No. 90

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FOR URBAN PLACES: IS ANYONE DOING IT?

Michael Mattingly

August 1998

Working Paper No. 90

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FOR URBAN PLACES: IS ANYONE DOING IT?

Michael Mattingly*

August 1998

***Michael Mattingly**
Development Planning Unit
University College London
9 Endsleigh Gardens
London WC1H 0ED
United Kingdom

Tel: + 44 171 388 7581
Fax: + 44 171 387 4541

E.mail: m.mattingly@ucl.ac.uk

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FOR URBAN PLACES: IS ANYONE DOING IT?

CONTENTS

The Concept of Urban Development Planning	1
The Importance of Urban Development Planning	1
Foresight	2
Comprehensiveness of Perspective	3
Coordination	3
The Myth of Urban Development Planning Practice	4
Attempts at Urban Development Planning	6
Planning London	7
Planning for London's Physical Environment	8
Planning for Economic Development	10
Planning for Social Development	11
Development Planning in London	13
Innovations	14
Conclusion	15
References	16

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FOR URBAN PLACES: IS ANYONE DOING IT?

The purpose of this paper is to define a form of urban planning which pursues economic, social, and physical betterment and, therefore, merits the title "development planning" for urban areas because it matches the use of the term when applied to nations, regions, and peoples. In order to illustrate this form of urban planning, activities of the Greater London Council in the early 1980s will be examined. It will be argued that those activities demonstrated, as have few others, that urban development planning can be practised, raising the question of why it has not been widely carried out, given that statements of intentions to achieve the development of a city or town are so ubiquitous.

This argument will be based upon several major premises. The first of these is that "development", when applied to lives collectively, can be accepted as a common term for changes to the social, economic, and physical qualities of those lives. A second of these is that such development is widely and genuinely wanted for collectives of people. A third is that populations associated with particular geographic areas, namely urban places, are legitimate objects for a concern to achieve development. Finally, it is assumed that planning is widely seen to play a useful part in progressing toward objectives. Taken together these assumptions underpin a belief that the practice of a form of planning which pursues the improvement of social, economic, and physical qualities of urban areas is of substantial value and thus worthy of attention. These assumptions will be given brief discussions in their defence, but not in the above order.

The Concept of Urban Development Planning.

A definition of urban development planning may be given as this: it is a process of policy formulation and decision making which:

- is future oriented;
- creates policies and strategies for social, economic, and physical betterment;
- interrelates its concerns, the circumstances creating them, strategies to deal with these concerns, and the expected consequences of these strategies;
- directs its strategies explicitly at conditions which are associated with urban life.

This definition begins with some fairly basic ideas of planning: that it has to take a future perspective in order to be distinguishable from ad hoc decision making and that it involves arranging or organising ideas and actions. The definition also asserts that planning needs purposes.

Purposes seem to be the crux of any debate about the nature of urban development planning. The addition which urban development planning makes to the basic concept of planning is that its objective is development, specifically development which is urban. The purpose named in the definition above is social, economic, and physical betterment. Whereas the limited circle of town and city planners treating the physical environment have traditionally referred to land development as simply "development", a much larger group concerned with urban affairs have been using the term for its meanings as applied to regions, countries and nations. The latter use of the term - placing physical betterment with social and economic - distinguishes a mode of planning which has greater significance in efforts both to improve urban life across its full range of facets and to improve the performance of urban areas in functions they have regarding larger regional, national, and international communities.

However, there is another point at issue here to be carefully considered: the subject of planning - that which is planned. Traditionally, urban planning has planned the physical environment, usually no more than land use. This is a logical - although not essential - limitation when the objective is to achieve land development of a certain quality. But this limitation makes no sense in the pursuit of social and economic betterment. The subjects of development planning are logically the economy and society, as well as the physical environment within which they exist.

The Importance of Urban Development Planning

National development is unquestionably important, no matter the debate about its desirability or substance. It has become widely accepted that development is a matter of social and economic change. The precise nature and extent of these changes, the balances among them, and the identities of the rightful beneficiaries all remain

matters of continuing dispute. However, these arguments serve to pin down that what is at stake is economic and social in nature.

In this post-Habitat II era, there should be little need to present a case for the complementary development of urban life as a critical component in national and regional development. Urban areas are now recognised as locations for major economic and social processes. Location in space has critical connections to the social and economic conditions which policies aim to alter. In light of these considerations, policy formulation which has cities and towns as its focus becomes of vastly greater significance than in the past.

The key roles of human settlements in production, their functions in fundamental social change and the nurturing of culture, their capacities to deliver social services are all now well documented. These aims were captured, more or less, in the various statements of agenda for urban affairs produced by prominent international organisations in the late 1980s and early 1990s (UNDP, 1991; World Bank, 1991). Greater urban productivity, the alleviation of poverty, adequate environmental management, the improvement of the quality of urban life, and sustainable growth are advocated as the priority matters to be addressed in all cities and towns. The Global Plan of Action and the Istanbul Declaration of Habitat II (UNCHS, 1997) were clear messages of agreement by governments, NGOs, and even businesses that sustainable development was or should be the preeminent concern of urban affairs. This is development whose substance is social, economic, and physical betterment.

If the gravity of enduring, unacceptable human conditions and under-used productive capacity concentrated in cities and towns is obvious to some, the prevailing impetus nevertheless remains to tackle problems of poverty, inequality, and inadequate production chiefly in rural areas. The point is made clear by the continuing focus of foreign assistance upon rural activities and by the enormous ignorance of - or inattention to - the human conditions which urban living reveals and the opportunities for their improvement offered by the same urban concentrations which make deplorable human conditions so apparent. Cities and towns have benefitted from only 3% of European Development Fund money allocated to Asian, Pacific and Caribbean countries (Manchotte, 1997). It is visible in national development plans which fail to acknowledge the unique potentials of urban-based investments and actions. It is evident in the actions of governments, such as those of sub Saharan Africa which currently direct only 10% of overall public investment to towns, even though they contain 25% to 50% of the population and produce 60% of the national GDP (Sinet, 1997).

If urban development is not being given attention it deserves, the functions of planning in the achievement of such urban development are even less known and appreciated. It is true that planning the construction of urban buildings and of physical networks for services has for very long been a ubiquitous activity. Yet outside of its related professions and certain government departments and international organisations, urban physical planning is hardly noticed in most parts of the world. Planning for the economic development of particular cities and towns is even less recognised, while urban planning for social development is almost unknown, even among administrators and policy makers.

Nevertheless, planning the physical environment, which is the most common, has created of a degree of confidence that planning can bring important benefits to cities and towns. In principle, these are the same benefits which give planning a major role within business corporations and national governments. They include the advantages of foresight, comprehensiveness, and coordination.

Foresight

Foresight in planning is more than a matter of prediction and imagination. It is true that urban physical planning has at times in its history effectively described the future as well as envisioned a form for the built environment which was then created, following policy expressed plan documents. Such achievements are rarely possible in today's conditions of rapid change, unpredictability, and complex decision-making processes.

Nonetheless, planning is a process which increases our ability to cope with the future. It can generate a state of readiness, which at the most basic level anticipates change and, beyond that, provides the details of those matters which are most predictable. Some business corporations plan in order to survive the worst of possible futures and to profit from the best. Business management practised a kind of strategic planning in the early 1990s, which may be described as standing in a mist on the edge of the past, not knowing what lies, rises or falls ahead, but aware that the contours of the ground underfoot may end abruptly in an abyss or rock face. Here, the focus is the immediate present and what may be just ahead; the past provides only clues which must be weighed with more intangible feelings and

instincts, and most of all, with the messages of the moment - of the edge itself.

