to master planning was primarily a result of a misconception of the Theory of Paradigm
193 shift. It has been revealed through this research that, the return to master planning approach was also spurred
194 by persistence of the dominant planning approach. The dominant approach to urban planning has persisted
195 in the sense that, the key SUDP stages involving introduction, plan formulation, content determination and
196 interpretation into actions were done in the context of laws and procedures of the master planning approaches.
197 In this regard, it is unfair and clearly misleading to assume that SUDP would have been effective in guiding
198 urban change while it was being practiced within the context of same failed laws and procedures of the master
199 planning approach.

200 **11 VI. Acknowledgements**

201 Acknowledgements are due to the following parties. First, Conreeb Company Limited for extending financial
202 assistance in support of a research from which this paper was produced. Secondly, Ardh University for granting
203 the permission to access library resources for this research. Thirdly, respondents for accepting to respond to
204 questions related to this research. Fourth, my family, Wife and Children for tolerating the pains of missing my
205 company when I was busy with a research leading to the production of this paper.

206 **12 Global Journal of Human Social Science**

1

S/N

[Note: Source: Kasala E.S, (2013): *Operationalizing Strategic Urban Development Planning: A case of Dar es Salaam City, Tanzania. An unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.*]

Figure 1: Table 1 :

Name of Plan and Planning Period	Implementation Status
Dar es Salaam Town Plan, (commonly known as the Pashen's Plan) 1930s to mid 1945	Was partly implemented. However, by mid 1944, was found to be conflicting with so many of then the existing township establishments (e.g open spaces) thus required major revisions.
The Leadbeater plan i to 1948	Was gazetted in November 1946. However no efforts were made to implement the plan. The reasons for this were: anti-planning tendency in the government; personality clashes among officials; Municipal Authority and the Department of Town Planning were not yet in place to enforce the plan. The plan had a considerable influence on the decisions to site a number of planning schemes
The 1949 Dar es Salaam master plan	Incorporated and implemented most proposals of the Leadbeater plan. Its new proposals were hardly implemented
The 1968 Dar es Salaam master plan	It was hardly implemented despite its impressive proposals. The reasons were: it was not justified iii and diverged from the city's (political, economic and social) development realities iv
The 1979 Dar es Salaam master plan	No deliberate efforts were made to implement its main proposals. This was due to inadequate resources at the period of gathering economic hardships and stringency. These hardships were in terms of rapid population growth, limited development expenditure, and a weak planning machinery
The 1999 Dar es Salaam city's SUDP	Fairly implemented, challenges, and has been dropped. 5

The factors included professional clashes resulting from complications that arose from issues of plan contents and their interpretation into actions (Albrechts, 2001, p.306), market forces (McConnell 1981), and political pressure (Steinberg, 2005, p.76)
While writers (McConnell1981, Taylor 1998 and

Figure 3:

¹A Return to Master Planning in Dar es Salaam: A Misconception of the Theory of Paradigm Shifts?

208 ii Including: the European residential areas in Kurasini and Oysterbay; Commercial neighbourhood centres in
209 Oysterbay; the African zones in Kinondoni and Mwananyamala, and the industrial area along pugu, to mention
210 but a few, iii It could not justify its proposals for an outright removal of emergent squatter areas and all
211 developments inconsistent with the master plan, and non-payment of compensation to those affected (Kironde
212 1994, p.355), iv For instance, it underestimated the rate of the city's future growth (refer Figure ?? and Table
213 ??), did not anticipate the government's policy inability to control city expansion, its proposals stressed rural
214 and ignored urban development ??Halla 1997 p. 23), v This included the decentralization of economic activities
215 from Dar es Salaam to other urban centres, and the shifting of the Country's capital to Dodoma,
216 [Healey ()] , P Healey . *Salet and Faludi* 1997. 2000.

217 [Namangaya ()] 'A comparative Assessment of the Merits of Master Plans versus Strategic Urban Development
218 Plans in Guiding Land Use Development'. A Namangaya . *Journal of Building and Land Development* 2013.
219 p. . (Special Issue)

220 [Albrechts ()] L Albrechts . *pursuit of new Approaches to Strategic Spatial Planning*, 2001. 6 p. . (A European
221 Perspective)

222 [Kasala ()] 'Analysis of Outputs of a Planning Process: Sinza Strategic Urban Development Planning (SUDP)
223 in Dar es Salaam'. S E Kasala . *Tanzania. Global Journal of Human-Social Science: B Geography* 2014. 14.
224 (Environmental Disaster Management.. Issue 7 Version 1.0)

225 [Watson ()] *Change and Continuity in Spatial Planning: Metropolitan Planning in Cap Town under Political
226 Transition*, V Watson . 2002. London Routledge.

227 [Healey ()] 'Collaborative Planning in Perspectives'. P Healey . *Planning Theory* 2003. 2 (2) p. .

