

EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN LAND USE PLANNING: ANALYSIS FROM HUMAN ACTION THEORY PERSPECTIVE

Kwasi Gyau BAFFOUR AWUAH

University of the West of England, Bristol, Coldharbour Lane Bristol, BS16 1QY, United Kingdom

Kwasi.Baffourawuah@uwe.ac.uk

Felix N. HAMMOND

University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton, WV1 1LY, United Kingdom

f.hammond@wlv.ac.uk

Colin A. BOOTH

University of the West of England, Bristol, Coldharbour Lane Bristol, BS16 1Q, United Kingdom

colin.booth@uwe.a.uk

Jessica E. LAMOND

University of the West of England, Bristol, Coldharbour Lane Bristol, BS16 1Q, United Kingdom

jessica.lamond@uwe.ac.uk

Abstract

While numerous literature discuss urban land use planning theory, it is still unclear the framework that should drive planning practice signifying the need for further interrogation of the subject. This work analyses evolution and development of planning from the human action theory standpoint, drawing on experiences from the UK, Japan and sub-Saharan Africa in the extant literature. It is established that evolution of planning and its practice over time, although uneven across these areas, are rooted in human action. To ensure that planning contributes to addressing the sustainable development challenges confronting the world today, there is a need for planning design regimes and their practice to include human action - incentives

Keywords: evolution, development, urban land use planning, human action theory

1. INTRODUCTION

Cities are the future of the twenty-first century (Brown, 2012). Their contribution in socio-economic development is widely acknowledged (Cohen, 2006; UN-Habitat, 2009). Cities and urban areas generate more than 80% of the global Gross Domestic Product (McKinsey Global Institute, 2012). Statistics also show that cities in Europe account for 80% of energy use and 85% of the continent's

Gross Domestic Product (Barroso, 2012). Indeed, the city hypothesis premised on urban economics theory, which has a long historical antecedent postulates that cities propel economic growth and development through multiplier agglomeration of people and economic activities (Marshall, 1890; Park et al., 1925; Hirsch, 1973).

Consistent, however, with the city hypothesis there are also many problems of urban growth (Baffour Awuah et al., 2014). Cities in the world are currently confronted with sustainable development challenges and other urban problems. The litany of challenges and problems include: rapid urbanisation; climate change; environmental pollution and degradation; resource depletion; unsustainable nature of urban form; social injustice; spatial segregation; inequitable distribution of resources and services; unemployment; poverty; traffic congestion; and urban sprawl and fragmentation (Roy, 2009; Abukhater, 2009; Bart, 2010; Brown, 2012). Estimates suggest that more than 50% of the world population at present live in cities. This is expected to increase to about 70% by 2050. Meanwhile, over 1 billion of the world's population live in urban slums with no water or sanitation. This population is equally anticipated to increase to 2 billion by 2030 (Brown, 2012). In the USA, 10 massive climate change impact with an estimated cost of over 1 billion dollars apart from deaths was reported in 2011 (Mathews, 2012). This is beside recent environmental challenges in other parts of the world, such as the recent Japanese tsunami and the earthquake in Haiti, which demonstrate the severe effect – flooding, storms and earthquakes that natural hazard can have on cities and urban areas.

Against the foregoing backdrop, concern for sustainable development and management of urban areas is rife in both global north and south (Cohen, 2006; UN-Habitat, 2009). This idea of sustainability emerged from the publication by the World Commission on Environment and Development titled: *Our Common Future* in 1987 (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987 p8) explains sustainable development to mean development that meets the needs of present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to attain their needs. Although the concept has been applied and interpreted severally (Williams and Millington, 2004; Redclift, 2005), sustainable development in the context of cities and urban areas implies creating livable cities and urban centres that reconcile the conflicts among economic development, ecological preservation and intergenerational equity (Godschalk, 2004). Sustainability, thus, hinges on economic, ecological, social and cultural pillars, and forms a dynamic balancing by which society exploits the environment, create wealth and fulfill social needs (Stahel, 2011).

Land use planning is widely offered as an appropriate tool to drive sustainable development (Godschalk, 2004; UN-Habitat, 2009; Watson, 2009a; Roy, 2009; Bart, 2010). Critical to the success of land use planning creating such livable cities and urban centres is the lens through which planning is conceptualised and practiced (Godschalk, 2004). Campbell and Fainstein (2003) argue that a robust and appropriate underpinning theory is fundamental to planning since it always provides a basis for reference. Abukhater (2009) also notes that theory in general provides: 1. A frame of reference; 2. A system of knowledge organisation to clearly delineate the boundaries and parameters for each distinct subject purposely for constituting a knowledgebase for the development of future research and development of a field; and 3. A basis for building on past theories developed as a reaction against previous and existing thinking and practice. Abukhater (2009) further observes that planning is unique due to the difficulty in defining the discipline, which is manifested by the various interests pursued by planners. These various interests create tensions and sometimes an overlap between planning and other fields of study. Connected to this, is also the lack of indigenous planning theory, which has resulted in planning borrowing ideas and principles from other disciplines with the effect that the role, purpose and tasks of planning as a profession are usually unclear (Allmendinger, 2002; Allmendinger and Haughton 2012). Consequently, a well-defined planning theory as a component part of the planning profession is imperative.

Additionally, Abukhater (2009) recognises that planning theories may mean different things to different people, and while planning theory is generally perceived as useless by practitioners, academics see it as a very important component of the profession. This, in part, contributes to the present gap between theory and practice, which is compounded by the lack of appropriate planning theories. As such, a well-defined planning theory is needed to close the gap by serving as a vehicle to enhance the ability of planners to comprehensively address important practical issues based on a holistic appreciation of the larger picture within which the issues are often generated and evolved.

Given the foregoing, this paper based on a review of the extant literature conceptualises evolution and development of land use planning using insights from the Austrian economics theory of human action. The aim is to contribute to the efforts at building an appropriate planning theory for the advancement of the planning profession. Apart from the useful practical insights it offers, the human action theory also enables planning policy analyses to be undertaken from individual perspective with the view to contributing to the wider policy debate. It is argued that evolution and development of urban land use planning are driven by human action - incentives.

The analysis is based on a purely historical approach and focuses on the United Kingdom (UK), Japan and sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The choice of the three areas was informed by the different ways by

which planning was instituted in these jurisdictions as well as the different motivations that drove it. For example, while planning was introduced in the UK to correct market failure like most of the Western European countries, it was to drive development in Japan. Conversely, it was to aid exploitation of resources by European colonialists in SSA. Besides enriching the discussion, the selected areas also clearly illuminate the workings of the human action theory. It is further acknowledged that any analysis, which tend to treat SSA as a single unit of analysis runs the risk of making an over generalisation. Nonetheless, there are equally similar political and socio-economic structures, such as the planning regimes bequeathed to constituent economies by colonialism, which with the exception of Republic of South Africa, makes it suitable to analyse the region as a single unit (Mamdani, 1996; Watson, 2002). The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. First, some theoretical positions on land use planning are examined after which the human action theory is outlined and discussed. Second, the theory is applied to evolution and development of land use planning and then conclusions drawn are at the end.

2. LAND USE PLANNING – A THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

Planning practice is heterogeneous (Abukhater, 2009) so is defining planning theory intriguing. However, planning theory, in general, seeks to address the goals, form, procedure and justification for urban land use planning (Pennington, 2000; Campbell and Fainstein, 2003; Lai, 2005). Following its inception, formal land use planning was based on the modernist rational comprehensive model (Naess, 2001; Rakodi, 2001; Campbell and Fainstein, 2003; Thompson, 2007). The rational comprehensive planning model fundamentally operates from the standpoint that, planning is essentially a technocratic activity and the professional planner is presumed to be an objective expert (Heikkila, 2000; Rakodi, 2001). It proceeds with situation analysis based on which a problem is identified and planning goals set. This is then followed by determination and evaluation of alternative courses of action for addressing the identified problem. Next is the selection and implementation of appropriate course of action. The final stage is monitoring of implementation of the course of action to ascertain whether or not the planning goals set at the outset are being achieved if not the whole process commences once again. The operation of the rational comprehensive planning model is therefore cast in a cyclical mode (Ratcliffe, 1983; Egbu, 2007). This planning model is also based on land use segregation concept, which is underpinned by unifunctional land use, discrete zoning, regulation and consensus, and the use of master plans (Afrane, 1993; Lai, 1994; Njoh, 2009). Government funds planning projects and it is assumed that its decisions are always in the best interest of society (Rakodi, 2001).

The rational comprehensive planning model is often criticised as too technocratic and does not take into account the socio-economic, cultural and political context within which planning is conceived and practiced (Naess, 2001; Campbell and Fainstein, 2003; Thompson, 2007). As such, over the years, in particular, since the 1980s, there has been proliferation of works on planning theory. These works have sought to examine planning from several disciplines such as economics, political economy and sociology (Allmendinger, 2002). Emerging out of these works have been several planning theories and models like multi-culturalist, the just city, new urbanism and collaborative planning models (Allmendinger, 2002; Watson, 2002; Campbell and Fainstein, 2003; Harrison, 2006). These planning theories and models predominantly attempt to introduce democracy into planning practice through larger stakeholder participation in the planning process. However, the one which has comparatively gained acceptance and seems to be driving planning practice across the globe is the collaborative planning model (Naess, 2001; Agger and Lofgren, 2008; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2012). A brief discussion of the model is, therefore, necessary.

