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Abstract

This thesis reveals both the formal structures and the informal strategies that support the application of social logics in integrated planning practices in Melbourne, Australia and Buenos Aires, Argentina. Integrated planning has been promoted in both cities since the early-1990s to overcome the shortfalls of traditional urban policy, including through programs that spatially target inequality and bring together multiple stakeholders for more coordinated policy responses. Through qualitative and comparative methods, this doctoral study examined multiple experiences of integrated planning focused on redressing disadvantage across both metropolitan settings. It employed a conceptual framework for understanding how to reduce disadvantage through planning by marrying the Theory of Social Logics (Fincher and Iveson, 2008) and understandings of practical wisdom (inter alia: Davoudi, 2015; Hillier, 2002; Flyvbjerg, 2001). This thesis reports the research findings, commencing with a localised and grounded understanding of integrated planning and then expounding the conditions necessary for integrated planning with social logics to occur and be sustained over time. In order to better understand the challenges to integrated planning for the reduction disadvantage, it also reports in detail the common barriers faced in formal policy and governance structures. The thesis also describes the informal strategies and tactics of urban planners in pursuing social logics despite the uncertain and at times unfavourable conditions revealed. Finally, it offers recommendations for the design of policy and urban governance structures to pursue integrated planning for reducing disadvantage, as well as a theoretical proposition for a phronetic Theory of Social Logics.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Background: why study integrated planning with social logics?

This thesis is concerned with integrated planning practices that aimed to reduce disadvantage in Melbourne, Australia and Buenos Aires, Argentina between the mid-1990s and 2015. Relative disadvantage is a growing problem in both contexts and is reflected through increased socio-spatial polarisation, with worsening spatial clustering of households on relatively low incomes in Melbourne (Baum & Gleeson, 2010; Jones, 2012; Pawson & Herath, 2012; Randolph & Holloway, 2005) and Buenos Aires (Echevarría, 2008; Pírez, 2002; Torres, 2001, 2004). The geography of relative disadvantage predominately correlates with ‘locational disadvantage,’ whereby substandard urban conditions deprive households of adequate access to services, infrastructure and employment opportunities (Echevarría, 2008; Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Pawson & Herath, 2012; Pírez, 2002; Torres, 2004). Relative disadvantage is especially acute in both cities’ north-west regions and to some degree in the outer southern metropolitan area (Figure 1.1). Integrated planning formed the focus of this research because it has been “ cresting a wave of interest” (Holden, 2012, p. 305) since the mid-1990s and because of the imperative to better understand contemporary planning interventions that target disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, often through ‘place’ or ‘area’ based approaches.

Figure 1.1 Relative disadvantage* in Melbourne, by lowest statistical division

*darker red/orange indicate areas of highest relative disadvantage

Integrated planning has been championed over recent decades to address disadvantage in ways that seek to overcome the shortfalls of traditional urban policy, including ‘silohed’ and fragmented urban governance settings, as well as delivering cross-sectoral policy outcomes in specific locations (Healey, 2006; Holden, 2012; Kidd, 2007; Stead & Meijers, 2009). Integrated planning has sought to bring together policy areas that are often dealt with separately, such as health policy and transport planning, and different actors to address complex urban challenges, from government and non-government sectors. Integrated planning refers to the “management of cross-cutting issues that transcend the boundaries of established policy fields and that do not correspond to the institutional responsibilities of individual government departments” (Holden, 2012, p.306). It often involves partners and stakeholders from outside of government in urban policy. This thesis focuses on integrated planning that has been applied in the cause of reducing social disadvantage.

In both policy settings, the commitment to combat relative disadvantage through integrated approaches to planning has translated into quality of life improvements in some communities. In the
case of Melbourne, specific examples include the Australian Federal Government’s Building Better Cities program (1991-1996) (e.g. Bryant, 2016; Victorian Auditor-General’s Office, 1996), the State Government of Victoria’s neighbourhood renewal strategies (2001 to present) (e.g. Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, 2008; Shield, Graham, & Taket, 2011); and various localised revitalisation strategies (e.g. Revitalising Central Dandenong, Victorian Auditor-General’s Office, 2011). Positively evaluated examples from Buenos Aires can be found in the PROMEBA neighbourhood renewal program (e.g. Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe, 2007; Secretaría de Vivienda y Hábitat, 2011), and the socio-spatial improvement strategy ‘Plan Ahí’ (e.g. Simone, Laurens, & Sarchi, 2013).

More detailed analysis of the overall net-positive outcomes outlined above demonstrates a more complex array of metrics, with the nature of these benefits varying between each integrated application. For example, in Buenos Aires some place-based approaches have delivered the reduction of ‘unmet basic needs’ through housing improvements and service delivery. Also, Melbourne’s neighbourhood renewal strategies has been assessed to deliver positive cost-benefit outcomes for government ($2.2 in non-housing benefits for every $1 spent) (Wood & Cigdem, 2012) and have generally proven to be “effective in improving trust in government, perceptions of community participation, influence and control over community decisions; improved services; (…) and addressing area-level determinants to improve social inclusion” (Shield et al., 2011, p. 4). In fact, the perceived successes of these program led to the development of a Mainstreaming Strategy “to embed the key features of neighbourhood renewal – joined up government, place management and community governance – into the workings of state and local governments” (States Services Authority, 2007, p.11).

Despite some successes, many integrated planning initiatives have not been monitored or evaluated, and others have been critiqued for displacing disadvantage through gentrification or for failing to lift quality of life outcomes in Melbourne (inter alia Fincher, Pardy, & Shaw, 2016; Porter & Shaw, 2009) and Buenos Aires (Wagner, Varela, & Silva, 2004). Evidence suggests that overall planning has generally been inadequate both Melbourne (Baum & Gleeson, 2010; Jones, 2012; Pawson & Herath, 2012; Randolph & Holloway, 2005) and Buenos Aires (Echevarría, 2008; Pérez, 2002; Torres, 2001, 2004) in combating disadvantage. Furthermore, while ‘integrated’ approaches to policy are widely encouraged in both contexts, the definition varies considerably in policy documentation and in academic literature (Holden, 2012; Lowe, 2015; Rayner & Howlett, 2009; Stead & Meijers, 2009). Given its variable effectiveness and the increasing focus on integrated approaches in urban policy and planning (Holden, 2012), it is imperative to further understand its functioning and, in particular, how ‘social logics’ manifest in policy definition and implementation processes. In this regard, while many of the evaluations undertaken focus on outcomes and formal governance processes, rarely is attention given to the everyday settings and practices that support efficacious integrated planning. This aligns
with findings in urban governance literature, which have suggested that decision-making in planning can seem like a ‘black-box’ (Albrechts, 2006) and “much of what takes place in everyday practice is as yet untheorised… (including) the tactics…to achieve policy decisions in the cause of social justice” (Hillier, 2002, p.ix). This thesis addresses the problem of definitional opacity by producing a conceptual framework for understanding integrated planning as well as revealing different formal structures and informal strategies used to shape the social ambition and substantive policy content of integrated planning initiatives.

Theoretical underpinnings and ambition

The Theory of Social Logics (TSL) developed by Fincher and Iveson (2008) was used in the research as a theoretical basis to foreground and deductively examine the social dimensions of integrated planning. Social logics are broad working principles applied in planning to advance socially-just outcomes in cities, including the reduction of disadvantage. Logics “provide guidelines on how to interpret and function in social situations” (Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011, p. 317). Born out of theoretical contributions on social justice and the ‘right to the city’ (Marcuse, 2009a; Soja, 2010), the roles of difference (Young, 1990), recognition and encounter (Amin & Thrift, 2002; Fraser & Naples, 2004), TSL offers a powerful explanatory framework to consider the social obligations, opportunities and achievements of integrated planning.

The social logics are those of redistribution, recognition and encounter. An example of redistributive action in many Western planning contexts is the collection of rates and allocation of funds to deliver specific services for communities in need. Through redistribution, planning can address material and, in turn, opportunity gaps between the rich and poor. Recognition entails overcoming nonmaterial differences so that people’s identities and their unique ways of being are valued. Planning with a particular focus on the needs of children or other groups, such as immigrants, the disabled or older persons, can ‘recognise’ difference and promote social inclusion. Encounter promotes the interaction of individuals to offer opportunities for increased sociality and conviviality in cities. Planning for encounter might involve designing public infrastructure such as libraries or public spaces as well as festivals, drop-in centres, cafes and community centres to enhance social interaction. Ideally, the three norms of redistribution, recognition and encounter are intertwined to optimise the social efficacy of planning. The decision rules devised by Fincher and Iveson (2008) to implement the social norms include those shown in Table 1.1 below.

Whilst TSL offers a comprehensive conceptual framework for exploring the social potential of contemporary integrated planning, it “is far from a complete guide to planning action (and) leaves open matters of interpretation” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 214). In particular, the authors call for
“grounded investigations of justice” and suggest that “the production of a longer list of decision rules is desirable” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, pp. 231, 214). More recently, Iveson has highlighted the need to consider not only “the what and the why of urban (in)justice” but also “the question of how we might act collectively in specific historical and geographical situations to challenge injustice” (Iveson, 2014, pp. 992-993). This thesis seeks to take up these challenges. It does this by first revealing the inner-workings of contemporary practice realities from two contexts (results in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6) and then proposing modifications to integrated planning practice (Chapter 7) and extending TSL based on the politico-institutional conditions of practice settings and ‘practical wisdom’ (Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 1998; Hillier, 2002) uncovered (Chapter 8). Overall, this thesis extends the ‘rules of thumb’ developed in TSL for redressing disadvantage by considering the ‘rules of the game’ necessary for agile integrated planning practice in Melbourne and Buenos Aires.

Table 1.1 Decision rules for social logics in planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistribution</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• equity in the allocation of expenditure in different local areas and populations; and</td>
<td>• make a checklist of social or identity groups and allocate resources between them; and/or</td>
<td>• provide a variety of social and economic infrastructure (e.g. meeting places like drop-in centres, planned events or public libraries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social mix (the intention is to ‘mix’ people of different income groups, particularly by precluding ‘concentrations’ of poor people).</td>
<td>• devise cross-group projects and allocate resources to these.</td>
<td>• encourage stakeholder agency in encounter; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• create safe and transparent spaces for encounter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: developed based on Fincher and Iveson (2008)

Research aim and questions

The aim of this research is to improve critical understanding of contemporary integrated planning practices in Melbourne and Buenos Aires oriented towards the reduction of disadvantage. The research questions are:

1. Based on contemporary characteristics and socio-historical influences, how is integrated planning understood in Melbourne and Buenos Aires?
2. In these contexts, what are the formal structures and informal strategies that support social logics for reducing disadvantage through integrated planning?
3. Are there grounds to support modifications to integrated planning practices and extend the theory of social logics based on cross-case conclusions? If so, in what way?

Research method

To respond to the research aim and questions and to enable close examination of the practice reality of integrated planning for reducing disadvantage, the research design followed a ‘phronetic’ (Flyvbjerg,
2001) approach. This approach emphasises the social and historical conditioning of each context (Flyvbjerg, 2001) and focuses on the inner “working of institutions” (Chomsky & Foucault, 1974, p. 171). To elucidate the nature of practical wisdom from both case contexts, and in the tradition of studying the experiences of planners (inter alia: Burton, 2011; Forester, 1989; Healey & Underwood, 1977; Hillier, 2002; Hoch, 1994; Inch, 2012; Underwood, 1980), the ‘micro-practices’ of planners used to navigate the barriers to advancing social logics through integrated planning were examined.

In this regard, the study worked deductively from an understanding of social logics to identify the different formal structures and informal strategies used to shape and implement social logics in everyday planning realities. It is important to note that the focus was on uncovering repeated structures and actions in state-led planning so as to give greater weight to the practice recommendations and theoretical propositions. The specific cases explored within each context were selected in order that different politico-institutional conditions and governance features could be explored, and therefore vary considerably in terms of spatial scale, number of actors, mix of policy domains, and levels of investment. More detail about these experiences is provided in Chapter Four.

The case study method was imbued with an ethnographic sensibility (Henderson, 2016) to make visible social processes that are difficult to observe without close examination of contexts and practices. The specific methods employed sought to maximise possible exposure to and interpretation of institutional practices and individual agency within them. Specifically, qualitative content analysis of policy documentation was used to develop an understanding of the formal structures of integrated planning in both contexts. This covered all relevant strategic planning policies between 1915 and 2015. Then, approximately 20 semi-structured interviews were undertaken in each context (18 in Melbourne and 24 in Buenos Aires) to uncover a practice-based account of the formal structures and ‘tacit skills’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) employed for social change. Interviews with planners were conducted until repetition of findings reached a point of saturation or significant standard of proof. It should be noted that the focus was on planners’ own perspectives rather than that of other actors interested or involved in city planning. Where practicable, participant observation at key events, meetings or the workplaces of planners was also carried out. This assisted triangulate findings and for relationship-building, but did not prove useful in revealing new data. Each phase of the study was framed by the TSL and a view of practical wisdom. Interpretation therefore moved between using ideas to make sense of data and using data to change ideas (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007) or “to move between normative theorising and worldly situations, between universal and particular” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 237).

A comparative approach was adopted to enhance the possibility of moving between universal and particular conditions for integrated planning to reduce disadvantage. The cases selected come from two Southern Hemisphere countries that share similarities, from geography and climate, to historical
immigration flows (from European to now predominantly regional neighbours) and composition of their economies (largely dependent on primary industry exportation). There are also important differences, in particular for this research regarding their traditions of government with the most significant being the depth and pace of policy change when a new reality emerges (such as a change of administration or surge in community interest in an issue): In Argentina this can be more abrupt than in Australia. Nevertheless, this research found many convergences between the two politico-institutional settings and practices, and it is from this basis that intertwined, cross-case conclusions are made throughout this thesis. This goal to make general observations from diverse experiences of integrated planning sits within a general trend of growing interest in comparative urban research (Clarke, 2012; Dear, 2005; McFarlane, 2010; McFarlane & Robinson, 2012; Nijman, 2007; Robinson, 2004, 2006). Furthermore, the findings from the empirical work are used throughout this thesis, including from the beginning to sharpen and localise theoretical accounts of integrated planning (Chapter 2) and in relation to conceptualisation of social justice as social logics in planning (Chapter 3).

Contribution of this research

The findings of this research contribute to planning theory and practice. Regarding practice, greater transparency is brought regarding the interplay between the rationalities of urban development and the formal structures and informal practices that seek to guide this process. For applied dimensions of planning, the findings identify common trends and offer recommendations to strengthen the practice of integrated planning for delivering socially just urban outcomes in Melbourne and Buenos Aires (which may also be relevant in other metropolitan settings with similar politico-institutional conditions). In particular, uncovering and analysing the key features of integrated planning brings clarity for policy-making and highlights possible pathways to strengthen and extend practices for reducing disadvantage through applied social logics. This is relevant to both case contexts given chequered past experiences and current efforts to improve integrated planning practices. Through the consideration of both formal and informal practices, this thesis offers a contribution to efforts for “planning officers to act more effectively in the shadow of inequalities” (Hillier, 2002, p.19).

Regarding theory, this thesis proposes extending TSL by developing explicit, conceptual ties to practical wisdom in the planning process. In this regard, the comparative approach helped go beyond the identification of local contexts and ‘thick’ (Hillier & Healey, 2010) descriptions of specific case experiences to identify some generalisable features of integrated planning and then draw theoretical interpretations from this for extending TSL. In particular, the research proposes a new set of decision rules for operationalisation of TSL in practice-settings marked by a generally neoliberal policy agenda and uncertain politico-institutional conditions. In addition to the findings relating to practice and
theory, an innovative methodological approach was used by bringing an ethnographic sensibility to case study research. This approach, elaborated in detail in *Toward of an Ethnographic Sensibility in Urban Research* (Henderson, 2016), offers a reproducible framework for addressing the challenge of “maintaining an effective dialogue between theoretical and practical consciousness” (Flyvbjerg et al., 2014, p.283) in urban research.

**Thesis structure**

This thesis is the product of a doctoral study conducted between April 2013 and October 2017. Detailed information about the conceptual frameworks, methods and findings are presented over the following seven chapters. **Chapter 2** specifically responds to the first research question by elaborating a basic conceptual framework of contemporary integrated planning. This was developed from a review of planning and governance literature as well as a genealogy of integrated approaches in strategic planning initiatives from each case context between approximately 1915 and 2015; the era during which urban planning emerged and evolved in each city. **Chapter 3** sets up the theoretical framework used to examine the ways and means of reducing disadvantage in contemporary integrated planning. In particular, it brings together TSL and understandings of practical wisdom as an approach to foreground integrated planning practices that reduce disadvantage. **Chapter 4** describes the methods employed to respond to the research questions. **Chapter 5** starts to respond to the second research question by detailing the opportunity scenarios as well as the formal conditions that support integrated planning for reducing disadvantage. **Chapter 6** completes the response to the second research question by describing the barriers to integrated planning for reducing disadvantage, as well as the strategies and tactics employed by planners to advance social logics in sub-optimal circumstances. Finally, practical reflections and recommendations are put forward in **Chapter 7**, while **Chapter 8** contains specific interpretations of the research for extending TSL. Together Chapters 7 and 8 respond to my final research question.
Chapter 2. A grounded understanding of integrated planning

Introduction
This chapter responds to the first research question by developing a grounded understanding of integrated planning applicable to Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Integrated planning is a generic policy nostrum used to describe contemporary urban policy-making that links diverse objectives and multiple stakeholders. It has been “cresting a wave of interest” (Holden, 2012, p. 305) since the mid-1990s in Western cities and characterises a vast number of planning interventions in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. This chapter first explores the characteristics of contemporary integrated planning expounded in urban planning and governance literature. Then a genealogy of integrated planning practices is developed over three distinct evolutionary phases shared between approximately 1915 and 2015, highlighting broad similarities in the “evolution” (Weaver, 2017) of the concept in terms of policy focus and institutional frames. The Foucauldian concept of genealogy is used as it foregrounds the possibility that contemporary concepts and knowledge are tied to a plural and non-linear historical evolution of events (Foucault, 1977; Foucault & Sheridan, 1979). It allows the meshing together of scholarly and local practice knowledge to reconceptualise current or “taken for granted” (Kearins & Hooper, 2002, p. 734) understandings of integrated planning. Finally, a basic conceptual framework for understanding integrated planning is presented towards the end of the chapter. Overall, the interpretative frame offered is rooted first in theory and then grounded in context through an understanding of a variety of influences and events over the century-long timeframe in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. For this, and in line with the overall style of this thesis, the chapter draws both on relevant literature and findings from the empirical work conducted as part of this doctoral study (planners from Melbourne are prefaced with M and BA for those from Buenos Aires). This mixed approach was adopted so as to deepen and ground the conceptualisation of integrated planning.

Improving concept clarity regarding integrated planning is a necessary starting point for this thesis for four main reasons. First, as an internationally popularised concept, the practices of integrated planning vary between jurisdictions in terms of policy focus, scope and mechanisms of integration. Second, integrated approaches are often touted in practice as a panacea for tackling complex urban problems without clear definition (Holden, 2012; Stead & Meijers, 2009). Third, the various definitions of integrated planning in academic literature (inter alia Healey, 2006; Holden, 2012; Kidd, 2007; Lowe, 2015; Rayner & Howlett, 2009) differ based on authors’ choice of theoretical frameworks and problems of study. For example, they are different depending on whether they are taken from political science, urban planning or sustainability perspectives. Lastly, clarification for the specific case contexts is needed to identify and thread together contingencies between current integrated approaches and historic planning occurrences. The chapter therefore responds to calls for closer
examination of the dimensions of this “umbrella term” (Kidd, 2007, pp. 162-163) in order to gain “more definitional resolution” (Holden, 2012, p. 305). Because this thesis is concerned with integrated planning that aims to reduce disadvantage, the proceeding discussion relates specifically to this purpose, though acknowledges other integrated approaches occur in policy.

Integrated planning explained: from a general understanding to specificities

**Integrated planning broadly defined**

Integrated planning is a broadly and imprecisely used concept which generally refers to an urban governance approach for managing cross-cutting issues in specific geographies between multiple actors. There are a wide range of definitions and applications of the concept (Healey, 2006; Stead & Meijers, 2009). For example, it is promoted by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2002) for achieving sustainable development, by the United Nations (2016) as part of the recent New Urban Agenda agreement that encourages “integrated approaches to urban and territorial development” (p. 5), as well as at the city level in areas such as health (Kidd, 2007), sustainability (Holden, 2012), housing (Slocombe, 2003) and transport (Curtis, Armstrong, & Babb, 2010). Despite widespread references to the need for integrated approaches in urban policy and its breadth of application in tackling ‘complex’ urban problems, few academic studies or policy instruments “contain much elaboration of the concept itself or expand on how it might be achieved in practical terms” (Stead & Meijers, 2009, p. 319). Healey has highlighted this broad interpretation of integrated planning, explaining that it has been used to describe a variety of purposes, including:

- as a way of linking diverse policy objectives (the search for a beneficial economic, social and environmental ‘balance’);
- as a way of connecting issues as they play out spatially (for example, housing and economic development, or land use and transport);
- as a way of linking different types of government intervention (especially regulatory power and investment power);
- as a way of overcoming the fragmentation of area and development-based policy initiatives and the competition between individual projects;
- or as a way of linking policy with ‘implementation’. An ‘integrated’ approach may also be used to refer to increasing the connections between levels of government, or to linking multiple stakeholders in the pursuit of an agreed framework or strategy (2006, p. 64).

Planners interviewed from both Melbourne and Buenos Aires as part of this research suggested that localised understandings of the concept were broad and opaque. They explained that while there is growing awareness about the value of integrated planning and service delivery, for example because “it avoids retrofitting later and drives better quality of life outcomes” (M4) and “encourages learning from others and risk management through networks” (M16), there was general agreement that use of the term was vague. In Melbourne, it is a concept that is “really open to interpretation” (M1) and is
“used loosely” in a way that “can sometimes be in the eye of the beholder” (M2). While there is a general view that integrated planning is about “bringing together all the elements that work together in a community,” as a concept it has been used in “so many different contexts and places that it has become a cliché, a descriptor for something which people don’t really understand” (M13). Nevertheless, it has become “pretty mainstream now,” and “we're not having arguments about why we're doing this anymore: it's around how we do this and the problem solving of doing it” (M2). This sentiment was repeated in Buenos Aires: “it is easy for people to become confused because there isn’t a clear definition about what it is” (BA4). Even the 2006 Strategic Plan for Buenos Aires (‘Lineamientos’) states that:

integrated management today is a concept and objective shared by the majority of public and private actors, however the implementation of this idea is not a clear or simple task given the necessary processes to build consensus and enact collaborative planning between multiple levels of government, social actors and the private sector, all who have different interests, points of view and value criteria when prioritising actions (Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006, p. 133).

The drivers of contemporary integrated planning

To distil the main features of contemporary integrated planning relevant to Melbourne and Buenos Aires, the possible drivers behind this approach are considered first. It appears that the widespread application of ‘integrated approaches’ to planning in recent decades is driven by a range of factors. Firstly, there is a practical philosophical interpretation about the role and act of integration generally. Dewey, for example, considered that integration is fundamental to “the human practice of making sense of experience, restoring quality to troubled, ambiguous, disturbed parts” (1981, pp. 227-228 cited in Holden, 2012, p.305). Holden (2012) claims that this is the root driver behind integration in planning. The second, not unrelated driver, is the argument that cities are complex systems that require multidisciplinary and multi-actor approaches to urban planning (Rotmans, van Asselt, & Vellinga, 2000). The conception of cities as ‘complex systems’ appeared in practice at least from the 1920s in both Australia and Argentina (see discussion in proceeding genealogy) and, similarly, in theory emerged with the utopian thinkers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Fishman, 1977). Complexity has remained a constant justification for planning since its emergence as a modern field.

I believe that the third more recent factor is the influence of post-structural critiques on approaches to planning. Post-structural critiques of planning emerged across the Western world by the late 1960s in reaction to the rational comprehensive model of planning, in particular its universal and homogenous character that often caused detrimental impacts for communities (Sandercock, 1975). These critiques are conceived as post-structural in that they challenged planning theory and practice to change its
technical-rational orientation and become more responsive to social complexity and diversity. In this regard, diverse “voices of dissent” emerged from “groups whose particular views, experiences of the city and expectations had been marginalised in the planning process” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 2). Urban politics became greatly influenced by feminist, racial, sexual and environmental movements, for example through “spatial conflicts” (Martin, McCann, & Purcell, 2003, p. 113) around land development trends and land prices. Such discontent led to a “shift towards integrated models of administration and policy development” (Gleeson, Darbas, & Lawson, 2004, p. 353) from the 1980s onwards in many Western contexts. Integrated models of planning were promoted to respond to questions of difference by linking up policy areas to focus on the needs of specific geographies and specific population groups. Furthermore, integrated and relational models of governance were promoted to “realise the democratic potential of planning” (Healey, 1992b, p. 143), through broader representation of stakeholder groups in planning decision-making processes. While integrated and inclusive models of policy-making have broadened the scope of engagement, this has also increased the complexity of integrated planning given that a wide range of interested parties can be involved.

The rise of post-structural critique was met with sweeping changes in modes of “governance” in many Western cities from the 1980s onwards, which clearly have become another strong driving force behind contemporary calls for integrated planning. The new governance paradigm was the product of multiple forces of change in society including, and in addition to, the increasing role of social movements, the rise of new information and communication technologies (Castells, 1996), the “problematisation of the role of the State” (Pedersen & Johansen, 2012, p. 10), which included “much criticism of traditional government structures based upon strong sectoral divisions” (Kidd, 2007, p. 163), and a related “crisis of representative democracy and the globalization of the economy and of culture” (Albrechts, 2006, p. 1487). There were perceived limitations to the traditional political-bureaucratic and technocratic model of ‘big’ government. Instead, the idea was that a hybrid mode of governance (Skelcher, Sullivan, & Jeffares, 2013) would materialise as the conformation of networks for cooperation (Rhodes, 2007b, p. 1246) or collaboration between government, businesses and civil society.

In this context, governance can be understood to both comprise and go beyond government: it is a process that “involves interaction between the formal institutions and those in civil society (…) whereby elements in society wield power, authority and influence and enact policies and decisions concerning public life, and economic and social development” (International Institute of Administrative Sciences, 1996 as cited in Wilkinson, 2005, p. 70). New Public Management (NPM) reforms were introduced in many Western contexts from the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s with the aim to increase efficiency in public services through a suite of ‘structural adjustments’. These are not discussed in detail here, but for the purposes of clarifying the concept of integrated planning it is...
relevant to note that some measures, such as outsourcing or privatising former public services to the private sector and civil society organisations, expanded the role of non-government actors in urban policy (Sager, 2011) and concurrently the need to coordinate these multiple actors. In this context, conceptual frameworks such as policy network theory have been popularised, and terms such as ‘whole-of-government’, ‘joined-up government’, ‘cross-agency programs’, ‘boundary-spanning policy’, ‘intersectoral action’ and ‘policy integration’ have emerged to describe governance approaches that emphasise the coordination and mobilisation of policy networks that address complex problems. In theory, governance structures have become ‘“multi-organizational” networks or ‘loosely coupled’ organizational systems that bring together a diverse range of actors rather than State hierarchies of command and control” (Painter, 1987, p. 9).

Contemporary integrated planning is intimately tied to this shift from government to governance. The model of planning as a government-only activity held “decreasing validity at the beginning of the twenty-first century as analysts and practitioners realise the importance of complex networks” (Hillier, 2002, p. 92). For planning, governance trends have led to a shift away from centralised decision-making to a pluralist approach “of coexisting networks and partnerships that interact as overlapping webs of relationships at diverse spatial scales” (Hubbard, Kitchin, Bartley, & Fuller, 2002, p. 176). In this regard, some planning scholars have linked NPM reforms with integrated approaches to planning (Sager, 2011), including through public-private partnerships in urban infrastructure delivery and outsourcing of public services such as housing. The “dispersal of government capacity caused by NPM” (Sager, 2011) led to a fragmented urban government setting in many Western cities (Davies, 2009; Gleeson, Dodson, & Spiller, 2012; Sager, 2011), further fuelling calls for integrated approaches to planning that would ‘join-up’ actors’ activities. Non-government organisations and citizens’ groups also participate further in planning processes, from formal engagement mechanisms to acting as implementation and service delivery agents.

