

□ URBAN PLANNING
METHODS:
RESEARCH AND
POLICY ANALYSIS

IAN BRACKEN

**□ URBAN PLANNING
METHODS:
RESEARCH AND
POLICY ANALYSIS**

IAN BRACKEN

**METHUEN
LONDON AND NEW YORK**

First published in 1981 by
Methuen & Co. Ltd
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Published in the USA by
Methuen & Co.
in association with Methuen, Inc.
733 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

© 1981 Ian Bracken

Printed in Great Britain by
Thomson Litho Ltd, East Kilbride, Scotland

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Bracken, Ian
Urban planning methods.
1. City planning
I. Title
711'.4 HT166

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Bracken, Ian.
Urban planning methods.

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

1. City planning—Methodology. 2. Municipal
research. 3. Urban policy—Methodology. I. Title.

HT166.B7 307.7'6'072 81-13013

AACR

ISBN 0-416-74860-0

ISBN 0-416-74870-8 Pbk

□ CONTENTS

List of figures	ix
Introduction	1
Part One Urban Planning and Policy Making	
Introduction	9
1 The planning process	11
2 Designs and plan generation	36
3 Evaluation and monitoring	69
Guide to further reading	91
Part Two Methods for Urban Research	
Introduction	99
4 Research theory and designs	102
5 Research concepts and operations	135
6 Urban simulation and prediction	175
Guide to further reading	217
Part Three Methods for Urban Policy Analysis	
Introduction	227
7 Policy study: concepts and problems	230
8 Policy analysis: modes and methods	258
9 Policy and planning: some methodological implications	288
Guide to further reading	318
A concluding comment	323
Appendices	
1 Statistical notes and check list	324
2 Analysis of four-variable non-experimental research design	331
3 Determination of sample size and confidence limits	335
4 Simple matrix methods applied to the analysis of population change	341
5 Input-output analysis: an introductory example	344
6 A regression approach to migration analysis	349
7 Example of a double-constrained gravity model: residence and employment	353
Name index	389
Subject index	397

□ LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Normative and positive activity in planning	18
Figure 1.2	The different modes of urban planning	22
Figure 1.3	Dual processes of urban planning	25
Figure 1.4	Problems and issues in Structure Plans: examples from Welsh authorities	29
Figure 1.5	Conceptual inter-relationships of goals, objectives and policy instruments	32
Figure 2.1	Decision tree of development alternatives	45
Figure 2.2	Decision tree of preference probabilities with and without independence of factors	46
Figure 2.3	Comparison of (a) tree and (b) semi-lattice structures in design and problem solving	49
Figure 2.4	Development potential factors in a sample of Structure Plans	51
Figure 2.5	Summary of development potential calculation	52
Figure 2.6	Convergence of values in the design process	53
Figure 2.7	Classes of design problems	55
Figure 2.8	Factor contributions to a design problem	56
Figure 2.9	A land development problem as strategic choice	57
Figure 2.10	Development action sets	60
Figure 2.11	Degree of commitment alternatives in strategic choice	60
Figure 3.1	Generation-evaluation process with clustered options	71
Figure 4.1	The hypothetico-deductive route to scientific explanation	109
Figure 4.2	The process of theory formulation	113
Figure 4.3	Component stages of theory formulation	113
Figure 4.4	Simple experimental research design	121
Figure 4.5	Four-group experimental research design	122
Figure 4.6	Possible tests for significance in experimental design	122
Figure 4.7	A quasi-experimental research design	124
Figure 4.8	Some possible outcomes for a quasi-experimental research design	125
Figure 5.1	Perception and learning	135
Figure 5.2	Types of sample frame	151
Figure 5.3	The data cube	152
Figure 5.4	The problem of choosing an 'observational' base	153
Figure 5.5	The problem of interval measurement over time	154
Figure 6.1	Linear and non-linear population prediction	178
Figure 6.2	(a) An age and sex structure pyramid of a population (b) A diagram of a simple cohort survival model	180
Figure 6.3	Regression coefficients relating household size to selected socio-economic data	184

X LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 6.4	Typical industrial and service sectors in input-output analysis	189
Figure 6.5	Regression of migration and economic, social and demographic variables	194
Figure 6.6	The migration function and scatter of points around it	196
Figure 6.7	Relationship of trips or journeys, and distance	198
Figure 6.8	An application of the 'gravity' concept	201
Figure 6.9	Two functions relating trips to distance	204
Figure 6.10	Generalized flow chart of the Lowry model	209
Figure 7.1	Policy implementation 'tension' matrix	232
Figure 7.2	Judicial, political and professional components in a planning system	238
Figure 7.3	Influential implementation agencies for Structure Plan policies	242
Figure 7.4	Non-statutory plans and programmes	243
Figure 7.5	Types of coercion, policy and political activity	248
Figure 7.6	A categorization of Structure Plan policy types	253
Figure 8.1	A basic 'methods' framework for policy analysis	264
Figure 8.2	Principles of decision analysis	275
Figure 8.3	Variables as predictors of events	280
Figure 9.1	A forecasting framework for planning	309
Figure A4.1	Population vector of age groups	341
Figure A4.2	Survivorship matrix with survival coefficients	341
Figure A4.3	Population vector pre-multiplied by survivorship and fertility matrix	342
Figure A4.4	Numerical example of a population estimation by matrix methods	343
Figure A5.1	Input-output analysis: a transactions table	345
Figure A6.1	Migration model estimates by three-stage least-squares method	351
Figure A7.1	Example of a double-constrained gravity model	354

□ INTRODUCTION

The objective of this book is to set out a range of established and developing methods relevant to the practice of urban planning.¹ The treatment adopted, at an introductory level, explains the principles which underlie these methods and hence seeks to promote their useful application. A detailed discussion of the theory of more general social research and policy making cannot be attempted, but it is intended that the reader will acquire a sound understanding of the application of methods in rigorous and comparative urban study and socially sensitive urban policy making. However, urban planning methods reflect the diversity of the subject and there is continued debate about their relevance and application within the statutory urban planning processes. This book does not seek primarily to justify a particular approach to urban plan and policy making, but rather to explain a useful range of concepts which will provide the reader with a firm foundation from which to select and apply appropriate methods according to need. However, we suggest that two requirements are general. The first of these relates to the need for the planner to be able to conduct good quality, relevant research into the substantive world with which he must deal, and the second is for him to understand and be able to assess the impacts and effects on the world of the policy-making processes of which he is a part.

The recent history of urban planning shows that the development of these two areas of methodology has not been equal. The importance of analysis and understanding of substantive matters – population change, migration, housing needs, employment trends, transportation and land-use relationships, as ‘inputs’ to the planning process – has long been widely acknowledged. In contrast, attention to policy – its relevance and effectiveness, the ‘instruments’ by which it is effected and so on, that is, the ‘outputs’ of the process – is a much more recent phenomenon among planners, indeed one that is only now generally taking place.

The text is structured in three parts. In the first part, Chapter 1 draws attention to the emergence of strategic urban plan and policy making over the past fifteen years or so and the conceptual and methodological developments. It also reminds readers of the political, administrative, professional and technical contexts within which urban planning is set. Chapters 2 and 3 explain and comment upon the ways in which planners have sought to develop more systematized approaches to strategic plan and policy making, in such tasks as plan design and generation, the

evaluation of alternative courses of action, the need to monitor ongoing change and adapt plans and policies to changing circumstances.

Against this background, Parts 2 and 3 focus upon urban research and policy study respectively. Part 2 concentrates upon how urban affairs may be efficiently and validly studied, so that planners can maximize the quality of their data and information in order that, through analysis, they may obtain explanations about urban phenomena. In this part, Chapter 4 deals with the underlying theory of appropriate research designs; Chapter 5 with aspects of the operationalization of these designs in the urban context, and Chapter 6 discusses established ways in which the particular spatial and aspatial matters of concern to urban planners can be explored, predicted and understood.

In contrast, Part 3 focuses upon urban policy-making processes and outcomes, but as with Part 2, the approach adopted makes clear the developing role of methods available to the planner and their application in systematic analysis. Chapter 7 sets out the basic organization theory and concepts for the study of urban policy and the more important problems to be faced. Chapter 8 deals with the methods by which planners may analyse and obtain insights into the process of policy formulation and its outcomes. Finally, Chapter 9 examines some of the implications of the wider use of policy analytic methods within the urban planning process.