The collaborative planning model also known as the communicative planning hinges on American pragmatism as developed in the thoughts of John Dewey and Richard Rorty, and Jurgen Habermas's communication rationality idea (Watson, 2002; Campbell and Fainstein, 2003). As noted previously, this planning paradigm posits the adoption of democracy in planning through citizens, interest groups and other stakeholders' participation in the planning process. It, thus, subscribes to creating a medium for these players to form arguments, debate differences, exchange ideas towards understanding and negotiating proposals to arrive at a consensus on particular goal(s) and course of action. The planner's role in this process is more of a facilitator, negotiator and experiential learner to contribute to building consensus instead of determining goals and framing blue prints plans (Harley, 1996, 2003; Agger and Lofgren, 2008). Although this planning model attempts to bring on board diverse interests as well as place emphasis on the value of local experience, it has not gone without criticism (see Huxley and Yiftachel, 2000; Naess, 2001; Agger and Lofgren, 2008; Purcell, 2009; Lovering, 2009). For example, Agger and Lofgren (2008) point out that this planning model does not provide a basis for the determination of how deliberative a planning process is. Besides, there is the likelihood that sub-standard planning projects will be delivered without express decisions from experts in certain cases (Naess, 2001). This was the situation with some community projects in India (Friedmann, 2005). Most important, in a world full of unbalanced power relationships it is debatable whether this planning model will not rather advance the interest of the powerful in society at the detriment of the marginalised. Indeed, in developing regions like SSA Home (2012 p42) observes that the marginalised like the poor are generally pre-occupied with day-to-day existence, rather than engaged with time-consuming

solidarity activities such as deliberative planning process while outside elites may manipulate the process to their own advantage.

Nonetheless, unlike rational comprehensive planning model where government and its agents set planning goals and prescribe the form and procedure for planning practice, these issues are supposed to be determined by wider stakeholder interests in society through deliberation and negotiations under the collaborative planning model. That said, from the economics perspective, the goal, justification, form and procedure for planning intervention through regulation of the urban property market, are diverse and unclear. Economic theory suggests that for society to achieve growth and development, resources including land must be allocated efficiently (Harrison, 1977; Kula, 1997; Corkindale, 2004). While the definition for efficient allocation of resource is open to debate, the most widely acknowledged definition is the one given by Vilfredo Pareto (1843-1923). This definition states that resources are efficiently allocated if at least it improves the welfare of one person in a society without making another person worse off (Kula, 1997; Corkindale, 2004).

Neo-classical economics theory suggests that pure price operated markets are the appropriate mechanisms to promote efficient allocation of resources (Smith, 1776; Klosterman, 2003; Adams, 2008). However, real markets are not efficient and might never be efficient (Pigou, 1932; Harrison, 1977; Klosterman, 2003; Evans, 2003; Lichfield et al., 2003; Fainstein, 2003; Lai, 2005). This is often described as market failure. In the land and property market, this failure is associated with adverse externalities such as incompatible land uses, environmental degradation and non-provision of public goods like parks (Harrison, 1977; Klosterman, 2003; Baffour Awuah, 2013). Therefore, economic justification for urban land use planning and indeed any form of government intervention in urban property market was fundamentally constructed on Pigou's welfare economic orthodoxy of market failure. This has been expanded and popularised by the likes of Klosterman (2003), Cheshire and Shepherd (2002, 2004), Fainstein (2003), Lichfield et al. (2003), Adams et al. (2005), Adams (2008), and Qian (2010).

This traditional welfare argument is criticised severally on its claims regarding promotion of public interest (Campbell and Marshall, 2002; Lai, 2005). For example, the idea of public regulation of the property market from the welfare economics standpoint hinges on the presumption that the public authority assigned with the responsibility for regulation will at the very least act in the best interest of society (Bertaud and Malpezzi, 2001; Khakee, 2003). What if this public authority fails to act in the best interest of society? In any event if the public authority is even desirous of acting in the interest of society what about a situation where it does not have knowledge of society's land use requirements?

Following insights from Coase (1960) and others such as Alchian (1967) and Alchian and Demsetz (1973), it is now emerging that market failure itself is caused by the existence or magnitude of transaction cost (Baffour Awuah, 2013). The need for creation of institutions such as clearly defined property rights to provide adequate information to aid market transactions is, thus, regarded as necessary to reduce transaction cost and, therefore, one of the solutions to the market failure problem (North, 1997; Stiglitz, 2001). Thus, planning intervention is now being justified on the basis of creating institutions such as user rights, lot sizes and description to provide information to aid the performance of the urban property market (Buitelaar, 2004; Lai, 2005; Musole, 2009).

That notwithstanding, it is argued that planning intervention as a means to redress lack of perfect information and, in part, market failure is untenable. This is because planners themselves have inadequate knowledge of society's land resource needs (Hayek, 1944;1983; Lavoie, 1985; Pennington, 2000; Staley, 2004). Lavoie (1985), for example, intimates that knowledge comes in two forms namely articulate and inarticulate. While articulate knowledge is information that can be objectively ascertained and accessed through media such as market surveys and interview guides, inarticulate knowledge also known as implicit knowledge reflects complexities of consumer behaviour. Therefore, it is not easy to ascertain. Others from the public choice economics scholarship also argue that planning intervention stems from the need to promote private interest rather than to pursue the general good of society (see Stigler, 1974; Posner, 1974; Niskanen, 1994; Evans, 2003; Quigley, 2007; Carnis, 2009).

Given the foregoing, it remains unclear the rationale and justification for planning intervention and, therefore, the form and procedure by which it should be exercised. Nonetheless, the general relevance of urban land use planning as a tool for socio-economic development is undisputed. Even ardent market advocates such as Hayek (1944, 1983), Friedman (1962) and Mundell (1968) advocate for some form of central planning although they persistently warn against supplanting the market with central planning (Baffour Awuah, 2013). Hayek (1944 p40), for example, notes that:

“Thus neither the provision of signposts on the roads, nor, in most circumstances, that of the roads themselves, can be paid for by every individual user. Nor can certain harmful effects of deforestation, or of some methods of farming, or of smoke and noise of factories, be confined to the owner of the property in question or to those who are willing to submit to the damage for an agreed compensation. In such instance we must find some substitute for the regulation by the price mechanism.”

Clearly, Hayek from the above quotation was advocating for some form of central planning. This, therefore, requires that evolution and development of land use planning be appropriately conceptualised

as part of the determination of the motivation and justification for planning in the quest to fashion-out a suitable theory to drive planning practice.

Economics doctrine postulates that human beings act on the basis of incentives (O'Sullivan and Sheffrin, 2007; Mankiw, 2011). This presupposes that planning intervention is promoted on the basis of incentives. What constitutes incentives at a particular time and place is often milky (Pejovich, 1999; Buitelaar, 2011). The Austrian economics theory of human action, however, offers a practical and an effective explanation of incentives and the mechanics for its operation. The theory is, therefore, employed as a lens to conceptualise evolution and development of urban land use planning.

3. THE THEORY OF HUMAN ACTION

The human action theory emerged from a branch of political economy often referred to as Austrian economics, as a praxeological concept (Mises, 1949; Rothbard, 2004; Carnis, 2009). It is said that the theory was connected to the 1870s economic revolution by Menger (1871), Jevons (1871), and Walras (1877) (Smith, 1999; Rothbard, 2004), but it took the work of Mises (1949) for insights of the theory to be formally presented as an integrated theory (Baffour Awuah et al., 2011). The theory holds that every human being acts, and acts instinctively in an economical manner to achieve what he or she desires (Mises, 1949; Rothbard, 2004; Baffour Awuah et al., 2011). For example, a residential property owner faced with a threat of adverse externality such as pollution from a nearby factory or lack of access road to the property will act in the cheapest way possible to address the problem. Thus, the theory postulates that economic schemes should focus on individuals rather than on groups such as companies since groups do not have independent existence of their own. Rather, groups are collections of individuals and there is nothing like group or collective actions which are not pursued by actions of specific individuals (Mises, 1949; Rothbard, 2004; Kinsella and Tinsley, 2004; Facchini, 2007). This presupposes that the conception of land use planning and its implementation are traceable to some individuals and any analysis on them should focus on such individuals. To this extent, therefore, evolution and development of land use planning intervention as government action should be analysed from the viewpoint of individuals who constitute government after all it is these individuals who enter into some form of agreement with others and in this case citizens of society to act on their behalf (Mises, 1949; Greaves, 1949). For example, an exercise of action by a president of a country by say assenting to a bill on land use planning for it to become law is under normal circumstance deemed to have been done on behalf of the country's citizens.

Human action is defined as a deliberate use of 'means' to achieve a desirable state of affairs referred to as 'ends', which will otherwise not occur without such deliberate application of 'means' (Mises, 1949; Baird, 1998; Hülsmann, 2004; Rothbard, 2004). This act is distinguishable from mere behaviours such as individual's physical movements, which are undertaken unintentionally and do not reflect any purpose (Kinsella and Tinsley, 2004; Hülsmann, 2004; Facchini, 2007). This means that human action takes place within a 'means' and 'ends' framework, and the rationale is to substitute a more satisfactory state of affairs for less satisfactory of affairs (Menger, 1871; Mises, 1949; Greaves, 1949; Baird, 1998; Rothbard, 2004). In the context of this paper, it suggests that land use planning is a 'means' to achieve a desirable 'ends'.