Generally, planning is thought able to reduce the inefficiencies of coping with crises because it can confront problems and opportunities before they are fully developed. This may avoid the higher costs of a crisis and its tendency to divert resources and attention from normal priorities.

Planning requires a goal or purpose; there must be something to plan for. Because it is future oriented, the process of planning asks at every step "to where will this lead?" It is the future orientation of planning which gives the management process its objectives. The broadest aim of an institution is discussed in today's world as a mission. Good organisational management calls for a mission statement to be drawn up and made known to all personnel. To the extent that they understand and embrace this mission, they will perform their tasks effectively to achieve it. The mission is both a target which orients the direction of efforts and a mark against which to measure progress.

The combination of 1) objectives drawn from a view of the future, and 2) a comprehensive picture of problems, opportunities, available resources, and their interrelationships, in relation to objectives, is what permits priorities to be set. So it is from the future orientation of planning that essential features of urban management are taken. Planning demands objectives and, then, assessments of the future in terms of objectives. This lifts the administration of urban affairs out of the rut of repeating its everyday tasks, shifting the focus to those different and additional actions which might improve the product and quality of urban life and which might be more appropriate for what is inevitably a very different tomorrow.

Comprehensiveness of Perspective

Integration of a broad range of concerns and responses to them are expressed in the tradition of urban physical planning as comprehensiveness, that is, attention to relationships among the various parts being handled and the relationships of the parts, individually and collectively, with the various contexts of the process, so that problems, opportunities and planned actions are brought together into a whole.

Planning thus can take an overall perspective which other actions of managing urban affairs do not. This comprehensive view permits the definition of problems in fundamental terms by using a larger frame of reference. It permits the analysis of how problems - and their solutions - affect one another because their interrelationships are visible. Furthermore, it permits identification of the potentials of a variety of resources, because it seeks knowledge of a full range of possibilities. And finally, it permits the setting of priorities because it can relate the importance of any policy and task to that of another. These capabilities allow consideration of a public interest which rises above the many conflicting interests of individual citizens, businesses, and institutions. Planning provides a unique opportunity to consider costs and benefits which are external to any single actor, as fits a concern to manage the activities of an urban area as a whole.

Much of the attraction of urban physical planning in the West has resided in the belief that it can produce synergy: a whole greater than the sum of individual parts which otherwise duplicate, conflict, and fail to support one another. Without physical planning, urban initiatives were seen to be no more than a sequence of unrelated public works projects. Though it is rarely recognised, the comprehensiveness of planning also enables managers to judge the degree of sufficiency in the sum total of actions proposed or carried out. Take the simple example of a large housing development requiring the individual efforts of the house-builders, road makers, the water supply authority, and electricity company. For the efforts of any one to be truly useful, all must not only build; they must build a sufficient amount. Otherwise the residential area is to a degree uninhabitable because some parts lack roads, or water pipes are not connected to a distribution main, and so on.

The comprehensiveness of many planning models is the subject of strong criticism. In urban physical planning, where it is a dominant feature, it has been roundly condemned because its practice has tended toward a glut in information and issues which overwhelm rational thought and considered action (see Green, 1979 and Devas, 1993, for example). Similarly, it is claimed that formal business planning was weakened by its attempts at comprehensiveness, causing corporations to shift to strategic planning. (Porter, 1987) Wholesale rejection of comprehensiveness is an act of throwing out the baby with the bath. Practical benefits may be won from a comprehensive perspective long before mind-boggling and administration-freezing levels of concerns are reached. As explained already, they include precisely that remedy which critics of comprehensiveness call for: to prioritise problems, possibilities, and actions. How else can one thing be judged more important or urgent than

another, unless the possible others (and their relationships to one another and beyond) are somehow taken into account through a broad perspective on relationships?

Coordination

Cullingworth and Nadin (1997:32) comments that planning is a coordinator, if it is nothing else. By identifying relationships and considering the overall effects of many actions in concert which employ a range of resources, the comprehensive approach of planning provides a matchless platform for effective coordination. Yet, hardly any structures for urban management in the developing countries are set up to establish priorities or to coordinate from a comprehensive perspective. Instead, actors are placed in competition with one another for very limited funds, skilled manpower, and equipment. Planning is not used to rationalise competition and weaken the divisions between actors.

The complexity of urban situations - and therefore of corresponding management operations in response - gives the coordination aspect of planning a key function. The most effective and cost efficient strategies frequently require attention to several normally separated areas. Transport is a prime example. Problems of access and equity require treatment of private vehicles, taxis, buses, and perhaps trains, as well as traffic management and improvements to roads and networks, plus attention to how land is used and fare levels. Consequently, tasks may be divided among many organisations. In the developing countries it is even possible to find there is joint responsibility among different levels of government for the same service. Planning works to coordinate actions of various public and private sector agencies by defining overall priority needs and opportunities, obtaining joint decisions as to what is to be done, and scheduling the performance of actions at the right times and places. In this way it is seen to overcome the urban affairs equivalent of the prisoner's dilemma (as Klosterman, 1985, points out), making possible a collective action which no individual can initiate without risking the loss of his investment, but from which he cannot benefit unless the action is initiated.

Belief in these and others powers of planning give it real value as a process for formulating policy (ie what a group agrees to do) leading to action. If managing a city or town means running it (as managing a business seems to mean), then urban management would seem to need planning as one of its constituent parts. Other notions of the relationship of planning to management may exist, but they do not diminish the importance of planning where ever-better urban management is an aim.

Urban management may have been thrust into prominence by international organisations to serve their own institutional agendas (Werna,1995; Jones and Ward, 1994). Nevertheless, it is a concept with appeal which can and does extend beyond these special interests. There are interpretations and applications enough to conclude that it is about better localised action to deliver goods and services to local needs. To the extent that the improvement of particular economic, social and physical circumstances in a particular town or city is important, the improvement of the way that an urban area is run (or managed) is also important, and consequently urban planning which is essential to that management is important. Therefore, to the extent that these improvements can be envisioned as development, planning which aims to achieve this development - that is, urban development planning - is important.

The Myth of Urban Development Planning Practice

Allusions to urban development planning in practice fail to fulfil the dimensions which the concept offers. In the first place, a misleading title of "development plan" is applied to documents produced for urban places as distant as Chicago, London, and Bombay (Mumbai). Secondly, commentators and analysts do not look carefully for these dimensions. As a consequence, they imply that there is a practice of urban development planning where there is not.

During the 1970s and 1980s, urban policy documents entitled "development plan" became commonplace. An example is that for Lambeth Borough in London (Lambeth Borough Council, 1980). The table of contents identifies as the main issues: people and homes, economic and social opportunities, quality of life, and access and transport. The policies follow: housing, employment, shopping, recreation and leisure, transport, social and health, education urban landscape, and public utilities. Indeed, some of these are quite promising. Under employment are the retention of existing jobs, the promotion of new job opportunities, assisting Lambeth firms, office development, promoting better access to jobs, and improving the work environment. Others are less so. The subheadings for education read: nursery education, primary and secondary school sites and

buildings, access to primary and secondary schools, special schools, community use of primary and secondary facilities, leaving school and starting work, further and higher education, and adult education.

As these policies for employment and education are examined more closely, physical environment matters begin to dominate. The retention of existing jobs boils down to specific policies of avoiding the relocation of firms so as to minimise disruption to their activities, resisting changes in land use from employment generating uses to non-generating uses, and providing help to existing firms in finding additional lands or buildings without moving. The promotion of new job opportunities contains many which are physical in their nature as well as specific policies to give financial support to certain enterprises. Turning to a later chapter on implementation and resources, the discussion of financial resources is limited to investments in capital projects, leaving unanswered any questions of how a policy of financially supporting certain firms can be implemented beyond investments in land, buildings, and other works upon the land.

