

CP234532 – Planning Theories

Module Name	Planning Theories
Module level, if applicable	Advance BoURP
Code, if applicable	CP234532
Subtitle, if applicable	-
Course, if applicable	Planning Theories
Semester(s) in which the module is taught	5 th Semester
Person responsible for the module	Ardy Maulidy Navastara, ST, MT
Lecturer	Dr. I Dewa Made Frendika Septanaya, ST., MT., M.Sc. Ir. Putu Rudy Satiawan, M.Sc. Putu Gde Ariastita, ST., MT. Siti Nurlaela, ST., M.COM., Ph.D
Language	Indonesian, English
Relation to curriculum	Compulsory Courses for undergraduate program in Urban and Regional Planning
Type of teaching, contact hours	M1: Group discussion M2: Simulation M3: Case study Lecture (Face to face lecture): 1.5 hours x 12 weeks 18 hours per semester
Workload	Regular (2 SKS) Class: 1.5 hours x 12 weeks = 18 Hours Structured activities: 2.83 hours x 12 weeks = 34 hours Independent Study: 2.83 hours x 12 weeks = 34 hours Exam: 1.5 hours x 4 time = 6 hours Total = 92 hours
Credit points	2 SKS ~ 3.2 ECTS
Requirements according to the examination regulations	Registered in this course Minimum 80% attendance in this course
Recommended prerequisites	Introduction to Urban and Regional Planning Planning Process Urban Planning Urban Planning Practice

<p>Module objectives/intended learning outcomes</p>	<p>General knowledge:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Able to understand the theoretical concepts of urban and regional planning in the aspects of urban studies, regional studies, coastal studies, spatial science, planning science, data science, built environment design, infrastructure and transportation systems, environmental management, social systems, economics, management studies, and research /project 2. Able to understand spatial and non-spatial planning methods in decision making in the field of urban and regional planning 3. Able to develop planning concepts and direction plans through the study of strategic issues in the context of cities, regions, coastal areas with an understanding of planning issues through observing and utilizing physical/spatial, social, economic and environmental data 4. Able to compile spatial plans and evaluations that are creative, innovative, sustainable and accommodate public interests whose results are assessed against planning principles and theories and communicate them visually, verbally and in writing that can be accounted for academically <p>Specific knowledge:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students are able to understand the nature of science, the influence of political/non-political ideology, various models and traditions of planning 2. Students are able to analyze various product planning models due to the impact of a paradigm shift 3. Students are able to analyze the challenges and opportunities of planning 4. Students are able to evaluate the spatial planning system in Indonesia 5. Students are able to understand the ethics of the planning profession
<p>Content</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban and planning history 2. Ideological planning 3. Planning models 4. Planning traditions 5. Shifts and the impact in planning practice 6. Planning approach 7. Planning challenges and opportunities 8. Ethics and the role of planner 9. Planning practice in Indonesia 10. Case Studies

<p>Study and examination requirements and forms of examination</p>	<p>4 assessments:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="724 253 1257 864"> <thead> <tr> <th>Evaluation</th> <th>Method</th> <th>Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Weekly Presentation and Discussion</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Planning Paradigm Shifts Analysis</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Role-Play & Simulation</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Spatial Planning Systems Evaluation in Indonesia</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1. <i>Weekly Presentation and Discussion</i> 2. <i>Planning Paradigm Shifts Analysis - week 6-8</i> 3. <i>Role-Play & Simulation - week 12</i> 4. <i>Spatial Planning Systems Evaluation in Indonesia - week 14-16</i></p>	Evaluation	Method	Weight	1	Weekly Presentation and Discussion	40%	2	Planning Paradigm Shifts Analysis	10%	3	Role-Play & Simulation	20%	4	Spatial Planning Systems Evaluation in Indonesia	30%
Evaluation	Method	Weight														
1	Weekly Presentation and Discussion	40%														
2	Planning Paradigm Shifts Analysis	10%														
3	Role-Play & Simulation	20%														
4	Spatial Planning Systems Evaluation in Indonesia	30%														
<p>Media employed</p>	<p>Classical teaching tools with Ms.Word, Powerpoint, LCD, Web Cam.</p>															
<p>Reading list</p>	<p>Main reference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Diktat Teori Perencanaan Allemndinger, P., Jones, T.M.2002. Planning futures: New directions for planning theory. London and New York: Routledge. Allmendinger, P. 2017. Planning theory: 3rd edition. London: Palgrave. Campbell, S., & Fainstein, S.S. 2003. Readings in planning theory 2nd edition. Blackwell: Berlin. Faludi, A. 1973. A reader in planning theory. New York: Pergamon Press. Friedmann, J. 1987. Planning in the Public Domain. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. <p>Supporting reference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Alexander. E.R. 2000. Rationality revisited: Planning paradigms in a post-postmodernist perspective. Journal of Planning Education and Research, vol.19, p. 242 – 256. Allmendinger, P. 2002. Towards a Post-Positivist Typology of Planning Theory. Planning Theory, vol.1(1), p.77-99. 															