As intimated earlier, a basic doctrine in economics postulates that human beings act on the basis of incentives. Thus, contingent upon human action is the need for incentives. Since human action occurs within a 'means' and 'ends' framework, individuals intuitively compare the value of 'ends' with the value of 'means' or 'resources' used up or to be used in action. The positive difference between the values of 'ends' sought by action and the 'means' deployed to accomplish action, constitutes the prime incentives that drive action (Mises, 1949; Baird, 1998; Rothbard, 2004). The value of the 'means' is known as cost while that of the 'ends' is referred to as benefit (Mises, 1949; Rothbard, 2004). This suggests that land use planning institutionalisation is a form of human action and it is undertaken because its benefit from the standpoint of individuals who constitute government is more than the cost. Thus, planning intervention provides incentives. The point of interest is that human beings speculate either by actual calculation or perception to determine the existence or otherwise of incentives (Mises, 1949; Greaves, 1949; Rothbard, 2004). For example, the USA is known for protection and preservation of private property rights based on its market oriented philosophy. In fact, with the exception of the right of eminent domain clause in the USA Constitution, which ordinarily allowed for acquisition of private property, intervention of the Federal Government in the urban property market was limited (Pena, 2002; Schmidt and Buehler, 2007). However, with unbridled market activities, which resulted in adverse externalities, zoning was introduced in the 1920s. When a suit was brought before the supreme court in *Village of Euclid, Ohio v. Ambler Realty Co.*, 272 U.S. 365 (1926) challenging the constitutionality of zoning on the grounds that it is an infringement on private property rights, it was ruled that zoning was constitutional (Dale and McLaughlin, 1999). This reflects the perceived net gains of zoning on the part of the USA authorities and, therefore, incentives for zoning intervention. This net gain may not necessarily be monetary gains. It may vary depending on the standpoint of actors.

Since situations and individuals who also constitute government change over time the 'ends' to which land use planning is directed may change with time and from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. For example,

since 1980 land use planning in Australia has been marketised (Gleeson and Low, 2000; Freestone, 2007; Williams, 2007a; 2007b). The rationale among others things is to be competitive in a globalised world to attract private capital for development of infrastructure and other social services. These 'ends' are different from the era before the 1980s when these services were provided by the state and planning was to protect citizens against the vagaries of the market (Gleeson and Low, 2000; Williams, 2007a). Similarly, because individuals may perceive cost and benefit of action differently they are often said to be relative and subjective (Lai, 2005; Egbu et al., 2008). However, this observation may not be different from many other theoretical frameworks. For example, the welfare economics thinking proceeds on the conceptual basis that social welfare is determined through summation of individuals' utilities and dis-utilities. These individual utilities and dis-utilities are determined by individuals themselves. Besides, objectivity usually commences from subjectivity (Kim, 2009) and that subjectivity is not an affront to policy formulation. Rather, proxies can be developed to extract individual benefits and costs, and using statistics common trends can be established for policy purposes.

To the extent that the 'ends' to which land use planning intervention is directed may differ over time so could the form and the procedure for planning intervention. That aside, the human action theory further states that 'means' in actual sense exists in the universe as elements and not as 'means' properly so called. It is only when human beings are able to conceive these existing elements in the universe as important or relevant to the achievement of 'ends' that they become 'means' (Mises, 1949; Greaves, 1949; Rothbard, 2004). Thus, it is the ability of human beings to establish a cause and effect relationship between elements in the universe and the 'ends' they are desirous of attaining. In production, this is equivalent to discovering technology (Rothbard, 2004). As applied to this study, it presupposes that land use planning itself may not be a 'means' for the achievement of a desired 'ends', for example, correcting market failure through provision of public parks unless individuals constituting government establish a causal relevance between land use planning and correction of market failure. Underneath this is the knowledge of those individuals, which could translate into discovering new form and procedure for planning intervention.

It can, thus, be surmised from the foregoing that human action is driven by incentives, which is determined by speculation of the positive difference between the values of 'means' and 'ends'. However, the 'means' used to achieve 'ends' are discovered only when human beings are able to establish a cause and effect relationship between them and the 'ends' sought. This means that where 'means' are not discovered there cannot be incentives, and without incentives action cannot also be instituted. Where 'means' are even discovered, but are not available action cannot take place since it

signifies the lack of incentives. As applied to this paper, the logic is that land use planning intervention and its form are determined by incentives.

Apart from being the cornerstone of Austrian economics (Bratland, 2000; Kinsella and Tinsley, 2004), insights from human action have been applied in several fields such as legal theorising (Kinsella and Tinsley, 2004) and political ethics (Hoppe, 1989). Kinsella and Tinsley (2004) as applied to legal theorising, for example, demonstrate that establishing culpability with respect to causation and aggression is rooted in human action. In murder cases, for instance, two fundamental issues are usually supposed to be proved. First, there must be 'mens rea' – wicked intention to commit the act that is, the murder, which is also known as malice aforethought. The second issue is 'actus reus', which is the murder itself. Thus, before culpability for murder can be proved, it should be established that the culprit deliberately or intentionally wanted the victim dead, which is traced to a reason, the value of which constitutes the culprit's 'ends'. To do so, a 'means' must be found. This could be a gun, which he or she used himself/herself or by hiring assassins. However, murderers usually place much more premium on the reason ('ends') than the 'means' or resources used in committing murder. This constitutes incentives for them to commit murder. Kinsella and Tinsley (2004), therefore, observe that the courts usually examine these issues, which is a reflection of a form of human action.

More recently, Baffour Awuah et al. (2011) used insights from the theory to examine compliance with land use planning regulations in SSA. The study conceptualised compliance with planning regulation by land users as a form of human action, which is based on incentives – individual land users should be aware of regulations, perceive them as relevant to their socio-economic development, speculate a positive difference between the benefit and cost of compliance with regulations and have the 'means' (resources) to meet the cost. The logic of the analysis was that where planning regimes in the region provide incentives to land users, compliance with their regulations will be high and the outcome of the region's planning systems will be manifested by orderly developments with provision of the necessary infrastructure and amenities. However, this is the first time the theory is being applied to evolution and development of urban land use planning. This is even more imperative given that the application examines planning in three different jurisdictions at a time when the call for academic development of a research field in which the planning systems of various countries particularly those of global north and south at various times are compared and related to their socio-historical backgrounds (Watanabe, 1980) is yet to be fully achieved.

4. EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN LAND USE PLANNING AND HUMAN ACTION

Land use planning is said to be as old as human settlement itself (UN-Habitat, 2009). Nonetheless, formal land use planning emerged in the Western world during the nineteenth century and spread across the globe through importation of planning ideas and colonialism (Watanabe, 1980; Nadin and Stead, 2008; Watson, 2009a; 2009b; Baffour Awuah, 2013). The emergence and spread of planning ideas were distinct among nation-states and have been discussed based on different time periods in the literature. Watanabe (1980), for example, classified Japanese land use planning history into four main epochs namely: the Meiji (1868-1912); Taisho-Early Showa (1912-30); Wartime (1930-45); and Post-War (1945-present). However, three time periods form the basis for discussion in this paper. These are the origins of land use planning in the various jurisdictions that constitute the subject matter of this paper up to 1959, the period from 1960-1979, and the 1980s and beyond. These periods were chosen because they mark major turning points in land use planning history.

4.1 *Origins of Urban Land Use Planning – Before 1960*

The UK

The origins of land use planning in the UK are traced to the nineteenth century industrial and agricultural revolutions (Simpson et al., 1989). These events led to uncontrolled growth of urban areas. The market's response to the situation was inadequate and resulted in unfit housing situation. This period was characterised by a number of social and environmental ills including: pollution of residential areas; emergence of slums and houses with poor water and sewerage services; small houses with damp and poor ventilation; and over-crowding (Simpson et al., 1989; Cullingworth, 1997; Hall, 2002; Boelens, 2006; Mullins and Murie, 2006). Although regulations such as the (1830) Public Health Act, (1848) Public Health Act, (1851) Labouring Classes' Lodging Houses Act and (1866) Labouring Classes' Dwelling Houses Act were promulgated to address some of these social and environmental ills, there was virtual inaction on the part of government (Simpson et al., 1989; Mullins and Murie, 2006). Indeed, a report by the Royal Sanitary Commission in (1871) suggests that powers that were given to public officials under the acts to address the then prevailing insanitary conditions were not being used (Mullins and Murie, 2006). Excepting the permissive nature of the acts and uncoordinated government institutions, Mullins and Murie (2006) explain further that the inaction stemmed from two main reasons. These were: the high cost of government intervention; and the unwillingness of government to distort the operations of the market. This presupposes that intervention at that time was perceived by individuals in government as costly – human and material resources required and interfering with

market operations compared to the benefits it would have brought, a reflection of a form of human action.

Voluntary efforts to stimulate philanthropy and working class self-help through new initiatives in urban control, civic design and rural rehabilitation such as the Ebenezer Howard' Garden City concept to address the social and environmental ills occurred around the latter part of the nineteenth century (Simpson et al., 1989; Malpass, 2000). A number of regulations were also passed during this period to help address the problem by setting proper standards for housing. These included the Health Acts of (1872), (1875) and (1890), and the (1890) Housing the Working Class Act. However, these acts especially the (1890) Housing the Working Class Act – it gave local authorities power to build housing for general needs, were promulgated following the agitations and threats of civil strife from the Labour Movement, which was formed at that time (Mullins and Murie, 2006). It can, thus, be surmised that government intervention was identified as a 'means', which was perceived as less costly to curtail civil strife, provide somewhat good urban environmental conditions for the working class and most importantly ensure that individuals in government remain in power – 'ends'. In fact, the prescriptions of the Garden City Movements and other similar recommendations were expected to be cheap to have a statutory basis.

Even so, the preceding efforts were not enough to address the socio-economic conditions that confronted the country. According to Simpson et al. (1989) the UK by (1900) was a troubled giant; her economy was stagnating. Agriculture was in the midst of a long recession and much of the countryside was in rural slum while the industrial towns, home of almost 80% of the population manifested a lack of amenity- high level of unhealthiness, widespread overcrowding, pollution, and above all 30% of the population lived under the 'poverty line'. However, land use planning together with good housing were conceived as a 'means' around (1904) for the achievement of good health, amenity and social contentment by the National Social Reform Council and other environmental groups. Subsequently, the (1909) and (1919) (Addison Act) Housing and Town Planning Acts and the (1932) Town and Country Planning Act were, for example, passed. These acts were, in essence, promulgated to promote housing (Simpson et al., 1989; Mullins and Murie, 2006; Harris, 2010). The (1909) Act, for example, put an end to the obligation on local authorities to sell houses in redevelopment areas within 10 years and prepare town planning schemes while the (1919) Act introduced exchequer subsidies for local authority housing. Simpson et al. (1989) profess that, following World War I the British Government promised building 'homes fit for heroes'. This promise had delayed due to disputes among government departments on one hand, and government departments and local authorities on the other. This was compounded by housing shortage in the decade preceding (1914) and at a time when the working class population was

growing. With insurrection in sight and taking a cue from what had happened in Russia in 1917, government under the (1919) Act, earmarked the building of half a million of 'low rent' homes over three years. Thus, it was the incentives from addressing housing needs of the working class and the imminent insurrection that led to the intervention, an indication of a form of human action.

