

Key Debates in Urban Planning and Policy



Pro-democracy and pro-government protesters confront each other in Hong Kong in 2014 (Reuters / Bobby Yip)

SpringA '21 ARCH 4300GU Barnard and Columbia Colleges Architecture Department
Meetings MWF 1:10-2:25 PM Eastern / ONLINE ONLY
Instructor Nick R. Smith, nrsmith@barnard.edu
Office Hrs TBA (sign-ups at urbanismith.com/teaching)

Course Description:

This advanced seminar explores key debates in contemporary urban planning and policy. Most fundamentally, these debates are about how we make collective decisions regarding shared problems, which arise from our co-inhabitation of urban space. Resolving these debates is not always an either-or proposition—there are multiple shades of gray and multiple potential resolutions. Nor are there necessarily right or wrong answers. The positions one takes in these debates are fundamentally normative—they are shaped by one's place in the world and one's view of it. Nevertheless, these debates require decisions. In urban planning and policy, we are called upon to *act*, not just debate. In this course, we will endeavor to develop informed positions that can help us engage with others to take action.

These debates are not new, nor are they unique to any one place. But their specific articulation varies as a function of historical and geographical context. In this course, we will explore both levels of these debates: we will first discuss them as they have been understood in history and theory, and we will then discuss them with reference to cases drawn from different parts of the world. Specific cases will be selected collectively by the class at the beginning of the semester, and students will develop and present the case study materials in consultation with the instructor. Students are therefore actively involved in the design of the course and are encouraged to bring

their own interests and agendas to the table. (Case studies might address, for instance, policing, school busing, mixed income housing, participatory budgeting, universal basic income, etc.)

This year, the course is being offered in an immersive, online format with an introduction and five one-week modules. Each module will address one debate: preservation versus progress, democracy versus authority, diversity versus identity, plan versus market, and reform versus revolution. In the first meeting of each week, we will explore the debate's general contours; in the second meeting, we will investigate its articulation in a specific case study; and in the third meeting, we will hold an in-class debate.

Prerequisites:

The class is open to juniors, seniors, and graduate students, or with prior permission of the instructor. There are no prerequisites for the class. The class cannot be taken asynchronously.

Student Learning Objectives:

Through full participation in this course, students will develop the following skills:

- *Reflexive Judgment*
Students will learn to weigh rival arguments for and against proposed solutions, discern the reliability and persuasiveness of evidence, and reflexively interrogate their own assumptions, values, and norms. In response to problems with no easy solution, students will have to choose one solution over another and also understand why others might choose the alternative. By repeatedly practicing these skills, students will learn the discipline of situated ethical judgment, preparing them to take active roles as citizens and leaders as their communities face the challenges of the future.
- *Persuasive Argument*
By writing position papers and participating in class debates, students will learn to use persuasive rhetoric and strong arguments to convince others of their positions. This involves recognizing the distinct values and reasoning of others' positions and finding ways to persuade rather than defeat the opposition. These skills provide the basis for achieving shared understanding and taking collective action in a divided world.
- *Impartial Research*
Through the development and presentation of a case study, students will learn to conduct rigorous secondary research that provides a balanced and comprehensive overview of a controversial issue in urban planning and policy, while also making clear what the stakes are and why it matters. This involves the collection, evaluation, and synthesis of relevant materials necessary to arrive at an informed opinion on the case, similar to what might be expected of a policy brief.

Readings

Each week includes approximately 100 pages of required reading. Many of the readings are drawn from the fourth edition of *Readings in Planning Theory* (2016), which is available electronically via CLIO. All other readings will be provided electronically via Canvas.

Weekly Schedule

(In Week 1, the Monday and Wednesday meetings will be used for course set-up. The Friday of Week 1 will be treated as the Monday of Week 2, which includes the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday. The final Monday of Spring A will be used for a retrospective discussion of the course as a whole.)