In a similar fashion, promoting better access to jobs includes the continuation of encouragement of the provision of job training by encouraging the construction of a particular job training centre. But it also includes the promotion and financing of employers' training associations and grants to voluntary and self-help training schemes. Here we are definitely out of the realm of land improvement. In a similar fashion, the general education policies break down mostly into matters of locations for facilities and their sizes, ending with a few of a decidedly non-physical nature, for example, a policy to support the improvement of vocational preparation or to support training courses or to assist the expansion of vocational and day release courses. And again, the questions of implementation through means other than land improvements remain unanswered.

In fact, the vast majority of the spaces given in this document to proposals for actions to implement these policies contain statements about the locations of, or improvements or changes to, land use and buildings. This "development plan" for Lambeth was prepared to become a statutory document which would back local government control of land use. Britain has been creating plans for this purpose since a 1947 act of Parliament called for each town to have a development plan defined as "indicating the manner in which the local planning authority propose that land in their area should be used" (quoted in Planning Advisory Group, 1965:5).

This statutory role does not prevent the Lambeth Development Plan from declaring other policies of the Borough Council. However, to be a development plan in the manner defined in this paper, these others would have to be the full array of future oriented policies for changing life in Lambeth for the better, and these policies would have to be integrated into a whole, constituting an overall strategy for the pursuit of this better life. A few policies for giving grants of money or for encouraging certain activities do not add up to such a plan, even though they may be responding to a projected view of problems and opportunities, and even though they may be tacked onto a coherent plan for changing elements of the Borough's physical structure.

The development featured in these plan documents is the development of land. The planning process which produced every one is preoccupied with how land should be build upon or otherwise used. The aim is to provide a policy framework for the regulation of land use and for actions by governments with or without private sector or NGO collaborators to invest in improvements to land.

To be sure, these plans record analyses of social and economic conditions along with those of the physical environment. A tradition of comprehensiveness in urban physical planning calls for this broad perspective. The interrelationship of social and economic problems and opportunities with physical conditions are there as well, again the result of the traditional comprehensive perspective. Such connections help to define priorities by linking buildings, land, landscape features, service networks, community facilities, roads, and so on to social and economic problems or aims. However, in the end, the future actions which are the substance of these plans are nearly all, if not entirely, for the manipulation of the physical environment. In the end, the best of them with strong links between desired social and economic change and change to the physical environment are not development plans but land development plans to achieve aims which include social and economic betterment.

Turning to models of urban development planning which have been put forward in the literature, one finds similar inconsistencies. The term urban development planning may have first appeared in the writings of Otto Koenigsberger (1964), whose interest lay in the quality - specifically the appropriateness and effectiveness - of what was practised as planning for the cities of the world's poorer countries. For a number of professionals

working in developing countries, his statements laid the foundation for a planning approach to urban areas which subjugated traditional objectives of an architectural, land use, and public health nature to a set which described overall betterment in social and economic terms of the people using a city or town. Upon this foundation, several authors and practitioners have sought to elaborate and make more explicit the nature of urban development planning.

Prominent among them has been Safier (1974, 1983). While building his model, he unfortunately intertwines it with an elaboration of a particular method devised and labelled "action planning" by Koenigsberger (1964).

> The process of urban development planning is embodied in the methodology which has come to be known, following Koenigsberger, as "action planning". (Safier, 1983:111)

Although the resulting confusion of content with method draws attention from the precise nature of that content, Safier identifies, in a number of cases where action planning was applied, a pertinent intent to use planning to tackle agendas of social and economic, as well as physical, change. These were planning projects for Lagos, Singapore, Calcutta, and Karachi.

However, Koenigsberger's action plans for Singapore (Abrams, et al, 1980b) and Lagos (Abrams, et al, 1980a) resulted in proposals for no more than land use and capital investments in land. It appears that Koenigsberger was mostly concerned to formulate methods of his "action planning", a form of planning which would be more responsive to the particularities of the given situation, especially to the opportunities of capital investment projects (ie the "actions"). He was also more concerned to draw out the positive nature of urban growth, especially the component of in-migration so reviled at the time.

The Calcutta Basic Development Plan (CMPO, 1966), tackled low productivity in factories, poor economic growth, poverty, inequity, weak community development and so on as best it could with strategies for new bridges, housing, service networks, and roads (and repairs to existing ones) and the improvement of water supply, waste disposal, and community facilities, especially in the low income bustees - all of them aspects of the physical environment.

Development planning for Karachi, which Herbert (1982) described as a participant, confronted decision makers with trenchant issues of social equity versus economic growth. Although it aimed to achieve, among other things, "expansion of essential support programmes including financing, technical assistance and training for small enterprises" and "improvements to education services, with priority for and increase in basic literacy, primary education, technical training and community development programmes" (Herbert, 1982: 87), the planning process was such that in relation to these objectives it could only produce recommended actions regarding land use, service networks, road systems, and investments in land, buildings, and other engineering works.

In time, development planning has become a term automatically associated with urban planning in developing countries. For example, Zaris et al (1988) use the term "strategic urban development planning" when describing an approach formulated in Indonesia to guide capital investments in land made as part of that county's Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Programme. There is some influence here from Safier's writings, in which he attempts to identify a tradition of urban development planning. He appears to define development planning as government intervention to improve urban conditions which are dependent upon economic and social relations. (Safier, 1983:110) Later, he distinguishes this tradition as one in which social and economic development concerns dominate the agendas of urban planning processes. (Safier, 1992) Although he argues that the growing importance of development objectives has produced "a body of planning principles and practices that respond to the new agenda of urban development, covering - and seeking to interrelate - parallel interventions in economic, social, institutional and spatial/physical dimensions..." (Safier, 1992:8), the collection of practice accounts to which this assertion is a preface fails to support his contention. Rather, it repeatedly illustrates practice which in Safier's own words either "remains essentially concerned with the ways and means by which spatial and physical planning...can improve the functioning of the built environment and land-use..." (Ibid:7) or is "financial and social investment appraisal applied to ... concrete, visible development 'projects'" (Ibid:7), that is to say, capital investments in the physical environment. Terminating this article, he comments that "As yet, outside the specially designed urban 'development' authorities and corporations, metropolitan and municipal governments are rarely, if ever, equipped with the intention or machinery to be development agents." (Ibid: 11) Having asserted that development planning corresponds to a general urban management operation, he thereby acknowledges that the only

machinery for urban planning to be found in nearly every case is for physical planning and control.

Safier seems much less insistent that planning prescribe direct attacks upon the barriers to economic and social progress than he does that it adopt such progress among its goals. As a result, it is enough to him that urban planning remain more or less within its usual sphere of activity, providing it is sensitive in its actions to the service of the development goal. Thus land use planning which aims to increase productivity or to improve the equity of access to land rights can be said to be urban development planning.

In what was intended to be an extended discussion of planning and managing urban development, Devas and Rakodi (1993) avoid the issue altogether, saying little more than that "urban planning is concerned ...particularly with the spatial and land-use dimensions of urban development..." (ibid: 44). As an example of evolving view of urban planning, they emphasize that Sivaramakrishnan and Green (1986:56) conclude a shift of emphasis has been taking place from land use plans towards research and analysis "requiring contrasting and changing clusters, patterns, and flows of activity not necessarily focused on land uses" which may be "concerned mainly with defining development problems and goals in the economic and social context..." (Devas and Rakodi, 1993:44) This concept of planning does not seem to include the generation of responses to problems and goals, and so it does not trouble itself with knowing whether land use policies will suffice or whether policies for economic and social changes are essential also.