The period (1939-1950s) witnessed the coming into being of a comprehensive planning system, which strengthened the then existing modernist rational planning approach in support of the creation of a welfare state. The prominent regulation, which brought about this comprehensive planning regime, was the Town and Country Planning Act (1947) (Newman and Thornley 1996; Corkindale, 2004; McKay et al., 2003; Shaw and Lord, 2009). Earlier in the 1930s, a number of land development problems came to the fore, which planning advocates suggested state intervention for their redress. There was, for example, uneven development with decline in old industrial areas and growth in areas such as the Midlands and South East. Developments in the countryside were also in chaos. These developments led to the formation of the Barlow Royal Commission in 1937 to examine the problem, but the state was not prepared to intervene in the operations of the market. However, with World War II especially following the bombing of UK cities a lot of physical destruction occurred. According to Mullins and Murie (2006) 4 million houses were destroyed during the war. Simpson et al. (1989) also point out that financial markets were disrupted while property values kept falling. This demanded swift government intervention for reconstruction and also address the 1930s urban development issues. As such, the interest groups (land and financial), which were bent on perpetuating relatively unregulated urban land market, had their case weakened. Consequently, the (1947) Act was passed.

At the heart of the Act were three major issues - government control over the planning process, development schemes and development control (Newman and Thornley 1996; Corkindale, 2004; Shaw and Lord, 2009). However, government reconstruction efforts benefitted both sections of the manufacturing industry that experienced and profited from close wartime relationship with the state and ordinary working and fighting population whose loyalty and commitment were essential for the prosecution of the war (Simpson et al, 1989). For example, this period witnessed the introduction of the national health insurance system, expansion of education and mass construction of council houses (Mullins and Murie, 2006). It is therefore the incentives from the reconstruction – ensuring improved quality of life and social welfare that necessitated the introduction of a comprehensive planning system, a manifestation of a form of human action.

Japan

While the idea of state intervention in the operations of the market was to correct market failure in the

UK, state intervention in Japan was to build a nation-state. Thus, it was the perceived incentives of turning around a feudal society and exhibiting the power of a modern state that prompted land use planning in Japan. Land use planning in Japan is traced to the period of the Meiji Restoration, which marked the beginning of modern Japan (Watanabe, 1980; Shibata, 2008a). In (1868), the Japanese leader; Tokugawa Bakufu was overthrown - the commencement of the Meiji Restoration. Following this restoration, the Meiji Government sought to pursue two main goals. These were to build a wealthy nation and a strong army (Watanabe, 1980; Shibata, 2008a). However, several issues such as lack of modern technology, natural resources, capital and skilled labour served as obstacles to the achievement of these goals (Shibata, 2008a). This was the epoch when Western capitalism and industrialisation were at their height. With mobilisation of land taxes to build capital, the Meiji leadership also decided to import Western technology and pursue enlightenment – civilisation as the West has done or at least catch-up with them. The mantra then was ‘Japanese spiritWestern technology’ (Shibata, 2008a). Consequently, the Iwakura mission (the ruling elite), bureaucrats and students visited Western Europe (between 1871 and 1873) and imported western technology (Sorensen, 2002; Shibata, 2008a). Planning was embedded in the imported technology and was conceived as architecture and engineering driven by ‘rational’ science, which were to drive a massive programme of building infrastructure, and industrialisation (Friedmann, 2005; Shibata, 2008a).

Japanese authorities, therefore, pursued remodeling of their cities particularly Tokyo, the capital along the lines of Western cities to symbolise modernity, and embark on infrastructural development and industrialisation. The first rail line, for example, was opened between Tokyo and Yokohama in (1872) while the Ginza Brick Quarters, commercial and residential developments comprising 1,400 two-storey Western-style buildings were constructed in (1872-1877). Most of the infrastructural facilities that were constructed in Tokyo in the years that followed were, however, made feasible by the Tokyo City-Ward Reform Ordinance passed in (1888). Indeed, the goals of mass industrialisation and infrastructural development were pursued even at the peril of the lives of Japanese. According to Shibata (2008a) the serious pollution problem resulting from the Ashio mine contamination, the organic mercury poisoning (Minamata disease) and the cadmium poisoning (Itai-Itai disease), which occurred in the 1890s, for example, did not attract much attention from the Japanese Government. This signifies that the incentives of modernisation agenda was the driving force behind Japanese authorities institutionalisation of intervention.

The mass industrialisation programme embarked on brought in its wake unprecedented urban growth and urbanisation. For example, the population of Tokyo grew from between 600,000 and 700,000 in the latter part of (1860s) to 7 million in (1940) while the sub-urban and central and inner cities populations

grew by 183% and 94% respectively between (1897) and (1920)(Shibata, 2008a). Similar to what occurred in the UK, the urban growth and urbanisation led to social and environmental ills such as poor urban environmental conditions and inadequate housing. It also led to increases in prices of land and houses (Watanabe, 1980; Shibata, 2008a). Initially, the Japanese authorities were not concerned about this development. Instead, it was recognised that the agitations, which resulted from the external effects from industrialisation in the Western World during the 'Industrial Revolution', were due to high political consciousness of the people. As such, the government speculated that in order to avoid such an occurrence, there was a need for the people to be educated to sacrifice for the development of the state (Plye, 1973; Shibata, 2008a). The first planning act(s); City Planning Act and Urban Building Standard were, therefore, passed in (1919) (Sorensen, 2002; Friedmann, 2005; Shibata, 2008a). These enactments came into being upon recognition of the difficulty with continuation of the educational programme in the face of deteriorating socio-economic and environmental conditions, and probable civil unrest (Shibata, 2008a). Even so, the City Planning Act was weak and limited in scope, and above all created a centralised planning regime. However, following the Great kanto Earthquake in (1923), a Special City Planning Act was promulgated to address the devastating effects of the earthquake (Watanabe, 1980; Evans, 2002; Shibata, 2008a). Consequently, it could be inferred that while the (1919) Act was perceived as a comparatively cheaper 'means' to address the imminent insurrection for continuation of the country's developmental programme, that of (1923) was perceived as a cheaper 'means' to deal with the effects of the earthquake. This reflects a form of human action on the part of the Japanese authorities.

The foregoing planning arrangement continued through to World War II during which all efforts were concentrated on the War. The War, however, brought a lot of destruction. For example, 215 cities were air-raided. This was accompanied by food shortages and massive repatriation problems (Watanabe, 1980). The new Ministry of Construction created in (1948), therefore, took charge of planning. The Urban Building Standard was replaced with Building Standards Act while the City Planning Act was supplemented by Special City Planning Act (1946-1954). The incentive for all these planning arrangements was to reconstruct damaged Japanese cities through comprehensive land consolidation programme (Watanabe, 1980; Evans, 2002; Shibata, 2008a) including, for example, providing 300,000 homes for the homeless in the first winter after the War.

SSA

As pointed out earlier, formal land use planning emerged in the Western world in the nineteenth century. This was the period when Western Europe had colonised Africa. The modernist planning arrangements,

which then existed in Western Europe particularly Britain and France, were therefore parachuted into SSA (Rakodi, 2001, 2006; Njoh, 2009; Baffour Awuah, 2013). Planning, however, began as a limited colonial government activity such as passage of legislation, slum clearance and preparation of development schemes. Home (1990) reports that British colonial town planning activities in SSA prior to World War II, were mainly road improvements, slum clearance and housing in areas where colonial officials ruled directly. The remainder was undertaking preparation of layouts, building of administrative headquarters, railways and mining towns. Such was also the situation in the French controlled areas. Njoh (2004), for example catalogues sixteen of such planning projects at the turn of the nineteenth century. These included: the (1890) urban development plans for the capital colony of Dahomey (now Republic of Benin) and city of Doula in Cameroun; the (1880) design and construction of military settlement at Saint Louis in Senegal for the French military personnel stationed at the colony; and the first urban development plan for Conakry, capital of Guinea in (1895) (Baffour Awuah, 2013). In the immediate period before World War II and thereafter, planning became a comprehensive government activity. Several regulations such as: Kenya's (1936) Town Planning Ordinance; Ghana's (1945) Town and Country Planning Ordinance (Cap 84); Nigeria's (1946) Town Planning Ordinance; Malawi's (1948) Town Planning Act; and Tanzania's (1956) Town Planning Ordinance were passed (Baffour Awuah, 2013).

What is intriguing is that land markets in SSA at the time planning was introduced were not developed. Besides, there was no 'industrial revolution' suggesting that there was no market failure. What then was the motivation for introduction of planning? The idea of Western Europe's colonisation of Africa was to exploit the resources of the continent (Nkrumah, 1970; Amin, 1972; Njoh, 2004). However, at the time of colonisation, the continent was not opened-up. Colonial officials were also confronted with threat of diseases and nationalistic reprisals from natives, which needed to be addressed to put the colonisation agenda on course (Njoh, 2009; Baffour Awuah, 2013). For example, the (1923) annual address of the president of Royal Town Planning Institute cited in Home (1990) notes that:

".....we have to remember that many of our members are working in remote parts of the world, confronted with problems very different from those we have at home. Housing, sanitation, and traffic present very distinctive features in India and in our tropical colonies. We have to accept a much more economical scale of housing as reasonable where for ten months of the year it is possible, and indeed advantageous, to sleep in the open air, but the established type often leaves much to be desired from the sanitary point of view, and while we struggle to remedy this, the conditions prescribe that our efforts take much simpler and more primitive form than is customary at home. There are numerous endemic and epidemic diseases to be battled with..."