In addition to the approach of governing through ‘networks’, market-based mechanisms have become more prevalent in planning. Practitioners from both Melbourne and Buenos Aires commented on this shift towards relational and market-based models of governance with shared responsibilities between government and non-government actors. Partly, many participations talked about needing “to do more with finite resources” (M1) or “there not being enough money in government to address all the needs” (M2), which has led to the exploration of opportunities to plan in ‘partnership’ or ‘collaborate’ with non-State actors. “Integrated planning and working together is a way of saving money” (M6), but also the way to generate “the biggest impact in a context in which governments are not flushed with cash anymore” (M9). The need for improved integration was also tied to the increasingly fragmented context of urban governance. The “transfer in role of government from being the service provider to being the facilitator” (M1) has led to the multiplication of actors and increased “fragmentation”,
which places new ‘stresses’ and ‘demands’ on planning to coordinate the actions of multiple stakeholders. Also, planners interviewed as part of this research suggested that changes in governance have also led to integrated approaches in planning specific areas or “pieces” of the city where there is an identified need for “coordinated action” or where the “market decides it is interesting to act” (BA1).

This approach to planning ‘pieces’ of the city also responds to a governance trend toward more spatially-targeted and strategic policy interventions (Albrechts, 2004, p. 743). “There has been something of a return to using spatial planning to integrate policies across sectoral, organizational and territorial boundaries” (Vigar, 2009, p. 1572). Planning is seen as giving strategic orientation to policy interventions that “emphasizes the qualities of places” (Healey, 2006, p. 527). A specific spatial focus, like a neighbourhood or river basin region, is used to bring together different stakeholders to define and implement policy that attends to the specific needs of place. However, there are other key reasons for this place-based focus in contemporary settings. First, neoliberal structural adjustments have led to rising social inequality (Brenner & Theodore, 2002) with similar cost transfers to the worst off communities as well as increasing clustering of disadvantage in some neighbourhoods (Adams & Hess, 2001; Jessop, 2002; Reddel, 2002). Integrated planning can take on a specific focus to redress disadvantage in these instances, for example through neighbourhood revitalisation projects. These kinds of contemporary urban interventions to address disadvantage are conceived as “exceptional” in the context of a “residual state sector” (Jessop, 2002, p. 461): one that has retreated from its centralised and hierarchical character to adopt networked approaches to government. Conversely, targeted place-based interventions under neoliberal governance regimes may also be mobilised for market-based developments, as “sites for capital accumulation” (Brenner & Theodore, 2002, p. 355). Under both scenarios, integrated approaches are used to bring together stakeholders to work together to formulate and execute place-based development strategies.

From the above overview of socio-institutional influences behind contemporary integrated planning, two umbrella themes emerge to support the development of a basic conceptual framework: spatial integration and actor interrelations. The first theme links integration and space, from both post-structural critiques that have advocated for plurality in planning for heterogeneous communities as well as from governance trends with public policy emphases on strategic, spatial interventions including those to address disadvantage in particular communities (Albrechts, 2006). The second theme foregrounds the nature of actor interrelations, in particular broadening democratic participation in planning decision-making as well as navigating multi-actor and fragmented urban governance settings. If contemporary integrated planning comprises both a focus spatial integration and actor interrelations, in what kinds of practices and actions of planning can this ‘integration’ be seen? The
following section provides an overview of the planning processes that support these two dimensions as related in urban studies literature.

**First dimension of integrated planning: spatial integration**

It is “widely accepted that integration is one of the central features of spatial planning” (Kidd, 2007, p. 161) and, at a basic level, spatial integration focuses on the role of space to achieve policy ends. According to Albrechts (2006, p. 1492), the term spatial “brings into focus the ‘where of things’, whether static or dynamic; the creation and management of special places and sites; as well as the interrelations between different activities in an area.” Following this definition, planning and governance literature reveal two main understandings of the role of space relevant to contemporary integrated planning.

The first relates to planning in a way that accounts for interactions between different activities or places. In this regard, and through both strategic and statutory tools, planning can either provide for the separation of incompatible land uses, like heavy industry and housing, or support the integration of symbiotic land uses, infrastructure and services, like transport hubs and higher density housing or community facilities and retail premises (e.g. Curtis and James, 2004; Geerlings and Stead, 2003; Potter and Skinner, 2000). The motivation here is to maximise the benefits from both the eventual interactions between land uses (Curtis et al., 2010) and through a multidisciplinary approach to land use planning, whereby elements such as transport, housing, retail and social services are planned together for timely and mutually-beneficial delivery. Another related spatial planning tactic is territorial integration, which aims to overcome disjointedness produced by varying public policy between jurisdictions or the pace or quality of development in different areas. This kind of ‘cross-boundary’ planning (Kidd, 2007) between areas with different urban qualities can improve efficiency, for example relating to the movement of people and goods between areas, as well as improving the quality of urban environments, for example by reducing inequalities and fragmentation.

The second spatial dimension relevant to integrated planning relates to contemporary place-based approaches that are strategic and targeted, as opposed to past practices of universal and comprehensive planning. Place-based planning involves the management of specific places, often to address disadvantage through coordinated actions (Lawson, 2008; Reddel, 2002). Since the late 1980s, place-based approaches “have gradually replaced certain functional administration frameworks with new spatially based approaches that emphasise whole of government service delivery to meet the needs of a geographically defined local community” (Lawson, 2008, p. 1). Specifically, this involves “moving away from regulatory policy and instruments to a more development-led approach that aims to intervene more directly, more coherently and more selectively in social reality and development” (Albrechts, 2006, p. 1489). This approach might include actions like urban renewal, neighbourhood
revitalisation, bioregional planning or in relation to specific projects and policies, such as the design of spaces for social integration and ‘encounter’ (Amin, 2006; Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Tools for place-based planning include involving public sector and non-government actors, creating shared visions for place, developing implementable strategies with “decision frameworks for influencing and managing spatial change” (Albrechts, 2006, p. 1491). In contrast to other integrated public policy approaches, both place-based approaches and planning for the optimisation of land use interactions bring into focus the role of space in integration. The often deal with similar problems that have become concentrated in different places, such as lack of services or unemployment, in a context of growing socio-spatial polarisation.

**Second dimension of integrated planning: actor interrelations**

Processes that support actor interrelations are key features of contemporary integrated planning. The focus on actor interrelations has been driven by a perception of government “as fragmented both internally and in its dealing with other sectors; a focus on outcomes rather than outputs to measure success; and the recognition that issues such as community renewal…require many different players” (IPAA, 2002, p.5). While coordination between public sector actors has been a constant focus in planning, the multiplication of non-State actors in the planning process was described above to have two origins: it is the produce of post-structural critique and the shift from approaches from government to governance. Bringing together the different actors required to define and implement urban policy is referred to variously as ‘intersectoral action,’ ‘whole-of-government’, ‘joined-up government’ and simply ‘policy integration’. These contemporary integrated approaches seek to overcome ‘silo’ or ‘line’ governance models to deliver “the spanning of traditional boundaries among government departments, between public sector agencies and private and third sector organisations, and between citizens and communities” (Langford & Edwards, 2002, p.7).

The urban policy literature reveals different focus points on interrelations between actors in integrated approaches. Here, contributions by five main authors that have influenced the planning field (Albrechts, 2004, 2006; Healey, 2006; Holden, 2012; Kidd, 2007; Stead & Meijers, 2009) have been used to identify two distinct yet related types of actor interrelations. Firstly, integration appears within government either as a vertical form of coordination between governments of different levels or as horizontal coordination in two main forms. Horizontal integration occurs between departments within the same level of government (such as transport and planning, housing and education) as well as between governments of the level that share spatial boundaries and common planning questions, often between adjoining local governments. Secondly, contemporary integrated planning depends significantly on State-Society linkages between key actors, including for example infrastructure delivery agencies, civil society groups and committees (particularly metropolitan foundations, neighbourhood management committees) and economic actors, such as land developers and private
service providers. Different types and depths of actor interrelations are mobilised in support of integrated planning, including to advance the aforementioned elements of spatial integration. Each of these forms of actor interrelations is described below and inform the final development of the framework for contemporary integrated planning presented at the end of this chapter.

Coordination between different levels of government is commonly understood as ‘vertical’ integration (Holden, 2012). Vertical integration involves the “force of legitimate authority” and the “transmission downwards of authorised decisions” (Colebatch, 1998, pp. 38, 23). In both federated political systems (such as Australia’s) or presidential systems (such as Argentina’s), vertical coordination has been a prominent feature of planning and urban governance practices, for example with higher levels of government establishing policy objectives and passing on implementation responsibilities to lower levels of government. In both settings lower levels of government are reliant of funding from above, the state or provincial governments are responsible for metropolitan planning (as well as health, education and other social services) and local governments are created by the states to undertake basic services such as street cleaning and road building. Local governments in Australia often play a broader role in urban development and planning with a greater capacity to raise funds, while in Argentina most local governments focus on the urgent task of basic infrastructure planning and provision (with some important exceptions such as the City of Buenos Aires). The federal level in Argentina has played a more consistent role in urban planning since the 1950s with dedicated areas of government and funding programs for local development, such as for sewerage treatment plants, road improvement or in social housing (including with support from international donor agencies).

The connecting up of different governance initiatives has been termed ‘joined-up’, ‘holistic’ or ‘whole-of’ government (Healey, 2006). Achieving vertical coordination can depend on institutional, bureaucratic and political forms of direction and administration. For example, legislating or mandating structures of coordination through arms-length entities that support State-led land development or reallocating responsibilities within the public sector (e.g. centralising or merging) might be achieved through new institutional forms. Alternatively, issuing formal lines of control or introducing processes (e.g. budgeting) might occur through bureaucratic and political forms of direction. Coordination is always directed from more powerful levels of government downwards, which often leave little room for manoeuvre by lower levels of government (or subordinate departments) and can overlook procedural information sharing mechanisms or political factors (Bouckaert, Peters, & Verhoest, 2010; Mintzberg, 1979). Structures and processes that embody this verticalisation can indicate the presence of ‘integration’ between higher and lower levels of government.
On the other hand, horizontal integration comprises integration across sectors or departments within the same level of government or across jurisdictions within the same sector (e.g. between neighbouring local governments) (Colebatch, 1998; Curtis et al., 2010; Holden, 2012; Kidd, 2007; Stead & Meijers, 2009). It is characterised by “collaboration, coordination and the building of working relationships that span departmental and agency boundaries and policy areas” (Albrechts, 2006, p. 1158). It seeks to overcome inefficiencies related to duplication or policy deficiencies, and promote consistency and synergies in policy (Kidd, 2007) as well as “to improve the achievement of cross-cutting goals, encourage greater understanding of the effects of polices on other actors and to help promote innovation in policy development and implementation” (Stead & Meijers, 2009, p. 319).

The mechanisms of horizontal integration differ from vertical integration, relying more on “negotiation, co-ordination and bargaining” as opposed to “authority and conformance” (Curtis et al., 2010, p. 6). Horizontal integration is pursued in different ways, for example through promoting, requiring or rewarding shared knowledge building and strategic goal setting, joint operational collaboration (budgeting, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) through formal structures (e.g. task forces, cabinet systems, advisory committees) and technical work in interdisciplinary teams (Holden, 2012; Kidd, 2007). Various authors (e.g. Holden, 2012; Stead & Meijers, 2009; Vigar, 2009) have highlighted that different levels of integration exist in practice. For example, Stead and Meijers (2009) found that integration can exist as cooperation, coordination or as deeper integrated decision-making with different degrees of inputs, outputs and structures in place, with different demands on actors and consequences for institutional arrangements (resources, time, etc.) and outcomes. Objectives and structures that seek to bring efficiency to public policy through cross-sectoral interaction indicate the presence of horizontal integration in integrated planning.

In many Western contexts, integration within the contemporary network governance regime “entails not only cooperation and collaboration across public service agencies, but also two-way communication with organisations such as community groups, business, academics and other governments” (Australian Public Service Commission, 2015). Inter-organisational interrelations are particularly important in integrated planning because of the high number of actor organisations now involved in the definition and implementation of policy (Stead & Meijers, 2009). Often, a specific territorial focus provides the basis for State-society interactions (Albrechts, 2006). Formal structures for integration such as management boards or policy committees exist as well as partnerships (e.g. Public Private Partnerships) and legal service delivery contracts that give a more prominent role to the private sector (Sager, 2012). Civil society groups and the private sector may influence contemporary policy through other means as well, such as lobbying and advocacy work. The drive for governments to be more responsive to citizens has also led to new consultative processes in planning to engage with civil society (Albrechts, 2006; Healey, 1992b, 2006). There is a broad range of mechanisms to
support civil society links, for example from policy working groups, public hearings and surveys, to non-government organisations taking on the role of service provision. Similar to the nature of horizontal and vertical integration, the degree of integration between the State and civil society varies significantly.

**Overview: drivers and dimensions of contemporary integrated planning**

This review highlights the main justifications behind and dimensions of contemporary integrated planning. Justifications for ‘integration’ based on cities as ‘complex’ systems and the value of integration as means to make sense of experiences or restore integrity to fragmented parts form part of historical and contemporary settings. Contemporary justifications for integrated approaches, however, also relate strongly to shifts in governance regimes and post-structural critiques of post-war planning models. As a product of these influences, this research found that contemporary integrated planning has two key features: spatial integration and actor interrelations. Spatial integration brings into focus the role of space as an articulating element for public policy, either in terms of the interactions produced between different activities and geographies, or in relation to bringing together disparate areas of policy under place specific agendas. Delivering spatial integration then rests on different forms of actor interrelations. The literature reviewed highlights that while traditional models of vertical integration between different tiers of governments persist, growing emphasis in contemporary governance settings appears to be given to horizontal integration that links up policy areas across different agencies as well as State-society relations. For further concept clarity and specificity relevant to the case contexts a genealogical review was undertaken of integration in planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires.

**A genealogy of integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires**

The above drivers and dimensions of integrated planning were used as guiding categories for the proceeding genealogical review of practices between the 1920s until 2015 in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Three periods were used for developing the genealogy of integrated planning based on the distinct, localised planning trajectories of Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Despite differences, parallels between policy and institutional frames permit a broad periodisation for both regions. The first begins after World War One when the first strategic plans for these cities were developed. This occurred in 1925 in Buenos Aires and 1929 in Melbourne as a response to growth pressures, manifested for example through traffic congestion and public health issues. The second period commences following World War Two and extends to 1983. It was an era marked by unprecedented planning activity in both cities, including the first strategic plans to be implemented in both contexts. The end of this era was tumultuous relative to each setting; it marks the end of the ‘Dirty War’ dictatorship in Argentina and, in Melbourne, the rise of social movements, a shift away from the thirty-year long conservative State regime and political controversies, for example the dismissal of Melbourne City Council by the
State Government in 1980. The last period begins in 1983 and traverses a predominantly neoliberal period to the present (2015). It can be broadly characterised by significant changes to public sector management, though there are also differences produced in line with local institutional frameworks and policy regimes reflecting distinct ‘actually existing neoliberalisms’ (Brenner & Theodore, 2002). Overall, the below genealogy traces the common trends between the two metropolitan settings and highlights some key differences relevant for the construction of the interpretative frame of contemporary integrated planning.

Early planning activities in Melbourne and Buenos Aires were driven by unprecedented population growth in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While both cities have adopted similar policies and institutional frames relative to their national context, Buenos Aires is atypical given its sheer size (now 10 times bigger than the second largest city Córdoba, while Melbourne has grown to be a similar size to Sydney in recent decades). Nevertheless, in this early period, growth was the main factor beyond planning. Both cities more than doubled in size, from 471,000 to 801,000 between 1891 and 1921 in Melbourne (McCarty & Schedvin, 1978) and from 780,000 to 1,500,000 in Buenos Aires between 1885 and 1914 (Scobie, 1974). Growth was fundamentally influenced by changes in their economies (due to more sophisticated agricultural production practices, for example with improved rail transport from the countryside to cities and meat packing technologies, and in the case of Melbourne the earlier gold rush), which attracted a large wave of European immigration (e.g. Irish, British, Germans) as well as, to a smaller extent, internal migration from the countryside to the city (Scobie, 1971; Stilwell, 1974). In the late 19th century and early 20th century, both cities became stronger trading centres with diversified administrative and trade functions, and active commerce, construction and real estate sectors (Davison, 1978; Schteingart & Torres, 1973; Stilwell, 1974). These changes led to improvements in each city’s respective infrastructure networks (e.g. paving streets, replacement of open sewers, tram electrifications) and expansion of their urban footprints beyond the municipal limits of the Cities of Buenos Aires (Gorlik, 1998; Sargent, 1974; Scobie, 1974) and Melbourne (Neutze, 1977).

The 1920s planning activities in both cities set out to provide coordinated and strategic direction to growth and ‘complex’ urban problems. The 1929 Melbourne Report and 1925 Buenos Aires “Proyecto Orgánico” reflect a focus on basic infrastructure works, especially relating to transport, as well as civic projects, such as open space, public buildings and amenities. The introductions and other commentary throughout these strategic plans highlight why planning became prominent in the public policy debate of the time: each city had outgrown its singular municipal boundaries and urban issues had become more complex, for example in relation to congestion or public health concerns, necessitating coordinated action by different jurisdictions and public authorities to ensure ongoing ‘prosperity’ in each context (Comisión de Estética Edilicia, 1925; Metropolitan Town Planning
Commission, 1929). This complexity argument in support of greater coordination between public policy sectors as well as between jurisdictions continues to be used into the present.

From a review of the 1920s strategic plans, there are two main areas of focus in terms of spatial integration. The first relates to the need for greater territorial integration between adjoining municipalities as part of each metropolitan agenda. In the Melbourne case, concerns were raised about different techniques for mapping and data recording, as well as “a lack of co-ordination in the various phases of development within each municipality” (Metropolitan Town Planning Commission, 1929, p. 291). Another priority in the Melbourne Plan was upgrading road infrastructure to improve physical connection and reduce traffic congestion. In the case of Buenos Aires, disparities in the quality of subdivision and basic infrastructure between the centre and periphery, as well as the need for improved connectivity and less congestion were identified as key spatial planning issues (Comisión de Estética Edilicia, 1925). Notably, the Buenos Aires “Proyecto Orgánico” incorporates the infrastructure needs of the municipalities adjoining the City to promote better territorial integration (Novick, 2003). Those municipalities outside Buenos Aires City, according to the Plan, could “no longer remain unconnected” and were invited to “share the future” of the metropolis (Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006, p. 12). Common threads shared by the 1920s Buenos Aires and Melbourne plans in terms of territorial integration were a concern for development standards to be more uniform, in both prescription as well as outcomes, and for there to be improved connectivity between the city centre and periphery, with less resulting congestion.

From a review of policy documentation, insights were also gained about the relationship between interjurisdictional actors at this time. In particular, the 1920s Plans highlight the need for the coordination of actions by different municipal governments, with notably very different levels of capacity by State Government authorities. In Melbourne, the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works (MMBW) had been established in 1891 in large part to address the “disadvantages of relying on fragmented local government” (Neutze, 1977, p. 209) in infrastructure delivery. The MMBW included representation of local councillors and the Melbourne Commission tasked with preparing the 1929 Plan was required to “consult with the several municipalities…and with every relevant public Authority…, with respect to the subject matter of its inquiries” (1929, p.7). The Buenos Aires Commission was comprised of representatives from different government authorities, including the Ministry of National Public Works and the City of Buenos Aires. The multi-institutional structures for these Commissions and conference activities reflect the importance placed on developing a more coordinated approach between government authorities in planning and infrastructure activities. However, the language used in each document, such as “confer” (Melbourne Metropolitan Town
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1 In Argentina, the second tier of government between municipal and federal levels is referred to as Provincial. For the purposes of this thesis, I refer to the Provincial Governments as State Governments as in Australia.
Planning Commission, 1929, p. 304), indicates that the decision-making was centrally held and consultative mechanisms were used for information gathering and sharing. In this regard, the form of actor interrelations was strongly marked by ‘vertical integration,’ to the extent that the authors of both 1920s Plans recommended permanently establishing a form of metropolitan planning authority to continue to support interjurisdictional coordination efforts. In the case of 1920s Buenos Aires, key policy makers like Benito Carrasco (Director of the Municipal Office of Boulevards) and researchers like Carlos María della Paolera (Director of the Institute of Urbanism, Buenos Aires and also a key policy maker in the 1930s) advocated for a regional planning body or a confederation of municipalities to address the need for coordination and delivery of regional level projects and issues that extended beyond the bounds of the City of Buenos Aires (Novick, 2003). In the 1929 Melbourne Plan, the authors urged the State Government to establish a State Town Planning Authority to address common issues in a coordinated way (Melbourne Metropolitan Town Planning Commission, 1929).

Despite significant investment in strategic planning activities and major infrastructure projects in both cities, neither 1920s plan was implemented due to shifts in political agendas. Instead, planning during the 1930s and 1940s was largely through piecemeal interventions, such as the expansion of particular infrastructure or, in the case of Melbourne, the (controversial) creation of the Housing Commission of Victoria in 1938 to replace slums with low-cost public housing. Despite the controversy associated with this approach to non-consented housing demolition and the creation of densely populated housing blocks, this model of is perhaps the earliest area-based approach to urban policy focused on the redress of disadvantage. In Buenos Aires, there are earlier precedents of responding to the ‘housing crisis’ produced by rapid population growth, including changes to rental laws in the 1920s (e.g. laws 11.156 and 11.157), but also through early ‘working-class’ housing built by the State in targeted locations from 1882 (‘casas para obreros’, located on Las Heras Avenue just outside of the city centre at that time) and throughout this period at punctuated times. Post-WWI housing policies in Buenos Aires responded to a similar reformist tradition in Melbourne, reasoned through hygiene and sanitation concerns (Cravino, 2016). In both settings, State-led social housing initiatives arguably represent the first integrated planning approaches to reducing disadvantage through their spatially targeted (place-based) and multiple policy focus points.

Overall, the primary planning activities that demonstrated characteristics of integrated planning occurred in the 1920s as a reaction to growth pressures from previous decades. Both 1920s Plans in Melbourne and Buenos Aires focused overwhelmingly on the expansion of infrastructure networks to accommodate growth in a way that supported spatial integration between different municipal jurisdictions. Furthermore, the planning process of the 1920s in both cities incorporates interactions between local and state level authorities marked by a downward transmission of planning objectives
and standards. Interviews conducted in Melbourne and Buenos Aires with planners highlighted these experiences as early examples of integration by coordination of service delivery. The very similar planning elements that emerged in this period appear to relate to similar development influences and the shared influences of British ties (including engineering, surveying and transportation technologies). It should be noted however that the planning and architectural styles of this era in Buenos Aires were more greatly influenced by French methods. Overall, the two basic themes of integrated planning in the 1920s, territorial integration and vertical coordination of public sector actors, have remained present, though evolved throughout the ensuing century. While no substantive reforms were made to planning processes as a result of the 1920s plans, many infrastructure projects were realised and specific, area-based housing improvement programs undertaken during this era.

**Integrated approaches to planning in the post-war period: 1945-1982**

Reactivation of strategic planning activities occurred in the period following WWII as part of the Keynesian welfare state model immediately adopted in both countries at this time (Isuani, 2010; McLoughlin, 1992). This produced high levels of investment in infrastructure, services and, in combination with new transport technologies, extensive areas of land were opened up for urbanisation to accommodate high levels of growth (from 3.2% and 3.3% respectively in Melbourne and Buenos Aires between 1947 and 1960), driven mostly by immigration from southern and central European countries to Melbourne and by rural to urban migration in the case of Buenos Aires (McLoughlin, 1992; Torres & Schteingart, 1973). The similar development patterns in both cities were driven in large part by the shift in both cities towards protected manufacturing, making up 24% of employment in Buenos Aires and 32% in Melbourne by around 1970, compared to past urban economies supported predominantly by primary modes of production (Scobie, 1971; Stilwell, 1974).

Spatial integration during the immediate post-war period in Melbourne and Buenos Aires demonstrates a continuation of tendencies from the previous period, including a concern for territorial integration between municipalities, and a new, strong focus on the need to better coordinate land use planning and infrastructure delivery. For example, in the case of Melbourne the Town and Country Planning Board was established in the late 1940s with a multidisciplinary staff of town planners, engineers and surveyors to coordinate the development of planning schemes by local governments to ensure some parity in procedure and outcomes (McLoughlin, 1992; Neutze, 1977). Also, Preferred Development Areas were introduced in 1973 through the Development Areas Act in an attempt to limit subdivisions to areas with comparatively better service capacities (Victorian Government, 1973). However, attempts to achieve territorial integration were often hampered by administrative constraints, including the use of different spatial boundaries (Tsutsumi & Watt 2006). Coordination between different local governments in planning and different areas of the city were primary focus points in Buenos Aires as well in the immediate post-war period, in particular to achieve territorial
integration between burgeoning informal settlements and formal development in the city (Organización del Plan Regulador de Buenos Aires, 1958). In both contexts, planning initiatives from the 1950s sought to better integrate public infrastructure and land-use planning activities, in particular to manage the pace and quality of urban expansion and housing. These focus points and challenges remained relatively constant throughout this period in both contexts as reflected in each city’s successive strategic plans.

Similar to the previous period, it is clear that strategic planning in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires in the immediate post-war era involved a focus on ways to coordinate actions between State and local governments. In Melbourne, both the 1954 and 1971 Plans focused on the definition of settlement patterns and infrastructure works programs through a “coordinative” (Freestone, Amati, & Mills, 2016, p. 311) and State-led “comprehensive” (Gleeson et al., 2012, p. 125) planning approach. The MMBW operated at arm’s length from State Government departments and coordinated the planning activities of municipal governments (Gleeson et al., 2012), “superimposing on the existing planning powers of the individual municipalities” (MMBW, 1954, Chapter 1.2). This approach of integration by delegation was reiterated in subsequent planning policies, including 1981 Metropolitan Strategy, in which “integration” was explained to involve “ensuring that all projects and local development schemes will fit into and further the metropolitan strategy” (Metropolitan Melbourne Board of Works, 1981, p. Chapter 2). Though the State Government played the largest role in metropolitan planning and infrastructure delivery throughout this period, the Federal Government controlled the purse strings for large infrastructure funding (Neutze, 1977) and, during the Whitlam government (1972-1975), this activity increased to direct intervention in urban planning, for example through land banking for State-led development initiatives. Overall, public sector actor interrelations were firmly characterised by vertical integration throughout this period in Melbourne, which produced coordinated and expansive urban interventions particularly in infrastructure provision, though not without difficulty in terms of the often unaligned and competing political interests of different levels of government (McLoughlin, 1992; Neutze, 1977; Stilwell, 1974). Such tensions culminated towards the end of the 1970s and early 1980s, when the State Government dismissed Melbourne City Council and took over the administration of the Council, revealing the “political and bureaucratic struggles for control over the development” (McLoughlin, 1992, p. 121).

In Buenos Aires, centralised and comprehensive approaches to planning were also common at the beginning of this period. However, Buenos Aires experienced a far more extreme version of political turbulence with the loss of democratic government to dictatorships twice in this period: the ‘Argentina Revolution’ (1966-73) and the ‘Dirty War’ (1976-1983). Aside from the social and economic impacts of these dictatorial regimes, integration in planning took on a tightly-held, centralised modality with delegation downward to provinces and municipalities from the federal level. In fact, lower levels of
government were entirely stripped of their own planning powers under military rule (Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006). Instead, the National Development Board (CONADE in Spanish) and the Regional Office of the Metropolitan Area of Buenos Aires were created by the federal government, which led largescale infrastructure programs, such as opening a new port in the city of Buenos Aires (Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006). Periods of democratic rule immediately following WWII and between dictatorships were also characterised by central government planning, however attempts were made to collaborate with both state and local levels beyond questions of implementing national plans. By the end of the 1970s the idea of a comprehensive plan was starting to be “discredited” from two angles: the first was an “intellectual debate around the inefficiency and impossibility of implementing absolute, comprehensive plans” and second “the beginning of a shift towards divestment by the State and descentralised models of government, which weakened traditional planning institutions” going into the following period (BA1).

It is during this post-war period that concerns to improve cross-sectoral policy definition and implementation (or horizontal integration) clearly emerge in both contexts. In Melbourne, the MMBW was tasked with improving integration between land-use planning and infrastructure, however by 1968 several new bodies had been set up including the State Planning Council, which aimed to assist coordinated planning work in the State and between authorities, including the MMBW and between different local governments (McLoughlin, 1992). Then, the State Co-ordination Council was set up in 1981 to evaluate and report on progress with a task group of representatives from a wide range of State Government departments (e.g. Housing, Transport, Education, State Electricity Commission) (Metropolitan Melbourne Board of Works, 1981, p. Chapter 6.1). This proliferation of planning authorities was later re-centralised within the Ministry of Planning (1973) and the State Coordination Council (1975). Though a suite of horizontal coordination initiatives existed in Melbourne, functional plans between sectors were “often not integrated with one another” (Bryson & Einsweiler, 1987, p. 6) and the MMBW, as the principal planning authority, “had no official links, and imperfect working links, with the other utilities and departments…(e.g.) railways, trams, buses, power, gas, education, housing, hospitals, harbors and industrial promotion” (Stretton, 1971, p. 200).