So the term urban development planning has been misused widely, or has been widely misleading. Generally, land development is meant by it when applied to practice, while those offering us the concept have accepted as applications of their ideas cases which do not justify the name. The achievement of economic and social objectives requires actions upon society, the economy, and the physical environment, as indeed is recognised by national and regional planning efforts - although not without neglect of one or another of these aspects in many cases of practice. When the theatre of action moves to the local level - and specifically that which is urban - no new element is introduced which removes the need to act upon society and the economy. It is simply not enough to pursue economic and social objectives. The urban economy and society must be objects of development planning. While this will inevitably involve actions upon the physical aspects of towns and cities, to go no further - avoiding direct actions on social and economic structures - is only a beginning at best and a diversion at worst.

Contrary to the impression created, there is no significant tradition of urban development planning in practice. Instead, it is the planning of the urban physical environment - basically no more than land use - which has long been established. Because this practice was founded first and was subsequently never seriously challenged by any rival, planning of the urban physical environment has long been synonymous with the terms town planning, city planning, urban planning, and settlement planning throughout the world. Efforts began many decades ago to expose the economic implications of physical plans, and then to respond to these in the planning. Similarly, efforts were made regarding the social consequences of physical planning actions. However, these efforts have been only elaborations of the physical planning tradition. They did not even begin to establish a new tradition of urban development planning.

Attempts at Urban Development Planning

There have been distinctly different occasions when preparations were made to change social and economic facets of a town or city, along with associated physical qualities. These have not been numerous and accounts of them are not well documented. The following is one.

The history of Tenancingo in El Salvador illustrates clearly, on a very small scale, what is involved when planning actually arranges social and economic development. The following account is mostly from interviews and text provided in 1988 by Alfredo Stein who participated as staff of FUNDASAL in the activities described.

In 1983, armed conflict between the forces of the revolutionary guerrillas (the FLN) and the Salvadorean Government intensified in a way which brought large scale destruction and death to Tenancingo. Three thousand people living in the town and nearby hamlets fled and 40% of the houses were destroyed. Two years later, the Catholic Bishop of San Salvador joined with the refugees in a effort to return them to their homes. FUNDASAL, a non-governmental organisation, was asked to coordinate the implementation of the town's reconstruction.

The planning which followed attempted to reconstruct a community based upon new and different socio-economic relations and upon the

participation of the poor in decision making. It produced five programmes:

1. Emergency assistance to returning families which provided transportation, food, tools and basic domestic utensils;

2. Repair and reconstruction of housing which provided material loans and organised mutual-help works in the town and the abandoned hamlets;

3. Repair and reconstruction of the social infrastructure which provided access and internal roads, water and sewerage systems, electricity, health centres, schools, municipal offices, and market and a church;

4. Reconstruction of the local economy which provided agricultural development, small industries, services, and credit to artisans;

5. Social, educational and cultural services which provided formal education, training for different programmes, social organisation of the town's hamlets, and mental education.

By June, 1987, more than 800 families had directly benefitted from the planning. They had resettled in the town and its hamlets, 51 houses were rebuilt, 1430 hectares of land was under cultivation, many small businesses were back in operation and new ones had been created, all basic services were restored, four schools and a kindergarten were repaired and functioning, and there was broad participation of the population in the decision making processes affecting them.

The planning behind this achievement addressed issues which went far beyond the mere physical aspects of rebuilding a town. It arranged to create an economy which was different through redistribution of land and redistribution of financial and technological resources. It sought to change the structure of local political power. The scope of this planning was social and economic, as well as physical. Not only were houses and community facilities built, but sources of employment were created. Social planning was not a matter of restoring community facilities or even of restoring social services; it organised changes in basic social relations which achieved greater equity. This was done by securing land for peasants to farm for themselves. Having abandoned the area and fearful of returning early, a few rich landowners were persuaded to give up fields or long-lease them to peasants, many of whom had been their labourers in the past. New small businesses were promoted, especially in the hat-making industry which had previously been the sole domain of a few businessmen who employed outworkers and stifled competition. The change gave peasants year round employment and freed them from dependence on the large land owners and the dominating small clique of local entrepreneurs. Planned social change was also brought about by creating cooperatives and community organisations and giving them experience in negotiations and greater knowledge.

The village setting which makes this experience easier to understand considerably reduces the interest which Tenancingo can claim from urbanists. They usually confront problems of complexity and size absent from this case. Consequently, similar efforts within a major city would seem to offer more substantial lessons. Probably the only well-documented instance of this taking place was in London, beginning some 17 years ago.

Planning London

These concepts of an urban planning which directly pursues social and economic change have been given real dimensions by the actions of the Greater London Council (GLC) in the early 1980s. Surprisingly, important matters gain shape and detail by their absence in this case as well as by their presence. It is as though, once having broken the skin of the established approach, the scales drop from one's eyes and altogether new possibilities can be envisioned. For actors in the GLC - perhaps overwhelmed by too many other concerns and robbed of time to carry the processes of innovations to their ends - a complete image of development planning did not take shape, as we shall see.

At the time, the GLC was a representative body for the metropolitan area of London, occupying a place between the most local level of government (that of the 33 boroughs and cities) and the national government housed in Parliament, a position roughly equivalent to a county council (a regional government). From 1981, the GLC was in the control of the Labour Party, the only real opposition to the party in power in the national government. This opposition can be seen as a basis for much of the creativity which transpired, feeding as it did the determination of the majority in the GLC not only to stay in power, but to successfully counter the effect of national government policies inimical to its political beliefs. Principally, the Labour Party members of the GLC sought to strengthen the support which had put it into County Hall. Critical

among these because of its new power was the combination of interests representing women, low income households, ethnic minorities, and a variety of other minority groups. Generally, their circumstances had failed to improve under policy of the previous government, and new national leadership promised even less in its laisser faire market stance. Logically, the Labour Party-led GLC had much to gain from new interventions across the full range of possibilities. Among the tools for formulating, organising, and implementing these interventions, it chose the planning functions which it had been given to carry out its statutory duty to prepare various policies for the physical change and preservation of London. In using this existing function as an instrument for a new endeavour, rather than merely continuing it as required by law, the GLC entered into the realm of innovation.

Clearly, the GLC, in doing this, sought to operate urban planning as a political tool. The objectivity of urban planning as a technical or professional or administrative activity has long been dismissed by analysis and criticism which has revealed the basically political nature of urban planning (see for example, Catanese, 1974; Gyford, 1980; Batley, 1993). It is hard to imagine how even those convictions of neutrality and objectivity which remain stubbornly in place after determined study could stand up to the questions raised by planning which aims to achieve social and economic targets. This is so clearly about the allocation of resources - who gets what and who pays - which is the very essence of politics. There should be no mistake that urban development planning is a political activity, whose agenda is politically determined when it is effective.

Although it could not know it, the GLC of this day had only a short time in which to launch and carry through with its innovations. When in 1986 it was dissolved by Parliament along with the 4 other metropolitan authorities after a protracted battle - a life and death struggle which underscored the growing effectiveness and potential of its creativity in a number of policy areas - most of its remarkable planning initiatives were in their infancy. They lacked substantial operational procedure, experience, practical detail, testing and modification. Perhaps the most prepared planning instrument was a revision of the Greater London Development Plan (GLC, 1976) known as the GLDP - the documentation expressing land use and building policies which the GLC, as the overall physical planning authority for the London area, was obliged by law to produce. Even this - though widely distributed as a final draft - could not be approved in time.

Nevertheless, the contents of the draft GLDP provide an appropriate starting point for a search for urban development planning practice. This investigation will have four focuses. It will look for evidence of planning for the physical, economic and social development of London. Then, finally, it will consider how planning for the three were interrelated so they might be mutually supportive, achieving the remarkable arithmetic of 1+1+1=4.