The colonial planning arrangement, therefore, created spatial segregation. This was done through physical separation of European settlements where all the infrastructure and amenities were provided, and high health standards and building regulations were enforced, from those of Africans by 'cordon sanitaire' of open spaces with parks and race-courses (Larbi, 1996; Njoh, 2009; Home, 2012). An example of this was the creation of threefold urban centre divisions of native city, the non-European Township and European Reservation in Nigeria by the Township Ordinance of (1917), and allocation of separate zones for railway employees, European and Asian traders and African labourers in Kenya (Mabogunje, 1990). Although some few areas occupied by the native population had infrastructure and amenities, these services were to facilitate the activities of colonial officials such as sanitary inspectors, tax collectors, and the police and military to ensure good sanitary condition, smooth revenue mobilisation and maintain law and order, respectively (Njoh, 2004, 2009). To enhance further exploitation of the sub-continent's resources, the planning arrangements supplanted indigenous African land tenure systems with systems that pertained in Western Europe. These permitted large scale commodification of land in Africa and in some cases vesting of entire ownership in colonial governments (Rodney, 1972; Amin, 1972; Wekewe, 1995; Okoth-Ogendo, 2000; Njoh, 2004, 2009; Home, 2012). It also ensured control over all land transactions by colonial governments and made the so called 'unoccupied and ownerless lands' properties of colonial governments to advance their political and economic ends (Hammond et al., 2006; Home, 2012). While colonial governments, for example, made free grants of these lands to the few educated and politically active indigenes to control them, it promoted large scale plantations and mining with their home companies as beneficiaries. This was executed through generous offer of land either free of charge or at a giveaway prices to such companies (Rodney, 1972; Amin, 1972; Njoh, 2009). Thus, unlike the UK and Japan, the incentives of securing the health of colonial officials stationed at the colonies, assuaging reprisals from natives and economic exploitation prompted institutionalisation of planning in SSA, a reflection of a form of human action. It is in this vein that Rakodi (2006) notes that contemporary African cities with the exception of few were new creations in the colonial period and represent the aims and vision of the politically and economically powerful – the expatriate colonial entrepreneurs and administrators.

4.2 Urban Land Use Planning: 1960 - 1979

The UK

Whilst the fundamental principles established under the UK planning system through the Town and Country Planning Act (1947) remained intact (Nadin, 2007; Shaw and Lord, 2007; Nadin and Stead, 2008), efforts were made to modify the country's planning system. Globally, the 1960s and 1970s

witnessed poverty crises, the rise of civil societies, post-modernism and feminism (Campbell and Fainstein, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2009; Watson, 2009a; 2009b). The UK was not immune from these phenomena and their impact. For example, Mullins and Murie (2006) report that the country had to grapple with large scale poverty. This was compounded by mass immigration from the Caribbean and South Asia, a situation which resulted in homelessness with its attendant agitations and campaigns from grass-root movements and churches as well as the formation of shelter and other housing associations. The extant planning arrangement, therefore, came under immense criticism as not taking into account the socio-economic context within which planning is practiced. For example, the planning arrangement was said to concentrate on physical development of space – it prevented undesirable developments, but did not promote desirable developments, it did not involve interest groups in the planning process, and promoted suburbia developments separating work from home, among others (Albrechts, 2006).

In response to these developments, incremental and strategic planning approaches which promoted participation of stakeholders in the development process were introduced (Conyers and Hill, 1984; Lai, 1994; Pennington, 2000; Healey, 2003; Shaw and Lord, 2009 p419). Indeed, the acid test for the efficacy of planning at that time was: the scope and content of structure plans; the structure plan in relation to other policy making processes; interagency linkages for development and implementation; public participation; aims, objectives and problems in planning methodology and monitoring research and intelligence (Drake et al., 1975 in Shaw and Lord, 2009 p418). Thus, it was the incentives for addressing the agitations that stemmed from post-modernism in the face of urban development challenges that existed at that time, which prompted the modification of the planning approach, a reflection of a form of human action.

Japan

Unlike the UK, the latter part of the 1950s marked the beginning of the recovery of the Japanese economy with rapid economic growth once again. As such, the 1960s through to the greater portions of the 1970s witnessed economic prosperity. Watanabe (1980) reports that the entire country was intensively developed with heavy industries, highway systems, bullet train lines, new towns and golf courses. Besides, there was rapid urbanisation with central business districts of cities inundated with high-rise office complexes' while their fringes showcased sprawling sub-urban developments. In essence, although there was material prosperity and physical convenience, the developments left in their tracks increases in land prices, deteriorated environment and demise of non-material values (Watanabe, 1980; Evans, 2002). Somewhat similar to the UK, this was the period when civil society activities and post-modernism were infiltrating into the body politic of Japan. Japanese authorities in the

face of these urban challenges, therefore, had to also contend with opposition (Evans, 2002; Shibata, 2008b).

As a consequence, the City Planning Act (1968) known as the 'New Act' was passed to replace the (1919) Act. A new Urban Redevelopment Act (1969) was also passed to consolidate old and new redevelopment programmes. A prominent feature of the 'New Act' was the creation of City Planning Areas, which divided these areas into Urbanisation Promotion Areas and Urbanisation Control Areas. The remainder was delegation of plan-making functions to the prefectural and municipal levels, and the introduction of development permission system, public participation in the planning process, sophisticated zoning system as well as creation of a hierarchy of plans (Watanabe, 1980; Sorensen, 2000; Evans, 2002). Although it is argued that hitherto the central government control of the planning system at this point did not change (Friedmann, 2005), it signaled the beginning of decentralisation and public participation in planning in Japan (Evans, 2002). It is, therefore, the incentives to address the deteriorating environmental conditions and 'contain' the then prevailing opposition – civil society activities and post-modernists that this planning arrangement was put in place, an indication of a form of human action.

SSA

At independence mostly in the 1960s, leaders of newly emergent African states were enthusiastic to embark on rapid socio-economic development. They, therefore, sought to overhaul the colonial structures including land tenure, planning and development policies (Baffour Awuah et al., 2013). The idea was to operate a state controlled economic system with state funded industrialisation as the primary driver of development (Rakodi, 2006; Baffour Awuah, 2013). However, the modernist planning system – rational comprehensive planning model with the use of master plans remained intact and in some cases consolidated. For example, Ghana after independence in (1957) adopted welfare economic model of development, which sought to achieve growth and development through state led industrialisation (Car, 2008). However, attempts to integrate policy planning with land use planning under the country's first president; Dr Kwame Nkrumah to promote development was short-lived (Baffour Awuah, 2013). Similarly, Wekwete (1995) reports that Tanzania in 1967 made the Arusha Declaration, which led to the introduction of African Socialism (Ujamaa) as its new political philosophy. As part of that new philosophy, all lands were nationalised and land use planning was supposed to have been people-oriented, but this could not materialise.

Analyses by studies such as Wekwete (1995), Okoth-Ogendo (2000), Hammond et al. (2006) and Home (2012) demonstrate that the colonial land use planning policies could not be revised because

they ensured control of land and its related resources by few elites and powerful – individuals in government and their agents. This, thus, served as incentives for them to maintain the planning arrangement, a reflection of a form of human action.

4.3 Urban Land Use Planning: 1980s and Beyond

The UK

The 1980s witnessed the neo-liberal turn in planning and urban development (Evans, 2001; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2012). Thus, urban development became private sector or market led (Anderson, 1990; Robinson and Shaw, 1994). The argument was that state controls and subsidies were responsible for the then economic decline in the UK. Economic liberalism through the 'free market' was offered as a mechanism to bring about prosperity. The rationale was to enhance physical and economic regeneration in rundown areas. The presumption was that such regeneration will stimulate wider economic and social benefits – the so called 'trickle-down effect' (Robinson and Shaw, 1994). To carry through this agenda, the concept of enterprise zoning was introduced with the establishment of Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) to take over some key areas of the planning system (Anderson, 1990; Robinson and Shaw, 1994; Marshall, 2009). Enterprise zones created around this period included Dudley, Clydebank, Hartlepool and Salford while an example of UDCs established was the London Docklands. Connected policies also included: simplifying planning procedures whereby developments, which conformed to the rules for each of the zones did not require individual planning permission; enhancing capital allowances against corporation and income tax liabilities for investment in industrial and commercial property; and exempting property from local business rates. In essence, local authorities were dramatically weakened (Marshall, 2009). However, with the re-occurrence of economic crises particularly the property market crash in the late 1980s, which led to the collapse of a number of companies that were to lead developers under the UDC projects – for example, the Canary Wharf developers Olympia, was collapsed in 1992, some of these neo-liberal policies were reversed. It can, therefore, be argued that it was the incentives for promoting the 'ends' of free market 'apostles' and their adherents, which led to the formulation of the 1980s planning policies.

Following the (2004) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the UK planning system currently has gone beyond the traditional land use planning system to spatial planning system (Shaw and Ford, 2007, 2009; Tewdwr-Jones et al., 2010; Allmendinger and Haughton, 2012). This spatial planning arrangement is said to bring together and integrate policies and programmes, which influence the nature of places and how they can function (Shaw and Ford, 2007; Nadin, 2007; Tewdwr-Jones et al., 2010). Although some of its features may not be different from planning arrangements since the post-

World War II period, Nadin (2007) identifies five major themes, which are to drive the planning system. These are: to support timely plan and decision-making processes to enable planning authorities to positively shape outcomes rather than to report them; promote community and stakeholder participation throughout the plan-making to ensure widespread understanding of difficult decisions at the heart of planning practice; creation of an integrated mechanism by which private stakeholders, public service providers and community groups could have their activities for place-making designed; encourage and promote development rather than restricting development; and ensuring that policies are clearly rooted in evidence. Clearly, this new planning arrangement subscribes to collaborative approach to planning (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2012).

