

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

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

II. Methodology

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

a) Review of secondary data sources

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

The secondary data sources reviewed and analysed included: the 1979 Dar es Salaam master plan; the 1999 Dar es Salaam City's profile, Strategic Urban Development Planning (SUDP) reports (volumes I to VII) covering stages of initiation, implementation, and evaluation in Tanzania. It also included: the 2006 guidelines for preparation of planning schemes, the S 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.

Global Journal of Human Social Science

III. Findings a) From master planning (MP) to strategic urban development planning (SUDP)

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

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

6 (B)

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

7 b) The implementation of SUDP approach in Dar es

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 b) The Theory of Paradigm shifts

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

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

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

The practice of abandoning one planning approach and switching on to another is not new. Friedmann (2003) warn against the risk of practising urban planning without reference to theory, the situation obtaining in Dar es Salaam presents a complete disregard of the same. When time factor for example is used as a criteria for judgement, the Dar es Salaam Paradigm shift in terms of a "Return to Master planning" would be classified as premature. It is in the sense that, the Dar es Salaam SUDP hadn't attained the minimum requirements to dominate theory and practice to the extent of creating an impact in 17 years of its existence. In that context, the impact of SUDP cannot be compared with that of Master Planning approach that has dominated planning theory and practice for over 100 years in Tanzania. In this case, the conclusion arrived at by some writers and recently Namangaya (2013, p.1) on SUDP's Merits, and Suitability in guiding urban change is also premature and misleading. The conclusion: (i) is based on short term outcomes of SUDP, (ii) leaves out the core conceptual and theoretical tenets of SUDP which are central in determining and sustaining its long term outcomes.

V.

10 Conclusion

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

11 VI. Acknowledgements

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

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 S
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 ii in Dar es Salaam
The 1968 Dar es Salaam master plan	Leadbeater plan. Its new proposals were hardly implemented
	It was hardly implemented despite its impressive proposals. The reasons were: it was not justified iii and
The 1979 Dar es Salaam master plan	diverged from the city's (political, economic and social) development realities iv of 1960s and
	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.

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:

207

¹

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

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

[Healey ()] , P Healey . *Salet and Faludi* 1997. 2000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Kironde ()] *The Evolution of the Landuse Structure of Dar es Salaam*, J Kironde . 1994. p. . University of 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 Nedelandse 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. .