Mondays:

We will explore how the week's debate has been theorized in urban planning and policy and how it has been articulated in different historical periods and geographical contexts. This will begin with a short lecture from the instructor and continue with a class discussion of the debate's

contradictions, ambiguities, and gray areas. All students are expected to participate actively in discussion.

Wednesdays:

We will investigate how the week's debate has been realized in a specific case study chosen by the class. Case study materials will be developed by a team of students in consultation with the instructor (the case study team will meet with the instructor during the preceding week). Class will begin with a short presentation from the case study team, followed by an open discussion during which students can clarify aspects of the case study, connect the case study to the debate's historical and theoretical background, and explore potential positions on the week's debate. All students are expected to participate actively in discussion.

Fridays:

For each unit, students are required to write a position paper of ~1000 words in response to a proposition regarding the case study under consideration. The paper must take a clear position in response to the proposition, it should actively engage the most important counterarguments, and it should briefly point to the larger implications of the argument advanced. The argument should be specific and well-supported, with evidence drawn from the readings and case study materials (all of which should be cited using the Author-Date format specified in the Chicago Manual of Style). While you are welcome to go beyond this material, you are not asked to do so. The paper should seek to persuade the reader to adopt the chosen position. Position papers should be submitted on CANVAS on Friday at least 90 minutes before class meets. Late position papers will be marked down 5% for each *hour* the paper is late. (Students on the case study team are exempt from submitting a position paper for that week.)

On Friday, we will hold an in-class debate addressing the week's proposition. Students will be randomly assigned to the two sides of the debate. Students will then have several minutes to coordinate their arguments. Prior to class, the only preparation that is necessary is to write the position paper. The two teams will then offer arguments and rebuttals. This is not a debate competition: the objective is not to see how good you are at debating. The debate provides a structure within which to work with your teammates to articulate a common position, craft a substantive argument in support of that position, and critically engage with the arguments of others. By adapting and improving one's own arguments, challenging others' arguments, finding common ground, and even adopting elements of competing arguments, students should aim to persuade others of their position. Following the debate, the members of the case study team will score the debate and provide a brief assessment. Final grades for the debate will be determined by the instructor and will take into account both team and individual performance.

Grading

Position Papers:	4 x 10% per paper	= 40%
Debates:	4 x 10% per debate	= 40%
Case Study:	1 x 10% per case study	= 10%
Participation:	10 x 1% per class session	= 10%

Attendance Policy

Attendance is mandatory at all class meetings. Any student arriving more than twenty minutes after the beginning of class will be marked absent.

Absences due to acute illness, a personal crisis (e.g. a death in the family), religious observance, or for other reasons of comparable gravity may be excused at the discretion of the instructor. In all such cases, students must promptly email the instructor to communicate the reason for their absence and to arrange an opportunity to review any important information they may have missed. Students who know they will miss one or more scheduled classes due to a religious holiday should meet with the instructor during the first week of class to discuss anticipated absences. Unexcused absences, late arrivals, or early departures from class will be deducted from your Participation grade. Three non-consecutive absences will result in a further grade

reduction of one-third (1/3) of one letter grade (e.g., A- to B+).

Late Submission Policy

Students are expected to plan and manage their workloads and to ensure they do not lose work through IT malfunction. Students are expected to submit work on or before the deadlines specified in the syllabus or otherwise announced in class.

Because the Position Papers serve as the basis for the Debates, timely submission is essential. As a result, 5% of the assignment's total possible points will be deducted for each *hour* the assignment is late. If you believe you are going to have a problem submitting an assignment on time, please inform the instructor as far in advance as possible.

Non-Discriminatory Language and Conduct

This course encourages non-discriminatory language and conduct. Students should not use racist, sexist or other discriminatory language in class discussions or written work.

