



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: B
GEOGRAPHY, GEO-SCIENCES, ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & DISASTER
MANAGEMENT

Volume 15 Issue 2 Version 1.0 Year 2015

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)

Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

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

By Dr. Samson Elisha Kasala

Ardhi University, Tanzania United Republic of

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.

Keywords: *master planning (MP), strategic urban development planning (SUDP), paradigm shift.*

GJHSS-B Classification : *FOR Code: 050299*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



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

Dr. Samson Elisha Kasala

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.

Keywords: master planning (MP), strategic urban development planning (SUDP), paradigm shift.

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; Watson, and Gonzalez, 2005 and Graaf, 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 (1990-2007) 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

Author: Lecturer in the School of Urban and Regional Planning, Department of Housing and Infrastructure Planning, Ardhi University.
e-mail: samson.kasala@gmail.com

Urban Planning Act No.8 of 2007, Urban planning Orders and Seculars from the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Human Settlements Development (MLHHSD); written documents in forms of: books, journal articles, research and project documents, minutes of meetings, letters, newspapers, and Terms of References. The review of secondary data sources was also instrumental in providing the:-

- i. Chronology of events in the planning and management of Dar es Salaam City using master planning and strategic planning approaches, (see Table 1),
- ii. Views and perceptions of stakeholders on the implementation of SUDP strategies,
- iii. Planning decisions made during the implementation of the SUDP process

b) Interviews

Interviews were held with identified respondents, and informants both in institutions and local communities. Respondents interviewed were from academic institutions, local authorities, Professional firms, NGOs and CBOs that took part at various stages of the SUDP process in Dar es Salaam. Key informants were identified as individuals who were knowledgeable of the SUDP process in their communities, and who could provide meaningful information on what influenced the adoption of SUDP and later on, a return to master planning. Content analysis was applied in generating the type and quality of information required.

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.

Table 1: The Planning and Management of Dar es Salaam City: Chronology of Events

S/N	Event	Period
1	First physical development plan for Dar es Salaam was prepared by Arabs, under Said Majid, then the Sultan of Zanzibar	1840s
2	The first physical development plan for Dar es Salaam prepared by Arabs started to be implemented	1866
3	Implementation of the physical development plan for Dar es Salaam stopped due to Sultan's death	1870
4	Implementation of the first physical development plan for Dar es Salaam (prepared by Arabs), but started under the Germany rule but with some improvements.	1891
5	The status of Dar es Salaam was raised from a town to a municipality by the British. The first Master plan for Dar es salaam was prepared, and formal institutional arrangements for its implementation were founded. These involved enactment of the 1923 <i>Land Ordinance</i> , the 1956 <i>Town and Country Planning Ordinance</i> , and the <i>Dar es Salaam Municipal Ordinance of 1947</i> . It also involved establishment of the Department of town Planning to enforce the master plan and the related ordinances.	1949
6	The second Dar es Salaam Master plan was prepared by a Canadian, Toronto based firm, called Project Planning Associates Ltd.	1968
7	The third Dar es Salaam Master plan was prepared by a Canadian, Ontario-based firm called Marshall Macklin Monaghan Ltd.	1979
8	Adoption of a new planning approach due to evolution of planning thoughts that began way back in 1950s (Watson, 2009, Todes, 2009, UN-Habitat, 2009)	1992
9	The third Dar es Salaam Master Plan legally expired	1999
10	The beginning of implementation of the new guidelines for urban development planning and management	2006
11	Enactment of the Urban Planning Act No. 8 of 2007	2007
12	A return to Master Planning	2007-to date

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.

Table 2 : Implementation Status of the Dar es Salaam City's Plans: 1930s -1990s

Name of Plan and Planning Period	Implementation Status	Remarks
Dar es Salaam Town Plan, (commonly known as the <i>Pashen's Plan</i>) 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.	Ignored and a new plan was prepared
The <i>Leadbeater plan</i> ⁱ , 1945 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 ⁱⁱ in Dar es Salaam	Abandoned in 1947
The 1949 Dar es Salaam master plan	Incorporated and implemented most proposals of the <i>Leadbeater plan</i> . Its new proposals were hardly implemented	Adopted by the 1950 Municipal Authority
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} of 1960s and 1970s	Ignored in favour of a government development programme ^v
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	Ignored
The 1999 Dar es Salaam city's SUDP	Fairly implemented, encountered formidable challenges, and has been dropped.	Calls to abandon SUDP

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.