As will now be clear, this text covers a wide field, so that not only has selectivity of material been necessary, but the depth of treatment must also be limited. There is inevitably the danger of 'a little knowledge'. It is intended that the contents will explain and illustrate principles, thereby bringing the reader to an operational threshold in a frame of mind which is, at the same time, both eager to develop a deeper understanding of the methods discussed and critical in their use. To assist further reading, each part of the text concludes with a guide to selected case study material drawn from recent urban planning practice as well as the more usual guide to selected theoretical and applied literature. Although these guides cannot be exhaustive they will provide the reader with a number of 'links' into the more specialized areas of literature. In all cases, the works cited contain bibliographies and, where these are judged to be particularly helpful, additional comment is made.

The merit of this book is derived from the foundation of knowledge upon which it stands and the citations and the bibliography record this indebtedness. It is a recurrent concern of any writer that some acknowledgement to the work of others may have been overlooked or that some viewpoint is misrepresented. Hopefully, this will not be so, but in the event, your author accepts the responsibility. Many persons, too numerous to thank individually, have contributed over the past four years, directly and indirectly, to the writing of this text. It would be, however, quite wrong not to acknowledge more personally the help of valued colleagues who have contributed much to the environment within which the text has been written – notably Michael Batty, Philip Cooke, Clifford Guy, David Hume,

Gareth Rees and Richard Spooner. The numerous drafts of the text were admirably typed by Terry Davies, and Gareth Jones was responsible for the illustrations and helpful ideas on layout.

The remainder of this introduction summarizes some of the basic thinking which guided the preparation of this text. A starting point is to suggest that the reader of urban planning literature will note that the subject not only covers a wide field, but that it reflects a long history of practical concerns and attempted remedies for urban problems. The literature is both descriptive and normative, that is, it describes real-world situations according to particular perspectives *and* offers mainly idealistic remedies as to how a better urban future might be achieved. Urban planning is indeed largely practised in terms of a repertory of conventional wisdom, much of which has been established through these practical and intuitive approaches rather than through theoretical development.

It is also important to note at the outset the influence of the extensive statutory powers granted to urban planners² and the extent and effect of the professionalization of the activity. Whilst this has been effective in serving rather rigid interests and pursuits, a consequence has been the strong tendency for the practice of urban planning to be regarded as an activity 'apart' from discussions as to its purposes and from its emerging theories.

We subscribe to the view that the most important general debate should be about the *purposes* of urban planning, thereby identifying the various modes in which it is possible to conceive and operate an urban planning system. A chosen mode, in turn, will constitute a paradigm, that is, a conceptual framework which, for the time being, can be used to justify the processes and actions by which the planning is undertaken. For it is only within such a framework that a satisfactory choice can be made over the use of the heterogeneous collection of methods which the activity will inevitably comprise. It is not the purpose of this text, however, to argue a detailed ideology for urban planning, for that is well beyond its scope.³ Rather, it is to discuss a limited, though fundamental, range of methods by which urban planning may be enhanced when seen, broadly, as a problem-solving process. This is recognized as a necessarily pragmatic approach and acknowledges the inevitability of disagreement about the purposes of urban planning and hence that there will be periods of popularity for different modes and methods. The approach rests upon assumptions that in some reasonably satisfactory way society wishes, and is able, to identify *relevant* problems of concern, and can choose a mode of planning (that is a set of procedures) within which to seek their amelioration.

It is fundamental to our approach to suggest that answers to problems are more likely to be found, even though they will be partial, by as systematic an attempt as possible to understand their nature *and* the nature of the processes we choose to employ in seeking their solution. As will now be clear, this will involve distinct, but *related*, areas of methodology. First, there are methods through which an understanding of the nature of urban phenomena and problems can be achieved, and these broadly, will involve

adherence to accepted rules of social scientific investigation. Second, there is methodology by which such understanding may be synthesized to lead to plan generation and policy formulation designed to bring about some desirable change through the planning system. Third, there is methodology which addresses the need to analyse policy, and which in turn will 'feed back' learning and understanding as to the relevance and effectiveness of the other areas. As we discuss in Part I, it is the second area of methodology which has received the fullest treatment in urban planning literature. That being so, we choose to reflect upon it rather than offer detailed explanation in the first part of the text. However, if urban planning is to develop a more balanced structure as a process of urban understanding, i.e. the seeking of effective policies and learning,⁴ then a fuller development of a research and a policy analytic capability are fundamental.