It must be understood that little attempt will otherwise be made to comment upon the effectiveness of the GLC's planning or even its appropriateness. Good urban planning is not the issue here. The aim of this account remains to successfully argue for the possibility of a kind of urban planning which can legitimately claim the title of development planning, and, at the same time, illustrate through one case of practice the form its aspects may take.

Planning for London's Physical Environment

Planning the physical environment is an established procedure of long standing in the UK. The post-WWII machinery for town planning was built upon an accumulation of experience extending back at least to Britain's Health and Safety Laws of the 19th century. The objects of this planning were land and buildings. The objectives were various: improved public health and safety, convenience for users and dwellers of a town, conservation of historic places and structures or areas of amenity, increased general amenity, efficiency in the use of land and the servicing of land with roads, water, drainage, etc. Development, when it did not mean simply improvement of land and/or raising the quality of all physical aspects of an urban place which can be publicly perceived, meant accommodating in an acceptable, adequate way any physical growth or change, usually described in terms of population.

The precursor of the GLC - the London County Council - had adopted a set of physical environment policies in the form of a plan. The creation of the GLC to encompass a more truly metropolitan area was closely followed by the adoption of modifications to the British approach to planning which introduced new instruments (Planning Advisory Group, 1965). Accordingly, the GLC of 1965 prepared the first Greater London Development Plan proposals (GLC, 1976) which, owing largely to the dynamic nature of local government and popular participation in planning which followed, were the subject of controversy over a period of many years and were not legally approved by the Secretary of State for the Environment until 1976.

This statement of policy was intended to equip the GLC for its statutory duty to guide the boroughs (the lower tier of local government) in carrying out land use regulation, as well as to exercise those direct powers of land use regulations which fell the GLC under certain circumstances.

The GLDP was already 4 years old when there was a change in government of the GLC, so there was ample reason for the policies it reported to be subject to review and revision. Before changes and additions to physical development policies could be formally adopted into a second GLDP, the GLC itself was dissolved. However, the planning process reached the stage of producing for public discussion (and for internal use within the Council) a complete set of proposals which were published and widely distributed as "Draft Alterations to the Greater London Development Plan" (GLC, 1983).

As with its predecessor, the concern for development alluded to in its title is for the development of land. It addresses land development with a wide range of general policies and strategies for protecting or shaping London's physical environment, ranging from the conventional (eg the protection and maintenance of historical and architectural heritage in the central activities zone) through the lesser used but known (eg performance criteria for, say, the height of buildings) and extending to provisions which are quite original. An excellent example of the last are the policies for community planning, which are described later.

In this draft of alterations to the GLDP, like the GLDP itself, the statements of policy were clearly the product of a recognisable process of planning. Aspects of the future of London were anticipated which were relevant to particular goals and objectives (eg its population and thus the demand for land and units to house this population) and policy proposals were formulated to reduce problems or to seize opportunities likely to emerge in the future (eg a change of land use from residential to another purpose would not normally be permitted). A comprehensive approach was used to identify priorities; for example, emphasis was placed upon new policy proposals encouraging locally-sited employment opportunities which would be more accessible to child-rearing women.

The legal tools for implementation of the GLDP justified its preparation and adoption in that without the Plan, they could not be operated effectively or at all. Fundamentally, these were the tools of land development regulation. British law requires that any material change to the use of land be approved by the local planning authority. Acting as these authorities, the London boroughs and cities received applications for permission to alter land use and decided upon these with reference to the specific policies which they had created in accord with the adopted plan for Greater London.

Consequently, the GLDP and the draft alterations to it had little administrative imperative or even practical reason to state or propose policies which could not be implemented through the administration of the land development control procedures. Policies not dependant on land development control were in a sense extraneous, irrelevant, and unnecessary. They had no justifiable place in a document created to provide one of the legal foundations for intervening in the property rights of individuals and institutions.

Nevertheless, policies which go beyond land development regulation can be found in the planning documents of London going back some time. Perhaps they are there throughout the history of planning for London and even throughout the history of urban planning worldwide. It has always been impossible to adhere to strict boundaries of concern when planning urban areas, probably because of - as much as anything - the comprehensiveness which has characterised planning as a problem solving approach. To see connections and relationships is antithetical to boundaries. Where and when urban planning has been notoriously weak and ineffective, a principle cause has commonly been the failure of policy makers to formulate plans for which there are adequate instruments of implementation. And this has often been a reflection of the tendency to think comprehensively, extending networks of concern beyond the boundaries of possible actions. For example, urban planning studies have customarily diagnosed problems of poverty or poor economic performance, only to come up with proposals for siting low cost housing and services in response to the first and locations for industry in response to the second, neither of which is any more than a partial and indirect attack upon the problems identified.

In the GLDP of 1976, there are such policies which are physical in nature or so nearly so that they fit comfortably with the bulk of concerns, yet they fall outside the scope of statutory powers to enforce or implement them under Town Planning Laws. For instance, this plan calls for the GLC to give priority over provision for the private car to the maintenance and improvement of public transport.

The Draft Amendments to the GLDP stray even further from statutory requirements with their

physical proposals. The case of the Coin Street community area provides examples.

Community planning was a creation of this new GLC government. It took decisions on public resources to the level of neighbourhoods, involving stakeholders there in identifying what needed to be done and how it might be done, and in committing resources to agreed actions. A selection of areas for community planning were identified and delineated in the GLDP. In that one named Coin Street, much physical planning was implemented through this unique process. First, land was purchased by the GLC and added to existing GLC property in the area. Then the GLC made funds available to the Coin Street Community Builders in order that they could purchase land from this GLC supply. Other pieces of land were allocated at no cost to specific projects which had their own funding, eg cooperative public housing. Legal agreements were made to ensure that land was used for the sole purpose of community development. Priorities were decided for the implementation of activities so that a well-planned programme of actions took shape, eg a revenue generating land development project was first carried out which would provide revenue for financing other community projects like cooperative housing. At the same time, land use in the area was regulated by the GLC, so as to achieve general public benefits as well as those specific to the community planning programme. Agreed policy allowed for mixed land uses to be introduced in the area, in order to provide the commercial opportunities for revenue-generating community projects.

This approach to planning the physical environment played other roles as well. The community participation in deciding policy about land uses, density, and the programme of works built local institutional capacities to make informed decisions, to take responsibility for local affairs, and to embark upon initiatives in spheres other than the physical environment. And clearly, planning the physical environment was used as a political tool. Through its engagement with the Coin Street community, the GLC demonstrated its commitment to the concerns of neighbourhoods in general and the lower income households in particular.

In the draft amendments to the GLDP, the scale on which physical environment proposals are linked to non-physical policy proposals is new. So are the lengths to which these connections are taken. Beginning with those only moderately adventurous, like non-physical as well as physical improvements to public transport in order to increase access to jobs, they extend to such provisions as loans and grants to small industries which agree to increase workers' ownership. These are policies which may complement or be complemented by land use control measures; they may provide explanations for some land development proposals. But they could not be implemented by the land development control processes which required the preparation of the GLDP. Consequently, they signal a broadening of the functions of the planning activity initially put in place for the production of the GLDP. This was a broadening of the planning of the physical environment into the planning of economic and social development.