The historical antecedent of this new planning paradigm is traced to the post 1997 public service 'Modernisation Agenda' and the political philosophy of the 'Third Way' - so called collaborative working with the possibility to reconcile parties previously thought to have potentially competing objectives (Shaw and Lord, 2009). This, in part, is also attributable to the European Union's 'Territorial Agenda' - European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) and developments in planning in continental Europe (Nadin, 2007; Tewdwr-Jones et al., 2010). Tewdwr-Jones et al. (2010) outline three motivations for adoption of this new planning paradigm in the UK. These are: the need to respond to increased expectations of planning delivering at various spatial scales, within and outside existing territories; to sign onto the ESDP and benefit from the EU Structural Fund as well as attract significant investments; and to promote economic growth and contribute towards improved economic performance of all regions beyond traditional local government boundaries with emphasis on strong community involvement in the planning process at the local level through Local Development Frameworks to address social inclusion, economic and environmental issues and their spatial implications and inter-relationships – the idea of sustainable communities. Allmendinger and Haughton (2012), however, argue that the aim of this new planning paradigm to promote engagement and ensure legitimacy is superficial while its processes for participation are carefully choreographed to minimise the potential for offering people with dissenting views a hearing. This signifies that the incentives from attracting funds and significant investments from the EU and addressing concerns over the environment in a competitive globalised world prompted this new planning arrangement, a reflection of a form of human action.

Japan

The 1980s witnessed a gradual extension of decentralisation in planning. For example, the concept of district planning was introduced in 1980, which among others allowed a measure of citizen participation – land owners and residents were given opportunity to participate in district plans' preparation (Evans,

2002). However, like the UK the major policy during this period was 'Urban Renaissance'. Analysis by Shibata (2008b) demonstrates that Japan suffered economic crises in the early 1980s due to expansion of the social welfare programme and huge investment in public works in the 1970s. This, coupled with the rise of neoliberalism in the country led to a policy change – the introduction of 'Minkatsu Policy', which made private enterprise the driver of economic development. This policy change ushered neoliberal planning in Japan particularly in the area of urban development. Shibata (2008b) further reports that the 'Minkatsu Policy' sought to promote market-led land development to stimulate the then stagnated economy, and similar to the UK, deregulated land use controls to provide motivation for land developers. However, unlike the UK where rundown areas in urban centres were targeted, land use in these urban centres was not considered as the 'highest and best use' by business elites and the Japanese Government - central bureaucracy. Consequently, the Government introduced measures for example, to convert Category I Exclusive Residential Zone areas, which were reserved for low-rise residential buildings only, to high and medium-rise development areas. Public lands were also sold for urban regeneration and construction of quality high rise residential and office buildings. It was, thus, the incentive to attract investments and also satisfy neoliberal forces in an effort to rescue an ailing economy that brought about this planning arrangement, a manifestation of a form of human action.

The neoliberal planning policies adopted by the Japanese Government led to a short while boom, which later turned into a bubble that was destined to burst. For example, the country's total stock of property values was nearly four times the value of the total property stock in the USA and constituted about 20% of the world's wealth in 1991 (Shibata, 2008b). However, this bubble burst in the early 1990s as a result of Government's macro-economic mismanagement, speculative land investment and poor development control measures (Friedmann, 2005; Shibata, 2008b). The economic mismanagement created financial and administrative stringencies at the heart of Government, which meant a disincentive for Government to centralise planning. By this time also the activities of civil societies were becoming entrenched in Japan. Coupled with the Great Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake in (1995), which exposed the social and environmental excesses of decades of pursuing development, Government decided to strengthen democratisation of planning through vigorous decentralisation (Evans, 2002; Friedmann, 2005; Shibata, 2008b). This process started with the (1992) amendment of the City Planning Act, which required all cities within earmarked City Planning Areas to prepare their own master plans on the basis of citizens' opinions. Subsequent amendments extending this democratisation process occurred in (1999) and (2000) (Evans, 2002). Currently, the democratisation process is being pursued through 'Machi-zukuri'. This is a form of community planning (Sorensen, 2002; Evans, 2002; Friedmann, 2005; Shibata, 2008), which espouses the core principles of the collaborative planning model. Based on the foregoing

discussions, it can be argued that Government's disincentive to pursue a centralised planning arrangement on one hand and incentive to respond positively to civil societies and address decades of social and environmental excesses therefore gave rise to this planning arrangement – a reflection of a form of human action.

SSA

Since the latter part of 1970s, SSA like the UK and Japan suffered persistent socio-economic problems. By early 1980s, the region was in deep socio-economic crises. As such, many of the constituent economies were compelled to adopt the IMF and World Bank sponsored Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) (Konadu-Agyemang, 2000, 2001; Owusu, 2001). At the heart of these SAPs were neoliberal prescriptions, which required, among others, the cutting of government expenditure on social services, re-entrenchment of public sector workers, devaluation of currencies and removal of all forms of price controls. Planning systems in the region were not immune from these policy prescriptions. Indeed, the World Bank linked its lending agreements to reform of planning regulatory frameworks in the region (Payne and Majale, 2004; Musandu-Nyamayaro, 2008). The prescriptions of the World Bank, *inter alia*, sought to decentralise planning and promote public-private sector partnership in urban development.

A number of attempts were therefore made at reforms. For example, Governments of countries such as Tanzania, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana and Nigeria made attempts to reform their ULUP regimes. These were to be done through promulgation of flexible planning laws and development standards to suit the needs of the poor and low income people. The remainder was to relax development control and provide serviced plots of land, funds and materials for construction of buildings (UN-Habitat, 1999; Baffour Awuah et al., 2011; Baffour Awuah, 2013). In Ghana, several urban projects were undertaken between (1985) and (1990) (Larbi, 1996). Eventually, the Local Government Act (Act 462), which sought to decentralise planning was passed in (1993). However, these attempts at planning reforms in the SSA were sporadic and short-lived. Consequently, with the exception of Republic South Africa that has adopted integrated planning approach since (1994), constituent economies in the region, in the main, continue to hang onto their colonial planning arrangements (Musandu-Nyamayaro, 2008; Watson, 2009a). Thus, while the incentives for attracting development assistance to address development imperatives led to sporadic planning reforms in SSA, the incentives to control land and related resources by the few elite and their cronies have continued to ensure prevalence of the colonial planning arrangements. For example, in analysing the Ghanaian situation Konadu-Agyemang (1998 p145) notes that:

“The continuous existence of the colonial planning apparatus in the country for over four decades since independence should not be misconstrued to mean it is effective and acceptable. Rather, its continuous survival has been made possible thanks to the few rich and elites in society who are afraid that any changes will adversely affect their role in the administration of land and its resources.”

It needs to be acknowledged that following the recognition of the role of land policy and development as well as resource access and management in economic development, a number of countries are currently undertaking planning reforms in the SSA as part of wider land tenure reforms. These reforms are, in the main, being driven by Western normative planning models particularly the collaborative planning model (Watson, 2002; Harrison, 2006; UN-Habitat, 2009). Ghana for example, is currently undertaking a Land Use Planning and Management Project. The aim of the project is to develop a coherent, streamlined and sustainable land use planning and management system, which is decentralised and based on consultative and participatory approaches to effectively manage human settlement developments (GoG, 2009). Although insights of the collaborative planning model are not new to the indigenous culture of the people in the region (Baffour Awuah, 2013), whether or not it will be adopted depend on their provision of incentives for the elite and their cronies.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This paper analysed evolution and development of urban land use planning using insights from the Austrian economics theory of human action and based on a review of the extant literature. It dwelt on the UK, Japan and SSA as case studies. It is established that planning is not a universal concept. While planning emerged in the UK to correct the adverse externalities of the market, it originated in Japan as part of a grand design to pursue development. Conversely, it emerged in SSA as a tool to aid exploitation of the region's resources by Western European colonialists. Consequently, the conception of planning and its arrangements differed in these areas. Also, over the years planning arrangements in the UK and Japan have undergone changes while changes to those of SSA countries, in the main, have been marginal. Currently, insights of the collaborative planning model are driving planning arrangements in the UK under its newly adopted spatial planning system and in Japan based on its 'Machi-zukuri' planning arrangement. In SSA, attempts are being made under planning reforms to adopt such insights. The paper has, however, demonstrated that the origins of planning and its forms over the years in the case study areas have been underpinned by human action – provision of incentives for individuals who constitute government.

However, as indicated earlier, in the face of current urban challenges such as rapid urbanisation, poverty, environmental pollution and unemployment various calls have been made for sustainable development and redevelopment of cities and urban areas. Land use planning is offered as a more effective tool to deliver this goal. Adopted and proposed (in the case of SSA) planning arrangements in the case study areas appear to have some form of sustainable development components. Nonetheless, there have been recent concepts such as biomimicry, cradle-to-cradle, positive development and circular economy whose credentials planning is implored to take on board if it is to deliver sustainable cities and urban areas goal. From the standpoint of human action theory, the adoption of these credentials depends on their provision of incentives for individuals who constitute government and their agents. That aside, it is widely acknowledged that the effectiveness of a planning system is also contingent on compliance with its regulations and guidelines – policies, by regulated entities. As demonstrated by Baffour Awuah et al. (2011) – see section 3, compliance with planning policies is also a form of human action. This signifies that credentials of recent concepts must as well provide incentives for regulated entities to ensure their compliance. Given the foregoing, it is concluded that planning systems and practice like any other form of human institution should not be built on a stereotypic conceptual model, but should be conceived taking into account human action to ensure their success in addressing sustainable development challenges that confront the world today.