Such development has been implicit in the reforms that have taken place in urban planning practice since the mid-1960s – the need for a more flexible, management-like approach to urban planning, the need clearly to define the strategic, policy-based level of plan making (Structure Planning), and the widely recognized need for a more effective dissemination of data and information.⁵ But, further, we will suggest that there is an urgent need in urban planning for explicit, critical and well-conducted research *both* into substantive, procedural and policy aspects of the subject. Research cannot dictate policy, but makes a fundamental contribution through enhanced knowledge of the realities with which policy must deal. Research into substantive matters can make policy more relevant and more efficient. Research can reveal the dynamic nature of important urban phenomena, ignorance of which can preclude the adoption of effective policy measures. Research, through policy analysis, can suggest new alternatives and can reveal conflict and incompatibilities. It can reveal appropriate and inappropriate policy instruments and furthermore, by serving understanding, it can help to ensure that solving one problem will not give rise to a more serious one. Yet urban research and analysis of policy are not neutral activities for, in their turn, they will be founded upon assumptions and choice about relevant issues worthy of study. It is important to recall that the use of methods can never be an end in itself.

At the outset, the meaning of certain terms should be made clear. We must distinguish first 'designing' and 'planning'. The former is used in the general, non-aesthetic sense,⁶ meaning a set of procedures which set out how some particular situation may be achieved. Both terms refer, then, broadly to the same process and are distinguished only in degree. Planning and 'planning decisions' relate to situations in which the level of uncertainty,⁷ or uncontrolled influence, is relatively low. In contrast, the term designing is used for situations in which the level of uncertainty is relatively high. Similarly, a distinction must be made between the use of the term 'policy' and 'plan'. Generally we use the former to refer to 'a deliberate intention', most usually expressed verbally. In contrast, a 'plan' will be more spatially specific and will usually involve a diagrammatic treatment.

Though not definitive, the distinction will avoid ambiguity arising in the course of the text.

Finally, a distinction must be made between methodology and technique. It is a feature of the growing maturity of any subject that both methods and techniques become increasingly precisely defined. In general, techniques develop first and refer to the human actions and the instruments (that is, the design of procedures) by which specific tasks are performed. Methodology on the other hand, refers to the concepts and processes by which selection is made of appropriate techniques, including an explicit justification of purpose. These concepts provide a framework within which techniques can be properly developed, selectively applied and critically evaluated.

Notes

- 1 Throughout the text, this term is used to refer generally to the field of study. Variants such as 'regional planning', 'town planning' or 'rural planning' are subsumed as appropriate without further comment.
- 2 We are, of course, referring to professional planners, elected members of local councils and government here.
- 3 A guide to selected literature is given at the end of Part 1.
- 4 So as in turn, to make revised policies more relevant and effective. Indeed, the whole planning process may readily be conceptualized as a 'learning' process.
- 5 These points relate to only some of the reasons for the reform of the planning system. See later discussions.
- 6 Where necessary, the field of study explicitly concerned with urban aesthetics is referred to as 'urban design'.
- 7 It may also be helpful to consider this in terms of information. A design involves relatively less information than a plan, that is, it will generally have a higher intuitive content.

原书缺页

原书缺页

□ PART ONE

URBAN PLANNING AND POLICY MAKING

□ INTRODUCTION

Before discussing in an introductory way the nature of *urban* planning, it is important to make clear the meaning of planning in a more general sense. Strictly, planning means the setting out of a strategy by which some specified objectives may be met. A social interpretation by Myrdal (1968) for example, suggests that

planning... is a determined effort, through democratic institutions for collective decisions, to make... intensive, comprehensive, and long-range forecasts of future trends ... and to formulate and execute a system of co-ordinated policies framed to have the effect of bending the foreseen trends towards realising our ideals, spelled out in advance as definite goals. (p. 251-2)

As we discuss, however, faced with economic, political and social uncertainty, planners, both generally and in urban fields, have found difficulties in making such 'comprehensive' and 'long-range' estimates with reliability. Fundamentally, planning involves a paradox. To 'plan' means to attempt to be more certain about the future, yet that future is inherently unpredictable. Also, in society generally, there is a basic ambivalence towards planning (Gabor 1963, 1969). For while it is natural for human beings to plan their future activity, for example, to make the best use of time and other resources, society does not appear to want its opportunities limited by detailed prescriptions. Fundamentally, there is a matter of selection as to what are perceived to be the *relevant* concerns of any planning activity.

Myrdal's view, however, usefully makes clear that planning involves societal choice about the future, and that choice implies political activity. In policy terms, planning is about making something happen which would otherwise not have happened or vice versa, and it is the exercise of choice in such situations that is its essential intellectual act (Davidoff and Reiner, 1962). To exercise choice, however, genuinely alternative views of the future must be presented and, in order that selection may be purposeful and deliberate, both a knowledge and understanding of the present and an explicit anticipation of the future consequences of present actions are required.