In Buenos Aires, there were a variety of attempts under democratic rule to improve cooperation between sectors, however like in Melbourne, this was hampered by uncertainties around available funds, timeframes to commit to works programs and political processes that overwhelming supported ‘turf protection’ (Schteingart & Torres, 1973; Scobie, 1971).

In addition to the ongoing issue of coordination between levels and departments of government, another major question arose more prominently in the post-war planning period relevant to the conception of integrated planning: the role of non-government actors. In both cities, State-society relations during this period can be divided into two main categories: first, the rise of social
movements and their impact on planning authorities, and second, the role of the private sector, including residential, commercial and industrial land developers, in influencing the shape of the city planning policies and development patterns.

In terms of the private sector, Melbourne’s land use planning system could be historically characterised as always being more responsive than directive of development (Neutze, 1977; Stilwell, 1974) and the post-war boom saw “greatly increased investment in land development by private developers” (Neutze, 1977, p. 211). Private-sector actors would make representations to government, for example “for their responsibilities in servicing to be reduced” and apply pressure “to gain a favourable response at the political level” (Neutze, 1977, p. 244). These lobbying trends have continued into the present. In the case of Buenos Aires and prior to the mid-1950s, local land developers subdivided large, suburban areas in the periphery of Buenos Aires for self-built housing to follow, though State infrastructure delivery and even land-use planning was unable to keep up with the rate of expansion (Echevarría, 2008). This led to an almost total influence of land developers in shaping the expanding city and living conditions for the working classes, which continued throughout this period with the exception of some state intervention through the provision of social housing units. Following the ‘economic subdivisions’ of the Peronist period, land use planning legislation in Buenos Aires restricted access to affordable land and housing, worsening conditions for low-income households, and instead enabled development for higher-income groups (Torres, 1975), leading to growth and consolidation in the private sector of local land developers. While it is evident that land developers played a dominant role in leading the urban development pattern of Buenos Aires, from a review of planning literature, it is unclear to what extent the private sector lobbied governments to enable such land development opportunities, though this becomes a clear trend with the return of democracy after 1983.

In terms of other forms of State-civil society relations, social movements played a great role in influencing policy-making and grew in strength during the post-war period with differing impacts on planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Planning initiatives evolved in Melbourne in response to rising social concerns. First, the 1954 Plan differed from the 1929 Plan in seeking a minimum level of “citizen buy-in” (Freestone et al., 2016), evidenced through the shift from government-only committees and conferences in the 1920s, to informative public exhibitions in the early 1950s (Metropolitan Melbourne Board of Works, 1954; Metropolitan Town Planning Commission, 1929) and the use of planning arguments in favour “the city and its citizens” (Metropolitan Melbourne Board of Works, 1954, p. Chapter 14.13). However, while the 1954 Plan sought to consider social issues like housing and open space provision, it fell short of including diverse views in the planning process (Sandercock, 1975; Stretton, 1971; Troy, 1981) and implementation of some core social aspects of the plan did not occur. Later iterations of the metropolitan strategy paid greater attention to
public concerns (e.g. 1971 Planning Policies for the Metropolitan Region) and formal structures to mediate town planning conflicts, namely the Town Planning Appeals Tribunal which was set up in 1969. These mechanisms did not satisfactorily respond to rising social demands and throughout the 1970s civil society groups grew stronger and more sophisticated in their demands placed on planning authorities, for example through “cross-class coalitions” and the union of “disparate community and single-issue organisations” (McLoughlin, 1992, p. 152). Rising land and housing costs, loss of working-class housing (e.g. for highway development) and the uneven distribution of social services (Stilwell, 1974), contributed to an “evident loss of faith in big government” (McLoughlin, 1992, p. 26) and widespread opposition to planning interventions by the 1970s (Gleeson et al., 2004). While planning processes did not significantly change to incorporate citizen participation until the 1980s, under the Whitlam Government (1972-75) planning interventions were designed in collaboration with local governments for the first time to address a form of place-based disadvantage, such as service under-provision in various poorer areas.

The orientation of the State towards civil society in the post-war period in Buenos Aires ranged from considerate of social demands in democratic periods to extremely fraught and violent under military rule. In particular, citizen demands for improved housing conditions led to ‘economic subdivisions’ as part of the Peronist Five-Year Plans immediately following the war and the 1958 Plan reflected this focus. The reinstatement of Peronism (a political movement oriented towards social justice that promotes neither capitalism or communism) in the early 1970s brought about a revival of mechanisms of wealth redistribution through centralised planning efforts following the first period of military rule in this era. During this time, a Metropolitan Area Plan was created between federal and provincial governments departments, across policy areas such as transport, housing, public works and environment, with a continued focus on social concerns (CONHABITAT Program). Consideration of social issues by the State during democratic periods was responsive to civil society demands in terms of issue identification, however, like Melbourne, the metropolitan planning apparatus was not integrative of civil society beyond information sharing. During military periods, social movements were quashed and planning interventions of force, including housing eradication, were the norm.

Overall, tracing the genealogy of integration in planning during the post-war period in Melbourne and Buenos Aires demonstrates a continued focus on the issue of coordination between different levels of government. Horizontal integration through cross-sector and cross-departmental initiatives took on more importance, particularly in Melbourne. Similarly, planning initiatives in Melbourne became more responsive to though not inclusive of civil society over the period and remained permeable to the pressures of private sector interests. In Buenos Aires, State-civil society relations were marred by periods of military rule and it wasn’t until the return of democracy in 1983 when new practices of non-State actor participation were introduced. In sum, planning during this period in Melbourne
demonstrates broadening integration efforts, while in Buenos Aires integration is focused on vertical coordination, with only incipient shifts towards spatial integration in territorial integration, as well as land use and infrastructure planning. For the purposes of this research, the place-based response to address underserviced areas in Australia under the Whitlam Government seems to mark an early precedent of contemporary integrated planning for the reduction of disadvantage.

**Contemporary approaches to integrated planning 1983-2015**

The contemporary period in both cities (1983-2015) marked significant changes in direction for planning driven by a range of factors. While international immigration continued to drive urban growth, the origin of migrants shifted from European to more regionally focused, including from Asia in Melbourne and the bordering countries of Argentina. In both cases, employment attracts flows of migrants, in Melbourne overwhelmingly in highly-skilled, third sector professional services and in Buenos Aires in construction and domestic labour. Changes in political and governance configurations also continued. In Melbourne, this meant a shift to a democratic socialist regime led by the Australian Labor Party (ALP) following three decades of conservative government (from 1955 to 1982). In Buenos Aires, the shift was more extreme from a military regime that lasted seven years to a democratic government in 1983. In both cases, however, the influence of post-structural critiques and the shift from models of government to governance played significant roles in changing planning approaches.

In this regard, demands from different social movements for governments to better respond to the needs of citizens were coalescing in the 1980s in both cities. In Australia, for example, there were growing calls for increasing participation of women, homosexuals, indigenous people, people of diverse cultural backgrounds and people with a disability in mainstream Australian politics and institutions (Fincher, Iveson, Leitner, & Preston, 2014; Gleeson, 2006). In Buenos Aires, the end of the last military government in 1983 saw immense citizen pressure for democratic practices of inclusion in public decision-making from a rights-based perspective (Franco, 2015), to move from “an authoritarian regime to a pluralist regime” (Russo de Pagno, 2010). Planning was also transformed as governance approaches at the national level became more corporatist and decentralised especially during the 1990s, including under traditionally socialist-leaning parties (ALP in Australia and Peronism in Argentina) that promoted neoliberal reform, for example financial deregulation, privatisation of public services and public-spending reductions (Pírez, 2014). Comparatively, however, the commitment to social investment and inclusion under the neoliberal agenda was consistently stronger in Melbourne and wavering in Buenos Aires, particularly under the 1990s Menem federal administration. This section describes how such contemporary influences drove calls for integrated approaches to planning with some different points of focus to previous periods,
including to address locational disadvantage. It follows the structure of the previous reviews, commencing with spatial integration and then considering actor interrelations.

In Melbourne, an illustrative example of the focus given to spatial integration throughout the period relates to links between land use and transport planning. This is exhibited clearly in the 1995 Living Suburbs metropolitan strategy, which sought to “create a more functional city by better…integrating land development with transport systems” (Government of Victoria, 1995, p.53). This focus continues in Growing Victoria Together, which set ambitious and measurable targets for public transport to promote an efficient urban layout (Government of Victoria, 2001), and Melbourne 2030 in turn encouraged transport and land use planning “to proceed hand-in-hand” (Government of Victoria, 2002, p.173). More recently, the current metropolitan planning strategy, Plan Melbourne (Government of Victoria, 2014), is positioned as “an integrated land-use and transport plan” (p.7) seeking “to integrate long-term land-use, infrastructure and transport planning to meet the population, housing and employment needs of the future” (p.2). It promote some specific social goals such as providing housing choice and affordability (Government of Victoria, 2014). Successive, State Government initiatives, such as the Growth Areas Authority (2006) as well as regional partnerships, such as Northlink, have also promoted greater territorial integration between municipal areas, for example in areas such as transport connectivity and service provision. Another area of focus in territorial integration in Melbourne relates to improving the sequencing of services and infrastructure delivery in ‘growth areas,’ which are service poor, new development areas (e.g. Direction 5 in Our Living Suburbs 1995, Policy 6.3 in Melbourne 2030, the Growth Area Plan 2006 and current State Planning Policy Framework 11 on Settlement).

The historical imperative to coordinate infrastructure and land use planning continues in Buenos Aires into the contemporary period as well. For example, active normative frameworks like the Law of Territorial Planning (8912, 1977) and Law of Just Access to Habitat (14449, 2012), as well as strategic planning frameworks, such as the Strategic Guidelines for the Metropolitan Region of Buenos Aires (2006) promote land use integration, land use and transport integration and, in the case of strategic plans, better integration of different transport modes. For example, Law 14449 requires that all new residential developments provide “access to social and hard infrastructure,” as well as the right to appropriately develop “social and economic activities” and live in a “culturally rich and diverse” environment (Article 11). Territorial integration features widely in planning documentation in Buenos Aires, particularly in relation to connectivity between different parts of the metropolitan area and the exclusion of irregular neighbourhoods, for example through uneven distribution of infrastructure and services. In this regard, the most recent Strategic Plan for the Metropolitan Region of Buenos Aires considers how different densities and growth models impact how people can access
services as well as the “lack of integration between different modes of transport” as a challenge to connectivity (2006).

The concern to improve territorial integration in both cities expressed in urban policy documentation throughout the previous periods in both cities appears to be a precursor to contemporary place-based approaches to planning. In this regard, past practices of territorial integration related to providing infrastructure in underserviced parts of the city, standardising land use planning regulations between local government areas, delivering targeted social housing or improving interconnectivity in each metropolitan area represent some examples of this. Place-based planning in contemporary settings extends this approach to incorporate an explicit socio-spatial focus and the integration of multiple policy aims to address socio-spatial polarisation in both cities (Pírez, 2002; Torres, 2001).

Specifically, a “place-based planning” approach has emerged (inter alia: Byron, 2010; Lawson, 2008) with the aim to “cut across portfolio, professional, and institutional barriers” in addressing specific, place-based issues (Lawson, 2008, p.1). The genealogy included here suggests a more connected relationship with past planning approaches however than much of the academic literature on integrated approaches through place-based planning.

In Melbourne, this approach was initially driven by the Federal Government, through programs like Integrated Local Area Planning (ILAP) and the Better Cities Program (BCP) which commenced in the early 1990s. ILAP sought to adopt a “holistic view of local areas, linking related physical, environmental, social and cultural issues, rather than treating them separately” (Australian Local Government Association, 1993, p.1). In Victoria, the establishment of the State Services Authority in 2004 was a key facilitator of integrated approaches to planning and service delivery (State Services Authority, 2007, p.10). Experiences of place-based planning are now commonplace in Melbourne, for example in the Transit Cities Program (2002-2010), Neighbourhood Renewal (2001 to present), urban revitalisation projects and in delivering specific projects, like Food for All (food security in vulnerable neighbourhoods 2005-2010). Melbourne 2030, the metropolitan strategic plan introduced in 2002, clearly articulated a preference for “integrated, comprehensive approaches to places” to be delivered through “partnerships” (p.43) (Figure 2.1). For example, the Neighbourhood Renewal program employs “place-management” and “joined-up” approaches to achieve “cross-cutting outcomes” in neighbourhoods to address social exclusion (Victorian Government, 2015). Planners interviewed as part of this research underscored the value of integrated planning particularly to address ‘disadvantaged communities’ and ‘impoverished areas’ because it seeks to ‘cluster’ together a range of services and creates opportunities for people living in those areas and works against “the isolation of one group of society” to produce “better long term outcomes” (M17).
Targeted approaches to addressing disadvantage or urban decay have become widespread since the mid-1990s in Buenos Aires as well. For example, neighbourhood improvement programs (‘PROMEBA’) have been run since 1997 by the provincial government in collaboration with local governments and civil society groups in a way that seeks to “improve the quality of life and contribute to urban and social inclusion of the poorest groups” (PROMEBA, 2014). Likewise, the ‘Sustainable Environmental and Urban Management in the Reconquista River Basin’, has involved the development of an Integrated Management Plan that focuses on planning and infrastructure needs in areas of high “social and sanitary risk” (IDB, 2012). Plan Ahí is another place-based project that commenced in 2008 by the Ministry of Social Development (Argentina), which seeks to coordinate and optimise public resources to best address the needs of groups experiencing ‘social vulnerability’.

In Buenos Aires, interviewees pointed to a range of different programs (others include Ellas Hacen or “Women Doing,” Argentina Trabaja or “Argentina Works”), that take a holistic view of the elements needed to address disadvantage concentrated in specific areas. They identified mechanisms such as “working tables” that incorporate representatives from each neighbourhood, NGOs and government organisations, which highlight this shift “towards integrated rather than the sectoral thinking of the past” (BA4). As one interviewee states, these place-based programs “respond to the challenge of disadvantage not only from an infrastructure provision perspective, such as water and pavement or housing, but also incorporate considerations of work, training, health, land rights and education: this is what it means to think about place in an integrated way” (BA17). Overall, experienced planners interviewed across both case contexts suggested that growing calls for integrated planning through place-based approaches represents a reaffirmation of planning’s original rationale to comprehensively plan and thereby improve common urban development issues, just at a smaller and targeted scale.
In addition to a clear focus on spatial integration, the contemporary period demonstrates a focus on actor interrelations, including a continued emphasis on vertical and horizontal integration. However, the State-society connection becomes more important in planning processes. In Melbourne, vertical coordination has been promoted as ‘joined-up’ government and enacted during this period through intergovernmental entities, agreements, partnerships, councils and committees (Australian Government, 1995; OECD, 1995; Commission of Audit, 1996; Australian National Audit Office, 2003), like the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) from 1992. Specific programs like ILAP encouraged coordination of “related activities of different spheres of government” and the elimination of “unnecessary duplication between government programs” (Australian Local Government Association, 1993, p.1-2). The Building Better Cities Program (1991-1996) was another example which aimed to “demonstrate better urban planning and service delivery as well as co-ordination within and between the various levels of government” (Neilson, 2008, p. 88). ‘Whole-of-government’ policy frameworks were introduced at the State level to enhance cross-sectoral integration over the following decade, such as Growing Victoria Together, A Fairer Victoria, Meeting Our Transport Challenges, and Our Environment, Our Future. The current Plan Melbourne promotes “integrated long-term planning” and influenced the creation of a new Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA) to “help coordinate a whole-of-government” and streamlined approach to delivering the plan (Victorian Government, 2014, p. 17). Achieving greater coordination in policy and service delivery remains “a high priority of public administration in Australia” (APSC, 2015).

In Buenos Aires, public policy has traditionally been delivered through a strong central state that imposes its priorities on lower levels of government. In recent decades, while the central government retains the most powerful position in planning and infrastructure, more attention has been paid to “reconstituting or strengthening the State’s capacity to coordinate and undertake strategic planning” that can integrate the distinct functions of public policy and “between diverse areas” for example through cabinet committees, boards and multi-sectoral authorities (Caporal, 2009, p.2). This ongoing focus on vertical coordination in public sector activities is stated in all recent strategic plans, including the 1999 Urban Environmental Plan (1999), Strategic Plan for the Metropolitan Region of Buenos Aires (2006) and the 2012 Strategic Plan for Buenos Aires (2012). The National Commission for the Metropolitan Area of Buenos Aires (CONAMBA) operated at the beginning of this period, between 1987 and 1997, in an effort to integrate the planning of the city proper and the (then) fourteen municipalities of the Metropolitan Region of Buenos Aires (MRBA). Then, the 1999 Plan states the need for “agreements between the national, provincial and local levels in order to exercise their planning competencies and functions effectively” (Gobierno de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1999, p. 28). The 2006 Plan also describes the shift away from “defensive coordination” to “strategic cooperation” in governance, prioritising coordination between “governments of different levels,”
“governments of the same level” and “between sectors and agencies with sectoral policy responsibilities that have tended to define policy in an isolated way” (Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006, p. 304).

While the nature of vertical and horizontal integration in terms of actor interrelations has evolved along similar lines to past practices, contemporary State-Society relations have changed more radically compared to the past. Firstly, and in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires, the private sector has taken on a more active role in policy definition and delivery. In Melbourne, the delivery of public utilities and transport have been largely privatised or were “commercialised and corporatised under a new customer-oriented regulatory regime” in the 1990s (Victorian Government, 1995, p. 5, Part 5). This shift was justified in part due to critiques of the past centralised approach and in support of “more cost effective construction and operating methods” as well as “the dissemination of private sector skills,” “wider application of user-pays principles” and “a clearer separation between policy-making and service delivery, leading to increased public accountability” (Victorian Government, 1995). The role of the private sector has also grown in policy-making and delivery, for example through public-private partnerships and an openness by governments to “work with” and “welcome proposals from the private sector to deliver projects and services, including urban renewal” (Victorian Government, 2014). Policy documents over recent decades have highlighted this shift to ‘work with the private sector’, for example in urban renewal (e.g. Living Suburbs Melbourne 1995, Direction 5), ‘integrated private development and social housing’ (Plan Melbourne 2014), and a range of ‘policy initiatives’ in the Melbourne 2030 strategic plan (Figure 2.2). The private sector also exerts increasingly stronger influence in planning through formal engagement processes and informal lobbying efforts, for example in Melbourne through groups like the Property Council of Australia (formed in 1996) or the Committee for Melbourne (formed in 1985) (Gleeson & Low, 2000).

**Figure 2.2. Implementation of Melbourne 2030 through ‘partnerships’**

Source: Government of Victoria, 2002, p.45
In Buenos Aires, economic and governance restructuring during the 1980s and 1990s also led to a series of policy changes that involved the private sector. The role of the private sector became strengthened during this period through outsourcing and privatisation of public services and infrastructure, the permissive character of planning controls that enable private land developers to develop land without comprehensive consideration of social and environmental factors as well as the sale of significant tracts of public land for private development (Pírez, 2014). Policy reform “strengthened the role of the private sector in the economy and in the production of the city’s environment,” so that key decisions that impact land use development in Buenos Aires are “chiefly taken by economic actors” rather that the State (Pírez, 2002, p. 145). Others have argued that the governance reforms of the 1980s and 90s led the Argentine government to deeply rely on economic actors to consent to and implement land use planning policy (Palermo y Novaro, 1996). Strategic planning documents reflect this tendency, for example calling for the involvement of both “economic and social actors” in planning processes (Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006) or in “coordinated infrastructure and service delivery” (Gobierno de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1999; Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006). Various interviewees also commented on the deep influence of concentrated economic interests, particularly large land developers, on government policy-making and implantation (for example in considering exceptions to development controls) through formal lobbying and informal bribery.

Civil society organisations have also adopted a broader role in contemporary integrated planning. Organised, activist social movements characteristic of the previous period continue to influence planning practices, for example through by exerting pressure on governments to change policy or project proposals (e.g. environmental groups on contamination or housing advocates on homelessness). However new ways of interrelating have emerged distinct to this contemporary period. In Melbourne, and in line with the ‘network governance’ approaches, “two-way communication with organisations such as community groups, business, academics and other governments” is now encouraged in the public sector at different stages of the policy process, from formulation to delivery (Australian Public Service Commission, 2015). Examples of policy dialogue between governments and civil society abound in Melbourne, from State-level committees and formalised consultation processes to local government-civil society advisory and working groups (e.g. youth committees, citizens’ community forums, inter-faith groups). In addition to communication about policy, civil society groups have taken on more service provision roles since the 1980s in Melbourne, for example with NGOs delivering local services out of community hubs, neighbourhood houses and libraries, as well as at the State level, in areas such as housing and homelessness services. One example of the new reach of the community sector is in social housing where over the last decade all new housing has been delivered by the community housing sector, while public housing unit numbers have not increased at all (National Commission of Audit, 2015). There are also instances where citizens are
directly involved in the work of government as volunteers or in renumerated positions, for example “creating pocket parks, painting murals and partaking in other activities of neighbourhood improvement” (M13) and through formal partnerships with government to contract social enterprises, for example in urban renewal projects (e.g. social enterprise café in Ashgate urban renewal project that provides employment opportunities to disadvantaged people and local TAFE trainees employed in catering for events in Central Dandenong revitalisation project).

During the 1980s and continuing into the 1990s in Argentina, there was a dual (and often competing) process of reform. On the one hand, the ‘modernisation’ reforms described above that increased private sector participation also promoted mechanisms of transparency, accountability and citizen participation. On the other hand, pressure groups and social movements demanded that civic participation be a core component of democratic and institutional rebuilding. The impact of these processes is reflected in strategic planning documents from the period, with a description of mechanisms for civil society participation described in detail in each. For example, in the 1999 Urban Environmental Plan, the process was described as “broadening the traditional model of representational democracy” to include new mechanisms, such as “citizen working groups and public surveys” in addition to the traditionally used public audiences and information diffusion. The 2006 Strategic Plan called for “collective proposals for the future” and “participatory planning models.” Neighbourhood organisations are regularly contracted by governments to undertake local improvement works, such as paving footpaths (e.g. Plan Ahí, Ellas Hacen, Argentina Trabaja).

Outside of formal participation and collaboration structures, planners interviewed in Buenos Aires emphasised the role of civil society in agitating for change through organised social movements and protest action and, differently to Melbourne, as the main protagonists of constructing alternative practices of planning and infrastructure. Many poorer neighbourhoods (or ‘informal settlements’) are entirely self-built without State planning or development. In some cases, NGOs or neighbourhood cooperatives deliver infrastructure, parks, build or occupy housing or provide services in areas such as health and education, especially in areas of highest relative disadvantage (e.g. Fundacion COMACO in Tres de Febrero Municipality, Federación de Tierra y Vivienda, COOPTEBA La Matanza).

While there are some similarities in State-Society relations between Melbourne and Buenos Aires, the nexus with civil society appears to be fundamentally different. The first difference relates to the role of civil society and its relationship with the State. In Melbourne, the connection between State and civil society is predominantly mediated through government-led and managed processes and only on comparatively rare occasions does protest action occur in reaction to a government decision (e.g. to approve a development proposal, to reclaim land, to sell public assets) and even less often to make demands on or create alternatives to State directed planning policy. In Buenos Aires the State does not comprehensively address the basic needs of all citizens and is somewhat handicapped in steering
citizen participation in planning, often because demands remain unmet. Instead, greater agency is exercised by civil society groups in agitating for and carrying out change independently. Some planners interviewed in Buenos Aires suggested that institutional volatility and past State absence in planning and infrastructure delivery are potential influences behind strong social organisation. A second point of difference uncovered in this research relates to the protagonist role of universities in practice and, associated with this, the existence of a hybrid planner typology in Argentina that connects research and practice in influencing or engaging with integrated planning practices. The practice role of universities was linked to the “fragmented” character of urban governance, in which “a State that used to tie together the threads of metropolitan planning with infrastructure, policy, public works, etc., no longer existed…Instead, where “gaps emerged” and “demands were raised” universities “became dynamic actors,” “generating social, ideological and political commitments” in society (BA1) or “legitimating social practices through research” (BA3).

Conclusion

This chapter set out to develop a grounded understanding of integrated planning applicable to the contexts under study. The initial review of the concept of integrated planning was used to trace notions of integration through a genealogy of practices in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. From this, it is possible to distil the idea of integrated planning into two main themes: spatial integration and actor interactions. Spatial integration foregrounds the role of space in public policy based on the interactions between different activities and geographies or by bringing together different policy areas under place specific agendas. Actor interrelations involve vertical integration, between different tiers of governments persist, horizontal integration, which links together different policy areas, and State-society relations.

In particular, the genealogy found that the nature of spatial integration objectives bears great similarity between Melbourne and Buenos Aires over all time periods. Early planning initiatives focused on interventions that would improve links between basic infrastructure delivery and land development, as well as ways to improve connections and development standards between local government areas within each metropolitan area. In the post-war period, these points of focus continue, with broader attention given to some social infrastructure, including community facilities and affordable housing. More recently, place-based approaches have been widely promoted to link different policy areas in specific geographies, often to address questions of locational disadvantage in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires. While more widely promoted now, the foregoing account highlights that area-based approaches to planning have been a constant and evolving feature of planning with more singular (e.g. slum removal and public housing) to multiple policy focus points (e.g. urban revitalisation).
In contrast to spatial integration, aspects of actor interrelations have shifted substantially over the period studied. With similar beginnings, strategic planning initiatives in both cities during the early twentieth century were delivered by higher level governments that established norms and devolved some limited responsibilities to local governments. Non-government actors were not involved in the planning process at this time, with the exception of some expert consultants. A surveying and engineering focus prevailed in this early period, however by the 1950s the second generation of strategic planning initiatives in both cities expanded to consider social infrastructure like housing and community facilities. This broader focus encouraged closer links between different policy areas in planning and led to a focus on overcoming the limitations of ‘siloed’ or ‘line’ governance models. This focus on integrating diverse areas of policy and working holistically to tackle complex urban problems continues in the present.

State-society relations have also evolved over time. In Melbourne, planning instrumentalities slowly became more responsive to citizen demands and participation over time, while in Buenos Aires citizen engagement developed from the end of military rule in 1983. The planning systems of both cities have always been permissive of and mostly reactive to private land development trends. From the 1980s and especially in the 1990s the State and private sector became more closely interlocked through partnerships, outsourcing, privatisation and the work of lobby groups that have promoted large landholder and developer interests. Contemporary integrated planning differs significantly from earlier approaches to planning due to this increased role of economic and social actors. This multi-actor planning approach has been achieved through the demands of social groups to be recognised and involved in planning processes, as much as it has been impacted by market-based and networked governance trends. Civil society groups and universities have taken on protagonist roles in contemporary integrated planning in Buenos Aires, while in Melbourne the State remains the leading planning authority and linkages with non-government actors tend to be generated and mediated by the State. The proliferation of social and economic actors in addition to government has precipitated a highly fragmented urban governance setting in both cities, adding to calls for greater integration in planning.

Table 2.1 below summarised the key features that have emerged in the literature review and genealogy of integrated approaches to planning. It offers a basic conceptual framework for understanding the features of contemporary integrated planning. The dimension of spatial integration focuses on integration through land use interfaces, territorial characteristics and place-based initiatives. Actor interrelations relate to vertical coordination, horizontal cooperation and State-society interactions. Table 2.2 contains a summary of the genealogy which foregrounds specific aspects of both spatial and actor dimensions of integrated planning as they occurred through the three periods: 1.