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, 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).

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 Town and County Planning Ordinance, 1961*) was silent about the SUDP process until 2007 when it was reviewed into the current Urban Planning Act No.8 of 2007.
- iv. There was inadequate awareness and lack of appreciation of SUDP knowledge.
- v. Inadequate awareness and lack of appreciation of SUDP knowledge among stakeholders resulted into misconceptions, contradictions and varied perceptions on various aspects of SUDP. The misconceptions and contradictions affected the

performance of SUDP (See for example Kombe and Kreibich 1997, Majani 2000, and Kasala 2014)

- vi. Problematic institutional arrangements for SUDP. The institutional framework within which SUDP activities were carried out proved to be problematic. It was seen as operating parallel to the existing formal institutional structures (see for example Halla 1997, Kombe and Kreibich 1997, Majani 2000, Kasala 2013,);

c) *The return to master planning*

The return to master planning, amid the SUDP process was prompted by two factors, research has established. The factors were identified as “weaknesses of SUDP” on the one hand, and “issues beyond the SUDP” on the other.

- i. *Weaknesses of SUDP*
- a. The first, weakness of SUDP framework was purported to be the difficulty of showing how attracted activities in each development area could be turned into a single and acceptable future land-use map (Halla 2002, p.29). As such it is difficult to use SUDP to produce future land use plans with fixed or predetermined land use. This limitation, according to mainstream land use planners, makes SUDP unsuitable for land use planning as well as development control. However, recent research provide that this limitation doesn't hold given the breakthrough in mapping technology using Geographical information Systems, and the need to change the form and content through which planning outputs are presented (see for example Kasala, 2014, p.15)
- b. The second weakness of SUDP is the concern on time and resources spent to produce outputs. Research has revealed that the Dar es Salaam City's strategic urban development planning process was noted to have taken a relatively longer time to prepare with considerable input of financial resources as compared to master planning (URT, 2007). The time and resource concerns created confusion in the Ministry of Lands for Housing and Human Settlements Development (MLHHSD). 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 MLHHSD 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 (MLHHSD) directive to return to traditional master planning approach (See for example Kasala, 2013). The directive resulted from the MLHHSD'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 MLHHSD.

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.

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.

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; Kombe 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. It is a recurring phenomena worldwide. It started occurring in the European and American contexts in the early 1920s/30s and 1950s respectively (see for example Healey, P *et al.*, 1997; Mastop1998; Salet and Faludi 2000; Albrechts *et al.*, 2001). The question here is, were such paradigm shifts influenced by “theory governed realities?” The answer is hardly yes. Most shifts were influenced and governed by other factors than theory. 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 Friedmann2003) 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 over100 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. 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.

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.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Albrechts, L (2001), “In pursuit of new Approaches to Strategic Spatial Planning”, A European Perspective, *International Planning Studies*, 6(3)293-310.
2. Bryson, J .M., and Roering, W. D (1988), “Initiation of Strategic Planning by Governments”, *Public Administration Review* 48 () 995-1004.
3. Friedmann, J (1993), “Toward a Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning”, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 59(4): 482–5.
4. Friedmann, J (2003), “Why do Planning Theory”?, *Planning Theory*, 2(1) 7-10.
5. Giddings, B., and Hopwood, B (2006), “From Evangelistic Bureaucrat to Visionary Developer: The Changing Character of the Master Plan in Britain”, *Planning Practice and Research*, 21(3) 337-48.
6. Halla, F (1997), Institutional Arrangements for Urban Management: The Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project, Dar es Salaam.
7. Halla, F (2002), “Preparation and Implementation of a General Planning Scheme in Tanzania: Kahama Strategic Urban Development Planning Framework”, *Habitat International* 26() 281-293.
8. Healey, P (2003), “Collaborative Planning in Perspectives”, *Planning Theory* 2 (2) 101-123.
9. Healey, P (1997), *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, Macmillan Press Ltd, London.
10. Healey, P *et al.*, (1997), Salet and Faludi 2000; Albrechts *et al.*,2001; and Balducci 2001. In Healey