Honor Code

The Barnard Honor Code applies to all students in this class regardless of academic affiliation. Approved by the student body in 1912 and updated in 2016, the Code states:

We, the students of Barnard College, resolve to uphold the honor of the College by engaging with integrity in all of our academic pursuits. We affirm that academic integrity is the honorable creation and presentation of our own work. We acknowledge that it is our responsibility to seek clarification of proper forms of collaboration and use of academic resources in all assignments or exams. We consider academic integrity to include the proper use and care for all print, electronic, or other academic resources. We will respect the rights of others to engage in pursuit of learning in order to uphold our commitment to honor. We pledge to do all that is in our power to create a spirit of honesty and honor for its own sake.

The Barnard Honor Code includes relevant language for the proper use of electronic class material:

We consider academic integrity to include the proper use and care for all print, electronic, or other academic resources.

To be clear, this means that any recorded class content — from lectures, labs, seminars, office hours, and discussion groups — is the intellectual property of your professor and your fellow students, and should not be distributed or shared outside of class.

The Columbia College Honor Code and the Columbia College Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity can be viewed here:

<https://www.college.columbia.edu/honorcode>

<https://www.college.columbia.edu/faculty/resourcesforinstructors/academicintegrity/statement>

Center for Accessibility Resources & Disability Services (CARDS) Statement

If you believe you may encounter barriers to the academic environment due to a documented disability or emerging health challenges, please feel free to contact the instructor and/or the Center for Accessibility Resources & Disability Services (CARDS). Any student with approved academic accommodations is encouraged to contact the instructor during office hours or via email. If you have questions regarding registering a disability or receiving accommodations for the semester, please contact CARDS at (212) 854-4634, cards@barnard.edu, or learn more at barnard.edu/disabilityservices. CARDS is located in 101 Altschul Hall.

Affordable Access to Course Texts Statement

All students deserve to be able to study and make use of course texts and materials regardless of cost. Barnard librarians have partnered with students, faculty, and staff to find ways to increase student access to textbooks. By the first day of advance registration for each term, faculty will have provided information about required texts for each course on CourseWorks (including ISBN or author, title, publisher, copyright date, and price), which can be viewed by students. A number of cost-free or low-cost methods for accessing some types of courses texts are detailed on the Barnard Library Textbook Affordability guide (library.barnard.edu/textbook-affordability). Undergraduate students who identify as first-generation and/or low-income students may check out items from the FLIP lending libraries in the Barnard Library (library.barnard.edu/flip) and in Butler Library for an entire semester. Students may also consult with their professors, the Dean of Studies, and the Financial Aid Office about additional affordable alternatives for having access to course texts. Visit the guide and talk to your professors and your librarian for more details.

Wellness Statement

It is important for undergraduates to recognize and identify the different pressures, burdens, and stressors you may be facing, whether personal, emotional, physical, financial, mental, or academic. We as a community urge you to make yourself—your own health, sanity, and wellness—your priority throughout this term and your career here. Sleep, exercise, and eating well can all be a part of a healthy regimen to cope with stress. Resources exist to support you in several sectors of your life, and we encourage you to make use of them. Should you have any questions about navigating these resources, please visit these sites:

- Barnard Students: <https://barnard.edu/wellwoman/about>
<http://barnard.edu/primarycare>
<https://barnard.edu/about-counseling>
- Columbia Students: <http://www.college.columbia.edu/resources>
- GS Students: <https://gs.columbia.edu/health-and-wellness>
- SEAS Students: <http://gradengineering.columbia.edu/campus-resources>

CLASS SCHEDULE

Introduction

Mon (Jan 11) Planning and Policy in Perspective

Readings in Planning Theory (RiPT). Fainstein, Susan and James DeFilippis. "Introduction: The Structure and Debates of Planning Theory." 1-18.

RiPT. Marcuse, Peter. "The Three Historic Currents of City Planning." 117-132.

Wed (Jan 13) Course Logistics and Selection of Case Studies

Module 1. Preservation versus Renewal

Fri (Jan 15) History and Theory

Webber, Melvin M. 1963. "Comprehensive Planning and Social Responsibility: Toward an AIP Consensus on the Profession's Roles and Purposes." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 29 (4): 232-41.