3. Allmendinger, P. 2003. Planning in Postmodern Times. Routledge: London.
4. Baeten, G. 2017. Neoliberal planning. In: Gunder, M., Madanipour, A., Watson, V (Eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Planning Theory*. New York: Routledge.
5. Banfield, E.C.1959. Ends and means in planning. In: Faludi, A (Eds.), *A reader in planning theory*, p.139-150. New York: Pergamon Press.
6. Booher, D.E., & Innes, J.E. 2002. Network power in collaborative planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, vol.21, p.221 – 236.
7. Campbell, H. 2012. Planning ethics and rediscovering the idea of planning. *Planning Theory*, vol. 11, 4.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095212442159>
8. Calderon, C., & Westin, M. 2022. Understanding context and its influence on collaborative planning processes: a contribution to communicative planning theory. *International Planning Studies*, vol.26, 1, p. 14-27.
9. Chettiparamb, A. 2006. Metaphors in complexity theory and planning. Sage publication: New Delhi
10. Cooke, P. 1983. Theories of Planning and Spatial Development. London: Hutchinson.
11. Davidoff, P., Reiner, A. T. 1973. A choice theory of planning. In: Faludi, A (Eds.), *A reader in planning theory*, p.11-40. New York: Pergamon Press.
12. Dear, M.J. 1986. Postmodernism planning. *Environment and Planning D: Society and space*, vol. 4, p. 367 – 384.
13. Douay, N. 2018. Urban Planning in the Digital Age. Vol.6, ISTE:London.
14. Faludi, A. 1973. Planning Theory. Oxford: Pergamon.
15. Fainstein, S.S. 2000. New directions in planning theory. *Urban affairs review*, vol.35, 4,
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107808740003500401>
16. Fainsten, S., & DeFilippis, J. 2016. Introduction: The structure and debates of planning theory 4th edition. Wiley.
17. Forester. J. 2000. The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning process. The MIT Press: London.
18. Friedmann, J., Nisbet, R., Gans J,H. 1973. The public interest and community participation: Toward a reconstruction of public philosophy.