Planning for Economic Development

Three documents in particular attest to the economic planning of the GLC at the time: The London Industrial Strategy (GLC,1985), The London Financial Strategy (GLC,1986a), and The London Labour Plan (GLC, 1986b). Each treats a major dimension of London's economy and shows the hallmarks of planning. Its method involves the identification of problems and opportunities through analysis incorporating objectives and expectations of the future and the formulation of proposals for policies to reduce problems and grasp opportunities. The proposals are aimed at London's circumstances and are to be carried out by London's government. The objectives are the betterment of selected elements of London's economy in terms which are common to notions of economic development, for example, increases in production and jobs. But not entirely, for some take a position regarding economic factors which is strongly social in its concern for development, such as the intent to reduce ethnic, racial and gender discrimination in employment opportunities. Clearly, each of these documents reports on a process and its outcome which can be called planning for London's economic development. In the London Labour Plan it is said that there was a GLC Labour Party manifesto commitment to produce a plan (GLC, 1986b:11). In the making, this was found to best be a strategic view assessing forces and considering in detail what local government could do with others to influence how the restructuring of London's economy was occurring. It was to provide resources, research and synthesis. Thus, the documents themselves can be said to be plan statements, and economic development plans at that.

None of the three plan documents seems to have a clear precedent. The London Industrial Strategy notes "The strength of the present volume is that is shows clearly, we believe for the first time, how

detailed sectoral planning can generate ... strategies for economic growth." (GLC, 1985:viii) Previous governments of metropolitan London were not sufficiently driven by a focus upon the local economy to plan for its development in the sense of pulling together otherwise ad hoc and somewhat independent public sector efforts to improve growth of selected economic elements into an interrelated bundle of priority actions for dealing with the future. Unlike physical planning, central government had not yet provided a mandate to undertake local economic planning, and had not even advocated models of such actions. There was no tradition which had been created by a previous London area government, not even one institutionalised informally within the administration which eventually came to be the GLC. Nor were there traditions in other major metropolitan cities of the UK, or for that matter in the Western World. Perhaps the only tradition was that of physical planning, which was capable of illustrating not only planning concepts, but also the value of a method.

Characteristic of the first of these documents, the London Industrial Strategy (GLC, 1985), were proposals for:

1. Public investment in municipal enterprises, producer co-operation, new firms and firms facing closure. The needed public investment was financed through a discretionary tax, which Central Government had empowered the GLC to collect for uses other than this.

2. Construction and refurbishment of factories. The GLC owned land on which to create industrial estates. It also owned buildings which it could refurbish, or demolish and rebuild.

3. Establishment of a "direct labour" building organisation. With the cooperation of the London boroughs, labour was hired directly by local governments, favouring people who were unemployed or experiencing discrimination.

4. Funding technological schemes. Grants were given for enterprises developing new technology, also using funds from the discretionary tax.

Typical of the contents of London Financial Strategy (GLC, 1986a) adopted by the GLC were these strategies:

1. Local investment of local government pension funds. A capital development fund was created from such pension funds and made available to local companies.

2. Encouragement of local or socially responsible investment. A pensions investments resources centre was set up to act as a link between local authorities and local businesses.

3. Encouragement of local banking, creating institutions will to direct funds to special groups and areas. An example of this was the:

4. Provision of local finance for black businesses. A Black Enterprise Board and Black Banks were created to give positive assistance to the business development needs of members of the Afro-Caribbean community.

The Labour Plan (GLC, 1986b) strategies included:

1. Reduce unemployment for London residents through land use planning policies to discourage office development and to encourage industrial development; investment policies to develop industries, co-operatives and small enterprises; promotion of public sector employment (direct labour organisation and no privatisation); and redistribution of work within the public sector (encourage job sharing, increase training time).

2. Reduce the imbalance of employment

   (a) between different locations by using land use planning policies to encourage/discourage industrial development as appropriate;

   (b) between different skills by offering training which anticipates future demands and by promoting public sector employment;

   (c) between different ethnicities, sexes and abilities by offering training aimed at selected groups and by providing child care facilities.

3. Improve conditions for employees by strengthening unions; improving community facilities; improving housing; improving transport for workers; and promoting the GLC as model employer regarding equal opportunities.

4. Discourage existing employers from relocating out of London by using land planning policies to encourage refurbishment and expansion of existing workplaces; anticipating future needs for workplaces (reserving land); utilising land policies to discourage changes of use from workplace to other use; and assisting local relocation of workplace if expansion is not possible in existing location

The three documents were prepared sequentially and reflect a growing awareness of what was involved in planning for London's economic development. The last of these observed "As became clear in preparing the industrial strategy, and putting it into practice, the kind of planning that was needed was not some central plan, that assumed a form of public control that did not currently exist. Rather it was a strategic view of the economic field of battle...if there is one thing we have learned about planning, it is that it cannot be done from the centre. The task of a strategic authority is to proved resources, research, and the capacity for synthesis. But the detailed understanding of direction and possibility can only come from those directly involved...As a result many of the industrial sector studies contained in the London Industrial Strategy included strategies for workforces and users in those industries. In the London Labour Plan we have moved beyond the sectors to consider a number of the issues affecting labour which we found common to many sectors and which needed to be brought together...As with the other strategy documents, what is needed is not a blueprint but a rolling strategy." (GLC, 1986b:11)

Planning for Social Development

For some actors, planning to achieve social development is an act of self-annihilation and consequently illogical and unlikely. If the social change sought is radical - a major restructuring of social relationships - an institution or group which will lose power by the restructuring will not knowingly plan to bring about the change. In this way, a government cannot be expected to plan for social change which may mean its own demise, and as governments and their institutions are the chief agents of significant urban planning, it is not likely that one would shoot itself in the foot by tackling major social problems of urban areas with fundamental changes in who gets what that go against the interests of that government's power base.

In this respect, the position of the GLC in the early 1980s was unusual. A large measure of the support for the local Labour Party which had brought it into power in County Hall was from Londoners who had felt neglected by past government. These were a variety of minority groups and interests, and to them was added women, who as a group had been given no particular attention. To respond to this new-found support and to consolidate it, the Labour Party in the GLC had very good reason to cater to it with policies which sought substantial changes in social relations.

Yet, there was not a distinct process of social planning for London by the GLC. Rather the Council held in mind a selection of social problems when it formulated physical and economic interventions and strategies. The mechanisms for dealing with these social issues were contained in physical and economic planning.

So there were no additions to the principle documents attesting to the GLC's planning for London's development. Nothing like the GLDP or the 3 statements of economic plans was produced for social matters. Instead, these planning documents are peppered with many policies for social change. The policies aim at future problems and opportunities and are set down as strategies for achieving future improvements. They are neatly woven into the physical and economic planning proposals and through these others, they themselves are interconnected. But nowhere are they brought together as a coherent, integrated package for achieving particular future social objectives which could be called a social development plan, one which gives strong evidence that social planning for London had been undertaken directly and self-consciously.

Whereas the GLDP was prepared by the Transport and Development Department and the three economic planning documents by the Council's Industry and Employment Branch, it seems that no unit within the GLC's administration was given responsibility for social planning. This reflected the structure of the Council itself in which there was a committee for physical planning and another for industry and employment, while social concerns were distributed to a variety of committees. Apparently, the jobs of assembling, integrating, and presenting the GLC's social policies in plans were left to the physical and economic planners.

All things considered, the result was remarkable for the degree of social development which it pursued through planning strategies and for the number of fronts on which the GLC intended to act. This was a far cry from the urban planning of the 1950s and 1960s in Britain (and the USA, for that matter) which managed only to identify, and sometimes react to, the social consequences of changes to the physical environment or which merely sought to ensure space for buildings from which to dispense social services such as education or health care.

Instead, the GLC fashioned planning policies of the following kind:

1. To save jobs and create new ones in an attack on under-employment and unemployment, the Industrial Strategy proposed project investment

and construction of industrial floorspace in joint ventures with the private sector. This was to be implemented by the Greater London Enterprise Board.