**Table 2.1. Basic Conceptual Framework of Contemporary Integrated Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of integration</th>
<th>Focus of integration</th>
<th>Objectives of integration</th>
<th>Integration characteristics</th>
<th>Practice examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial integration</td>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>Maximise beneficial</td>
<td>Integration between land</td>
<td>Integrated land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interactions between land</td>
<td>uses and activities</td>
<td>and transport planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uses and activities</td>
<td>considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial</td>
<td>Overcome territorial</td>
<td>Cross-boundary planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standardisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disjointedness and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of municipal norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>physical barriers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-based</td>
<td>Manage specific places, sometimes to redress disadvantage and segregation. Integrate public policy objectives in place</td>
<td>Strategic and targeted place-based interventions, bringing together multiple actors.</td>
<td>Neighbourhood renewal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor interrelations</td>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>Deliver joint action</td>
<td>Downward command &amp; control.</td>
<td>Responsibilities enshrined in law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between different tiers of government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal</td>
<td>Deliver cross-sectoral</td>
<td>Cooperation and negotiation between public actors.</td>
<td>Cabinet or policy working committees/groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>public policy within or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between the same level/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State-society</td>
<td>Deliver public policy</td>
<td>Two-way interactions</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships. Ministerial advisory councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between public, private</td>
<td>between the State and non-government actors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and civil society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author, 2017

Overall, this chapter reveals that contemporary integrated approaches reflect the historical trajectory of planning in both case contexts as well as new governance dynamics and social demands. It responds to my first research question by delineating the contemporary characteristics and a range of socio-historical influences behind integrated planning in each context. It also provides the basic elements to study integrated planning, in particular for reducing disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. From this foundational understanding of integrated planning, it is now possible to examine more closely how the features of this policy approach support social logics for reducing disadvantage. For example, it provides a basis from which to identify and study the elements of actor interrelations, for example in governance arrangements, and on spatial integration, considering factors such as scale. In order to further frame this study, it is now necessary to define disadvantage and examine in what way it might be redressed through integrated planning with social logics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning era</th>
<th>Initial population</th>
<th>Urban growth drivers</th>
<th>Features of spatial integration</th>
<th>Features of actor interrelations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>BsAs</td>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>BsAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-WWI 1920-1945</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>European immigration (e.g. Irish, British, German), city as trade centre, improved regional railways &amp; urban trams, road paving, Gold Rush.</td>
<td>European immigration (e.g. Irish, British, German), city as trade centre, improved regional railways &amp; urban trams, road paving, new meat-packing/transport technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-WWI 1945-1982</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
<td>Rural to urban migration, protected manufacturing economy, new transport technologies (car).</td>
<td>Territorial integration between municipalities, functional integration between infrastructure and land-use planning, Federal-local place-based interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present-day 1982-2015</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>10,900,000</td>
<td>Predominantly regional immigration (asia-pacific) driven by highly-skilled, third sector jobs</td>
<td>Territorial integration between municipalities, functional integration between infrastructure and land-use planning, explicit place-based planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author, 2017
Chapter 3. Understanding ‘social logics’ in integrated planning

Introduction

Policy documents indicate that disadvantage has been as a distinctive driver for integrated approaches to planning in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires, particularly from the 1990s. Both cities have growing areas of relative disadvantage (Baum & Gleeson, 2010; Echevarría, 2008; Jones, 2012; Pawson & Herath, 2012; Pérez, 2002; Randolph & Holloway, 2005; Torres, 2001, 2004), though the material conditions and quality of life vary considerably. Disadvantage is manifest in these contexts through the ‘spatial concentration’ (Pawson & Herath, 2015) of disadvantaged households, including people with no or low incomes or other groups that experience social exclusion, as well as ‘locational disadvantage,’ which describes a geographic area that disadvantages the people who live there because “the bundle of services and facilities it offers its residents is substandard” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 31). Locational disadvantage tends to coincide with the spatial concentration of disadvantaged households, combining to create localities affected by social problems such as relatively higher rates of unemployment or domestic violence. In this place-based understanding of disadvantage, the locality is “not merely a context,” but a structure created by society that can “produce and reproduce injustice through space” (Dikec, 2009, p. 1793). For this reason, redressing this place-based disadvantage requires advancing social justice in planning.

This chapter builds on the framework for conceptualising integrated planning in the case contexts (Chapter 2) to explore how integrated planning action can act to disadvantage. It describes how disadvantage might be redressed in theory through applying ‘social logics’ with ‘practical wisdom’ in planning practice. This combination amounts to my conceptualisation of how social justice may be advanced through planning: with a combination of coherent norms and finesse. I adopted a ‘phronetic’ approach to the research that sought to maintain “an effective dialogue between theoretical and practical consciousness” (Flyvbjerg et al., 2014, p.283), which has been a recurrent demand in contemporary urban studies and social sciences (inter alia: Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Nussbaum, 2011; Olson & Sayer, 2009). Here I bring together this two-pronged conceptualisation of social justice in planning under two sections in this chapter. The first considers how the Theory of ‘Social Logics’ (TSL) (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) offers a practicable frame for realising social justice and reducing disadvantage through planning, while the second analyses how to move from this normative position to considering being in action with practical wisdom.
Social justice as ‘social logics’ in planning

Modern urban planning emerged at the turn of the twentieth century with the goal of improving the quality of urban life, including for the working poor and disadvantaged. Since then, and without me attempting a complete historiography of planning’s concern with social welfare, planning has undoubtedly taken on many forms and accompanied diverse political agendas. From the late 1960s until the present planning theorists have engaged directly with concepts of social justice to delineate norms and principles for urban planning aimed at overcoming disadvantage (inter alia: Davies, 1968; Dikeç, 2001; Fainstein, 2010; Harvey, 1973; Marcuse, 2009c; Smith, 1994; Soja, 2010). Such principles continue to influence planning for progressive social change. This section charts some of the main theoretical linkages between justice thinking and planning theory, with a particular focus on identifying how such justice principles are reflected in TSL (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Ultimately, I choose TSL as the primary theory to guide this research because of its unequalled synthesis of significant social justice principles into a coherent conceptual framework for planning.

In general, justice may be defined as “a name for certain classes of moral rules, which concern the essentials of human well-being” (Mill, 1863, p. unknown), while the term ‘social justice’ is used to focus on the “economic and political dimensions of life, insofar as they can sensibly be separated, and others which might be labelled cultural, or social in a narrow sense, but excludes retributive or criminal justice” (Smith, 1994, p. 26). Social justice “is a central moral standard that requires the fair and impartial treatment of all. Social justice differs from other realms of justice…being centrally concerned with the fairness of a social order and its attendant distributions of rewards and costs” (Blomley, 2009).

Since Henri Lefebvre’s The Right to the City (1968) and David Harvey’s pivotal work on Social Justice and the City (1973), planning has been enriched through an explicit engagement with social justice theorisations and notions of the ‘right to the city’. More recently, there has been growing interest in defining norms for planning that can support the realisation of social justice in the city (Campbell, 2006; Dikeç, 2001; Fainstein, 2010; Marcuse, 2009c; Soja, 2010). The emergence of (explicit) justice thinking in planning offers a lens to consider theoretical, moral, procedural and outcome based aspects of planning. In particular, there are two main strains of justice theorisations that have influenced planning thinking (Mayer, 2009), including the concept of justice as fairness as developed by Rawls’s (1971) and the ‘Right to the City’ concept, originally coined by Henri Lefebvre (1968) and further developed by a range of urban theorists. These influences can be traced in relation to the three ‘social logics’ for planning espoused by Fincher and Iveson (2008): redistribution, recognition and encounter. For Fincher and Iveson (2008), possibilities to deliver diversity in cities should be maximised and this is achieved by enhancing capacities for socialising through encounter,
by engaging in identity politics through recognition and by generating opportunities through redistribution. The social logics is a theory that provides ‘rules of thumb’ for planning practice and include:

redistribution, through which attempts are made to plan for the redress of disadvantage; recognition, through which efforts are made to define the attributes of groups of people so that their needs can be met; and encounter, through which the interaction of individuals is planned for in order to offer opportunities for increased sociality (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p.3).

In the following section I examine clear links between ongoing debates about justice and the right to the city with the social logics of redistribution, recognition and encounter.

Social justice as redistribution in planning

A Theory of Justice (Rawls, 1971) is one of the principal contributions to justice thinking in the tradition of liberal political philosophy and has been very influential in planning thought. In particular, the notion that planning for social justice should encompass redistribution was heavily influenced by Rawls. Rawls built on (a version of) Plato’s idea that justice should be the foundational virtue of social institutions. In seeking an alternative to modern utilitarianism\(^2\), Rawls proposed the idea of ‘justice as fairness’ based on the ‘maximin principle:’ to maximise benefits for society’s most disadvantaged. For Rawls, “all primary goods – liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect – are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these goods is to the advantage of the least favoured” (1971, p. 303). Rawls’s ‘justice as fairness’ explored a number of thought experiments, including the ‘veil of ignorance’ that would impartially relate everyone as equals (from the ‘original position’) and serve to develop principles for the creation of just institutions. Through a process of “reflective equilibrium” (Rawls, 1971, p. 48), Rawls claimed that ideas about justice would interact with more abstract beliefs to form a rounded understanding of justice. For Rawls, the following principles of justice would always emerge from this ‘original position:’

- each person has an equal right to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties which is compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for all; and
- social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions. First, they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity, and second, they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society (Rawls, 1971, p. 291).

\(^2\) The concept of maximisation under utilitarianism was seen by Rawls to produce an ethical conflict with justice; a mathematical consideration to maximise total average well-being or happiness said little about the experiences of losers and winners in utilitarian practices. According to Rawls: “justice denies that the loss of freedom for some is made right by a greater good shared by others. It does not allow that the sacrifices imposed on a few are outweighed by the larger sum of advantages enjoyed by many” (1971, pp.3-4)
From these principles, Rawls proposed a range of mechanisms to address inequality. He advocated for “principles of redress,” so that “undeserved inequalities” are compensated relating to one’s position at birth and in the context of differing natural endowments (Rawls, 1971, p. 100).

Ramifications for deploying justice in planning based on Rawls’s theory are wide-ranging. In this regard, David Harvey’s *Social Justice and the City* (1973) represents a watershed moment for social justice thinking in planning: it was the first time urban problems were explicitly analysed from a Rawlsian liberal perspective. Harvey saw (and continues to see) the city as a tool for entrenching distributional inequalities. He advocated for “territorial justice” and social justice, which for him meant “…a socially just distribution that is justly arrived at” (Harvey, 1973, p. 98). At a similar time, social planner Bleddyn Davies argued for ‘territorial justice’ to be realised through the distribution of public services and investments in a way that would reflect social needs and not just population size (1968). Harvey incorporated and built on this idea as part of his work on social justice and the city. Harvey also built on Rawls’s theory so that distribution would ultimately benefit the least advantaged territories. In his ‘liberal formulations’, Harvey elaborated three (3) principles of ongoing relevance to pursuing social justice through planning:

1. the spatial organisation and the pattern of regional investment should be such as to fulfil the needs of the population. This requires that we first establish socially just methods for determining and measuring needs. The difference between needs and actual allocations provides us with an initial evaluation of the degree of territorial injustice in an existing system.

2. a spatial organisation and pattern of territorial resource allocation which provides extra benefits in the form of need fulfilment (primarily) and aggregate output (secondarily) in other territories through spillover effects, multiplier effects, and the like, is a better form of spatial organization and allocation.

3. deviation in the pattern of territorial investment may be tolerated if they are designed to overcome specific environmental difficulties which would otherwise prevent the evolution of a system which would meet need or contribute to the common good (Harvey, 1973, pp. 107-108).

These essentially spatial and redistributive principles have invigorated debate and informed the evolution of social and spatial justice concepts ever since. Harvey’s work also provides critical analysis of injustice in the city, covering diverse issues such as the marginalisation of the poor through to the unequal provision of services, the location of harmful facilities or the privileging of highway construction over mass public transit. His liberal formulations focused on the redistributive effects of typical urban systems, highlighting for example the problematic functioning of housing markets and issues in access to services. Harvey explored the idea that widespread intervention was
needed to overturn injustice, though he ultimately turned away from the Rawlsian distribution ethic and concluded that a more radical approach was necessary. He argued that “programmes which seek to alter distribution without altering the capitalist market structure within which income and wealth are generated and distributed, are doomed to failure” (1973, p.110). This marked a definitive moment for the emergence of a new field of Marxist geography in which Harvey has continued to develop this position (Harvey, 1985, 2000, 2012).

In addition to Harvey’s work on social justice and the city, many other urban theorists have critically engaged with Rawlsian ideas of justice (inter alia Fainstein, 2010; McConnell, 1981; Smith, 1994; Young, 1990), extending the understanding of redistribution in planning as well as developing other principles for advancing social justice through planning. For example, McConnell (1981) argued that there are several lessons for planning from Rawls, particularly that decisions should be made based on:

- the greatest benefit of the least advantaged;
- an equal future distribution or redistribution of spatial resources, facilities, services and opportunities, with the exception that an unequal distribution or availability is to the advantage of the least advantaged in regard to their future opportunities;
- the ‘just savings’ principle is safeguarded, so that any resource or institution which will be of benefit in the future is protected within reason;
- the idea that any one person’s liberty is restricted only for the sake of the liberty of others; and
- the idea that the ethic of justice should prevail where a conflict arises between responsiveness and justice (McConnell, 1981, p. 194).

More recently, Fainstein has argued that Rawls’s conception of justice applies “in the assertion that a fair distribution of benefits and the mitigation of disadvantage should be the aims of public policy” (Fainstein, 2010, p. 39). Furthermore, Fainstein contended that the aim to “prevent excessive concentrations of property and wealth” by Rawls implies a “realistic utopianism” for planning in that “the expectation is not of eliminating material inequality but rather of lessening it” (2010, p. 39).

Despite the importance of Rawls’s theory of justice for the evolution of planning theory and practice, there are several limitations to the concept. Rawls’s has been criticised from the Right for “sacrificing too many individual rights and liberties” (Soja, 2010, p. 77) and because “his principles and rules imply too much interference in the free market as the distributive agency for resources” (McConnell, 1981, p. 180). On the other hand, as Soja has also explained, his theory has been critiqued by the Left as “aspatial and ahistorical” (2010, p. 78) and is hindered by its dominant focus on liberty; the idea that justice may be effected principally through distribution; and further by its narrow view of citizen
participation and perspectives. Feminist critiques have suggested that Rawls’s theory, not unlike those of other philosophers, are based on a “masculinist conception of adversarial democracy” (Fainstein, 2010, p. 44). While many of the other redistributive and procedural principles are eminently important for planning thinking, the original position falls short of meeting the needs of practitioners because “the conditions for a social thought experiment do not prevail in the world of action” (Fis cher, 2009, p. 61). Furthermore, there is “no indication how real societies may reach this position” (Smith, 1994, p. 82). Additionally, Rawls did not provide a framework for defining appropriate (urban) institutions or actual programs for addressing injustice (Fainstein, 2010). Overall, to think there can be only one form of impartial decision-making that would then lead to the unanimous choice of two principles of justice is a limiting conclusion. Instead, as others have indicated (Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Sandercock, 1998b; Sen, 2009), planning requires principles for practice that celebrate difference and support a process of agonistic pluralism.

Notwithstanding the weaknesses of Rawls’ theory of justice for planning practice, many of his foundational principles have permeated planning thinking and practice. Most prominently is the idea of equal rights for basic liberties and the notion that principles of redress should be applied to compensate inequity. This is most clearly reflected in urban theory as redistribution (Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Harvey, 1973; McConnell, 1981) and in practice, for example in planning schemes that promote a fair distribution of services. Many urban theorists have agreed that planning is implicated in the distribution of costs and benefits and should work towards distributional equality (Fainstein, 2010; Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Marcuse, 2009b; Sandercock, 1975; Stretton, 1971). There are a range of factors, including “budget requirements, institutional inefficiency, personal greed, racial bigotry, differential wealth and social power” that contribute to “distributional inequality, creating locationaly biased and hence discriminatory geographies” (Soja, 2010, p. 47). In this regard, it is generally accepted that urban planning “can distribute very different costs and advantages to different people” (Stretton, 1971, p. 2) and this distribution of costs and benefits produces spatial equality or inequality. Redistribution is proposed by Fincher and Iveson as a social logic of planning to address the “very great and increasing differences between rich and poor” in cities, which are seen in part as the product of uneven patterns of distribution in society (2008, p. 28). Building on the long history of thinking relating to redistribution, for Fincher and Iveson,

the spaces requiring redistribution in the contemporary Western city via urban policy and planning, are those spaces – both physical parts of urban built environments and areas of urban policy – limiting the opportunities available for disadvantaged people and therefore causing their material conditions and liberties to deteriorate” (2008, p.29).

The social logic of redistribution responds to the idea that questions of social justice can be both expressed and constituted in space. The spatial manifestations of inequality that redistribution should
seek to address vary considerably, but include things like redressing locational disadvantage, where a neighbourhood and the people who live there are relatively worse off compared to other parts of a city, as well as facilitating ways to improve people’s mobility and opportunities to access and participate in the city. The authors also highlight the importance of recognising group differences and enabling encounter in the pursuit of redistribution (Fincher & Iveson, 2008), the remaining social norms in TSL. Like Rawls, Fincher and Iveson acknowledge that “complete evenness in not achievable” through redistribution in spatial policy (nor is it necessarily desirable, for example some differences between places are inevitable and might be celebrated such as geographical or architectural variations, or even community characteristics), but that instead the focus should be on delivering equitable outcomes or access to equitable opportunities. Equity may require inequality in distribution to favour the most disadvantaged, an idea that can also be linked to Rawls’s justice as fairness (1971). Based on theoretical principles of redistribution as well as the authors’ study of various examples in practice of redistribution in planning, two decision rules for the social norm of redistribution were proposed:

1. equity in the allocation of expenditure in different local areas and populations; and
2. social mix (the intention is to ‘mix’ people of different income groups, particularly precluding ‘concentrations’ of poor people) (2008, p.40).

Achieving redistribution, however, faces potentially greater challenges than the other social norms in terms of implementation and measurement. One limitation to studying examples of redistribution is that it is hard to measure as “evidence of redistributive impact (is)… more difficult to determine” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 221). This is because measurement of impact may require monitoring demographic changes over long timeframes and across larger geographical scales. There may also be other factors at play that contribute to change. Fincher and Iveson (2008) explored examples of urban renewal, deinstitutionalisation and local child care planning as cases were the decision rules of redistribution were found to be present, though for example not necessarily effective for improving quality of life outcomes of the poor. Some authors have suggested that public transport is one of the clearest examples of social mixing achieved in contemporary Western cities, though this may be found to be an unintended result (Fainstein, 2010; Gleeson, 2013a). This means that questions of timing, geographic scale and measurement are important in researching the limitations and opportunities of redistributive policies in practice.

Overall, social justice in cities in part involves the removal of obstacles to delivering “a just distribution of goods and services” (Marcuse, 2009c, p. 92). This aspect of social justice is increasingly important given the widening wealth gap between rich and poor in cities that is expressed and reinforced spatially, as well as “rapidly widening gulf between the levels of state support for the poor and the reality of living costs” (Gleeson, 2013a, p. 47). Redressing distributional inequalities and
disadvantage through redistribution has been a core focus of planning theory (and practice), particularly since Harvey’s liberal formulations in *Social Justice and the City* (1973) and largely because of Rawlsian influences that continue in urban theory. Fincher and Iveson’s (2008) social logic of redistribution captures the central tenets of justice and urban theorisations on redistribution and elaborate working principles for lessening distributional inequalities. In this way, applying the social logic of redistribution is one way to advance social justice through planning, in particular through collecting funds along a progressive scale from available tax bases and channelling them to social programs in disadvantaged communities.

**Social justice as recognition in planning**

Some theorists support the view that the focus on distributive justice is misplaced (Harvey, 1973) or insufficient, and therefore the focus to achieve social justice through planning should focus on other aspects of social relations in cities. Lefebvre’s right to the city framework has served as a ‘linchpin’ (Purcell, 2008) or “common cause” (Iveson, 2011, p. 250) for uniting and strengthening claims for social justice in cities, in particular because it builds on the idea of equitably distributing resources in cities by adding the notion that people should be involved in shaping the kind of city they want to live in. In similar vain to the original advocacy planning movement, which invited “political and social values to be examined and debated” (Davidoff, 1965) in public, Lefebvre argued that citizens have participatory and spatial rights in cities (Lefebvre, Lebas, & Kofman, 1996), including for example to: participate openly and fairly in all the processes producing urban space, to access and make use of the particular advantages of city life, especially in the highly valued city center, to avoid all forms of imposed spatial segregation and confinement, to be provided with public services that meet basic needs in health, education, and welfare (Soja, 2010, pp. 99-100).

The ‘right to the city’ and recognition in planning imply participation in “urban social life” but also, “active participation in the political life, management, and administration of the city” (Dikec, 2009, p.75). The ‘right to the city’ has also been promoted to support alliance-building between different social and identity groups (Iveson, 2014). More recently, urban theorists have reworked notions of democratic participation in planning, through for example the idea of “parity of participation” (Fraser, 2004), to argue for a thematic orientation to participation or group-based representation in decision-making or resource distribution, with the view to advance participation in urban life as ‘peers’ or ‘equals.’ However, others have critiqued group identification as a tool for inclusion in the planning process, with drawbacks including “rigid inside-outside distinctions” that can encourage “conflict and parochialism,” divergent interests between group members and the notion of an essential group identity as it “denies differentiation within and across groups” (Young, 2000, p.89). Young (2000) argued for a fuller form of deliberative democracy, meaning “inclusion and political equality, which, when implemented, increases the likelihood that democratic decision-making processes will promote
justice” (2000, p.6). Whilst she offered strong support of participation in decision making, she suggested that the expected goal or outcome should not be consensus. Instead she celebrated “institutionalized struggle” in democratic processes (2000, p.51) that can lead to changing structural relations over time. For Dikec, “Lefebvre’s notion of the right to the city is a call to advance an urban spatial approach to political struggles with the participation of all those who inhabit the city without discrimination” (2009, p.75).

TSL distinctly addresses the question of participation in planning precipitated by Lefebvre’s right to the city as well as social movement demands from the 1960s onwards and the Habermasian ‘communicative turn’ (Habermas, 1991). In this regard, Fincher and Iveson (2008) acknowledge that the emphasis on procedural fairness in planning was tied to a shift towards the recognition of heterogeneity in urban populations. However, they also recognise the limitations of this model in responding to diversity and delivering equitable outcomes. They acknowledge that communicative approaches often differ from idealised models of procedural fairness given prevailing conditions of inequality between participants and the (often unconscious) privileging of certain viewpoints. Instead, for Fincher and Iveson, frameworks for planning must enable “planners to make calculations about what should be done, not just about how it is done” (2008, p.5). Developing their normative framework responds to demands in the social sciences, which outlines the importance of recognition for human wellbeing or flourishing (Sayer, 2009). Akin to Fincher and Iveson (2008; 2012), Sayer claims that “the development of a sense of self-worth requires mutual recognition among subjects who are in a strong sense equal and free to exercise autonomy” (2009, p.138).

Fincher and Iveson (2008) again logically and smoothly synthesise a diverse range of theoretical influences in the development of the social logic of recognition and its working principles. The logic of recognition aligns with the idea of participation in planning, from Lefebvre onwards as discussed above. It promotes planning for ‘multiple publics’ (Sandercock, 1998b) and to overcome the “drawing away for some of any sense of political power, participation, representation, and capacity for self-expression, whether based on class, race, gender, or any other human attribute” (Soja, 2011, p. 79). It builds on traditional notions of social justice, as well as feminist perspectives and the demands of social movements initiated in the latter half of the twentieth century. Young’s (1990, p. 47) idea of social justice helped form the social logic of recognition, based on the idea that justice “requires not the melting away of group differences, but institutions that promote the reproduction of and respect for group differences without oppression. TSL extends the ‘group value model’ proposed by Lind and Tayler (1988) that stressed the possibilities to overcome self-interest and encourage mutual help through representatives acting in group situations. For Fincher and Iveson (2008), enabling recognition in planning should follow a pragmatic and contextualised approach, using either a limited checklist or expanded cross-group based strategy to enable participation in planning. The checklist
approach involves making a checklist of social or identity groups to equitably allocate resources between them, while a cross-group approach involves creating and funding opportunities for collaboration in decision-making or projects by different groups together. Overall, recognition “seeks to accommodate the diversity of group distinctiveness, by attacking those forms of inequality which are a product of failures to recognise the existence of different needs and values” in the city (Fincher and Iveson, 2008, p.145).

Like the social logic of redistribution, there are complexities to understanding and operationalising recognition in planning. Firstly, it seems that recognition should avoid a singular focus on difference that might encourage or strengthen adverse boundaries between groups. Furthermore, it is important to focus not only on rights (i.e. right to difference), but also to accept and encourage people’s “capabilities for living in ways they have reason to value” (Sayer, 2009, p.138). Another challenge is recognising equality between those who see each other as peers, but especially with those who may be ‘misrecognised’ or stigmatised. In particular, it is suggested that planners in studying the social order expressed in space should reveal unjust limits on behaviours experienced by some people (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). For example, some people experience exclusion and stereotyping with damaging consequences that can limit their access and participation to the city (such as public space and facilities) and its opportunities (like services and employment). Uncovering these population groups and enabling their participation would present challenges in time-bound, politically sensitive and budget-restricted contexts. Furthermore, other authors have highlighted the problematic assumption that participation is a “tangible and constant phenomenon”, when in fact it manifests in very different ways (Burton, Goodlad, & Croft, 2006, p. 298). Burton has also highlighted how increased participation also brings about more uncertainty and that it should not unquestionably be incorporated in planning processes (Burton et al., 2006). Challenges also exist relating to distinguishing desirable forms of difference from those that are undesirable. Some groups may not notice or problematise their position in society in terms of exclusion or oppression, which means that planning not only needs to provide platforms for recognising the active ‘other,’ but also to challenge accepted relations of domination and overturn accepted practices that restrict the right to the city of the excluded ‘other.’ Given these critiques, it seems that idea of parity of participation presents almost as many challenges in practice as the Rawlsian ‘original position’ in that planning and urban policy decision-making invariably occurs in an imbalanced setting.

Despite implementation challenges, the second social logic of recognition clearly encompasses participation and the role of identity and plurality in cities. For Fincher and Iveson, “the devaluing and stigmatisation of some urban identities and ways of life is one of the principal forms of injustice in cities” (2008, p.84). In line with principles of justice, especially the notion of the right to the city, Fincher and Iveson argued that planning policy should recognise and respond to the different ways
people inhabit and use the city. For Fincher and Iveson, “the sheer variety of urban populations militates against any notion that urban policy and politics can work on behalf of ‘community’ or a universal ‘public’ that shares values and visions of the good city” (2008, p.89). For this reason, ‘recognition’ of the ‘other’ is fundamental. Overall, for Fincher and Iveson, “what is required is a politics of difference where identity groups with different values and visions of the good city can participate in a sometimes conflictual dialogue as equals in status” (2008, p.89).

Social justice as encounter in planning
Diversity that fosters social inclusion is also a key aim of the third social logic: encounter. Diversity or “social differentiation without exclusion” is achieved through “groups overlapping and intermingling across neighbourhood borders which are safe, ‘open and undecidable’” (Fincher and Iveson, 2008, p.145). It should “facilitate encounters between people, like and unlike, through a planning practice which does not seek to eradicate all forms of disorder in urban life” (2008, p.146). This approach rejects the traditional comprehensive model of planning characteristic of the post-war period and responds to the critique of planning as a homogenising force. It adopts the view of a ‘heterogeneous public’ or ‘multiple publics’ (Sandercock, 1998b), or of more equality in cities (Stretton, 1971). It assumes, as Jane Jacobs suggested much earlier, that “the main responsibility of city planning and design should be to develop – insofar as public policy and action can do so – cities that are congenial places for (a) great range of unofficial plans, ideas and opportunities to flourish, along with the flourishing of the public enterprises” (Jacobs, 1961, p. 241).

For Fincher and Iveson (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, 2014), the right to the city is also a right to encounter and the right to craft hybrid identities through encounters with others (2008). In most cities, however, there are spaces that can constrain both serendipitous and planned encounters with others, either through physical barriers to accessibility, through the existence of unsafe places or through practices of social exclusion. There are other places that inhibit encounter between diverse groups because they are accessible only to certain social groups. Furthermore, spaces exist that do not encourage encounter due to a lack of services, infrastructure or variety in land uses to activate them. Mixed use spaces, on the other hand, have the potential to promote social justice because they attract people to them and can create dynamic and safe spaces of encounter. In this sense, “places should be viewed as capable of sustaining a range of different activities rather than being defined through functional segregation, and people should be treated as capable of sustaining a range of identities and identifications in different situations” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 148). The task of planning is therefore to “plan for the presence of strangers” through embracing and planning “for a degree of disorder in the city” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 150). It is to enable “positive experiences of strangerhood” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 153). As one interviewee suggested as part of this research, it requires planning for vibrancy:
A vibrant place is one where ‘encounter’ is— that’s the promise. It’s a reminder that lots of different people exist with lots of different shaded skin and different heights and genders and abilities and sexualities and whatever, ages. For example, that’s what I love about public transport: it is a place of encounter and it’s also a reminder of the promise of social engagement: it is a promise made to the whole community that their lives matter and that everyone has the right to participate in the city (M6).