REFERENCES

- Abukhater, A.B. (2009). Rethinking planning theory and practice: a glimmer of light for prospects of integrated planning to combat complex urban realities. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 2(11), 64-79.
- Adams, D., Watkins, C. and White, M. (2005). Examining public policy and property markets. In: Adams, D., Watkins, C. and White, M. (Eds) *Planning, Public Policy and Property Markets*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 3-9.
- Adams, D. (2008). Mapping out the regulatory environment and its interaction with land and property markets. *Energy Policy*, 36, 4570-4574.
- Afrane, S.K. (1993). *The integration of housing and economic activities: a case study of low income settlements in Kumasi, Ghana*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of British Columbia, Canada.
- Agger, A. and Lofgren, K. (2008). Democratic assessment of collaborative planning processes. *Planning Theory*, 7(2), 145-164.
- Albrechts, L. (2006). Shifts in strategic spatial planning? Some evidence from Europe and Australia. *Environment and Planning*, 38, 1149-1170.
- Alchian, A.A. and Demsetz, H. (1973). The property rights paradigm. *Journal of Economic History*, 33(1), 16-27.

- Allmendinger, P. (2002). Towards a post-positivist typology of planning theory. *Planning Theory*, 1(1), 77-99.
- Allmendinger, P. and Haughton, G. (2012). Post-political spatial planning in England: a crisis of consensus. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(1), 89-103.
- Amin, S. (1972). Underdevelopment and dependence in Black Africa – Origins and contemporary forms. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 10, 503-524.
- Anderson, J. (1990). The new right, enterprise zones and urban development corporations. *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research*, 14(3), 468-489.
- Baffour Awuah, K.G., Hammond, F., Booth, C., Lamond, J., Proverbs, D. and Bloch, R. (2011). Conceptual analysis of the role of human action theory in Sub Saharan Africa urban land use planning. *Journal of International Real Estate and Construction Studies*, 1(2), 147-165.
- Baffour Awuah K.G. (2013). *A quantitative analysis of the economic incentives of sub-Saharan Africa urban land use planning systems: case of Accra, Ghana*. PhD Thesis University of Wolverhampton, UK.
- Baffour Awuah, K.G., Hammond, F.N., Lamond, J.E. and Booth, C. (2014). Benefits of urban land use planning in Ghana. *Geoforum*, 51, 37-46.
- Baird, C.W. (1998). Profit and loss. In: Boettke, J. (Ed) *The Elgar companion to Austrian Economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Inc., 142-155.
- Barroso, J.M. (2012). Speech delivered at the 5th European summit of regions and cities in Copenhagen. March, 22 -23.
- Bart, I.L. (2010). Urban sprawl and climate change: a statistical exploration of cause and effect, with policy options for the EU. *Land Use Policy*, 27(2), 283-292.
- Barzel, Y. (1997). *Economic analysis of property rights: political economy of institutions and decisions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bertaud, A. and Malpezzi, S. (2001). Measuring the costs and benefits of urban land use regulation: a simple model with an application to Malaysia. *Journal of Housing Economics*, 10, 393-418.
- Boelens, L. (2006). Beyond the plan: towards a new kind of planning. *disP – The Planning Review*, 42(167), 25-40.
- Bratland, J. (2000). Human action and socially optimal conservation: a Mises inquiry into the hotelling principle. *The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 3(1), 3-26.
- Brown, A. (2012). Challenges of development and undevelopment in a globalising world. In: Campagna, M., De Montis, A., Isola, F., Lai, S., Pira, C. and Zoppi, C. (Eds.) *Planning support tools: Policy analysis, implementation and evaluation*, proceedings of the seventh international conference on informatics and urban and regional planning. Milan: Franco Angeli, 77-93.
- Buitelaar, E. (2004). A transaction cost analysis of the land development process. *Urban Studies*, 41(13), 2539-2553.
- Buitelaar, E., Galle, M. and Sorel, N. (2011). Plan-led planning system in development-led practices: an empirical analysis into the (Lack of) institutionalisation of planning law. *Environment and Planning A*, 43, 928-941.

- Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S.S. (2003). Introduction: the structure and debates of planning theory. In: Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S.S. (Eds) *Readings in planning theory* (second edition). Berlin: Blackwell, 1-18.
- Campbell, H. and Marshall, R. (2002). Utilitarianism's bad breath? a re-evaluation of the public interest justification for Planning. *Planning Theory*, 1(2), 163-187.
- Car, E.R. (2008). The millennium village project and African development problems and potentials. *Progress in Development Studies*, 333-344.
- Carnis, L.A.H. (2009). The economic theory of bureaucracy: insights from the Niskanian model and the Misesian approach. *The Quarterly Journal of Australian Economics*, 12(3), 57-78.
- Cheshire, P. and Sheppard, S. (2002). The welfare economics of land use planning. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 52, 242-269.
- Cheshire, P. and Sheppard, S. (2004). Land markets and land market regulation: progress towards understanding. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 34, 619-637.
- Coase, R.H. (1960). The problem of social cost. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 3, 1- 44.
- Cohen, B. (2006). Urbanisation in developing countries: current trends, future projections' and key challenges for sustainability. *Technology in Society*, 28, 63-80.
- Conyers, D. and Hills, P. (1984). *An introduction to development planning in the Third World*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Corkindale, J. (2004). *The land use planning system evaluating options for Reform*. London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Dale, P. and McLaughlin, J. (1999). *Land administration*. New York: Oxford University press Inc.
- Demsetz, H. (1967). Towards a theory of property rights. *American Economic Review*, 57(2), 347-359.
- Egbu, A.U. (2007). *Impact of land use planning on urban housing development in Nigeria*. unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Wolverhampton, UK.
- Egbu, A. U., Olomolaiye, P. and Gameson, R. (2008). A neo-institutional economic critique of the system for allocating urban land and development rights in Nigeria. *Habitat International*, 32, 121-135.
- Evans, A. (2003). Shouting very loudly economics, planning and politics. *Town Planning Review*, 74(2), 195-211.
- Evans, N. (2001). Discourses of urban community and community planning: a comparison between Britain and Japan. Available at: <http://www.shef.ac.uk> (accessed 4 November 2012).
- Evans, N. (2002). Machi-zukuri as a new paradigm in Japanese urban planning: reality or myth? *Japan Forum*, 14(3), 443-464.
- Facchini, F. (2007). Apriorism, introspection, and the axiom of action: a realist solution. *The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 10, 234 -249
- Fainstein, S.S. (2003). New directions in planning theory. In: Campbell et al. (Eds) *Readings in planning theory* (Second Edition). Berlin: Blackwell, 173-195.
- Freestone, R. (2007). A history of planning. In: Thompson, S. (Ed) *Planning Australia: an overview of urban and regional planning*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 67-89.

- Friedmann, J. (2005). Globalisation and the emerging culture of planning. *Progress in Planning*, 64, 183-234.
- Gleeson, B. and Low, N. (2000). *Australian Urban Planning: new Challenges, New Agendas*. Sydney: BPA Print Group.
- Godschalk, D.R. (2004). Land use planning challenges: coping with conflicts in visions of sustainable development and liveable communities. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(1), 5-13.
- Government of Ghana (2009). *Human settlements and land use policy and planning in Ghana: A policy study (Land Use Planning and Management Project)*, Town and Country Planning Department. Accra:Ghana.
- Hall, P. (2002). *Urban and regional planning* (Fourth Edition). London: Routledge.
- Hammond, F.N., Antwi, A. and Proverbs, D. (2006). The political economy of Sub-Saharan Africa land policies. *American Review of Political Economy*, 4(1/2), 19-35.
- Harrison, A.J. (1977). *Economics and land use planning*. London: Croom Helm Ltd.
- Harrison, P. (2006). On the edge of reason: planning and urban futures in Africa. *Urban Studies*, 43(2), 319-335.
- Hayek, F.A. (1944). *The road to serfdom*. London: Routledge.
- Hayek, F.A. (1983). *Knowledge, evolution, and society*. London: Adam Smith Institute.
- Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. London: Macmillan.
- Healey, P. (2003). Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory*, 2(2), 101-123.
- Heikkila, E.J. (2000). *The economics of planning*. New Brunswick: New Jersey Centre for Urban Policy Research.
- Hirsch, W. Z. (1973). *Urban economic analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Home, R.K. (1990). Town planning and garden cities in the British colonial empire 1910 – 1940. *Planning Perspectives*, 5(1), 23-37.
- Home, R. (2012). Towards a pro-poor land law in sub-Saharan Africa. In: Homes, R. (Ed.) *Essays in African Land Law*. Pretoria: Pretoria University Law Press, 25-46.
- Hoppe, H. (1989). *The theory of socialism and capitalism*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Huxley, M. and Yiftachel, O. (2000). New paradigm or old myopia? Unsetting the communicative turn in planning theory. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(4), 333-342.
- Hülsmann, J.G. (2004). The a priori foundations of property economics. *The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 7(4), 41-68.
- Khakee, A. (2003). The emerging gap between evaluation research and practice. *Evaluation*, 9, 340-352.
- Kim, Y. (2009). Validation of psychometric research instruments: the case of information science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(6), 1178-1191.
- Kinsella, N.S. and Tinsley, P. (2004). Causation and aggression. *The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 7(4), 97-112.