In practice, choice needs to be exercised at several levels. One concerns the purpose of planning, the criteria by which the purpose is determined and described, and by whom the criteria are selected. A second level

concerns the fact that most situations which require planning are, by their nature, more or less complex, and therefore choice needs to be exercised over how, of many possible ways, a particular objective can be achieved. A third area recognizes that, to be effective, planning needs to be translated into action through policies and that choice will be required as to the way in which the activity can be guided over periods of time towards the achievement of objectives. This will further require choice to be made about the allocation of the necessary resources.

The purpose of planning, in a general sense, normally rests upon two concepts which serve as rather general aims. They are not always complementary. The first, the pursuit of *efficiency*, concerns the desire for careful management of resources. This efficiency can, however, only be measured in terms of the purposes which the planning serves. As we discuss, in a social context, this can ultimately only be defined in terms of values held within a society. Efficiency has been associated traditionally with the second concept, that is *rationality*. This is usually defined in terms of 'reasonableness' in the exercise of choice, and 'comprehensiveness' by which an adequate understanding of the nature of the problems has been achieved.

Clearly, other than in trivial situations, complete rationality is impossible to obtain. The problems, for example, in acquiring a full knowledge of any human situation or social system are immense. A more commonly accepted notion is that of bounded rationality (Kaplan, 1964) which essentially focuses upon the reasonableness or fairness of decision making. In practice, this involves the provision of relevant information to decision makers about what exists in the world and what may be expected under certain *specified* conditions. In turn, this allows 'political' decisions to be made.

Experience of planning has shown that a strategy which is based upon knowledge and understanding is more likely to be sound than one based on speculation and intuition. Planning has therefore become synonymous, not only with the preparation of a strategy, but also with the acquisition of an adequate base of information and intelligence which makes understanding possible. However, it is also this understanding that permits the identification of problems and therefore the formulation of objectives. This raises an important issue, because what is *sought* in a given situation not only provides a context for its study (and hence understanding), but it also moulds perceptions by which the *relevant* concerns to a given problem situation tend to be determined. Planning has additionally acquired the connotation of guiding a selected strategy towards some desired objective over time. This may be achieved by influence and persuasion or by direct control, such as statutory powers.

As a result, the activity of planning can be readily conceptualized as some kind of process with discrete stages, though as we will discuss, this has too frequently led to the assumption that these stages are independent of each other. In turning to discuss the nature of urban planning we can usefully begin by examining how the activity has been increasingly systematized under an emerging 'process' view.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Changing attitudes in urban planning

Urban planning has, for a long time, been seen implicitly as a 'process'¹ of professional activity though, until the mid-1960s, it was practised principally as an art form within a traditional design context. Its purpose was seen mainly in the promotion of new development that was aesthetically pleasing and which complied with certain standards of layout. This purpose was broadly carried forward from the public health and housing reforms of the previous century enforced through an extensive set of statutory controls. Gradually, this pursuit has developed into a more general concern for amenity set in a context of rather covert assumptions about 'service to the public interest'. An inevitable development was that this pursuit of amenity became increasingly concerned with attempting to ensure that the hindrances and annoyances created by the actions of one individual, or group, or social sector, minimally imposed upon the interests, that is, the amenity of others. Urban planning, then, became concerned with attempting to resolve conflict over needs and actions between members of society.

In order to provide guidance, and indeed to justify these pursuits, physical land-use plans in a variety of forms have been employed. Their rationale lay broadly in a belief that it was possible to achieve pleasant and efficient environments through control over physical layout. This general approach was supplemented by a further belief in the relevance of a 'set of standards' which could be used to specify suitable guidelines for that layout. The origins of this stemmed from the work of the urban reformers, philanthropists and 'utopians' of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.²

As urban planning became more comprehensive, largely through the acquisition of greater statutory powers³ and growing confidence on the part of planners, a further pursuit emerged. This was a search for urban efficiency defined in functional terms, that is, a concern with the operations and workings of the urban system as a whole. To this was linked a traditional, though somewhat latent, concern about the 'efficient' use of resources and particularly land. This aim has also been pursued through extensive physical statutory control. Increasingly, however, shortcomings were revealed. First, there was shown to be an inadequate understanding of the complexity and dynamic nature of urban issues. Second, there was a