228 [Samson ()] *Consolidating Environmental Planning and Management Practices: The Case of Solid Waste
229 Management that Benefits the Poor in Dar es Salaam*, E Samson . 2004. (An unpublished Masters Thesis)

230 [Kombe, W., and Kreibich (ed.) ()] *Decentralised Development and Prospects of Planning in Africa*, Kombe, W.,
231 and Kreibich (ed.) 1997. Spring Research Series, Dortmund Germany.

232 [Giddings and Hopwood ()] 'From Evangelistic Bureaucrat to Visionary Developer: The Changing Character of
233 the Master Plan in Britain'. B Giddings , B Hopwood . *Planning Practice and Research* 2006. 21 (3) p. .

234 [Healey ()] P Healey . *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, (London) 1997. Macmillan
235 Press Ltd.

236 [Bryson and Roering ()] 'Initiation of Strategic Planning by Governments'. J M Bryson , W Roering . *Public
237 Administration Review* 1988. 48 p. .

238 [Halla ()] *Institutional Arrangements for Urban Management: The Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project*, F Halla
239 . 1997. Dar es Salaam.

240 [Majani ()] 'Institutionalizing Environmental Planning and Management: The Institutional Economics of Solid
241 Waste Management in Tanzania'. B Majani . Spring Research Series 2000. (28) .

242 [Mcconnell ()] S Mcconnell . *Theories for Planning*, 1981. William Heinemann Ltd.

243 [Mastop ()] *National Planning: New Institutions for Integration, paper for the XII AESOP Congress*, H Mastop
244 . 1998. Aveiro. Nijmegen School of Management, University of Nijmegen

245 [Kasala ()] *Operationalizing Strategic Urban Development Planning: A case of Dar es Salaam City, Tanzania,
246 an unpublished Ph*, S E Kasala . 2013. University of Dar es Salaam (D Thesis)

247 [Todes ()] *Paper Presented at an Inaugural Lecture. School of Architecture and Planning*, A Todes . 2009.
248 University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa (Reframing Planning: New Agendas, Shifting Perspectives)

249 [Innes ()] 'Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice'. J E Innes .
250 *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 1995. 14 (4) p. .

251 [Halla ()] 'Preparation and Implementation of a General Planning Scheme in Tanzania: Kahama Strategic Urban
252 Development Planning Framework'. F Halla . *Habitat International* 2002. 26 p. .

253 [Watson ()] 'Sociological Institutionalist Approach to the Study of Innovation in Governance'. V Watson ,
254 Gonzalez . *Urban Studies* 2005. 42 (11) p. .

255 [Steinberg ()] 'Strategic Urban Planning in Latin America: Experience of building and Managing the future'. F
256 Steinberg . *Habitat International* 2005. 29 p. .

257 [Sustainable Cities: Concepts and Applications of a United Nations Programme United Nations Centre for Human Settlements ()
258 'Sustainable Cities: Concepts and Applications of a United Nations Programme'. *United Nations Centre for
259 Human Settlements* 1994. (UNCHS)

260 [Un-Habitat ()] 'Sustainable Urbanisation: Revisiting the role of Urban Planning'. Un-Habitat . *Global Report
261 on Human Settlements. Nairobi* 2009. UN-Habitat.

262 [Kironde ()] *The Evolution of the Landuse Structure of Dar es Salaam*, J Kironde . 1994. p. . University of
263 Nairobi (Doctoral Thesis)

264 [The Management of Human Settlements: The Municipal Level UNCHS ()] 'The Management of Human Set-
265 tlements: The Municipal Level'. *UNCHS* 1993. (United Nations Centre for Human Settlements)

266 [Watson ()] 'The Planned City Sweeps the Poor Away: Urban Planning and the 21st Century Urbanization'. V
267 Watson . *Progress in Planning* 2009. 72 p. . (i Named after the advisor for the plan's preparation: the Local
268 Government Engineer Mr. H. Leadbeater)

269 [Albrechts ()] 'The Resurgence of Strategic Urban Development in a European context'. Albrechts . *Healey*,
270 2001. 2001. 2004. 28 p. .

271 [Salet and Faludi ()] *The Revival of Strategic Spatial Planning*, Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Weten-
272 schappen, W Salet , A Faludi . 2000. Amsterdam.

273 [Un-Habitat ()] 'The Sustainable Cities Programme in Tanzania'. Un-Habitat . *The SCP, Documentation Series*,
274 2004. 1992-2003. 3.

275 [The Urban Planning Act No. 8 of ()] *The Urban Planning Act No. 8 of*, 2007. 2007. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
276 URT

277 [Friedmann ()] 'Toward a Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning'. J Friedmann . *Journal of the American Planning
278 Association* 1993. 59 (4) p. .

279 [Tugwell (ed.) ()] *Tugwell's Thoughts in Planning*, R Tugwell . Salvador Padilla. (ed.) 1974. Puerto Rico:
280 University of Puerto Rico Press. p. . (The Fourth Power)

281 [Taylor ()] *Urban Planning Theory Since*, N Taylor . 1998. 1945. London: Sage Publications Inc.

282 [Friedmann ()] 'Why do Planning Theory"?'. J Friedmann . *Planning Theory*, 2003. 2 p. .