In order to engender encounter and hybridity, opportunities should be created for people “to experiment with different identifications with others in a range of different situations” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 154). In developing the social logic of ‘encounter’, Fincher and Iveson have built on work by Amin and Thrift (2002) and in particular Fraser’s notion of ‘parity of participation’, suggesting that this frames the possibility for people to both “be themselves” but also to have opportunities to “become someone else through exploratory encounters with the strangers with whom they share the city” (2006, p.12). Fraser’s work combines both a “cultural politics of differences” with a “social politics of equality” in her conceptualisation of justice (Fraser, 1995, p. 69). Planning for encounter is enabling a “conviviality in urban life where diverse individuals can work together on shared activities, projects and concerns which don’t totally reduce them to fixed identity categories either as ‘citizen’ or ‘group member’” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 154). To deliver effective spaces of encounter planning should adopt a ‘light-touch’ approach and should avoid micro-managing interactions to create opportunities for sociality in everyday contexts and special events (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 211). Fainstein (2009) has also argued for an affirmative and pragmatic approach to supporting diversity and encouraging tolerance, for example through ensuring that internal boundaries are porous and public spaces enhanced. In planning for encounter, Fincher and Iveson have synthesised and expanded on a suite of social justice norms relating to encounter by proposing three decision rules for planning action:

1. provide a variety of social and economic infrastructure (i.e. meeting places like drop-in centres, planned festivals, public libraries, public transport, etc.);
2. encourage stakeholder agency in encounter; and
3. create safe and transparent spaces for encounter.

Planning for encounter is increasingly difficult in contemporary Western cities where “we were seeing the collapse of the public realm, of shared spaces, structures, institutions and even outlooks” (Gleeson, 2013b, p. X). Working towards Young’s ‘differentiated solidarity’ (2001) or planning for encounter is challenged by trends towards separation and segregation, for example in the separation of public and private schools and health services, through the pushing out of low-income groups to the City’s periphery, through the ‘splintering’ of infrastructure and user-pays models (Graham & Marvin, 2001) and the growing number of gated estates, for residential and commercial purposes. Fewer
places tend to be left for encounter, for example in public spaces, transport and green areas, and raising funding or requiring public realm initiatives as part of private developments is challenging in neoliberal planning contexts. However, much of the infrastructure or occasions required to deliver encounter can be small-scale, providing an opportunity to advance social justice through convivial sharing of public places. As with the challenges of delivering deep redistribution and genuine recognition, providing larger scale spaces and opportunities for encounter requires deeper modifications to the planning system when market-based approaches prevail.

**Critical synthesis of TSL for social justice in planning**

Overall, TSL provides a normative framework that adopts key tenets of traditions in social justice theorisations, for example on redistribution (Harvey, 1973; Rawls, 1971), the right to the city (Lefebvre, 1968), the role of difference (e.g. by Iris Marion Young’s ‘politics of difference’ 1990), participation (Habermas, De Greiff, & Cronin, 1998), recognition and encounter (Amin & Thrift, 2002; Fraser, 1995, 2000; Fraser & Honneth, 2003). It is also firmly embedded in empirical knowledge about applied experiences of planning for reducing inequality and advancing a just diversity across a range of Western cities. I believe that TSL is the most valuable and operable theory to guide planning that aims to reduce disadvantage because, as described above, it effectively draws together a range of social justice norms that have evolved in planning theory over several decades and has been tested by the authors across different Western contexts to explore the presence of social logics in practice. My research takes up the opportunity to operationalise and extend TSL by offering a closer examination of how social logics are developed and deployed in practice, including how practitioners navigate the unequal settings of urban policy and planning to mobilise social logics. I have responded to the authors’ call for “grounded investigations of enactments of justice as well as of injustice” (Fincher & Iveson, 2012, p. 231), by closely examining the possibilities of integrated planning practice for the reduction of disadvantage. From this foundational understanding of social logics in planning as principles to effect social justice in cities, I now consider the possibility of further grounding the theory through elements of practical wisdom, including knowing how to act and considerations about being in action in integrated planning for reducing disadvantage.

**Practical wisdom: from knowing what to knowing how**

The TSL provides a normative framework for knowing what to aim for in planning and principles to apply when devising strategies to redress disadvantage. In practice, knowing how (Iveson, 2014) to move from principles to action and being in action, or ‘doing’ (Davoudi, 2015) are also important elements. Davoudi distinguishes knowing how from knowing what as about technical and cognitive abilities, as distinct from theoretical knowledge (2015). She draws on the Aristotelian notion of phronesis, which has also been applied by Flyvbjerg to describe planning’s ‘virtuous actors’ (2001):
people who have practical experience in reacting to contextual conditions and a well-developed ability to make practical judgements about what is possible from what is intended. This section explores specific qualities that may emerge in practices of integrated planning relevant to knowing how and doing. As a starting point for this, five main qualities of practical wisdom that planners are likely to exhibit based on planning literature on this subject are explored below. The rationale here is that to respond to my second research question on the formal structures and the informal strategies used to support social logics in practice it is valuable to understand in theory what planning skills might be required.

**Practical wisdom quality one: the characteristics of ‘missionary’ planning**

Planning is profoundly political and thus a quality of planning actors’ practice must be to choose how they will deal with this political world. Knowing that planning is almost always a political act as plans create winners and losers (Hillier, 2002), the question then becomes how to respond and act in these contexts. One dominant characteristic is the circular nature of reasoning or ‘rearialrationalitat’ in planning, whereby “analysis is used to rationalise politics” in many cases (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 35).

Navigating and having influence in such settings requires not just technical skill but also political savviness (Burton, 2006). As Forester explained, this doesn’t necessarily involve campaigning for candidates, but an ability “to think and act politically” (Forester, 1989, p.7). It requires that efficacious planning actors have “much experience, perseverance and a capacity to learn through practice, as well as the strength and resources to bend the course of events in the desired direction” (Matus, 2008, p. 4).

The political role of planners has been variously categorised, for example by Howe and Kaufman, who identified three categories of planners: “politicians” who are more value committed; “technicians” who are committed to rational expertise; as well as a “hybrid” type who are concerned about both rationality (did we do it right?) as well as political relationships (did we do good?) (1979). In Howe and Kaufman’s research, both politicians and hybrids were found to have employed practical and informal strategies and tactics such as lobbying, covert activities, building support and alliances to advance their goals in planning. Hoch (1984) then elaborated a two-pronged scheme of ‘being right’ and ‘doing good’ in planning, which distinguishes technical accurateness from the moral or political preoccupation of pragmatically pursuing some good effect. More recently, Hillier’s research based on experiences of planning in Western Australia (2002) identified two main typologies of planners: ‘chameleon’ and ‘missionary’ planners. In this characterisation, both types showed “schemes of perception, appreciation and action” that enabled them to engage in “prudence”, for example to predict the mood and reactions of those in powerful places. The difference, however, lies in how they anticipate and respond to the “subtexts and plays of power” (Hiller, 2002, p.13), either
following the rules of the game (for organisational survival for example, avoiding blame, etc.) or by ‘getting their hands dirty’ for what they believe should be done in the pursuit of social justice. Hillier explained:


Hillier also explained how missionary planners “anticipate and respond to the subtexts and plays of power; how they anticipate various forms of political pressures and ‘improvise’ in pursuit of social justice” (or other ends, such as market facilitation (2002, p.13). Practical knowledge and acting politically is also therefore about improvisation, experimentation and being flexible (Hillier, 2002).

Knowledge about contextual factors seems to be a helpful antecedent to understanding and working against the regressive potential of planning and urban policy. Planning occurs within a context marked by political relations and has the capacity to recreate and reinforce negative relations of power, for example through the control of information or the inclusion of some voices over others. In this sense, it has been argued that planning can have a regressive or ‘dark side’ and has been found to be complicit in the reproduction of inequality or exclusion (inter alia: Flyvbjerg, 1996; Yiftachel, 1996, Huxley, 1994). By being aware of the regressive potential of planning, actors involved in the planning process can actively develop strategies that avoid reinforcing inequality (including those that seek to treat all people as equals) and use their specialised knowledge and technical skills to limit the “raw exercise” of negative power (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p.194). This might be done following the ‘missionary’ planning characterisation. For example, by drawing actors’ attention to particular opportunities, “pre-empting definitions of problems and thus approaches to solutions” (Forester, 1989, p.17), applying pressure on decision-makers, “questioning assumptions” (Hillier, 2010, p.368), working to avert obstructions or delays or increasing awareness of the project or policy by involving others. In sum, planners “face a recurrent political choice: to anticipate and partially counteract distorted claims, or to acquiesce in the face of them, to be complicit in obscuring them from public view” (Hillier, 2010, p22).

Practical wisdom quality two: understanding contextual conditions

One important practical skill for planners is to develop and wield knowledge about contextual factors in order to respond to opportunities and constraints. “A planner’s knowledge of a range of contextual factors is indispensable for agile phronetic action in ‘power-full’ settings” (Hillier, 2002, p. 24). Contextual factors might include characteristics of institutions, culture, questions of timing and, not least, the motives of different actors involved in the planning and development process. Learning
about contextual factors proves invaluable for developing effective strategies and tactics to advance progressive social change, for example to pick the right time, to know how institutions respond and to appropriately match action to local, cultural and historical contexts. Forester explained that without deep knowledge of contextual factors “planners may present rational analyses to politicians, developers, citizen groups, and other agencies and then be bewildered when no one seems to listen, at least not to the merits of the case” (Forester, 1989, p. 5). Initially then, a key feature of knowing how relates to the actor’s knowledge about relevant contextual factors.

Many authors have highlighted the political nature of planning and the role of practical wisdom in exploring possibilities, and in negotiating and mobilising support for projects (inter alia: Albrechts, 1999; Hillier, 2002; Thompson, 2012). Flyvbjerg has identified other factors that politicise the planning process, such as lobbying and the role of the media (1998). One dominant characteristic shared by both contexts explored in this thesis and many others is the circular nature of reasoning or ‘realrationalitat’ in planning (Flyvbjerg, 1998). Real rationality in planning means that rationalisation is used in place of rationality in planning: there is often decision-making first and rationalisation later. Policy might be informed by evidence, but planning policy is rarely ‘evidence-based’. Instead, “analysis is used to rationalise politics” in many cases (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 35). To understand how planning can effect social change, it therefore seems important to understand the dynamic between formal planning and the party political process, and for practitioners to remember that it is possible to plan “in a constructive empowering way, but we cannot do this by avoiding power relations” (Flyvbjerg & Richardson, 2002, p.62).

Rational argument and persuasion can be used as a tool for progressive social change, however at times this may require entering into conflict with dominant forces and views of the world. Where transformation becomes possible, Flyvbjerg (2012) highlights the role of ‘tension points’ created through the problematisation of existing accepted and potentially regressive circumstances. Alternatively, planning may require harnessing existing positive structures and patterns for social change. “Power is both positive and negative in struggle” (Hillier, 2002, p.49). Part of this research therefore entailed distinguishing the dominant forces behind planning and urban development to critically understand the realrationalitat in local contexts. In particular, and following Flyvbjerg (1998), this required a focus on the Foucauldian or Nietzschean “what” questions for this research in applied settings: what actually occurs, what ‘rationalities’ are at work in planning, and then, what are the ‘strategies and tactics’ required to be effective in achieving planning ideals (social logics).

**Practical wisdom quality three: coalition-building**

One key aspect of exercising ‘prudence’ evident in urban planning and politics literature is the strategy of coalition-building. Planners are “coalition-builders:” they develop and use widespread
contacts to facilitate collaboration (Forester, 1989, p.16). Planners need to be close to the reality of and can create alliances with those they are planning for or with as means to better understand local contexts and effect change through collaboration. In this regard, planners can build alliances, mobilise their networks and work towards reaching workable levels of consensus for program initiatives (Albrechts, 2006). Other authors, building on the concept of ‘assemblage’ or ‘agencement’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988), have explored the notion of ‘agencing’ (Bogue, 2007) as a way of creating an ‘assemblage’ of actors that operate as a coalition of stakeholders with its own agency (Hillier, 2002). Urban researchers have explored some of the more successful alliances, including Iveson’s analysis of Sydney’s green ban movement in the 1970s which helped block a range of developments through the actions of an unusual coalition of construction workers, resident activists, and progressive professionals (Iveson, 2014). In essence, to be an effective political actor in the planning process you may need to “team up with like-minded people and fight for what you want, utilizing the means which work in your context” (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p.236). In sum, coalition-building and mobilising tactics are likely to be part of a planner’s practical wisdom for pursuing social logics in planning.

**Practical wisdom quality four: communicative action**

In addition to building coalitions and operating through networks to effect change, planners also seem to benefit from strong communication and argumentation skills. Since the ‘communicative turn’ in urban planning, many theorists have focused on argumentation and communicative action as important discursive components of practice (inter alia: Forester, 1989; Healey, 1997; Innes, 2000). These authors have explored the way that planners communicatively engage in political processes and have analysed participatory planning mechanisms. One of the practical activities of planners has been understood as facilitating the process of deliberation in planning (Healey, 1997). Another strategy of ‘knowing how’ involves listening and reflecting “on their own discursive practices, in particular their ways of arguing” (Fischer, 2009, p.53). Understood through this lens, planners ideally can operate discursively to advance opportunities for consensus building and to promote the representation of different points of view, as promoted through the social logic of recognition in the checklist or cross-group approach to participation in urban policy-making. In this way, effective communicative action can act to equalise conditions “so that the force of argument can be the deciding factor rather than an individual’s power or status in some pre-existing hierarchy” (Sandercock, 1997, p.96). Or as Forester explained, the task is to “work toward a political democratization of daily communications” (1989, p.21).

Despite widely acknowledged critiques that participatory planning should become the dominant approach (Innes, 2000) or the rejection of the exclusive view of planner as mediator (Campbell, 2006; Fainstein, 2009), public deliberation has become at least procedurally significant in practice and constitutes one realm of action where planners may exercise different strategies and actions to reduce
inequality and advance social logics. In this regard, planners may focus on “what gets said, and how it is said, and to whom” (Forester, 1989, p.23). In this way, planners can identify distorting claims that are made through manipulation, imbalanced arguments, threats, undisclosed data, etc., and then work in ways to remove obstacles to engaging other voices and viewpoints in a democratic planning process. They may also play a role in influencing and supporting “counterpublic discourses which, in dialogue with the state and from within the state, influence public and social policy relevant to cities and their inhabitants” (Wolf-power, 2009, p.163).

Versteeg and Hajer have also highlighted how the way in which planners articulate their analysis and results matters greatly (2010) as part of their practical wisdom. They extend their analysis beyond the discursive capacities of argumentation, mediation and deliberation to consider other performative ways messages are conveyed, for example through visual, textual, graphic and electronic means (2010). The implications of the setting in which communication takes place, as well as whether behavioural and engagement strategies, for example as to whether they respond to the needs of different publics, form key areas of focus (2010). Furthermore, as Haugaard has explained, discursive knowledge can be used to problematise practical consciousness knowledge, simply by ‘consciousness raising:’ making something observable and therefore open for discussion and evaluation (2012). This line of thinking suggests, for my research, it was therefore important to be aware of the different approaches to communicative action and the capacity for social change through recognising and integrating diverse voices in the planning process.

**Practical wisdom quality five: engaging in direct struggles**

Pursuing progressive social change through formal participatory mechanisms and political processes doesn’t appear to be a panacea for all social actors. Where the formal planning process fails or “overly limit the alternatives that may be considered” (Hillier, 2002, p.15), ‘reasonable citizens’ may choose not to engage with existing structures and instead agitate for change through strategies and tactics of resistance or building alternatives (Young, 2001). Many authors (Harvey various; Young, 2001; De Sousa, 2006; Needleman and Needleman, 1976; Legacy, 2014), have demonstrated the role and effectiveness of citizens’ movements in agitating for change in the face of a conceded formal planning process. Planners may also play a role in “informal and direct action,” (Hillier, 2002, p.15), for example through acts of lobbying and persuasion, or even by joining social movements and possibly operating as ‘guerrillas in the bureaucracy’ (Needleman and Needleman, 1976). Helpfully for my research, De Sousa articulates three kinds of social movements as those that operate “together with the state, despite the state and against the state” (2006, p.327). Social movements can be ‘critical urban planning agents’ (ibid) and form a key role of influencing urban outcomes.
Through recognising the role of social movements, some theorists have identified strategies and tactics that planners might employ to harness their effectiveness. The way authors envisage the role of planners in social movements is different. David Harvey is a key proponent of the role of urban social movement in influencing a way of doing politics differently that might effect transformative change (Harvey, 2000; 2008; 2009; 2012). Wolf-Powers has also identified a need for “progressive planners to strategize both about mobilizing resources for such groups and about reframing urban issues in public discourse” (2009, p.163). She argued that planners “are in a good position to ‘shake things up’ both by offering expertise to social movement actors and by introducing alternative visions of the city into the dominant public discourse” (2009, p.168). Other authors have studied and at times participated in ‘activist planning’, ‘insurgent planning’ or ‘confrontational planning’ (de Souza, 2006; Miraftab, Wilson, & Salo, 2015; Sager, 2016; Yiftachel, 2001), which takes action into areas of unsanctioned planning in the search for alternatives to pursue progressive social change. In such pursuits, planners can help others acquire knowledge for the pursuit of strategies of resistance (Hillier, 2002) or jointly engage in critique or contestation of planning institutions. One other key strategy for planners, perhaps, is sustaining conflict and uncertainty, in particular through supporting agonism as a way of productively engaging with decision-making processes in planning (Hillier, 2002, building on Arendt’s ‘agonistic public sphere’). Overall, as part of their practical wisdom, it seems that a planner’s role might move from operating within formal structures to effect change to also engaging in “direct struggles,” (Flyvbjerg, 2012, p.236) through urban social movements.

**Fallibility of practical wisdom**

Part of practical wisdom I believe is also about acknowledging the fallible nature of practice as well as the distance between aims and realities. The responsibility of acting within short timeframes and in diverse contexts means that not every decision can be thoroughly considered, which can ultimately lead to limited analytical reasoning and diminished transparency in applied practice. Whilst there are many positive outcomes from skilled and agile practical reason, phronesis is imperfect because it may “fail to take account of relevant things and misjudge situations, not merely randomly and occasionally, but recurrently” (Sayer, 2011, p.86). Such failings can arise from a range of sources, including an unreflective practice, ill-fated path-dependency in decision-making or simply indifference to outcomes. Also, of course practical knowledge is not objective: it is based on reflective practice that is intimately tied to the learning experiences of people. Decisions will not be effective for all times and all places. Furthermore, there is significant complexity in translating and using general principles of social justice like redistribution or recognition in specific contexts. This reality of practice indicates that my research should seek to uncover and be observant of these limitations and particularities, especially the way planners through practical wisdom are able to acknowledge barriers to practices.
Conclusion

This chapter examined the trajectory of social justice thinking in planning and brought into focus the elements of practice that planning actors may bring to bear to effect social change. From the opening review of justice and planning literature, TSL was shown to be a potent theory for understanding what social justice is and the norms required to pursue social justice in planning. The three social logics of redistribution, recognition and encounter systematically provide a normative foundation as well as principles for framing planning action to reduce disadvantage. Then, I proposed one possible avenue to extend this theory and operationalise my research frame to consider the everyday practices of ‘virtuous actors’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) or ‘missionary planners’ (Hillier, 2002), including “the tactics…to achieve policy decisions in the cause of social justice” (Hillier, 2002, p. ix). In this regard, TSL offers a central theoretical framework for knowing what to do, which is extended to consider knowledge about the skills and actions that are needed in practice creates. Overall, it provides a ‘phronetic’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) or ‘practice-centred’ (Forester, 1989) framework for this doctoral study, illuminating the ideals “worth fighting for” (i.e. social justice), but also the “strategies and tactics needed for moving toward the ideal” (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p.384). It also provides scope for different practice ontologies across the settings in the translation of ideals into strategy. Following the consideration of commonly found strategies and tactics across both metropolitan settings, this thesis later offers new decision rules for operationalising TSL that build on the existing decision rules for redistribution, recognition and encounter.

Specifically, the characteristics of ‘missionary’ planning actors are germane to understanding the political function of planners that goes beyond technical competency. These features include an ability “to think and act politically” (Forester, 1989, p.7), a capacity to persevere and learn through practice (Matus, 2008), a facility for creative thinking and improvisation as well as an aptitude for anticipating and responding to the “rules of the game” (Hillier, 2002, p.210). From these general characteristics, four additional qualities of practical wisdom were uncovered through a review of planning literature, offering possible strategies and tactics used by planners in the pursuit of social justice through integrated planning. The first “indispensable” quality (Hillier, 2002) was an ability to understand and respond to the contextual conditions, such as the motives of powerful actors and the subtleties of knowing the right time for action. The second quality was ‘coalition-building’ (Forester, 1989) or the use of networks (Albrechts, 2006) or ‘assemblages’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988; Hillier, 2002) so as to “team up with like-minded people and fight for what you want, utilizing the means which work in your context” (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p.236). The third important quality related to communicative action, in particular the value of strong communication and argumentation skills (inter alia: Forester, 1989; Healey, 1997; Innes, 2000; Fischer, 2009; Sandercock, 1997) for effective action
in political processes. The final quality studied was the ability to agitate for change and engage in “direct struggles” (Flyvbjerg, 2012, p.236) through alternatives to formal planning practices, including participating in social movements or leading ‘activist’ planning initiatives (De Sousa, 2006; Miraftab et al., 2015; Needleman and Needleman, 1976; Wolf-Powers, 2009; Yiftachel, 2001, Young, 2001).

Overall, I found TSL to be the most fitting theory for studying planning that aims to reduce disadvantage because it provides guidance for action in a way that draws on and comprehensively synthesises critical elements of urban and social justice theories. However, TSL “is far from a complete guide to planning action (and) leaves open matters of interpretation” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 214). I believe that the TSL could be extended through further grounding in the diverse practice realities of integrated planning for reducing disadvantage. In this regard, from the initial analysis of how social justice works theoretically in planning, this chapter then described how ‘practical wisdom’ (Campbell, 2006; Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 1998; Hillier, 2002) supports agile planning action. I believe that foregrounding understandings of practical wisdom offers one avenue of possible theoretical extension of TSL. Primarily for this research, bringing together an understanding of the principles of social logics with the qualities of practical wisdom provides the conceptual framework for the final two research questions:

1. What are the formal structures and informal strategies that support social logics for reducing disadvantage through integrated planning?

2. Are there grounds to support modifications to integrated planning practices and extend the theory of social logics based on cross-case conclusions? If so, in what way?
Chapter 4. Methodology

Introduction

This study was designed to bring greater transparency to the inner workings of integrated planning practices where social logics are shaped and applied to reduce disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. The research followed a ‘phronetic’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) approach that promoted close dialogue between the foundational ‘social logics’ (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) and analysis of ‘practical wisdom’ (Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Forester, 1989; Hillier, 2002) in action. This reflects an “interactive understanding” of the relationship between theory and practice that privileges a focus “on how action is accomplished” and how ideas “are created and made manifest in practices” (Healey, 2010, p. 38). In particular, I employed an ethnographic sensibility to closely examine the practice reality of integrated planning and used the Theory of Social Logics (TSL) (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) to orientate my search for experiences of integrated planning that sought to reduce disadvantage. This chapter provides a detailed description of the way an ethnographic sensibility was developed and employed, as well as a synopsis of the methods used for data collection, including qualitative content analysis, interviews and participant observation, as well as data analysis and interpretation, including comparative study of the case experiences.

An ethnographic sensibility in case study research

An ethnographic sensibility was used to closely examine the everyday practices and settings that drive integrated planning in directions that seek to reduce disadvantage. As described in the previous chapter, TSL (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) was used as a foundation for understanding the kinds of broad cases and working principles that might be applied in planning to advance socially just outcomes. From this basis, this study focused on practical wisdom (Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Forester, 1989; Hillier, 2002) in planning, in particular how social logics are defined and put to use as well as the problems encountered in integrated planning practice to reduce disadvantage through formal structures and informal strategies. In this regard, an ethnographic sensibility was applied to gain close proximity to practice realities, uncovering the way social logics materialise in favourable and unfavourable settings, through formalised processes and through realrationalitat (Flyvbjerg, 1996).

Case study and ethnography are approaches in qualitative social science research that have similarities and differences. Both seek to examine contemporary phenomena within specific contexts using a range of data collection and interpretation methods. The main difference is that while case study involves the study of an “instance in action” (Macdonald & Walker, 1975, p. 2), ethnography is the study of a specific group or culture. Another important distinction is that ethnography involves
inductive inquiry, while case study is used in both inductive and deductive research. Other differences include the more commonly used ‘immersion’ approach in ethnography, particularly through participant observation. Notwithstanding some of these differences, some scholars have sought to “move on from a dichotomous consideration of case study versus ethnography (to) consider instead the possibilities of assembling a combination of ethnographic and case study approaches” (White, Drew, & Hay, 2009, p. 18). The case study approach crafted for this doctoral study is supported by an ethnographic sensibility, building on the compatibilities between ethnography and case study.

Case study and ethnographic approaches share many similarities and appear to be compatible where the social interactions (in the case of this doctoral study the social interactions that drive the planning process) form the central aspect of inquiry. Case study inquiry helps to “understand complex social phenomena” by permitting researchers “to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (Yin, 2009a, p. 4). Similarly, and through immersion based methods, ethnography “goes with interpretative, symbolic and constructivist perspectives on how social realities are enacted and structured by the people that are part of and make up such realities” (Rhodes, 2007a, p. 3). Both approaches were drawn on to gain proximity to the realities of integrated planning practices. In line with ethnographic research, this meant focusing on “what happens, how the people involved see and talk about their own actions and those of others, the contexts in which the action takes place, and what follows from it” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 4). Through a more deductive, case study approach, it meant using concrete case experiences to illuminate the nuances of planning practice and attempting to calibrate the parameters of theory to specific contexts of practice (Neuman, 2011, p. 42). Other similarities between case study research and ethnography drawn upon in this doctoral study are the sources of evidence from documentation, interviews and observation.

Despite some overlap and compatibility, there has been limited use of ethnography in studying the inner-workings of planning practice. While there is an established tradition of ‘urban ethnography’, with the Chicago School as the early referent for studying urban spaces or Jane Jacobs’s seminal ethnography on the Life and Death of Great American Cities (1961) very few ethnographic studies have addressed the urban planning process itself, leaving decision-making to seem like a ‘black-box’ (Albrechts, 2006). As Rhodes stated, “political practices…deep inside the policy-making process have not been studied in this way” (2007a, p. 2). There are a few notable exceptions in urban research where scholars have employed ethnographic methods to explore ‘what planners do’ (Hoch, 1994) or what actual work is done (Abram & Weszkalnys, 2013), from complete immersion by following planners “in their daily work, attending meetings with them, conducting formal interviews, joining in their own informal discussions and generally being around for a period of six months” (Underwood, 1980, p. 5) to less immersive approaches, including conversational interviewing (Hillier, 2002), semi-structured interviewing (Burton, 2011) how planners retain their idealism and ‘shadowing’ planners.
for short time periods (Healey, 1992a). My thesis sites within this trajectory of ethnographically-informed research into planners’ own perspectives of their work and the role of the state.

An ethnographic sensibility in case study research offers a platform to better understand values, reasoning and action in urban planning based on what is said and done, as well as in relation to the cultural, historical and other social conditions of specific contexts. In terms of analysis and interpretation of data, an ethnographic sensibility is attuned to the social relations and interactions between people that produce and reproduce meaning in everyday practices. The term sensibility implies flexibility around the type of immersion in research and a broad view of ethnography that goes beyond the process of on-site data collection (Schatz, 2009). It means paying particular attention to the perspectives of people being studied and seeking to reveal the meanings people attribute to their social world (Schatz, 2009). Imbuing case study research with an ethnographic sensibility serves to highlight the agency of actors and interplay between them in the micro-politics of everyday planning practice. In particular, I employed two main pathways in this research to develop this sensibility: through taking advantage of an ‘insider afterwards’ perspective (Norell, 2007) and by employing selected ethnographic methods in case study research.