2. Again, to combat under and un-employment, and to increase opportunities for groups subject to discrimination, training was proposed and linked in the Labour Plan and the Industrial Strategy. This was to be implemented by the Greater London Training Board. Investment was proposed in: apprentice training, other youth training, adult training, training for women, including specialised professions, research and development, and to improve business take-up. The main aim was to support the provision of high quality training for both adults and young people.

3. Suppliers and contractors to the GLC were encouraged to adhere to policies of equal opportunities, health and safety, fair wages, trade union rights, and training for employees by creating and using a list of approved firms for contracting by the GLC. This was enforced by the Contract Compliance Unit.

4. Grants were proposed to groups and organisations willing to create alternative forms of employment which were more socially equitable, to be provided through a Project Development Unit. The main areas of investment were in job campaigns, unemployment centres, community enterprises cooperative development agencies, trade union support units, ethnic minority projects, disabled persons' projects, domestic production projects and women's employment projects. For example, advice to black businesses and training of black youngsters was attempted to improve access to jobs for a minority group, to guarantee their rights at work and to help combat racism in the workplace.

5. Creches and nursery facilities throughout London were to be provided to relieve women of their reproductive role during part of the day, so that they could participate in productive activities.
6. People were involved in the planning of their own economy and environment, through a programme of "popular planning" providing public information and undertaking consultation. Funds were provided to local groups to produce publicity and local plans for physical and economic development, and to hold meetings and forums. The Community Planning featured in the physical planning process was part of this.

7. Equality was to be promoted through housing policies (for example, in land use planning and housing standards), house production targets for boroughs, the reduction of transport fares and expansion of routes, and through employment policies.

8. Disabled and elderly were dealt with under infrastructure, transport, employment housing and location of services and facilities in the draft amendments to the GLDP (eg access at curbs, seats at bus stops). Although there was no chapter for them, there were chapters on ethnic minorities and on women.

Development Planning In London

Although the draft amended GLDP would seem to be claiming the role, there was no development plan for London in the terms set out in this paper. This proposed GLDP, like its predecessor, was about the development of the physical entity of London. Less tangible but more important matters of economic growth and social betterment provided some of the objectives implicit in the plans for London's buildings, land and space. They were also part of the recognised context of such plans, to be served by the GLDP policies, when they possessed physical dimensions which made this possible. But the amendments to the GLDP could not to any substantial degree launch a direct and concerted attack upon London's major looming social and economic difficulties. Nor could they lead the Council down paths which would exploit opportunities for London's social and economic betterment. The draft changes to the GLDP were required to update a statutory document necessary to carry out land development control in the public interest, and this remained its primary intent.

However, there was development planning for London - not without some thin components, but nevertheless bringing together, as had never been done, policies for social, economic and physical change and expressing them as plans. Objectives for improvement of London's physical fabric, its economy and its social conditions - implicit in definitions of problems and opportunities and sometimes explicit - motivated analysis and the formulation of policies and strategies across a broad range of the GLC's activities. These objectives - or the solutions to the problems and exploitation of the opportunities which they defined - provided a set of images of the future of London towards which the resources in general of the GLC would be marshalled. A conscious effort was made to inter-relate the different dimensions of these images -

buildings, social relations, investment, etc - and in parallel, to interconnect the policies and strategies for their realisation.

A prime example of this integration of dimensions of images and of policies and strategies can be seen in the GLC's treatment of women and employment. In pursuit of the greater empowerment of women through an improvement of their earning ability, the Labour Plan proposed to ease the problems of working mothers with expanded child care service facilities at locations which were stated in the draft GLDP, with easier physical access to work opportunities - policies for neighbourhood locations for industries tending to employ part-time female labour contained in the draft GLDP - and pricing policies for the public transport system placed in the Labour Plan.

Another example was the GLC's attack upon ethnic and racial discrimination. Training favouring groups which had been the targets of discrimination, the provision of instruments to give Black entrepreneurs greater access to capital, and environmental improvements which focus on inner city areas where there are concentrations of those discriminated against are woven into the physical and the economic development plans. An integrated strategy for reducing poverty is in these plans which also features policies on training, access to finance, and inner city improvements. So are there strategies for local empowerment and for better governance through more participation which have communities involved in such matters as land development and training course delivery.

Nowhere were social development strategies brought together. They remain distributed throughout the draft GLDP and the three economic plan statements; they are expressed as policies of physical and economic planning. Yet there exist changes in human relations and behaviour which are little achieved by physical and economic policies, for example, in education, basic rights, health, and culture.

Consequently, there is not evidence of a mature process of social planning for London. Objectives, priorities, and comprehensiveness all remain in question. What were the aims for social change itself? Those generated by concerns for London's physical form and economy will not necessarily pick up all that is important. Only with assurance that there are no major gaps in the vision of planning can a prioritisation of concerns be undertaken with confidence. And without a well-defined sense of social priorities, it would be difficult to negotiate for their support in realms of physical and economic action. There was a long-established office of physical planning to prepare the draft revisions to the GLDP and a team was assembled to propose economic development policies and present these into three planning documents. There were no equivalents of staff organisation or documentation for matters of social change.

The concept of development planning introduced at the beginning is not three separate processes. Like planning itself, this concept offers additional benefit from the synergy of integrating future-oriented policies for social, economic, and physical change which might otherwise be kept separate. The GLC did not come up with guidelines for prioritisation across physical, economic and social areas of concern or for resolving conflicts among these. But it did manage to capture some of the mutually supportive effect. For the most part, the documentation reads as one. The GLDP draft changes pick up the physical aspects of the economic plans, and vice versa.

The extent of the integration sometimes leads to a note of confusion for those involved in the processes, as if they are not entirely aware of what they have done when pushing beyond old limits. Thus the planning committee, its chairman and its technical staff write of interwoven social, economic, and physical planning in "Planning for the Future of London" (GLC, 1984a) in a way which jars with that document's overall message about statutory planning for land development.

In the end, however, the evolution to urban development planning in 1985 is incomplete. Physical planning is practised with a skilled and experienced staff and familiar set of tools. It is willing and able to acknowledge economic and social objectives and incorporate as much as possible of the physical dimensions of their policies. Furthermore, it is willing go beyond its statutory duties with initiatives like the community planning programme to carry out policies with important economic and social consequences. Economic planning is taking a mature shape. There are staff with substantial policy formulation experience, even though operational lessons are only beginning to feed back. There are actual documents setting down policies and the reasons for them. The instruments for action are not well tried and even experimental in many instances. There is obvious cooperation between these two efforts at all levels, even a sense of a joint mission. Yet, something is absent, a whole which would have them working together, not as armies sharing a battlefield against a common enemy, but as parts of the same army, each with a different line of attack. Not yet, does it

appear, has contributing to a true development plan replaced the preparation of a statutory plan in the minds of the GLC's Planning Committee and its staff.

And then, there is the absence of a distinct social planning activity. Without it, social planning is not an equal partner. To some extent, it remains a afterthought, in the manner of the old land use plans which asked: what are the consequences for those living there of a redevelopment scheme? The GLC of the time seems to have asked: what of our social aims can we further through our physical and economic planning? Yet, since the power of planning for physical and economic change is recognised, why should it be denied to social ends?

Innovations

Perhaps it was only a matter of time before this GLC would have created a distinct social planning process and produced social planning documentation. It was a time of experimentation and of learning by doing. There was a willingness, perhaps a need, to innovate in the GLC. In its hands, the GLDP required by law was becoming a much broader statement, with additional areas of coverage and connections which established a direction toward the fulfilment of its claim regarding development. When arguing for its continuation against the threat of abolition, the Council stressed that it had "a planning role in the widest sense with a particular responsibility to exercise its own statutory discretionary powers in taking action. This action, while changing in form, has been developed and extended under successive administrations at the GLC." (GLC, 1984b:25) But it immediately adds "The Council has recognised that, while many of the symptoms of 'inner city' problems are social and environmental, the basic cause is economic." (ibid:26), suggesting that an operational concept of social planning was not yet clear.