- (2004): "The Resurgence of Strategic Urban Development in a European context", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28 (1), 45-67.
11. Innes, J.E (1995), "Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice" *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(4), 183-189.
 12. Kasala, S E, (2013), Operationalizing Strategic Urban Development Planning: A case of Dar es Salaam City, Tanzania, an unpublished Ph. D Thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.
 13. Kasala, S E, (2014), Analysis of Outputs of a Planning Process: Sinza Strategic Urban Development Planning (SUDP) in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: B Geography, Geo-Sciences, Environmental Disaster Management*. Volume 14 Issue 7 Version 1.0
 14. Kombe, W., and Kreibich (eds) (1997), *Decentralised Development and Prospects of Planning in Africa*, Spring Research Series, Dortmund Germany.
 15. Kironde, J (1994), *The Evolution of the Landuse Structure of Dar es Salaam, 1890-1990*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Nairobi.
 16. Majani, B (2000), Institutionalizing Environmental Planning and Management: The Institutional Economics of Solid Waste Management in Tanzania, Spring Research Series No. 28, Dortmund.
 17. McConnell, S (1981), *Theories for Planning*, William Heinemann Ltd.
 18. Mastop, H (1998), *National Planning: New Institutions for Integration*, paper for the XII AESOP Congress, Aveiro. Nijmegen School of Management, University of Nijmegen.
 19. Namangaya, A (2013), A comparative Assessment of the Merits of Master Plans versus Strategic Urban Development Plans in Guiding Land Use Development. *Journal of Building and Land Development (Special Issue)*, 21-37
 20. Samson, E.K (2004), *Consolidating Environmental Planning and Management Practices: The Case of Solid Waste Management that Benefits the Poor in Dar es Salaam*, An unpublished Masters Thesis.
 21. Salet, W and A. Faludi (Eds) (2000), *The Revival of Strategic Spatial Planning*, Koninklijke Nedelandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam.
 22. Steinberg, F (2005), "Strategic Urban Planning in Latin America: Experience of building and Managing the future", *Habitat International*, 29(), 69-93.
 23. Taylor, N (1998), *Urban Planning Theory Since 1945*, Sage Publications Inc, London.
 24. Todes, A (2009), *Reframing Planning: New Agendas, Shifting Perspectives*. Paper Presented at an Inaugural Lecture. School of Architecture and Planning, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.
 25. Tugwell, R (1974), "The Fourth Power Salvador Padilla. (ed.). Tugwell's Thoughts in Planning", Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico Press. 149-186.
 26. UNCHS (1993), "The Management of Human Settlements: The Municipal Level", *United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. Nairobi*.
 27. UNCHS (1994), "Sustainable Cities: Concepts and Applications of a United Nations Programme", *United Nations Centre for Human Settlements, Nairobi*.
 28. UN-Habitat (2004), *"The Sustainable Cities Programme in Tanzania 1992-2003": The SCP, Documentation Series, Volume 3*.
 29. UN-Habitat (2009), "Sustainable Urbanisation: Revisiting the role of Urban Planning", *Global Report on Human Settlements*. Nairobi, UN-Habitat.
 30. URT (2007), *The Urban Planning Act No. 8 of 2007*, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
 31. Watson, V and Gonzalez (2005), "Sociological Institutional Approach to the Study of Innovation in Governance", *Urban Studies* 42(11) 2055-2069.
 32. Watson, V (2002), *Change and Continuity in Spatial Planning: Metropolitan Planning in Cap Town under Political Transition*, London Routledge.
 33. Watson, V (2009), "The Planned City Sweeps the Poor Away: Urban Planning and the 21st Century Urbanization", *Progress in Planning* 72() 151-193.

ⁱNamed after the advisor for the plan's preparation: the Local Government Engineer Mr. H. Leadbeater,

ⁱⁱIncluding: 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,

ⁱⁱⁱIt 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 4 and Table 6), did not anticipate the government's policy inability to control city expansion, its proposals stressed rural and ignored urban development (Halla 1997 p. 23),

^vThis included the decentralization of economic activities from Dar es Salaam to other urban centres, and the shifting of the Country's capital to Dodoma,