The “insider afterwards” perspective (Norell, 2007, p. 106) is used by scholars in circumstances where their research is directly influenced by lived experiences. Drawing on insider afterwards perspectives in planning appears to occur in two ways. The first consists of practitioners reflecting on past applied experiences in urban planning or policy to contribute to knowledge, either for theory development or to advance practice techniques. The second approach occurs when scholars define research problems closely informed by past experiences of applied practice. By reflecting on past experiences as an insider afterwards the researcher can frame and undertake research with specific knowledge of local context, issues and processes. Both approaches facilitate close proximity to the place, instance or subjects of study that would otherwise be difficult to attain. Past experiences help researchers to develop an ethnographic sensibility in research given their understanding of cultural, historical and other social conditions characteristic of the of study context. Furthermore, they are uniquely positioned to reflect on the application of theory given their applied experiences.

In relation to the first ‘insider afterwards’ approach, some scholars in urban studies have directly drawn on previous applied experiences to inform scholarly research and publications. For example, Jacobs drew on his experience as the Director of Planning for the City of San Francisco from 1967 to 1975 as well as previous applied career experiences to shed light onto the role of professional skills and political acumen in Making City Planning Work (Jacobs, 1978). Krumholz (1982) also wrote retrospectively about equity planning following his decade long work as director of the Cleveland City Planning Commission. More recently, authors of the compilation entitled Urban Infrastructure:
Finance and Management (Wellman & Spiller, 2012), drew on a range of practice experiences to test and further build theory, as well as advance understandings of decision-making processes and financing of urban infrastructure. These authors were “active participants” and wrote from the perspective of “reflective practitioners, taking time to scrutinize their practical experiences and share the results” (Birch, 2012, p. 276). Arguably, in such scenarios research is enhanced by the authors’ access to key informants and ability to frame their research based on expertise developed in practice and an understanding of the contingencies of local contexts and decision-making processes.

The second approach to capitalising on insider afterwards perspectives involves using prior knowledge gained through applied practice relating to the cases studied in research. This can be a key strength in research (Yin, 2009b), for example in problem identification, to uncover rich sites for analysis, for understanding nuances in local contexts and for building networks of potential research participants. Furthermore, previous experiences in the planning and policy process can illuminate potential scope for change or the practical limits of theory. Relating to the research participants can also be made more fluid by establishing a common ground about shared knowledge. In this way, the researcher demonstrates an understanding of the ‘researched’s reality’ through ‘experiential sameness’ (Mohammad, 2001). This can prove fruitful for getting to the crux of the subject of study. Employing an ‘insider-afterwards’ perspective to develop an ethnographic sensibility may also assist in making sense of information conveyed by research participants based on an understanding of micro-level dynamics of applied contexts and the interrelationships between stakeholders.

Notwithstanding the benefits of adopting an ‘insider afterwards’ approach, managing “a balance between being an insider and an outsider” (Spradley, 1980, p. 61) can present some challenges. For example, achieving a balance between outsider and insider perspectives in ethnography is an ideal constantly challenged by notions of objectivity and a desire to fairly interpret ‘native’ points of view. The challenge here is how to maintain critical distance in a setting the researcher is familiar with. Some techniques employed by ethnographers in immersion serve as lessons for research that takes an ‘insider afterwards’ perspective. For example, a researcher may analyse prejudices and biases to avoid them, try to be aware of alternative possibilities and remain curious about the topic to discover further detail (Naaeke, Kurylo, Grabowski, Linton, & Radford, 2011). Other challenges may also exist, such as how to be sufficiently sensitive to the multiple voices and how to choose which voices to privilege (Zirakzadeh, 2009). In this sense, it seems important that the researcher actively reflects on his or her own assumptions and, where possible, seeks to detect limitations and consider alternative positions offered through research findings. Recognising plurality in sources of knowledge and respecting different approaches in planning practice forms part of developing an ethnographic sensibility (Pader, 2006; Schatz, 2009). Without this sensibility, it is difficult to generate contributions beyond individual and pre-existing interpretations. Despite these challenges, “familiarity with the area brings more
benefits than pitfalls” and can be used as an advantage to “read” situations when thoughtfully employed (Hakansson, 2015, p. 188).

My research works deductively from the TSL to better understand how planners apply social logics to reduce disadvantage through integrated planning. I chose contexts that I am generally familiar with and had some applied experience in, but the research involved examining projects I was unfamiliar with and interviewing people with whom I had no direct working relationship during my fieldwork. While I was not a ‘complete member’ (Adler & Adler, 1987) of the studied groups, I feel that my recollections as an ‘insider afterwards’ (Norell, 2007) provided a unique grounding to understand the dynamics of the planning process and background to the contexts. My experience helped me to identify targeted questions for interviewing on the wherefore behind the different actions of planners. It also helped me to access sites for research and to move quickly in interviews to the core of the matter. It proved useful in terms of establishing and communicating a level of base knowledge, both technical and political, from which to discuss the inner workings of the participant’s practice reality. I sought to overcome possible challenges by actively reflecting upon my own views and, where possible, detect limitations and consider alternative positions and possibilities offered through the results produced. I discussed these potential biases with my supervisors and with participants throughout the research to manage their impact and ensure the salience of the findings, especially from the interview data. For example, when discussing the relevance of social norms like redistribution I offered my own interpretation of the concept and expressly asked about examples, differences or extensions to the concept based on their own experiences.

An ethnographic sensibility can also be engendered by studying past or present events from “an ethnographic problematization and framing of the work” (Kubik, 2009, p. 31). In this regard, “getting at the inside” (Billo & Mountz, 2015, p. 10) involves employing a “particular perspective” (Wedeen, 2009, p. 85) and commitment to evaluating what people actually do and a long-term commitment to people and place as subjects of study (Wedeen, 2009). This approach has been most comprehensively adopted in the field of political ethnography where “a sensibility” is employed “that goes beyond face-to-face contact” and focuses on “the meanings that the people under study attribute to their social and political reality” (Schatz, 2009, p. 5). In this regard, it is possible to “abstract from participant observation qualities that inform a more general ethnographic sensibility” (Schatz, 2009, p. 5). A seminal example of this is James Scott’s Seeing Like a State (1998), which explored the way officials simplified the representations of the actual activities of society and in doing so enabled these depicted realities to be remade through those simplifications.

In my research, I chose to conduct case studies in two cities where I had lived and worked for several years. I am committed to improving planning for the reduction of disadvantage in Melbourne and
Buenos Aires and my concern about impediments to reducing disadvantage through planning was born in my applied experiences. Past experiences and my commitment to both places helped me to ethnographically frame my work on the important role planners can play when progressive change does occur in politico-institutional settings that are usually marked by a neoliberal agenda and limited capacity to reduce disadvantage. Having closely observed and participated in planning practice, I have developed an understanding of what planners’ social reality may be like and I used this as a basis to inform my research. I maintained close ties to practice realities throughout my doctoral work in both cities and used methods to support what Wedeen (Wedeen, 2009, p. 86) refers to as “enmeshment in the social world under investigation,” for example through certain activities such as event ethnography and “learning a local language or dialect (and) participating in the daily life of the community through ordinary conversations and interaction.” I found a variety of ways to ‘get at the inside’, such as participating platforms of debate at universities or between practitioners and researchers, partaking in plan-making and project engagement processes, discussing specific issues with colleagues in practice, and to a limited degree, working on local planning projects.

Other ethnographic research techniques can also be used to help gain proximity planning action, such as ethnographic interviewing or focus groups. Ethnographic interviewing encourages storytelling that reveals details about cultural, historical and other social conditions of contexts, but also about different ways of reasoning and acting. Hillier (2002), for example, used ethnographic interviewing to produce a characterisation of different types of planners. Vignettes can also be used to explore actions in particular contexts based on participants’ perceptions, by using “short stories about hypothetical characters in specified circumstances, to whose situation the interviewee is invited to respond” (Finch, 1987, p. 105). Hakansson (2015) and Larner and Laurie (2010) have used this approach to discuss stories with informants in a way that reveals people’s professional perspectives, work experiences and assumptions. In my research, interview responses and interviewees’ stories provided insights into the planning process, including how interaction and collaboration between actors in the planning process contributes to making sense of situations and developing strategies in everyday practice. I also used qualitative content analysis and non-participant observation. Overall, it was through an ‘insider afterwards’ perspective combined with the use and triangulation of findings from interviews, document analysis and observation that I developed an ethnographic sensibility for this case study research. The following section describes each of the methods in detail.

**Qualitative data collection methods**

This research employed qualitative methods of data collection and analysis that focus on what happens in integrated planning practices. The time period selected for empirical study was from the
early-1990s until 2015 to align with the overt introduction and practice of contemporary integrated planning to reduce disadvantage across both metropolitan regions. There are three main components of the research method detailed below. The first involved content analysis of all key urban policy documentation from the 1920s to 2015 to trace historical understandings of integrated planning focused on the reduction of disadvantage. This helped develop the conceptual framework developed in Chapter 2, which then enabled an examination of the mechanisms of integration in planning with social logics. The second and third methods were closely linked, involving semi-structured interviews and non-participant observation within applied settings of planning. Interviews were conducted until repetition of findings indicted a point of saturation. The case study approach with an ethnographic sensibility sought to capture rich accounts of the strategies and tactics used to advance social logics that might otherwise be hidden from formal prescriptions or practices described in the policy documentation. Data collection and analysis was iterative, providing the opportunity to move between each phase, refining and adjusting throughout. This section describes each phase of data collection, following an introduction to the cases selected for comparative study.

Case selection
Melbourne and Buenos Aires were selected to study integrated planning for reducing disadvantage because in two very different contexts they exhibit the common troubles of worsening socio-spatial disadvantage and regularly changing policy frames due to divided political agendas. A dominant feature of both cities is worsening spatial clustering of disadvantage households (Baum & Gleeson, 2010; Echevarría, 2008; Pawson & Herath, 2012; Pírez, 2002; Randolph & Holloway, 2005; Torres, 2001, 2004) or “socio-spatial disadvantage,” which refers to the “geographic concentration of households whose relatively low income and resources deprive them of an acceptable standard of living and of opportunities for social and economic participation” (Jones, 2012). The inclusive qualities of suburban areas characteristic of the post-war era in both cities have diminished over the last few decades. In the case of Melbourne, disadvantaged households are clustered predominantly in areas with public housing and outer areas where housing is more affordable: affordable housing for average income households was located only 10 kilometres from the CBD in 1994, however by 2009 this distance had extended to 40 kilometres (Spiller, 2011). In Buenos Aires, the greatest expression of socio-spatial polarisation is the proliferation of both slums and gated communities since the early 1990s in predominantly outer metropolitan areas (Torres, 2004). The increasing concentration of disadvantaged households in specific localities in both cities can be linked to the impacts of governance changes and economic restructuring discussed in Chapter 2, in particular inequalities produced in accessing market-delivered housing and services. It should be noted that in absolute terms, Buenos Aires has a more pronounced socio-spatial polarisation and the conditions of disadvantage are more extreme, with some communities lacking basic needs such as potable water. However, in relative terms, both cities exhibit locational clustering of disadvantage.
As the metropolitan areas of Buenos Aires and Melbourne expanded in the twentieth century, the north and west absorbed much of the industrial development of both cities, as well as the working class housing that was developed through low-cost subdivisions in the post-war period. More recently, outer and peri-urban areas have absorbed new urban expansion, particularly towards the north and west of these cities: in Melbourne to produce low-cost residential estates on affordable land and in Buenos Aires for both exclusive gated communities and informal settlements that align with the Pan-American development axis. In these expanded suburban areas, poorer residents do not benefit from equal access to a range of urban services compared to the inner city, including in education, health, employment and public transportation. In the case of Buenos Aires, basic infrastructure such as potable water, electricity and sewer services may also be out of reach for poorer households. In each city’s periphery, development tends to be car-oriented and middle and high-income groups are increasingly choosing privately delivered services, such as in health and education, while low-income groups are continuing to rely on underfunded public services. In reflecting on the Australian experience, Gleeson (2006, p. 236) “the affluent are being pushed towards use of a subsidised and private sphere of service consumption and lured into areas of the cities where these services are richly supplied. The poor are left to fend for themselves in an increasingly stressed and dysfunctional realm of publicly provided services.” Both cities juggle very complex infrastructure and service delivery arrangements with a plethora of public and private providers as well as weak local government planning capacities to manage growth pressures on the periphery. In fact, the planning system overall has proven volatile due to regularly changing political agendas and, therefore, weak in combating the unequal conditions of urban development and the clustering of disadvantage in both metropolitan regions. Neither metropolitan area has introduced an urban plan that has outlasted a change of government for over twenty years and the development pattern is markedly led by private interests.

It is within this context of more pronounced socio-spatial disadvantage and fragmented urban governance regimes that contemporary integrated planning emerged in the 1990s with the aim of linking up the many disjointed aspects and actors of planning, as well as to address other emerging complex urban problems, such as the combination of declining population health and environmental indicators in certain parts of each metropolitan area. In particular, integrated approaches to planning have been championed to target specific areas of locational disadvantage with a high concentration of initiatives in the north and west in both metropolitan areas, for example around areas of informal settlements (Buenos Aires) and traditional public housing or industrial neighbourhoods (Melbourne). Some efforts at integrated planning have been subject to evaluation programs or critical commentary, as well as ongoing statistical tracking of changing quality of life outcomes. In general, these analyses suggest that despite a trend towards growing inequality and ongoing clustering of disadvantages households, there has been some reduction of relative disadvantage in some communities where
programs have been targeted. For example, in Buenos Aires there was a reduction in households with unmet basic needs in some areas where projects have been conducted between the census periods of 2000 and 2010 and in Melbourne, over a similar time period, neighbourhood renewal strategies have generally proven to be “effective in improving trust in government, perceptions of community participation, influence and control over community decisions; improved services; (…) and addressing area-level determinants to improve social inclusion” (Shield et al., 2011, p.4).

The focus of this research therefore is on practices of integrated planning that have aimed to reduce disadvantage. There are integrated approaches applied in a range of policy areas, for example in bushfire management (Howes et al., 2015), health (Lowe, 2015) and transport (Curtis et al., 2010). While literature relevant to these areas was reviewed as part of this study, the empirical work focused exclusively on cases of integrated planning with social logics. These initiatives were chosen in one of two ways: they were selected based on my knowledge of case examples and further document analysis or they emerged during the interview process as notable experiences to planners and policy makers. Four main experiences were chosen as a starting point in each case. In Melbourne, these included growth area planning, affordable housing, urban food security and neighbourhood renewal. In Buenos Aires, catchment basin planning for the Reconquista River, neighbourhood improvement programs (i.e. PROMEBA and Plan Ahi) and a policy to provide ‘just’ access to housing through the university-led alliance Habitar Argentina were studied. The table on the following page was used to identify the dimensions of these initiatives that demonstrate integrated planning as well as the presence of decision rules pertaining to social logics within policy documentation.

Through the interview process, other cases emerged in addition to the primary eight and therefore multiple examples were thus drawn upon from the interview material. These multiple embedded cases vary considerably in terms of spatial scale, number of actors, mix of policy domains and levels of investment. I faced some challenges given this open approach in terms of containing the focus of the study and at times discarded data from particular discussions, for example those that didn’t deal with initiatives about reducing disadvantage or emerged in isolated conversations without the possibility to triangulate findings. Nevertheless, the approach of allowing multiple cases to emerge through the interview process served well for uncovering some generalisable features about the use of social logics in integrated planning across different contexts. The table on the next page identifies the kinds of interventions studied and the combination of aspects of integrated planning and social logics that were considered when discussing case experiences. Overall, a multiple embedded sub-case study design was undertaken to elucidate possible repeated patterns as well as variations in patterns in an effort to offer “more ample descriptions and explanations of complex phenomena, all in the effort to enhance generalization from the data” (Birch, 2012, p. 269).
### Figure 4.1 Substantive elements of integrated planning with social logics in case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use integration</th>
<th>Territorial integration</th>
<th>Place-based integration</th>
<th>Vertical integration</th>
<th>Horizontal integration</th>
<th>State-society integration</th>
<th>Redistribution</th>
<th>Social logics</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case studies of integrated planning with social logics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing (1993-present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood renewal &amp; revitalisation (2001-present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban food security (2005-present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth area planning (2006-present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recyclops River basin planning (1995-present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood renewal PROMERA (1997-present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just housing through Habitar Argentina (2006-present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melbourne, Victoria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buenos Aires, Argentina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2017
Comparative research

Generating robust, broad claims that have the possibility to transcend local specificities requires comparison and cross-case conclusions. Having experienced similar opportunities and challenges in working with social logics in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, part of my research was dedicated to interrogating the common ground between cases and testing the possibility that any sameness could be found in multiple experiences across two diverse cities. I understood that comparative research involves the identification of common features and patterns (Jacobs, 2012), in order to position a case in a broader context or “to reveal the generality or particularity of a process or theme” (McFarlane, 2010, p. 730). “Comparative analysis can indicate the diverse ways in which a particular phenomenon can arise across nations, regions or social groups, and whether there is an ‘essential basis’ for the matter in question” (Dodds, 2013, p. 8). Given the “planetary” (Brenner, Marcuse, & Mayer, 2012) scale of contemporary urban transformations, comparison provides opportunities to observe policies in effect in different settings and draw lessons from different contexts (McFarlane, 2010; Rose, 2005). The effective translation of such lessons between contexts demands comparative study and dialogue between regions to ensure that unique, place-based perspectives and phenomena are thoroughly understood to be placed in a comparative context. Overall, I believed that the scope to strengthen theory, in this case the TSL, and tackle urban challenges from a practice perspective would be broadened through a comparative understanding of the trajectories of contemporary integrated planning for reducing disadvantage in both cities. This comparative aim is reflected in my final research question:

Are there grounds to support modifications to integrated planning practices and extend the theory of social logics based on cross-case conclusions? If so, in what way?

My interest in making general observations from diverse experiences of integrated planning sits within a general trend of growing interest in comparative urban research. Many urban scholars have called for the frame of comparative urban research to become broader since the early 2000s, in particular to move away from comparisons of ‘similar’ places or from the production or binary or simple categorisations (e.g. ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ cities) to bring to the fore the experiences of diverse cities (Clarke, 2012; Dear, 2005; McFarlane, 2010; McFarlane & Robinson, 2012; Nijman, 2007; Robinson, 2004, 2006). Robinson’s Ordinary Cites: Between Modernity and Development has played a pivotal role in driving a shift towards “a postcolonial revisioning” (Robinson, 2006, p. 2) of the way cities might be understood, including by bridging the ‘North-South’ comparative gap in urban research. In particular she encourages the examination of how theoretical approaches might change by considering the experiences of different cities and engaging with the work of researchers from different places (Robinson, 2004, 2006). Contemporary comparative research can therefore strengthen theoretical accounts from a range of experiences and perspectives, including by considering divergent practices and outcomes that might unsettle established knowledge in practice or theory (McFarlane &
Robinson, 2012). This broadening of comparative research frames requires overcoming the relative “absence of arguments and perspectives from Africa, Asia and Latin America” (Peck, 2015). In this doctoral study, I have brought into comparison two cities that are often positioned as peripheral to those of dominant cities in Western Europe and North America, as well as one each from the ‘Global North’ and ‘Global South:’ Melbourne and Buenos Aires respectively.

Despite the resurgence of interest in comparative urban studies, “there has been little effort to critically debate how comparison might take place, particularly in reference to comparison across the global ‘North–South divide’” (McFarlane, 2010, p. 725). McFarlane and Robinson (2012) have lamented that by the turn of the 21st century comparative methods in urban studies were stymied by an almost universal orthodoxy of studying similar cities and by development based categorisations (McFarlane & Robinson, 2012). Urban scholars, such as Jacobs (2012), have suggested that finding appropriate conditions and methods for comparative research that involves places previously conceptualised in relation to dominant centres is a central imperative.

From reviewing emergent literature on comparative urbanism, I sought to recognise and bring to the fore in this study both distinctive processes as well as the possibility of bringing together common patterns to support general findings. Anthropological methods have been offered as one model for this kind of comparative analysis (McFarlane & Robinson, 2012) and, in line with this trend, my doctoral study involved case study research imbued with an ethnographic sensibility. As an ‘insider afterwards’, I sought to build on a modest comparative tradition between Australia and Argentina (inter alia Duncan & Fogarty, 1984; Gerardi, 1985; Stancanelli, 2011) by extending this comparative lens to examine integrated planning practices with qualitative and ethnographic methods. There were challenges to making cross-case conclusions because at times the ‘unit’ of comparison, such as population scale, budget or geography, were vastly different. As Dear (2005, p. 247) has observed,

Everyone knows that comparative urbanism is difficult. Data sources are not always compatible nor equally available or accessible; institutional frames of reference, especially those relating to traditions of governance and practices of land-use regulation, often vary enormously from place to place; and the dynamics of growth and decline can be vastly different, according to the legacies of the geographical and historical record.

The challenge of comparison led me to reflect on “what contextual factors matter most?” (McFarlane, 2010) and I decided that the nature of the planning process in each case and actor behaviours were the most important dynamics when they were repeated across scales. For example, the ever-changing policy context linked to fluctuating political contexts was one clear dynamic, as was the deepening socio-spatial disadvantage (both processes are more extreme in Buenos Aires). This was a constant consideration throughout each of the three phases of data collection and analysis, as described below.
Phase 1. Qualitative content analysis

The initial phase of data analysis involved qualitative content analysis of policy documentation applicable to the local case contexts to develop a genealogy of integrated planning and to select appropriate cases to initiate phases 2 and 3 (interviews and participant observation). Qualitative content analysis is a flexible method (Cavanagh, 1997) for analysing textual data that “focuses on the characteristics of language as communication with attention to the content or contextual meaning of the text” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1278). While it can be used to analyse a variety of sources of evidence, here it was used for the study of policy documentation only. It is qualitative in that the approach examines the meaning of language content in context through a process of coding and the identification of patterns in policy language. In particular, the analysis was separated into two phases: the first phase examined the evolution of meanings attributed to ‘integration’ in strategic planning documentation between the 1920s and 2015, drawing connections between political and economic conditions and planning trends; the second phase was used to examine more closely the contemporary, formal structures of integrated planning for the reduction of disadvantage from the early 1990s to 2015.

In relation to the first phase, I undertook the analysis of strategic planning documentation and key legislation covering three periods: from the 1920s to end of World War II; the post-war period from the end of WWII to 1983; and a contemporary period from the mid-1980s to 2015. In adopting an ethnographic sensibility in this initial analytical phase, I paid close attention to the use of words in their different political and economic contexts, and that meanings of words can change over time. For this, I examined multiple public planning instruments as well as published studies by planning authors to develop a nuanced understanding of context and concepts. This led me to move iteratively between coding, analysis and interpretation (Altheide, 1987), formulating a basis for phases 2 and 3 of data collection. This reflexivity was part of employing an ethnographic sensibility. I inductively studied separate occurrences of ‘integration’ as they appeared and were described, then as trends about integration emerged I coded the document-based data with the assistance of NVivo. This enabled me
to develop a clear framework for identifying integrated approaches in planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires based on spatial consideration and actor relationships, which was then applied in subsequent processes of data collection. It also highlighted that despite considerable differences between the case contexts, for example in poverty levels, there are clear, shared trends in policy focus and institutional approaches. This enabled the periodisation in the genealogy of integrated planning (see Chapter 2). Overall, the first phase of content analysis enabled me to identify how integration was employed as a concept with changes and continuities over time and between contexts. The table below lists the documents studied for the preliminary phase of content analysis.

**Table 4.1. Strategic planning documents studied during first and second phases* of content analysis**

*indicated in italics during the contemporary period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Melbourne documents</th>
<th>Buenos Aires documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town and Country Planning (Metropolitan Area) 1948</td>
<td>Plan Director para Buenos Aires (1938), Plan influenced by Le Corbusier’s Plan (1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme (Surveys and Analysis Report, 1954)</td>
<td>Código de Edificación (1944), City of Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme (Scheme Report, 1954)</td>
<td>Plan Quinquenal (1947), Government of Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town and Country Planning Act 1961</td>
<td>Plan Quinquenal (1952), Government of Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Melbourne Board of Works Strategy (1967)</td>
<td>Plano Director (1958), Government of Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Melbourne Board of Works Report on General Concept Objections (1974)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living Suburbs Metropolitan Plan (1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Doughnut City to Cafe Society (1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne 2030 Strategy (2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Plan for Melbourne’s Growth Areas (2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne @5 Million (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the second phase of qualitative content analysis, a deductive and directed approach was adopted based on the framework of integrated planning developed during the first phase. The second content analysis phase focused only on contemporary planning documentation (in italics in the above table) to develop a critical account of integrated planning and its social objectives over twenty years between approximately 1995 and 2015. Having identified the main characteristics of integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires in the first phase of content analysis, the second phase focused on the first aspect of my second research question: what are the formal structures and informal strategies that support social logics for reducing disadvantage through integrated planning? In particular, this phase of content analysis sought to uncover formal arrangements that support integrated planning with clear social aims, in particular with clear use of one or more ‘social logics’ (redistribution, recognition and encounter). It also sought to identify key moments of change in policy documents that could later be discussed in interviews, including how these changes came about and the impact they had on integrated planning practices with social logics. The period of study was identified in the first phase as when integrated approaches to planning were specifically used to target disadvantage: from the mid-1990s to 2015.

Specifically, I started with an understanding of integrated planning (Chapter 2) and social logics in planning (Chapter 3) to establish codes for thematic analysis. NVivo was used to assist in coding data for this phase of analysis, specifically to gather data about both spatial integration and actor interrelations in formal policy directed toward reducing disadvantage. Unexpected data trends that contributed to understandings of integrated planning and social logics were inductively coded. Criteria questions were used to guide the characterisation process of integrated planning in each context, focusing on which areas of policy have shown the greatest interest in integrated forms of planning to reduce disadvantage over the period of study and what institutional structures, policy arrangements and governance mechanisms have been formally associated with integrated planning. The following table (2.3) includes the content analysis criteria used for the second phase of qualitative content analysis. The findings from this second phase of content analysis highlight formal structures of integrated planning for the reduction of disadvantage. These data were used to delineate preliminary understandings that informed subsequent phases of data collection and for the process of triangulation.
Table 4.3. Deductive content analysis criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria questions</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How has the meaning of ‘integration’ in strategic planning policy documentation</td>
<td>Spatial integration descriptions (territorial, land use, place-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evolved between the 1920s and 2015?</td>
<td>Actor interrelations descriptions (horizontal, vertical, State-society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is disadvantage identified as a dilemma to be resolved through integrated planning?</td>
<td>Other aspects of integrated planning (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what way does contemporary planning policy encourage or require &amp; demonstrate</td>
<td>Disadvantage as a driver (explicit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integration for reducing disadvantage (i.e. linked to other areas of government</td>
<td>Disadvantage as a driver (implicit in context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy/interjurisdictional horizontal or vertical organisational; role of</td>
<td>Other justifications for IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-government actors; spatial integration)?</td>
<td>Policy mechanisms and other structures for IP – general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence of major change between key strategic policies or in legislation</td>
<td>Policy mechanisms and other structures for IP – social logic redistribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regarding integrated planning with social logics?</td>
<td>Policy mechanisms and other structures for IP – social logic recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy mechanisms and other structures for IP – social logic encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in definition of disadvantage and social logics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in scope (increased/reduced ambition, language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicitness, robustness of objectives, targets and evaluation criteria,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extent of discussion of social problems)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 2. Semi-structured interviews

Following the content analysis, one-on-one interviews were conducted with approximately twenty planners in their native language in each context (18 in Melbourne; 24 in Buenos Aires) to explore in detail the local characteristics of integrated planning, the nature of competing rationalities that define planning practice, as well as the strategies and actions that characterise planners’ pursuit of social logics. Given the focus on planners’ own perspectives and experiences, the interviewee pool was limited to practicing planners. The interviews were “loosely-structured” in order to “evaluate, ground and refine the initial understandings, assumptions and concepts” (Robertson et al., 2012) of the research regarding the limits and opportunities of formal structures of integrated planning for reducing disadvantage, as well as the less-formal practices of planners. While there was a consistent line of inquiry moving from formal to informal and from general to particular cases, the “the actual stream of questions (was)…fluid rather than rigid” (Yin, 2009a, p. 106). They focused on both project details as well as interviewees’ opinions on planning practice. The interviews took place in person over an extended period of time, including in some cases over a couple of sittings. They were all recorded with the permission of participants and the participants are referenced in this thesis from M1 to M18 and from BA1 to BA24.

On the one hand, the interviews were used to corroborate and extend the understanding of formal structures and processes identified during the content analysis of policy documentation. Some of the strengths and limits to integrated planning practices for reducing disadvantage were also explored, including the implementation of the social logics of redistribution, recognition and encounter. Here particular attention was given to the different interpretation of these and other norms possible in these practice settings. Then, and based on an understanding of practical wisdom, the interviews moved to consider informal strategies and tactics employed to advance social logics in integrated planning in the context of the strengths and limits identified by each interviewee. This guide provided some
structure to ensure cross-case compatibility, however many of the questions led to new, unanticipated questions being raised.