The economic planning documents were themselves innovations from the start. Possibly they are unique today, even in terms of their basic concept: to commit to paper a concerted economic development strategy for a city or town. The GLC had no duty to prepare them. It sought no new powers or mandates from Central Government in order to produce or implement the policies and agreed actions these documents reported. It found new ways to use what was at hand to implement its wishes, and it conceived fresh strategies to carry out with familiar means, for example, when it tied financial assistance for firms to a greater commitment to work participation in ownership.

Staff organisation was given new elements. Consultants to and personnel of the Industry and Employment Branch were linked to the existing cadre of physical planners. Their efforts were directed by the Planning Committee and the Industry and Employment Committee, working in a new relationship of close cooperation. The social development elements appear to have been brought down directly from the ruling party's leadership through the joint actions of the two committee chair persons.

Given the fresh views of urban planning within which to take shape, many of the policies of this GLC were innovative. That of community planning had build upon ideas present in professional thinking for some time, and, in many ways, it was a physical medium seeking to incorporate economic and social concerns. A policy like that giving supporting financing to small companies which adopted worker ownership was more original. So was the creation of banks for minority groups in selected areas, using local government pension funds as the source of funding.

Conclusion

Planning cannot logically claim to be for urban development which does not pursue economic, social, and physical betterment by seeking changes to the local economy, society and physical environment. Urban development planning is important because it offers particular benefits - most importantly, foresight, a comprehensive perspective, and coordination - when making decisions affecting the crucial roles which cities and towns play in all human life, both rural and urban. Nevertheless, nearly all claims to the practice of urban development planning - and many of the conceptualisations of it - fail to do more than make the physical environment the object of their actions.

The short-lived efforts in the early 1980s of the Greater London Council achieved a degree of development planning which went well beyond anything performed by a major city before or since. It is more unique because of the documentation produced which allows examination of the details of its practices and the confirmation that it very nearly achieved what so many others have falsely claimed.

Driven perhaps to consolidate its newly-formed constituency, the London's new government of the left innovated. It began with its statutory duty to prepare a plan for regulating land use, and added to

it, as never before, concerns for social and economic change. But this was a limited tool, so three unprecedented plans for London's economic development were created which were integrated with proposals for changes to this statutory physical planning document. The result incorporated many of the GLC's social development policies into these two planning efforts, but did not pull them together into an integrated, forward-looking programme focused on social objectives.

A true development plan for London was not created, but development planning did take place, however thin its social development planning aspect might have been. Nevertheless, the GLC was innovative and did reach another stage in progress toward the performance of urban development planning. Given its direction, it is reasonable to think it might well have evolved a full urban development planning process, had the Council not been dissolved. Even the progress it achieved by undertaking economic development planning, integrating that with physical planning, and seeking social change through physical and economic planning, was lost. Yet the experience has revealed a great deal about the nature of urban planning which is aimed at structures on which development is built. This experience confirms that development planning for urban areas can be practised, even in a very large metropolis, and it illustrates just how limited are those attempts which presently call themselves urban development planning.

References

Abrams, C, Kobe, S, Koenigsberger, O, Shapiro, M, and Wheeler, M, 1980a, "Metropolitan Lagos", Habitat International, Vol 5, No 1/2, pp 55-83, Pergamon, Oxford

Abrams, C, Kobe, S, and Koenigsberger, 1980b, "Growth and Urban Renewal in Singapore", Habitat International, Vol 5, No 1/2, pp 85-127, Pergamon, Oxford

Batley, R, 1993, "Political Control of Urban Planning and Management", in Devas, N and Rakodi, C, (eds) Managing Fast Growing Cities, Longman, Harlow, UK

Catanese, A, 1974, Planners and Local Politics: Impossible Dreams, Beverly Hills, California

CMPO (Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organisation), 1966, The Calcutta Basic Development Plan, Calcutta

Cullingworth, J B and Nadin, V, 1997, Town and Country Planning in the U K, 12th edition, Routledge, London

Devas, N, 1993 "Evolving Approaches", Managing Fast Growing Cities, Devas, N and Rakodi, C, (eds), Longman, Harlow, U K

Devas, N, and Rakodi, C, 1993, "Planning and Managing Urban Development", Managing Fast Growing Cities, Devas, N and Rakodi, C, (eds), Longman, Harlow, U K

Greater London Council, 1976, Greater London Development Plan, Greater London Council, London

Greater London Council, 1983, Draft Alterations to the Greater London Development Plan, Greater London Council, London

Greater London Council, 1984a, "Planning for the Future of London", Greater London Council, London

Greater London Council, 1984b, "The Future of the Greater London Council", Greater London Council, London

Greater London Council, 1985, The London Industrial Strategy, Greater London Council, London

Greater London Council, 1986a, The London Financial Strategy, Greater London Council, London

Greater London Council, 1986b, The London Labour Plan, Greater London Council, London

Green, Harry, 1979, "Urban Planning in Nigeria", Journal of Administration Overseas, Vol XVIII, No 1, January,

Ministry of Overseas Development and Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London

Gyford, J, 1980, "Planning with Personalities and Politics in Mind", The Planner, London, Jan/Feb

Herbert, J, 1982, "The Karachi Experience", in Taylor, J, and Williams, D, (eds), Urban Planning Practice in Developing Countries, Pergamon Press, Oxford, pp 77-122

Jones, G, and Ward, P, 1994 "The World Bank's 'New' Urban Management Programme: Paradigm Shift of Policy Continuity?", Habitat International, Vol 18, No 3

Koenigsberger, O, 1964, "Action Planning", Architectural Association Journal, London, May

Lambeth Borough Council, 1980, Draft Development Plan, Directorate of Development Services, Lambeth Borough Council, London

Manchotte, Marie-Therese, 1997, "APC Towns and European Aid", Villes en developpment, June, no 36, ISTED, Paris

Planning Advisory Group, 1965, The Future of Development Plans, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London

Porter, M, 1987, "Corporate Strategy: the State of Strategic Thinking", The Economist, May 23, London

Safier M., 1974, "Habitat for Development - An Action Planning Approach" Proceedings, RTPI Summer School, RTPI London

Safier, M, 1983, "The Passage to Positive Planning", Habitat International, Pergamon, London, Vol 7, pp 105-116

Safier, M, 1992, "Urban Development: Policy Planning and Management: Practitioners' Perspectives on Public Learning over Three

Decades", Habitat International, Vol 16, No, 2, Oxford

Sinet, A, 1997, "Towns in Sub-Saharan Africa", Villes en Developpment, ISTED, Paris, No 36, June

Sivaramakrishnan, K C and Green, L, 1986 Metropolitan Management: the Asian Experience, Oxford University Press, New York

UNCHS, 1997, The Istanbul Declaration and the Habitat Agenda, UNCHS, Nairobi

UNDP, 1991, Cities, People and Poverty, UNDP, New York, New York

Werna, E, 1995, "The Management of Urban Development, or the Development of Urban Management? Problems and Premises of an Elusive Concept", Cities, Vol 12, No 5

World Bank, 1991, Urban Policy and Economic Development: an Agenda for the 1990s, World Bank, Washington, D C

Zaris, R, Carter, T, and Green, I, 1988, "An Action Plan Approach to Strategic Urban Development Planning", Habitat International, Vol 12, London.