- Klosterman, R.E. (2003). Argument for and against planning. In: Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S.S. (Eds) *Readings in planning theory* (Second Edition). Berlin: Blackwell, 86-101.
- Konadu-Agyemang, K. (1998). *The political economy of housing and urban development in Africa: Ghana's experience from colonial times to 1998*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Konadu-Agyemang, K. (2000). The best of times and the worst of times: structural adjustment programs and uneven development in Africa: the case of Ghana. *Professional Geographer*, 52(3), 469-483.
- Konadu-Agyemang, K. (2001). Structural adjustment programs and housing affordability in Accra, Ghana. *The Canadian Geographer*, 45(4), 528-544.
- Kula, K. (1997). *Economics of natural resources, the environment and policies* (Second Edition). London: Chapman and Hall.
- Lai, W.L. (2005). Neo-institutional economics and planning theory. *Planning Theory*, 4(1), 7-19.
- Larbi, W.O (1996). Spatial planning and urban fragmentation in Accra. *Third World Planning Review*, 18(2), 193-215.
- Lavoie, D. (1985). *National economic planning: What is left?* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Lichfield, N., Adams, D., Needham, B., Teitz, M. and Wenban-Smith, A. (2003). The concept of planned development: a presentation and commentaries on the contribution of Nathaniel Licfield. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 4(1), 45-71.
- Lovering, J. (2009). The recession and the end of planning as we have known it. *International Planning Studies*, 14(1), 1-6.
- Mabogunje, A.L. (1990). Urban planning and the post-colonial state in Africa: a research overview. *African Studies Review*, 33(2), 121-203.
- Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and subject. Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mankiw, N.G. (2011). *Principles of economics* (Sixth Edition). Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Malpass, P. (2000). The discontinuous history of housing association in England. *Housing Studies*, 15(2), 195-212.
- Marshall, A. (1890). *Principles of Economics*. London: Macmillan.
- Marshall, T. (2009). Planning and the new Labour in the UK. *Planning Practice & Research*, 24(1), 1-9.
- Mathews, R. (2012a). The green economy is the right solution for our troubled times. Available at: www.globalwarmingisreal.com (accessed 2 December 2012).
- Mckay, S., Berry, J. and McGreal, S. (2003). Planning enforcement: lessons for practice and procedure. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 4(3), 325-344.
- Mckinsey Global Institute (2012). *Urban world: cities and the rise of the consuming class*. Available at: <http://www.mckinsey.com/mgl> (accessed 4 August 2012).
- Mises, L.V. (1949). *Human action: a treatise on economics* (Scholar's Edition). Auburn, Ala: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Mullins, D. and Murie, A. (2006). *Housing policy in the UK*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Mundell, R. (1968). *Man and economics*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Musandu-Nyamayaro, O. (2008). The case for modernization of local planning authority frameworks in Southern and Eastern Africa: a radical initiative for Zimbabwe. *Habitat International*, 32, 15-27.
- Musole, M. (2009). Property rights, transaction costs and institutional change: conceptual framework and literature review. *Progress in Planning*, 71(2), 43-85.
- Nadin, V. (2007). The emergence of the spatial planning approach in England. *Planning, Practice & Research*, 22, 43-62.
- Nadin, V. and Stead, D. (2008). European spatial planning systems, social models and Learning. *disP – The Planning Review*, 172, 35-47.
- Naess, P. (2001). Urban planning and sustainable development. *European Planning Studies*, 9(4), 503-524.
- Newman, P. and Thornley, A. (1996). *Urban planning in Europe: international competition, national systems and planning projects*. London: Routledge.
- Niskanen, W.N. (1994). *Bureaucracy and public economics*. Fairfax, Va: The Lock Institute.
- Njoh, A.J. (2004). The experience and legacy of French colonial urban planning in sub-Saharan Africa. *Planning Perspectives*, 19, 435-454.
- Njoh, A.J. (2009). Urban planning as a tool of power and social control in colonial Africa. *Planning Perspectives*, 24(3), 301-317.
- Nkrumah, K. (1970). *Africa must unite*. New York: International Publishers.
- North, D. (1997). The new institutional economics and the Third World development. In: Harris, J., Hunter, J. and Lewis, C.M. (Eds.) *The new institutional economics and the Third World development* (Electronic Version). London: Routledge, 17-26.
- Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state and utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- O'Sullivan, S. and Sheffrin, M. (2007). *Economics principles* (California Edition). California, Prentice Hall.
- Owusu, J.H. (2001). Spatial integration, adjustment and structural transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa: some linkage pattern changes in Ghana. *Professional Geographer*, 53(2), 230-247.
- Park, R., Burgess, E. and McKenzie, R. (1925). *The city*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Payne, G. and Majale, M. (2004). *The Urban Housing Manual: making regulatory frameworks work for the poor*. London: Earthscan.
- Pejovich, S. (1999). The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development. *Journal of Markets and Morality*, 2, 164-181.
- Pena, S. (2002). Land use planning on the U.S. – Mexico border: a comparison of the legal framework. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 17(1), 1-20.
- Pennington, M. (2000). *Liberating the land. The case for private land use planning*. London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Pigou, A.C. (1932). *The economics of welfare*. London: Macmillan.
- Posner, R.A. (1974). Theories of economic regulation. *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, 5(2), 334-358.

- Purcell, M. (2009). Resisting neoliberalization: communicative planning or counter-hegemonic movements? *Planning Theory*, 8(2), 140-165.
- Pyle, K.B. (1973). The technology of Japanese nationalism: local improvement movement, 1900-1918. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 31(1), 51-65.
- Quigley, J.M. (2007). *Regulation and property values in the United States: the high cost of monopoly*. Available at: <http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/5692w323> (accessed 20 August 2010).
- Qian, Z. (2010). Without zoning: urban development and land use controls in Houston. *Cities*, 27(1), 31-41.
- Rakodi, C. (2001). Forget planning, put politics first? priorities for urban management in developing countries. *The International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation (IJAG)*, 3(3), 209-223.
- Rakodi, C. (2006). Relationships of power and place: the social construction of African cities (Editorial). *Geoforum*, 37, 312-317.
- Ratcliffe, J. (1983). *An introduction to town and country planning*. London: Hutchinson.
- Redclift, M. (2005). Sustainable development (1987-2005): an oxymoron comes of Age. *Sustainable Development*, 13(4), 212-227.
- Robinson, F. and Shaw, K. (1994). Urban policy under the conservatives: in search of the big idea? *Local Economy*, 9(3), 224-235.
- Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle L'Ouverture Publishing Co.
- Rothbard, M.N. (2004). *Man, economy and state* (Scholar's Edition). Alabama: Ludwig Von Mises Institute.
- Roy, M. (2009). Planning for sustainable urbanisation in fast growing cities: mitigation and adaption issues addressed in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Habitat International*, 33, 276-286.
- Schmidt, S. and Buehler, R. (2007). The planning process in the US and Germany: a comparative analysis. *International Planning Studies*, 12, 55-75.
- Shaw, D. and Lord, A. (2007). The cultural turn? culture change and what it means for spatial planning in England. *Planning, Practice and Research*, 22, 63-78.
- Shaw, D. and Lord, A. (2009). From land-use to 'spatial planning' reflections on the reform of the English planning system. *Town Planning Review*, 80(4-5), 415-435.
- Shibata, K. (2008a). The origins of Japanese planning culture: building a nation-state 1868 – 1945. Available at <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21682/> (accessed 2 February 2010).
- Shibata, K. (2008b). Neoliberalism, risk, and spatial governance in the developmental state: Japanese planning in the global economy. *Critical Planning*, 15, 92-118.
- Simpson, M., Hardy, D. and Ward, S. (1989). *British Planning History 1900-1952*. Available at: <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk> (accessed 4 April 2013).
- Smith, V.L. (1999). Reflections on human action after 50 years. *Cato Journal*, 19(2), 195-214.
- Sorensen, A. (2002). *The making of urban Japan: Cities and planning from Edo to the 21st century*. London: Nissan Institute/ Routledge.

- Stahel, W.R. (2011). The virtuous circle? Sustainable economics and taxation in a time of austerity. *Thinkpiece*, 63, 1-6.
- Staley, S.R. (2004). Urban planning, smart growth, and economic calculation: an Austrian critique and extension. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 17(2/3), 265-283.
- Stigler, G.J. (1971). The theory of economic regulation. *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, 2(1), 3-2.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (2002). Information and change in the paradigm in economics. *American Economic Review*, 92(3), 460-501.
- Tewdwr-Jones, M., Gallent, N. and Morphet, J. (2010). An anatomy of spatial planning: coming to terms with the spatial element of UK planning. *European Planning Studies*, 18(2), 239-257.
- Thompson, S. (2007). What is planning? In: Thompson, S. (Ed) *Planning Australia: An overview of urban and regional planning*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 11-27.
- UN-Habitat (1999). *Reassessment of urban planning and development regulations in African cities*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2006). *State of the world's cities 2006/7, the millennium development goals and urban sustainability: 30 years of shaping the Habitat Agenda*. London: Earthscan.
- UN-Habitat (2009). *Planning sustainable cities: policy directions, global report on human settlements* (Abridged Edition). London: Earthscan.
- Watanabe, S. (1980). Planning history in Japan. *Urban History*, 7, 63-75.
- Watson, V. (2002). The usefulness of normative planning theories in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa. *Planning Theory*, 1(1), 27-52.
- Watson, V. (2009a). The planned city sweeps the poor away.....urban planning and 21st century urbanization. *Progress in Planning*, 72, 151-193.
- Watson, V. (2009b). Seeing from the south: refocusing urban planning on the globe's central urban issues. *Urban Studies*, 46(11), 2259-2275.
- Wekwete, K.H. (1995). Planning law in sub-Saharan Africa – a focus on the experience in Southern and Eastern Africa. *Habitat International*, 19(1), 13-28.
- William, C.C. and Millington, A.C. (2004). The diverse and contested meanings of sustainable development. *The Geographical Journal*, 170(2), 99-104.
- Williams, P. (2007a). Government, people and politics. In: Thompson, S. (Ed) *Planning Australia: an overview of urban and regional planning*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 29-47.
- Williams, P. (2007b). Planning and the legislative framework. In: Thompson, S. (Ed) *Planning Australia: an overview of urban and regional planning*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 90-113.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our Common Future*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.