In covering these main themes, questions were formulated to encourage storytelling about planning experiences that contributed rich information about project examples as well as their institutional, cultural, political, historical and economic contexts. Stories helped in trying to understand decision processes that are difficult to explain because they formed part of the tacit knowledge of interviewees or were taken as given in more general level discussion, for example how interaction and collaboration between actors in the planning process contributes to developing strategies in everyday practice. Where challenges arose eliciting information about specific projects, I used vignettes as commonly employed in ethnographic interviewing styles to prompt discussion and uncover cultural norms derived from opinions about project experiences. Stories used in vignettes were based on true or true-like information about integrated planning projects in the region, for example by mentioning institutional frameworks, political actors, funding mechanisms and general geographical information.

**Interviewee selection criteria**
The selection of planners for the interviews followed three criteria in each context: specific kind of experience; length of experience and ‘missionary’ practitioner characteristics. In relation to the specific kind of experience, I sought interview participants with direct experience in integrated planning in communities with high relative disadvantage (generally in the north and west regions of both metropolitan areas) over the contemporary period of study (from 1990s to present). Where possible, I also sought out planners with experience in integrated planning experiences that had been positively evaluated to demonstrate an improvement in quality of life outcomes, for example in specific neighbourhood improvement programs. Next, I aimed to interview people with “true expertise,” with around 10 years or more of planning related experience, which has been considered as the time is takes to move from competent to expert in practice (Swap, Leonard, Shields, & Abrams, 2001, p. 182). Such experts call on their experiences across a variety of contexts to recognise patterns and inform their behaviour (Swap et al., 2001). The last criterion for ‘missionary’ (Hillier, 2002) practitioner characteristics led me to seek out planners who might step out of more technocratic roles in driving social objectives to negotiate the space between the ‘rational’ and the ‘political’. I considered this important given the multiple aspects of practical wisdom that rest on interpersonal and political actions and skills.

I drew on the planning literature about the different characteristics or profiles of planners in establishing this last criterion. In this regard, Howe and Kaufman’s characterisation of hybrid planners was useful as it combines understandings of planners as ‘politicians’ with strong value commitments (did we do good?) and as ‘technicians’ who are committed to rational expertise (did we do it right?)
In their research, hybrids employed practical and informal strategies and tactics such as lobbying, covert activities, building support and alliances to advance their goals in planning (Howe & Kaufman, 1980). Other planning authors have also studied practitioners with political characteristics. Forester through his planning stories method, for example, clearly identified those planners able to “anticipate conflict matters” and respond effectively in his research (1989, p. 5), while Needleman and Needleman went further in identifying planners “acting as administrative guerrillas or insurgents” (1974, p. 158). While I didn’t seek out insurgent planners specifically, some of the actions described in the interviews could be classified in this way. Lastly, and most usefully for my research, was Hillier’s characterisation of ‘missionary’ planners (Hillier, 2002). In Hillier’s characterisation, both ‘chameleon’ and ‘missionary’ planners showed schemes of perception and action that enabled them to engage in ‘prudence’ or practical wisdom and predict the mood and reactions of those in powerful places (Hillier, 2002). The difference, however, lies in how each type of planner might anticipate and respond to the subtexts and plays of power, either following the rules of the game (for organisational survival for example, avoiding blame, etc.) or by “getting their hands dirty” for what they believe should be done in the pursuit of social justice (Hillier, 2002, p. 13).

This characterisation of ‘missionary’ planners was particularly helpful in conceptualising the profile of planners to interview in my doctoral research. It helped me to, where possible, seek out planners who were highly aware of political processes and how they impact decision-making in planning. It meant that I requested interviews with planners who operate closely to or were directly involved in political decision-making processes. This included senior, director or advisor level planners in state government departments, senior or director level local government planners and, in specific cases, representatives from the private sector, peak body and/or industry groups involved in integrated planning practice. From my ‘insider-afterwards’ perspective, I requested interviews with planners I knew worked in environments with close links to political decision-making processes. I found that my background helped some informants to speak at greater ease of sensitive information. From an initial round of approximately ten interviews, I expanded the sample through snowballing to include another ten planners that the first interviewees believed to demonstrate an ability to bridge the ‘phronetic gap’ between technical and political planning functions. One distinction emerged in this process that led me to interview four planning experts based at universities in Buenos Aires, but who held significant experience in government office and as consultants. This kind of hybrid planner did not emerge in the snowballing process in Melbourne, however the rest of the interviewees’ profile followed a similar pattern between cases and included predominantly State and Local Government planners. The profile sought was practicing planners and did not extend to other actors involved in the planning process.

Once the interview data were collected, I employed narrative methods to analyse the stories told by respondents. Narratives were used as an interpretative device for attempting to understand interactions
between actors, how they made sense of the everyday practice of integrated planning, patterns that emerged to influence the planning process as well as details on the formal and informal strategies and tactics used to advance social logics in planning. Storytelling about specific experiences helped to create a broader picture of complex planning scenarios, which can illuminate “how these stories guide how ideas are translated into local settings” (Pedersen & Johansen, 2012). In particular, narrative analysis was employed to understand the way actors in the planning process understand, shape and advance social logics of planning.

Specifically, thematic analysis was employed to categorise aspects of accounts about integrated planning, and structural analysis was used to look beyond specific aspects to the broader socio-economic, cultural and organisational level. In this regard, the thematic and structural analysis is an interpretative method, starting out with pre-defined categories (as opposed to grounded and wholly inductive approaches) (Riessman, 2008). For this, the computer software NVivo was used to assist and manage the coding process from the basis of pre-defined codes. However, coding interview data, not unlike the document analysis, was an iterative process as new indicators of concept criteria emerged through comparison within and between case contexts. NVivo helped to store and code the data for easy access and (comparative) analysis. It also enabled me to gauge a sense of the importance of issues or phenomena based on detail and frequency of data. Using NVivo offered an additional key strength for this comparative approach: it encouraged and facilitated analysis through codes that are interrelated. This helped to connect evidence and develop linked-up stories about practices of integrated planning. Despite its utility, I also examined the interview transcripts separately and wrote descriptive summaries about context-related information that could be pieced together for broader, structural interpretation to create a more whole picture of social logics in integrated planning (NVivo wasn’t helpful in this process as the data often became decontextualised through coding and retrieving). The following table provides an overview of the final codes of analysis. The results are presented and discussed over Chapters 5 to 8.

Table 4.3 Research themes and codes for interview data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research themes</th>
<th>Codes and sub-codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of integrated planning</td>
<td>- Key elements of integrated planning (i.e. spatial, actor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Disadvantage (or related concepts) as justification for integrated planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social logics in integrated planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Redistribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enabling factors for integrated planning for reducing disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Political alignment between different levels of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Targeted focus of intervention (e.g. specific geography, time, entities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Legislative backing or other legal imperative for integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunism and political palatability (e.g. response to public concern or pressure regarding a critical issue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Conditions to maintain integrated planning for reducing disadvantage
  • Lasting formal structures to support collaboration and coordination (e.g. committees)
  • Strong leadership
  • Involvement of key actors
  • Sustained State-society collaboration, including conserving links to and pressure from social organisations and movements in a way that creates the possibility for some consensus and policy validation.
  • Individuals with both technical and realpolitik capabilities
  • Links to universities to access neutral grounds for discovery and debate
  • Mutual benefits realised

- Limits and barriers faced in integrated planning for reducing disadvantage
  • Political imperatives that work against integrated planning
  • Interruptions to policy continuity and personnel churn
  • Fragmentation in urban governance settings
  • Entrenched competition and turf protection, lack of tradition of dialogue and collaboration
  • Rigid bureaucratic structures and traditions
  • Fraught nature of vertical interrelations. Coercion.
  • Missing links in integrated planning policy content like economic development
  • Everyday issues (e.g. ‘tyranny of distance’ between departments on different levels, different policy languages)
  • Lack of funding for integration
  • Lack of good data to support integration
  • Lack of trust among non-government actors for participation
  • Lack of education and training in skills for integrated planning.
  • Integrated planning for the symptom that misses the problem of market power over citizen use and government control.

Practical wisdom in integrated planning

- Impact of limiting and enabling factors on practitioners
- Profile of ‘hybrid’ or ‘missionary’ planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires
- Social logics for knowing what to do in practice
  • Redistribution
  • Recognition
  • Encounter
  • Others
- Practice-based skills and actions
  • Skills and strength of argument (e.g. data and diagnostics, skilful presentation of findings)
  • Knowing the actors, understanding reality and responding with awareness of their objectives
  • Building networks to share knowledge and influence decision-making
  • Timing actions opportunistically
  • Communicating to media, practice networks, academia. Power of results.
  • Political lobby.
  • Supporting or partaking in insurgent or counter movements

Phase 3. Non-participant observation

In addition to the content analysis and interviews described above, I carried out non-participant observation throughout the research process to observe the behaviour of planners and other actors involved in the planning process. Firstly, I took advantage of opportunities throughout my fieldwork for spontaneous or ‘going-along’ observation (Kusenbach, 2012) to further my contextual understanding of the local planning process, for example by observing specific office or meeting
dynamics. For example, while waiting for interviewees I was invited on multiple occasions to join their staff and informally discuss their planning experiences, or to join the interviewee for an informal discussion or meeting if something urgent arose. Secondly, when possible I also undertook ‘event ethnography’ and attended formal meetings and workshops throughout the research process, including for example the Regional Management Forums in Melbourne. “Event ethnography is premised on short-term, yet important (if fleeting), moments of coming together” (Billo & Mountz, 2015, p. 14). The combination of these approaches has served to develop an ethnographic sensibility and improve my understanding of the dynamics in the planning process with an appreciation of the meanings planners assign to different aspects of this process. I made notes about these interactions and coded these data along with the interview responses. These fragments of data informed my research, my understanding of context and helped piece together evidence from other phases of this research to produce a context-informed understanding of integrated planning practices, discussed over the following chapters.

Complete immersion or active participant observation was not conducted for several reasons. Firstly, the timeframe of study is between the mid-1990s and 2015, though the research commenced in 2013. I therefore was not able to conduct participant observation previously. Notwithstanding the many possible benefits of participant observation, from the possibility of uncovering practices not discussed in interview settings, to enabling an understanding of how different features of the planning process may be linked or the possibility to conduct interviews spontaneously, there are also pitfalls, like perception fabrication in observation scenarios. In this regard, conducting participant observation in planning work environments may be challenged by the ‘guinea-pig effect’ (Bryman, 2012): where those people involved want to manage the perceptions or impressions they generate or might express altered attitudes and conduct themselves differently. For my research, it was more useful to discuss conduct in relation to examples and contexts, without participating in them myself. This helped me to gauge insights from the interviewees’ perspectives, as well as draw on my perspective as an ‘insider afterwards.’ I believe I was close enough to the social life being studied during the research and because of previous applied practice that long periods of immersion and observation weren’t necessary to comprehend the ‘native’ point of view.

Conclusion
This study investigated how both formal structures as well as informal strategies and tactics are used to shape and implement social logics in integrated planning. The approach adopted was a dual-case study of different experiences of integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. The research methods employed bring together TSL and understandings of practical wisdom to elucidate the limits and strengths of practice realities for integrated planning that seeks to reduce disadvantage. In the
tradition of authors who have sought to uncover “What Planners Do” (Hoch, 1992) in the “Shadows of Power” (Hillier, 2002) or to characterise a town planner’s role (Underwood, 1980), “A Planner’s Day” or “Planning in the Face of Power” (Forester, 1989), this research explored actually existing practices of integrated planning in pursuit of social logics. For this, an ethnographic sensibility was employed in case study research by building on reflections as an ‘insider afterwards’ as well as using ethnographic methods, including interviewing and non-participation observation. The methods of data collection and analysis, including qualitative content analysis, semi-structured interviews and non-participation observation, drew out both place-specific findings and generalisable claims to respond to the following three research questions:

1. Based on contemporary characteristics and socio-historical influences, how is integrated planning understood in Melbourne and Buenos Aires?
2. In these contexts, what are the formal structures and informal strategies that support social logics for reducing disadvantage through integrated planning?
3. Are there grounds to support modifications to integrated planning practices and extend the theory of social logics based on cross-case conclusions? If so, in what way?

Findings from this inquiry are presented over the following chapters, including a case specific examination of the formal structures (Chapter 5) and informal means (Chapter 6) of integrated planning for reducing disadvantage as well as a discussion of broader practice (Chapter 7) and (Chapter 8) theoretical implications based on common patterns shared between Melbourne and Buenos Aires in integrated planning for applying social logics.
Chapter 5. Conditions for planning with social logics

Introduction

This chapter identifies the conditions that generate opportunities for and support integrated planning practices with ‘social logics’ in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. It is based on the investigation of multiple experiences of integrated planning across these two metropolitan settings that address the specific purpose of reducing disadvantage through utilising the key dimensions of integrated planning. The results presented here demonstrate that it is predominantly the politico-institutional context as well as the individual skills of actors that create opportunities to plan with social logics in both contexts. Specifically, it reveals that the functioning of each politico-institutional context and, the opportunity scenarios that each provides, are critical to understanding how social logics arise and materialise in practice. The concept of opportunity scenarios was devised for this thesis to indicate the windows of opportunity that exist for introducing integrated approaches to urban policy and programs focused on reducing disadvantages. Once the opportunity is created for integrated planning with social logics, sustaining such practices relies on the continuity of supportive governance structures and context. When conditions exist that hinder a social justice agenda in planning, such as fragmentary governance settings, the tacit skills of individual actors become more important in navigating barriers to this cause. Following this logic, the chapter first highlights the four main politico-institutional opportunity scenarios that give rise to integrated planning with social logics and then the five supporting conditions for this to be sustained in both cases. Meanwhile, the following chapter focuses on the skills of individuals and how their tacit skills can overcome practice-based barriers. Together, they respond to my second research question: What are the formal structures and informal strategies in integrated planning that support the application of social logics in Melbourne and Buenos Aires?

The below findings about the internal workings of integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires are presented in a conjoined manner because my research found a deep congruence between the aspects of their politico-institutional settings and, in turn, the operationalisation of integrated planning policy. In particular, there is a shared trend of irregular planning policy-making and implementation driven by frequently shifting policy priorities. Because bi-partisan support for major urban policy has been elusive in both contexts, opportunities for progressive urban policy and their intra-electoral survival tends to rely on the continuation of one administration. Recently there have been fewer changes at the federal and provincial levels of government affecting planning in Buenos Aires, but true to historic trends these have been more turbulent and led to deeper policy changes compared to the changes that have occurred in the Melbourne setting, though these have been more frequent (with four different prime ministers and four different premiers between 2007 and 2017 compared to only
two at both of these levels affecting Buenos Aires) Moreover, policy direction can shift under the same executive government for different reasons. The first, as discussed in detail in this chapter, is permeability to external influences and a style of electoral politics coloured by forms of clientelism. Integrated planning was also found to be negatively affected by certain characteristics of federal systems of government, including a strong vertical fiscal imbalance and associated ‘command and control’ approaches to vertical integration that strip autonomy from urban regions, as well as divisive horizontal competition between governments and policy areas. Overall, a path dependency on instability and at times incoherency offers few opportunities for long-term integrated planning with social logics in both contexts.

Opportunity scenarios for integrated planning for redressing disadvantage

Opportunity scenario one: a social justice agenda as political platform
This research found that the introduction of and ability to sustain integrated planning practices with social logics relies on certain conditions to be present. In the cases studied, it was clear that urban policy in both cities is intimately tied to the policy platform of the government in office and, for this reason, the opportunity scenarios in both contexts are greatly influenced by (regularly changing) politico-institutional settings. In both cities, either State or Federal Governments have introduced policies to address unequal urban development using a social justice agenda at different times over recent decades. By elevating the question of inequality to policy platforms, some administrations governing urban policy in Melbourne and Buenos Aires have privileged the reduction of disadvantage in line with or over other policy goals. A political platform that focuses on reducing inequality helps to “bind together” (BA11) the different actors required to pursue social logics in integrated planning, to structure policy in a way that responds to social justice objectives and, in turn, design and support projects that seek to deliver this end. Essentially, as one State Government planning officer from Buenos Aires stated, delivering integrated planning for the reduction of disadvantage occurs “simply when governments are interested in this type of mission and have intelligent and coherent implementation policies to follow through” (BA24, emphasis added?).

In Melbourne, two contemporary examples of a high level social justice mandate followed through in integrated planning practice were the Australian Federal Government’s Building Better Cities Program (BBC) introduced in 1991 and the Victorian State Government’s Neighbourhood Renewal Program (NRP) introduced in 2002. New initiatives have also been introduced under the recent Andrews Government (2014-present) in line with a observable commitment to social justice, for example in areas of housing, however this research conducted until 2015 was not able to examine to what extent this commitment translated into implementation. The earlier BBC initiative sought to “improve urban consolidation and the quality of urban life” across four main geographic areas in
Victoria through a joined-up approach that delivered “coordination within and between the various levels of government” (Victorian Auditor-General’s Office, 1996, p. 11). The program was initially funded with AUSS$816.4 million as part of the 1991-92 Commonwealth Budget which explicitly committed to “improved social justice,” “equity” and “more liveable cities” (Neilson, 2008, p. 83). A senior BCC planner described how this policy was made possible because the Federal Government at the time, and especially the then Deputy Prime Minister Brian Howe, was “very social-minded” and “focused on redistribution as a philosophy” of government (M13). This commitment to social justice outcomes was transferred to project delivery through an approach that was “collaborative with the States,” demonstrating the importance of cooperative vertical integration for implementation (M13). The project has been credited with “creating the momentum required to forge social change, to attract new residents, workers and visitors to these locations, (and) to generate long term economic growth and returns on investment to both the community and governments in excess of the government’s own high-end expectations” (Bryant, 2016, p. 32).

Another example from the Melbourne case is the NRP which was first introduced under the Bracks Labor Victorian Government in 2001 and by 2015 the program had slowed but reached a total of twenty-one neighbourhoods. Originally, the Government designed the program to be a “place-based response to disadvantage that involves government working with local communities to address relative disadvantage and inequality to create successful, thriving places” (Victorian Government, 2002, p. 110). Interviews with various senior government representatives from this period indicated that the Bracks (1999-2007), and later Brumby, Labor Government (2007-2010) was particularly focused on a social justice agenda and collaborative planning with fixed and measurable targets. As one interviewee suggested, this Government was “different to other administrations because it had a stronger focus on social justice, from which matrix analyses were used to guide policy decision-making” (M8). This was reflected in the regular operation of government with the establishment of the ‘social development cabinet committee’ as well as in policy documents, such as Melbourne 2030, which stated that “particular priority” will be given to “social disadvantage in the outer suburbs”, with more “equitable distribution of social infrastructure” and spending to be allocated to “areas of greatest need” (Policy 6.2, p.109). Furthermore, Melbourne 2030 explained how social logics would be applied, for example with “the disposal of government land and buildings to reflect the best use rather than the highest price achievable, and base the policy on new socially responsible criteria” (Policy 6.1, Victorian Government, 2002, p. 108).

Giving specific emphasis to horizontal integration, one ex-minister commented that some of the successes of having a social justice policy platform were realised because there was “positive reinforcement” through the actions of multiple departments and agencies, for example through urban renewal, health and education, as well as “firm cross-correlation between social justice priorities and
economic outcomes,” when, at other times under different administrations, you might have “fewer departments working towards this end or working at cross-purposes” (2016). Like the BCC, some studies have found that NRP has had a positive impact in addressing disadvantage. For example, the Grattan Institute’s study on the non-housing benefits of NRP found an average return of $2.20 in non-housing benefits for every $1.00 spent (2014) and Shield et al. (2011) found NRP to be “effective in improving trust in government, perceptions of community participation, influence and control over community decisions; improved services; (…) and addressing area-level determinants to improve social inclusion” (p.4).

Similarly, and from the Buenos Aires case, PROMEBA was in operation from 2002 to 2015 as part of a national strategy to reduce poverty and exposure to environmental risks. PROMEBA initiatives mostly took place in informal settlements and involved “the execution of integrated neighbourhood plans that aim to improve neighbourhood areas through providing secure tenure, delivering urban infrastructure, community services, environmental improvement and through strengthening human and social capital” (Argentine Government, 2015). According to the program website, “the development of the projects is based on an explicit commitment to social justice and a methodology of commitment and participation of all of the actors through management roundtables that include representatives from state agencies, neighbourhood organisations, public service companies, building companies, professional colleges, civil society organisations, among others” (Argentine Government, 2016). PROMEBA was funded by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the national government to redress disadvantage through employment, housing and infrastructure. This correlated with the Kirchner Federal Government’s platform at the time to “recover values of solidarity and social justice” and create a State that acts as “a great repairer of social inequality through permanent projects of inclusion and creating opportunities to access education, health, housing and employment” (Kirchner, 2003). PROMEBA has achieved some success to date as measured through improved indicators of ‘unmet basic needs’ in some neighbourhoods. A senior planning officer within the Department of Urban and Territorial Planning of the Province of Buenos Aires (BA5) stated that this was possible “because the political ideology of those in government aligns with social justice objectives, but also because there is commitment to follow through and not just leave it at the level of campaign rhetoric.” Or, as another Senior Strategic Planner stated, “there was a political decision in the background to favour society, to resolve inequitable situations that had been created by an absent State that failed to regulate the market…having this commitment at a higher level makes it easier to deliver at the municipal level, to sustain the daily conflict between capital and social goals” (BA9).

**Opportunity scenario two: when crises sway policies**
In addition to the originating policy platforms of major parties of government, other factors can mould decision-making in government to support integrated planning initiatives with social logics. One notable cause is a perception of crisis held by the community that gains momentum through different means, for example from intense lobby, growing evidence in media or through judicial means, to apply significant political pressure or even lead to political “embarrassment” (BA19), converting a hidden issue into a topical and politically palatable one to address. For this scenario, there is often a “trigger point” and a “tipping point” for political engagement and action that follows some time later with mounting evidence and public pressure (M9). This aligns with what Flyvbjerg (2012) has named ‘tension points,’ which are created through the problematisation of existing accepted and regressive circumstances. Examples in Melbourne have included urban revitalisation responses to declining manufacturing employment and urban decay (e.g. Dandenong, or Geelong most recently) or significant changes to the State’s approach to social housing with the introduction of the National Disability Insurance Scheme and the Victorian Royal Commission into Family Violence (M9, M17). In Buenos Aires, fatal mass transit accidents involving the regional rail system drew attention to the lack of investment in public transport and provoked ire in the community, which over time led to “increased focus and investment by all levels of government in modernising the transport system” (BA5). Other examples include the creation of river basin committees (for the Reconquista River) to upgrade infrastructure and upgrade informal settlements following repeated major episodes of flooding that caused damage and aggravation in the local business and residential community (BA10).

Urban policy actors, particularly from the Melbourne case, emphasised how ideas that are well-communicated or persistent advocacy from different sectors, including the community, university and private sector at times, can influence the public agenda. These ideas can relate to new issues as they emerge (e.g. climate change) or elevate latent concerns in policy-making (e.g. homelessness). One example of this is the issue of food insecurity in Melbourne’s west, which led to the introduction of the Food for All program (2005-2010), the Food Alliance (2009-2013) and the creation of the Victorian Food Systems Network (2013-present). A Senior Program Advisor (M17) described how concerns about food insecurity were raised from locally based service providers in areas of housing and health, which led the Department “to advocate to have the Victorian Population Health Survey include two new questions to measure the level of food insecurity from 2000.” Strong evidence emerged that food insecurity was a problem faced by low-income households and that the cause of this was multifaceted, including access to fresh produce and transport for travel, as well as some cultural factors. Interviewees commented that the program to improve food accessibility was therefore devised as “collaborative” and “integrated” (M6) encompassing “questions about transport, education, service provision, trade policies, parks planning, health and housing” (M17). Food-for-all started with pilot projects funded by the State and local governments, for example in the design of parks to include edible vegetation, use of underutilised Council kitchen facilities as community kitchens, partnerships
with disability services to deliver food as part of existing passenger van services to social housing and the creation of a Foodbank in collaboration with food relief agencies, transport logistic companies and greengrocers in Melbourne’s west. These trial initiatives helped gather further data about the extent, geographic pattern and demographic trends associated with food insecurity, which was monitored and evaluated by a Victorian University team and then used to petition the State Government to increase funding and broaden the program over time (2011). The food security programs were also linked into the NRPs in Melbourne’s west, demonstrating horizontal integration in State policy. Interviewees described how the strength of the network of actors involved, from Councils to State Government and non-government actors, helped to maintain interest in the issue and, when funding commitments were withdrawn for a time by the State Government, the other actors involved were able to sustain the program until the issue returned to the official agenda of government. This policy occurred because of the weight of strong evidence that was well-communicated and significant pressure from external actors, who became collaborators on the project to ensure its longevity despite changing administrations.

A paradigmatic case from Buenos Aires was the creation of ACUMAR, a river basin committee with representation from all levels of government and private sector actors to redress poverty and clean-up contamination. The state of play for many decades had been “that no government wanted to take on the enormous task of cleaning up the Matanza-Riacuelo River Basin and there was no agreement between governments to work together, despite evidence of unsafe levels of contamination and devastating health impacts among low-income families settled along the river” (BA9). This changed in 2004 when a group of residents with the support of a range of environmental and neighbourhood NGOs (i.e. Greenpeace Foundation, Environmental and Natural Resources Foundation, Neighbourhood Association of La Boca) took legal action against all governments, as well as 44 private industries for harm caused to the community from unsafe levels of contamination. The Supreme Court of Argentina found in favour of the claimants, requiring the City of Buenos Aires, the Government of the Province of Buenos Aires and the Federal Government to take responsibility for a program that “improves the quality of life of inhabitants of the River Basin, restores the environment of the River Basin and prevents harm to the community” (Cafferata, 2008, p. 142). This decision served to “interrupt the stagnated political situation” (BA23): “it was the detonator that required all levels of government to work together to improve living conditions” (BA5). A local academic interviewed as part of this research suggested that “without the intervention of the court nothing would have happened because this particular area was not considered of great significance in terms of political capital accumulation or representation” (BA14).

ACUMAR has functioned since 2006, with funding from all levels of government and the IDB as well as in line with conditions of broader participation from the community (BA8). This relational model
has proven effective in some areas of its mandate because, according to three interviewees (BA16, BA17, BA18), the operational structure has been cleverly separated into two formal structures. The first is a board of directors with representation from three federal government executives and two representatives from each of the state and local governments, which is responsible for policy formation and direction. This permanent structure ensures that intergovernmental relations are managed in a focused forum that has authority and capacity to ensure alignment with the stated priorities of each administration. The second effectual structure is a management body that focuses on implementation and coordination with non-government actors. This experience is instructive, showing that an issue “must reach a point of crisis” (BA9) and “benefit from significant social demand” (BA13) to take hold of the political agenda and influence decision-making in favour of instigating and delivering functional formal structures that support relational models of governance for redressing disadvantage.

Opportunity scenario three: political alignment between levels of government

Another circumstantial, politico-institutional phenomenon that can facilitate the introduction of integrated planning approaches is when governments of different tiers are administered by the same party or coalition of parties. Planning actors explained how sharing a common political ‘colour’ and platform can make it easier to work together between levels of government and achieve smoother vertical coordination, for example in developing and operating collaborative structures and for funds to be allocated accordingly. Examples described from the Melbourne case were collaborative urban renewal projects as well as smaller scale initiatives, such as community and sports facilities planning. In the Buenos Aires case, planners recounted several experiences of integrated planning that emerged because of this opportunity scenario. The most frequently mentioned was the creation of the Puerto Madero Corporation with representation from the National and City governments on the board to redevelop the old port area. Many felt that without alignment at the initiation of the project it may not have come to fruition or would have produced an unequal decision-making structure and project outcome. As one interviewee explained, “the mayor and the president shared the same political party and idea about what to do with the Port, which made it possible to generate mutually beneficial terms of reference” (BA13). Another Buenos Aires example given was the creation of a consortium between four municipal governments to better standardise spatial planning controls. “It came about because the four municipal governments shared the same political profile which brought them together” (BA19).

Overall, as reported from the Buenos Aires case, “it can be much easier to interact in general when political forces are aligned” (BA15) and this presents an opportunity scenario for policy actors to create short or longer term structures to support integrated planning with social logics.