Moses, Robert. 1942. "What Happened to Haussmann?" *Architectural Forum* 77 (1): 57-66.

Hayden, Dolores. 1997. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. "Place Memory and Urban Preservation." 44-78.

Lynch, Kevin. 1984. *Good City Form*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. "Growth and Conservation." 251-260.

Mon (Jan 18) NO CLASS (Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday)

Wed (Jan 20) Case Study: Bukit Brown, Singapore

Heng, Chye Kiang, and Su-Jan Yeo. 2017. *Urban Planning*. Singapore Chronicles. Singapore: Institute of Policy Studies. "Housing and Mobility." 38-62.

Yuen, Belinda. 2005. "Searching for Place Identity in Singapore." *Habitat International* 29 (2): 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2003.07.002>.

Huang, Jianli. 2014. "Resurgent Spirits of Civil Society Activism: Rediscovering the Bukit Brown Cemetery in Singapore." *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 87 (2): 21-45. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ras.2014.0016>.

Fri (Jan 22) Position Paper and Debate

Module 2. Democracy versus Authority

Mon (Jan 25) History and Theory

RiPT. Scott, James C. "Authoritarian High Modernism." 75-93.

Fishman, Robert. "Revolt of the Urbs: Robert Moses and His Critics." Ballon, Hilary, and Kenneth T. Jackson. 2007. *Robert Moses and the Modern City: The Transformation of New York*. 1st ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. 122-129

Campanella, Thomas J. 2011. "Jane Jacobs and the Death and Life of American Planning." *Places Journal*, April. <https://placesjournal.org/article/jane-jacobs-and-the-death-and-life-of-american-planning/>.

RiPT. Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." 427-442.

Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *American Institute of Planning Journal*, July, 216-24.

Wed (Jan 27) Case Study (TBD)

Fri (Jan 29) Position Paper and Debate

Module 3. Diversity versus Identity

Mon (Feb 1) History and Theory

RiPT. Young, Iris Marion. "Inclusion and Democracy." 389-406.

RiPT. Sandercock, Leonie. "Toward a Cosmopolitan Urbanism: From Theory to Practice." 407-426.

Fainstein, Susan S. 2005. "Cities and Diversity Should We Want It? Can We Plan For It?" *Urban Affairs Review* 41 (1): 3-19.

Hague, Cliff. 2005. "Planning and Place Identity." In *Place Identity, Participation and Planning*, edited by Cliff Hague and Paul Jenkins, 3–18. New York, NY: Routledge

Tiebout, Charles M. 1956. "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures." *Journal of Political Economy* 64 (5): 416–24.

Wed (Feb 3) Case Study (TBD)

Fri (Feb 5) Position Paper and Debate

Module 4. Plan versus Market

Mon (Feb 8) History and Theory

RiPT. Klosterman, Richard E. "Arguments For and Against Planning." 169-186.

Strong, Ann Louise, Daniel R. Mandelker, and Eric Damian Kelly. 1996. "Property Rights and Takings." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62 (1): 5-16.

RiPT. Campbell, Heather, Malcolm Tait, and Craig Watkins. "Is there Space for *Better* Planning in a Neoliberal World? Implications for Planning Practice and Theory." 187-213.

Wed (Feb 10) Case Study (TBD)

Fri (Feb 12) Position Paper and Debate

Module 5. Reform versus Revolution

Mon (Feb 15) History and Theory

Harvey, David. 1985. *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. "On Planning the Ideology of Planning." 165-184.

RiPT. Foglesong, Richard E. "Planning the Capitalist City." 110-116.

RiPT. Miraftab, Faranak. "Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South." 480-498.

Wed (Feb 17) Case Study (TBD)

Fri (Feb 19) Position Paper and Debate

Mon (Feb 22) Retrospective Discussion