	<p>Journal of the American Institute of Planners, vol.39 (1), p.2-12.</p> <p>19. Friedman, J. 2007. Planning theory revisited. <i>European Planning Studies</i>, vol.6, 3.</p> <p>20. Goodchild. B. 1990. Planning and the modern/postmodern debate. <i>The Town Planning Review</i>, vol. 61, 2, p. 119 – 137.</p> <p>21. Harvey, D. 1989. <i>Theurbanexperience</i>. Oxford: Blackwell.</p> <p>22. Healay, P. 1997. <i>Collaborative planning: Shaping place in fragmented communities</i>. MacMillan Press: London.</p> <p>23. Healey, P., McDougall, G.. and Thomas, M.J. (eds). 1979. <i>Planning Theory: Prospects for the 1980s</i>. Oxford: Pergamon Press.</p> <p>24. Hirt, S.A. 2005. Toward Postmodern Urbanism? Evolution of Planning in Cleveland, Ohio. <i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i>, vol.25, p. 27-42.</p> <p>25. Hudalah, D., & Woltjer, J. 2007. Spatial planning system in transitional Indonesia. <i>International Planning Studies</i>, vol. 12, 3, p. 291 – 303.</p> <p>26. Hudson, M.B., Galloway, D.T., and Kaufman L.J. Comparison of Current Planning Theories: Counterparts and Contradictions. <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>, vol. 45(4), p.387-398.</p> <p>27. Innes, J.E. 1995. Planning theory's emerging paradigm: Communicative action and interactive practice. <i>Journal of planning education and research</i>, vol. 14, p. 183 – 189.</p> <p>28. Innes, J.E. 1998. Challenge and creativity in postmodern planning. <i>The Town Planning Review</i>, vol. 69, 2, p. v-ix.</p> <p>29. Innes, J.E. 1998. Information in communicative planning. <i>American Planning Association: Journal of the American Planning Association</i>, p. 52 – 63.</p> <p>30. Innes, J.E. 2007. Planning through consensus building: A new view of the comprehensive planning ideal. <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>, vol. 62, 4, p. 460 – 472.</p> <p>31. Irving, A. 1993. The Modern/ Postmodern Divide and Urban Planning. <i>University of Toronto Quarterly</i>, vol.62 (4), p.474-487.</p> <p>32. Jessop, B. 1997. The entrepreneurial city. Re-imagining localities, redesigning economic governance, or restructuring capital?. In: N. Jewson & Macgregor (Eds.), <i>Transforming cities</i>.</p>
--	--

	<p><i>Contested governance and new spatial divisions</i>, p.28-41. London: Routledge.</p> <p>33. Jon, I. 2020. Pragmatism and contemporary planning theory. Manchester University Press.</p> <p>34. Jon, I. 2020. A manifesto for planning after the coronavirus: Towards planning of care. <i>Planning Theory</i>, vol.19,3, p.329-345.</p> <p>35. Kiernan, J. 1983. Ideology, politics, and planning; reflections on the theory and practice of urban planning. <i>Environment and planning B: Planning and Design</i>, vol.10, p.71-87.</p> <p>36. Monclús, J., & Medina, C.D. 2018. Modern urban planning and modernist urbanism (1930-1950). <i>Urban visions</i>. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-59047-9_4</p> <p>37. Nagy, A, J. 2015. Planning and the public interest. A critical review. <i>Romanian review of regional studies</i>, vol.XI (2).</p> <p>38. Olsen, E.O.2007. Planning theory in a paradigm perspective. <i>Scandinavian housing and planning research</i>, vol.7(2), p. 83-91.</p> <p>39. Oranje, M.T. 2002. Planning and the Postmodern. In: Allmendinger, P. 2002. <i>Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory</i>. Routledge: London.</p> <p>40. Paddison, R. 2001. <i>Handbook of urban studies</i>. SAGE: London.</p> <p>41. Rukmana, D. 2015. The change and transformation of Indonesian spatial planning after Suharto's new order regime: The case of the Jakarta metropolitan area. <i>International Planning Studies</i>, vol. 20, 4, p. 350 – 370.</p> <p>42. Sager, T. 2011. Neo-liberal urban planning policies: A literature survey 1990- 2010. <i>Progress in Planning</i>, vol.76, p.147-199.</p> <p>43. Scott, A.J., Roweis, S.T. 1977. Urban planning in theory and practice: A reappraisal. <i>Environment and planning A: Economy and space</i>, vol.9, p.1097- 1119.</p> <p>44. Suchacek, J. 2008. <i>Territorial Development Reconsidered</i>. MPRA Paper.</p> <p>45. Widodo, T., & Suheri, T. 2015. <i>Teori Perencanaan: Memahami pemikiran teoretisi perencanaan</i>. Inside Publisher: Bandung.</p> <p>46. Yiftachel, O. 1989. Towards a New Typology of Urban Planning Theories: Environment and Planning B. <i>Planning and Design</i>, vol.16, p.23-39.</p>
--	--