Opportunity scenario four: the no alternative and ‘win-win’ scenario
Another scenario for the introduction of integrated approaches to planning is when a particular policy or project initiative could not feasibly be undertaken any other way or if there is a clear ‘win-win’ scenario for the actors involved. This occurs when “there is a perception among different jurisdictions or areas of government that for some technical, political or sectoral problem there is no other way to respond other than through the confluence of the distinct actors that have a stake in the matter with a common approach” (BA19). Examples provided of this include the nature of service provision in some areas that crosses jurisdiction (e.g. sanitation or transport infrastructure), the low level or lack of particular expertise in one area of government that requires the technical input or the participation of human resources from another (e.g. in smaller local government areas) or simply because a new law or government policy requires an integrated approach to planning (e.g. Transport Integration Act 2010, Victoria).

Urban policy actors explained, however, that if another approach could be adopted it would be preferable to decision-makers because of the costs and time required to effect coordination, which can be particularly burdensome in contemporary fragmentary governance settings, and the fact that an integrated approach is infrequently mandated. For this reason, clear mutual benefit to the parties involved is another opportunity scenario for integrated planning practices. Interviews described how intergovernmental cooperation can be facilitated, or agendas aligned, because of the limited capacity to raise funds at lower levels of government and the pressure to allocate funds in line with budgeting cycles and, mainly closer to election periods “in marginal electorates as a form of clientelism” (M8). Other examples of this explained included the significant cost savings involved in Buenos Aires when adjoining municipalities coordinate and share waste disposal services and infrastructure, or in the west of Melbourne where small community programs, such as My Smart Garden (2011 to present, 2017) in, can continue to operate and produce benefits, for example through awareness raising about on-site stormwater management and rainwater harvesting, only through shared resourcing.

Overall, the introduction of integrated planning with social logics is strongly connected to the policy platform of higher levels of government. This was clear in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires where positive flow-on effects were identified when a social justice agenda was embedded from the outset of an executive government’s term. Issues otherwise absent or considered low priority on political agendas have become part of an administration’s agenda following strong external pressure with clear evidence that leads to a ‘tipping point’ for policy change. Here the actions taken by non-government actors, from the media, the courts, the community sector, the private sector and social movement groups have proven critical in both contexts. In this instance, the cause in question must be made to be seen and fit within the political agenda, or the agenda shifted over time from persistent external pressure. Integrated planning for the reduction of disadvantage can also occur as part of the business of government when there is easy alignment between different tiers of government or clear mutual
benefit between stakeholders despite political context. These windows of opportunity for integrated planning with social logics to occur clearly do not respond to rational or evidence-based approaches to policy. Instead, the politico-institutional context creates opportunities for planning with social logics through the pursuit of a specific social justice agenda that is either embedded at the beginning of a Government’s term, formed through negotiation with other social actors or because there is clear mutual benefit for the actors involved. Once these opportunities arise, certain conditions must be in place to sustain integrated planning practices in favour of a social justice agenda. These are described in the next section of this chapter.

Conditions that sustain integrated planning for redressing disadvantage

Once opportunity scenarios emerge that support the introduction of integrated planning for reducing disadvantage, this research found that certain structures and conditions tend to convert this opportunity into material policy or project initiatives. The purpose of this section is to describe such supportive structures and conditions that have been in place in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Among others, they include legislative and strategic planning policy frameworks, the creation of special purpose entities to manage projects as well as having structures in place to engage community and channel social demands. Many of the structures and conditions uncovered also highlighted mixed views in the community of urban policy actors interviewed or demonstrated weaknesses in practice in terms of implementation and their capacity to sustain intervention over time. These weaknesses are mentioned in the discussion below and further elaborated in the following chapter about the barriers to the effective implementation of integrated planning initiatives.

Supportive condition one: policy or legislative framework

The first condition that provides for sustained integrated planning practices with social logics is a legislative or policy framework that mandates such practices. While legislation can be modified, it was identified by planners as one of the most permanent structures to support integrated planning practices in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. It is considered more permanent as it is comparatively less likely to change under new administrations and governs the multiple actors, government and non-government, that are involved in defining and implementing urban policy. Policy frameworks may change, but are likely to remain fairly fixed for periods of two terms of government at least (the minimum time it usually takes for an administration to change in both contexts). One challenge, however, is implementing legislative frameworks in both contexts that require deep changes to practice (e.g. from silo to coordinated policy-making).

Analysis of key planning legislative and policy frameworks in Melbourne and Buenos Aires indicates that integration is specifically mandated in some cases and, in others, encouraged through mutual
referencing. For example, in Melbourne, the current Planning and Environment Act 1987, the Victorian Planning Provisions, the Transport Integration Act 2010 and Plan Melbourne (2014) all refer to each other and require both state and local governments to introduce and regularly update planning policies that support integrated planning (with some definitional variation). These key frameworks promote integrated planning, for example by specifically mentioning ‘joined-up’ or ‘whole-of-government’ approaches, as well as identifying areas of cross-sectoral policy priorities. The Transportation Integration Act 2010 has the most explicit directives for integrated planning through requiring an integrated approach to land use and infrastructure planning as well as “integrated decision-making” (Section 15). Some interviewees commented (M5, M9, M10), however, that while legislative backing provided support for collaboration for certain initiatives, these directives were not comprehensively followed in practice.

In terms of key policy documents, Plan Melbourne (2014) tasked the new metropolitan planning authority (now the Victorian Planning Authority, 2016) to work “with local governments, institutions, businesses and other key stakeholders to prepare an integrated framework plan for growth (in the subregions) that includes land use, transport, infrastructure and open space.” Earlier planning documents also demonstrated evidence of integrated approaches, for example the 1995 Living Suburbs stated “capital expenditure will be tested against the Government’s Investment Guidelines, which call for interagency and interjurisdictional coordination” (Implementation, Victorian Government, 1995, p. 71). Again, metropolitan-wide policy was found by interviewees to encourage but not ensure collaboration between planning actors. Instead, some interviewees commented that project specific policies were far stronger frameworks for delivering collaboration between actors. One example provided from Victoria was the recent ‘Revitalising Central Geelong Partnership’ between local and state government representatives (M5) to implement the city’s revitalisation strategy. Furthermore, some planners identified local level policies that supported integrated approaches to reducing disadvantage, such as Hume City Council’s Social Justice Charter. Local government planners in Melbourne mentioned the fundamental role of these macro-policies and in some cases legislation not only in supporting specific project initiatives that seek to redress disadvantage collaboratively, but in defending their work in appeal situations (M1, M2 & M4).

Similarly, in Buenos Aires, the Urban-Environmental Plan (Gobierno de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1999) promoted “agreements between the National Government, Government of the Province of Buenos Aires and municipal governments of the metropolitan region in order to collectively exercise their capacities and functions.” It also suggested the creation of “mechanisms for interjurisdictional management” and “tools and organisational forms to support public-private cooperation.” The more recent Strategic Plan ‘Lineamientos’ (2006) promotes “active coordination and cooperation” as part of an “integrated management approach capable of guiding strategy” (Gobierno de la Provincia de
Buenos Aires, 2006, p. 371). Uniquely, this plan does not prescribe one approach, but sets out various scenarios and alternative approaches for integrated management with the purpose of stimulating debate. It recognises that integrated management of complex urban problems requires “constructing a complex institutional framework” in a relatively “descentralised system” to “articulate dispersed power, competencies, material and human resources and knowledge” (Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 2006, p. 373). This plan then sets out variables to take into consideration and steps to take to support decision-making regarding the type or types of integrated management approaches to be adopted. In terms of planning legislation, the Territorial Planning and Land Use Act 1977 promotes integrated spatial planning, though does not stipulate requirements for actor integration. Interviewees from the Buenos Aires case mentioned using these three macro policy documents and legislation to support the development of specific initiatives of integrated planning with social logics, for example the introduction of the basin committees and their supporting master plans for the ‘urbanisation’ of informal settlements and clean-up of contaminated areas (BA23, BA17 & BA5). Like the Melbourne case, some planners lamented that these recommendations were non-binding and are only followed through on a selection of independent policy and project initiatives.

While planning legislation and policy often commits or encourages areas of government or other stakeholders to collaborate or effect certain directives in both cases, they rarely provide detailed information about how to achieve integration for the purpose of reducing disadvantage (or other purposes), nor do they commonly set measurable goals with timeframes or monitoring and evaluation criteria. For planners in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires, the general vagueness within planning legislation and policy about how to effect integrated planning can be a disadvantage in practice, essentially because “it is not always prioritised and difficult to implement” (M1) and, without clear criteria, there is “weak backing for policy implementation when contested” (M2). Though the lack of definition on approaches for integrated planning with social logics was seen as a weakness by some, others interviewed as part of this research suggested a general objective was sufficient and in fact necessary to allow flexibility in the development of locally-specific solutions. For example, planners interviewed as part of this research from Buenos Aires described how multiple structures have been created to govern metropolitan questions over the last three decades, from the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area Agreement (AMBA) to the National Commission for the Metropolitan Area of Buenos Aires (CONAMBA) and including specific issue metropolitan wide organisms, for example in transport (e.g. the Coordinating Entity for Metropolitan Area Transport), as well as to support more spatially targeted initiatives, for example to plan large green space and waste facilities areas, upgrade different settlement areas (PROMEBA, as mentioned above) or clean-up and improve urban

3 One exception to this uncovered in the policy content analysis was Melbourne 2030, which had specific performance criteria, including social criteria that provided for the consideration of integrated services and facilities accessibility and integrated land use and transport planning.
conditions around river basins (i.e. COMIREC and ACUMAR). Despite disagreement about the required level of specificity in normative frameworks for integrated planning, all planners interviewed suggested that stipulating a role for integrated approaches in planning legislation and policy was fundamental to guiding their practice and ‘encouraged’ (though very rarely required) cross-departmental, agency and actor interrelations, as well as a focus on spatial integration, for example between urban development and key infrastructure.

**Supportive condition two: spatial scale**

In addition to a supportive policy or legislative framework, some interviewees in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires suggested that successful implementation of integrated planning initiatives requires an appropriate scale for intervention. Considering the longevity of smaller-scale projects in both cases compared to regional level initiatives, which tend to be abolished or significantly changed under new governments, it seems possible that adequate spatial scale is one factor in a highly politicised planning environment to support integrated planning with social logics. While I did not undertake further research to prove this, based on the interview results, planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires suggested that place-based approach to planning at neighbourhood to sub-metropolitan levels was the most appropriate scale for integrated planning in contemporary settings as it enabled ‘multidisciplinarity’ and “the interconnection of factors across social, economic and environmental considerations” that was “inconceivable” (M4) to consider at broader scales given the multiplicity of actors and fragmentary nature of urban governance. Attempts at large-scale, integrated approaches in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires, including successive attempts to create metropolitan level bodies to coordinate planning or infrastructure delivery over the last twenty years, were largely viewed as weak or to have failed.

For example, in Melbourne, since the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works was dismantled in 1992, contemporary metropolitan planning bodies (most recently the Victorian Planning Authority, 2016) have lacked clear definition in terms of purpose, scope and powers to act. Smaller, spatially targeted initiatives in urban revitalisation or neighbourhood improvement have been in place for around fifteen years and, according to some interviewees, have been more successful through “focusing collaboration through specific place-based approaches” (M1). In Buenos Aires, successive attempts at introducing a metropolitan level planning body have failed and larger-scale integrated planning efforts have suffered from various flaws, including “a lack of the necessary functions and capacities to meet the necessary obligations and objectives” (BA5); “superposition and inconsistencies of norms and laws that create implementation challenges,” (BA19); “the difficulty of planning in a heterogeneous environment with great diversity between different parts of the city, from suburban, urban and rural to industrial and commercial districts” (BA6); “lack of budget to match
scale” (BA15); “lack of experiences and practice in coordination between different levels and multiple areas of government” (BA11) and a “lack of democratic legitimacy to act interjurisdictionally” (BA1). The salient theme relating to integrated planning practice in Melbourne and Buenos Aires was the need to appropriately define the spatial scale for targeted and coordinated action to occur, with many respondents suggesting that the degree of complexity in coordination and likelihood of failure in integrated planning interventions increases from smaller to larger spatial scales in a highly politicised urban policy setting. This focus on specific scale for integrated planning aligns with contemporary governance trends towards spatially targeting strategic policy interventions (Albrechts, 2004; Vigar, 2009).

Supportive condition three: special purpose entities

Special purpose bodies to deliver integrated planning approaches proved to outlast and better support implementation compared to most initiatives carried out from within government departments. Often, examples of integrated planning practices from Melbourne and Buenos Aires that have lasted over time, albeit to different degrees, have been developed and implemented within entities created for the particular purpose of delivering project outcomes and coordinating State and non-State actor involvement. Some of the reasons cited for their relative implementation success included the ability to act dynamically by “bypassing departmental processes and approval procedures, such as local level planning permits” (M3), as well as access to “independent budgets” (M12), in some cases to independently raise or borrow funds, as well as “access to dedicated human resources” on specific rather than multiple projects (BA5), including to build and manage relationships with non-government actors. The main weakness of these entities (though not as great as department-led initiatives) is their susceptibility to change under new administrations. In some cases this can be circumvented by having multiple levels of government and non-State actors involved as well as through securing funding commitments from external organisations (e.g. in the Buenos Aires case, funding from The World Bank or Inter-American Development Bank).

From the Melbourne case, the State’s urban land development authority Development Victoria (formerly VicUrban until 2011 and then Places Victoria until 2017) was identified by interviewees as comparatively successful in leading urban renewal (e.g. Docklands, under construction from 2000) and revitalisation programs (e.g. Dandenong, in place since 2005) compared to department-led approaches. Similar to the Buenos Aires case, interviewees disagreed about the impact of these projects in leading social change, but most agreed that it was an efficient and effective model to bring together project stakeholders, focus government investment, leverage private investment and by-pass comparatively slower bureaucratic processes compared to ‘in-house’ operations. Projects like Docklands and Revitalising Central Dandenong were enabled by Places Victoria, for example with
the design of master plans and the preparation of business plans, but implemented in collaboration with different State Government departments, the relevant local authorities, private developers and in consultation with communities. A ‘place-management’ approach was adopted in these projects, as advocated in the 1995 and 2002 strategic plans for Melbourne, which “is a multifaceted approach to address all factors together” (Victorian Government, 2002, p. 153). Evaluations of these programs have been mixed, with some authors identifying favourable impacts for the city, such as through the incorporation of more housing stock, including social and affordable housing, while others have highlighted the failures of these projects, for example in failing to respect existing community identity and preferences, and pushing up housing costs (Shaw et al., 2016; Victorian Auditor General’s Office, 2012). In evaluations and interview comments provided as part of this research, the accomplishments recognised were often attributed to “vesting” authority in an “arms-length” entity (M3), though a lack of program boundaries and poor definition of coordination structures create challenges for this model.

The most frequently cited example of a special purpose entity by planners from the Buenos Aires case was the Puerto Madero Corporation, created in 1989 and still in operation. The Corporation was established to undertake a large-scale urban renewal project in the old port of the city that would revitalise the central business district, increase housing and office alternatives, and expand considerably the open space offer in the city. There was disagreement among those interviewed about the success of the project in relation to meeting its social objectives. Some felt the recovery of the CBD and provision of open space met redistributive goals and regenerated an area to provide for encounter between different social groups, while others expressed disappointment about the lack of social and affordable housing, and other social infrastructure like schools. However, of the seven planners who identified this example, all agreed that the mechanism created to sustain an integrated approach to urban renewal was highly successful (BA1, BA4, BA5, BA9, BA11, BA19, BA23). “It is of great merit that the Corporation has been able to bring together the City and National Government consistently to carry through the project over twenty-five years with multiple changes of government” (BA11). “Its capacity to coordinate the actions of different jurisdictions, the private sector and civil society is its mark of success” (BA1). Planners expressed that effective intergovernmental cooperation was achieved by establishing a board structure with equal representation from the City and National Government, and by transferring ownership of the land to the Corporation so no one actor held greater interest over the site. This ownership structure was also a factor attributed to the longevity of the Corporation and its ability to act relatively independently, for example by raising funds through property sales or borrowing against assets.

Another example of a special purpose body from the Buenos Aires case is the Reconquista River Basin Committee (COMIREC). The Unit of Coordination for the Reconquista River Project (UNIREC) was the first body charged with inter-jurisdictional management of the river basin. It was
created in 1995 with a US$360,000,000 loan from the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund (Japanese Government) to manage flood control and improve quality of life outcomes in informal settlements. This initiative produced some positive outcomes for flood prevention and improvements in environmental quality. However, other aspects of the project relating to infrastructure expansion did not occur as planned. The UNIREC was dissolved in 2006 and replaced by the COMIREC, which is responsible for the ‘holistic’ management of land and resources in the RRB. The COMIREC is governed by a Council with an Executive Branch comprised of representatives from the Province of Buenos Aires (such as the Ministry of Infrastructure) and three representatives from municipal governments and has five thematic units: Planning and Restoration, Integrated Management of Hydrological Resources, Administration and Finance, Institutional Relations, and Legal Affairs. “It also has a Consultative Council which aims to promote community participation in the activities of the COMIREC by organisations (private sector, social organisations, environmental groups, etc.) and individuals active in the RRB area” (Janches, Henderson, & Maccolman, 2014, p. 22). Despite chequered achievements in delivering improvements to disadvantaged areas, for example with only some neighbourhoods gaining planned access to basic infrastructure, the success of the UNIREC-COMIREC entity has been “its ability to act across multiple municipal jurisdictions on common themes, such as flooding and contamination, by bringing together the different actors” (BA8). Notwithstanding some of the advances made, evaluations of this initiative have suggested there are coordination and implementation challenges, largely relating to the relatively weak status of the entity, budget shortcomings and aligning the decision processes of the multiple government agencies, privatised services, community-based organisations and international financers involved in policy definition and delivery (Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, 2011; Defensor del Pueblo de la Nación, 2007; Janches et al., 2014). Overall, findings from both cases indicate that the structure provided by special purpose entities for integrated planning can be fruitful for improving, though not entirely avoiding, challenges in governance relating to intergovernmental and actor cooperation.

Supportive condition four: government committees and multidisciplinary working groups

For department-led initiatives, five urban policy actors from Melbourne (M5, M6, M8, M9, M13) identified that formal structures like committees, working groups and advisory boards are essential to sustaining the horizontal and vertical integration required for policy implementation. While research in Buenos Aires highlighted the existence of similar committees, ‘roundtables’ and working groups, interviewees did not explicitly single out the role of these in supporting integrated planning for reducing disadvantage. Nevertheless, this was implicit given the discussion on policy and project initiatives that were operationalised through such structures: these structures were described in a way that highlights their omnipresence and accepted status rather than uniquely supporting integrated
planning with social logics on individual projects. Planning actors in both contexts described how these formal structures were essential for sharing information, exploring opportunities for cross-sectoral collaboration and avoiding duplication between departments. One participant from Melbourne with extensive experience in government explained that these structures emerge when you have “a consultative kind of leader, who wants to make sure that people are aware of what was happening and were engaged in it. It means that there aren’t a lot of hidden agendas and that secretaries and executives of departments talk more regularly about what their departments are doing” (M10). Another state government policy actor explained that the existence of these collaborative structures, when there is ministerial backing for them, helps “stakeholders to really understand and know what their skills and knowledge are, and to understand where they can best add value to the process and not overstep their kind of expertise of their contribution. It’s really about knowing their best place in the process and looking to reach a win-win situation, while understanding that other stakeholders have different objectives” (M2).

Informative and consultative structures also exist between levels of government in the Melbourne case, such as the Council Forums used under the Bracks (1999-2007)-Brumby (2007-2010) Labor Governments in Melbourne to “decide how best to approach the variety of policy and implementation areas covered by Melbourne 2030,” (Victorian Government, 2002), as well as the introduction of ‘growth area brokers’ whose role was to develop State and Local Government relationships in planning new residential development areas from 2006. Another example described were the Regional Management Forums, which were introduced in 2005 and provided a forum for “inter-sectoral governance approaches” (Butterworth, 2013, p.1). As one interviewee commented, “my experience of engaging the RMF was a very positive one and that’s because we used in a very deliberative way: that was pitching the RMF to become a platform for inter-sectoral governance. It didn’t have a huge amount of formal authorisation, but it is a very important layer of governance” (M6). Another example, which is also the most significant and enduring structure that supports intergovernmental relations between all three tiers of government, is the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) and its associated Councils (e.g. Transport and Infrastructure Council). Though COAG was not mentioned in detail by any interviewees, some authors have found that it has delivered “a culture of more cooperative relationships that linked together the national, State and Territory governments in an arguably more effective way than had previously been the case” (Carroll & Head, 2010, p. 409). It was mentioned by two interviewees (M11, M15) for its role in the review of capital city planning systems (2009-2011) and input to the government’s most recent (though now nonoperational) National Urban Policy (2011).

**Supportive condition five: state-society engagement**
The last condition that emerged in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires in support of integrated planning to reduce disadvantage relates to the ability to create and sustain mechanisms of engagement between government and civil society. Different approaches to this were described depending on the case context, although overall cultivating alliances was identified as important in both contexts. In general, strong connections between the community and public sector was seen as a way to raise awareness about opportunities and problems, as well as to conduct debate and possibly reach consensus about how to take up opportunities or address problems as they emerge. But also, many actors saw this as a way to safeguard the future of integrated planning initiatives for reducing disadvantage: it has served in their experiences to engender broader commitment to a program within and beyond terms of governments that may, at times of policy change or withdrawal of public funding, help to sustain the initiative or parts of it. This was demonstrated through cases where different departments within government have taken on greater involvement after a policy change (for example health over housing), where local governments in both metropolitan settings have taken over some responsibilities when State Governments have shifted priorities (for example to support urban revitalisation and neighbourhood improvements) and also, where non-government actors have fulfilled traditional public policy roles, for example in social service provision or in funding new infrastructure with private finance, credit or other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic, international donors).

In the Melbourne case, and particularly at the local government level, reference groups, citizen forums, community liaison groups and group based committees were described as providing a platform for building dialogue and mutual understanding between state and non-state. While consultation mechanisms are built into high impact planning policies and applications, most planners interviewed as part of this research expressed that these short-term initiatives don’t create lasting links to sustain integrated approaches to planning. At the local government level, planners interviewed expressed that the design of a genuinely representative policies (M2) and an inclusive and functional public realm and services (M1, M14) rests on long-term and meaningful engagement with community members. An example provided from one outer area Council, was the design and construction of a community hub and library over ten years, which is a “source of great pride to all and there is a clear residue of that work in terms of community strength” (M4). This manager went on to explain, that …if your objective is reducing poverty or decreasing disadvantage then six years isn't going to cut it: there has to be a long-term commitment to profound change..(it requires) good principles of engagement and collaboration for a community-driven, partnership style approach, an integrated approach for the social and the built form, and to bring those elements of the economic as well into play to transform a community. In the case of the hub, because we are able to use long-term, culturally appropriate and accessible approaches to engagement
we were able to really connect and create a thriving hub that after only two years, it's almost outgrowing that space, which is a great problem to have.

Such an approach to long term engagement serves to raise the ability and expectations of community groups that previously were disengaged or had “low expectations about what they can ask for and demand” (M4). As another outer-Melbourne planner commented, “you need a long term approach to engagement to move beyond ‘bonding within groups,’ such as within a particular cultural group’s elderly citizen club or youth group, to achieve ‘bridging between’ groups in society (M1).

Similarly, some planners from Buenos Aires identified active engagement with civil society as a conduit for information sharing, knowledge transfer and building capacity in society so that citizens are further enabled to participate in shaping the urban environment and holding governments to account on commitments to reduce disadvantage. For example, one Buenos Aires planner identified the Project ‘Women Doing’ (Ellas Hacen), which is an inter-ministerial program established by the National Government to engage with 100,000 women in situations of “social vulnerability and provide them training in areas such as plumbing and building, as well as subsidies to assist in neighbourhood improvement programs, all the while offering social support in areas of citizen and gender rights, education” (BA20). The program assists these women to start employment cooperatives, which then through organised approaches are better placed to engage with government to express their needs and preferences for neighbourhood improvements. Another planner commented, “it is a great advancement to see the incorporation of citizens as a planning entity, or rather as an active agent of transformation. If they are being engaged and capacitated, I as a planner am more likely to recognise them as an agent capable of transforming reality” (BA21). Planners from Buenos Aires also described how engagement can be used as a tool to build political capital and support, which in turn can validate or provide “legitimacy” to integrated planning initiatives (BA15).

Overall, planners from both contexts highlighted the possibility to create alliances between State and non-State actors. This has occurred through State-led processes, including to help build understanding between stakeholders as well as to define project goals and parameters, locational questions and operational plans relating to specific projects. There are also circumstances under which civil society movements create momentum outside of formal State structures that influence the creation of planning interventions and broaden engagement possibilities. While broader representation and participation was regarded by planners as in principle a positive aspect of integrated planning, it adds complexity to managing relational models of governance and creates greater scope for uncertainty around policy direction, which in highly politicised environments is regarded warily. Despite the ambiguity attached to the ways State-society links might occur and the effect they may have, what is clear is that increased participation by non-State actors in agitating for policy change or in effecting it
broadens the possibilities for planners in creating relational models of governance for integrated planning with social logics.

**Conclusion**

This chapter responds to my second research question about the formal structures for supporting integrated planning with social logics. It underscores the importance of politico-institutional factors in creating opportunities for integrated planning that reduces disadvantage as well as five key conditions that can provide support to sustain these initiatives over time. Contemporary trends in urban governance are reflected in these findings, such as the focus on spatially targeting integrated planning initiatives (Albrechts, 2004, 2006) and the shift towards networked approaches to policy-making (Rhodes, 2007b). In particular, the foundational elements of actor interrelations for integrated planning outlined in Chapter 2 emerged in interviewee responses as fundamental to both generating and supporting efficacious practices of integrated planning. Responses indicate how vital certain opportunity scenarios are for vertical integration, including when there is political alignment between tiers of government or when clear ‘win-win’ scenarios emerge, as well as the type of collaborative structures that support horizontal integration and State-society relations, such as special purpose entities for integrated planning initiatives. More significantly, however, this chapter elucidates the conditions that give rise to and sustain contemporary integrated planning with social logics in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, two cities affected by frequently changing politico-institutional settings.

The key factors that generate opportunities for integrated planning with social logics uncovered in this research relate strongly to the politico-institutional setting of urban policy-making. In particular, the triangulated research findings demonstrate how social logics became embedded in urban policy under administrations with a clear social justice agenda and policy platform. Furthermore, interviewees described the way external pressure from non-government actors, such as the media, private sector and civil society groups, can influence the agenda of governments, swaying the direction of policy to incorporate social logics at times of crises, for example in favour of improving the living conditions of those affected by domestic violence or an environmental catastrophe. Another opportunity for integrated planning with social logics, particularly for enhanced vertical integration, is when the different tiers of government are politically aligned and share a common agenda. Lastly, a common opportunity scenario detected in this research was if no alternative exists to integrated planning, or if this is seen as a clear ‘win-win’ situation to the actors involved. The study revealed that these four opportunity scenarios provide improved possibilities for integrated planning with social logics to emerge, though sustaining this practice over time, particularly through changing administrations, requires the presence of other conditions.
The first though not infallible supportive condition is a legislative or policy framework that requires integrated action to reduce disadvantage. Identifying an appropriate scale for integrated planning that focuses on the reduction of disadvantage was another important condition, typically with smaller geographic areas resulting in more efficacious practices given that fewer actors across fewer jurisdictions are involved in policy definition and delivery. In both contexts, planners interviewed as part of this research also claimed that ‘arms-length,’ special purpose bodies have delivered some successes in integrated planning approaches that aim to reduce disadvantage as they are somewhat protected from the tumultuous policy environment of departments, which are more closely connected to fluctuating politico-institutional settings. This was proven in the Melbourne case with the continuation of a range of urban renewal and revitalisation programs between different administrations, as well as in Buenos Aires with the creation of a distinct development corporation of the port area. When integrated planning is directed and conducted from within government, effective horizontal integration was found to be important and rely on the operation of inter-departmental or cross-level committees, working groups, ‘roundtables’ and boards, though these tend to suffer the greatest upheavals when administrations change. Lastly, effective structures to support State-civil society engagement were identified as important in both contexts in order to create opportunities for dialogue, consciousness-raising between groups, consensus building and citizen involvement, but also even for the survival of integrated planning initiatives when government support may be abruptly withdrawn.

Figure 5.1 Opportunity scenarios & supportive conditions for integrated planning with social logics

Source: Author
As related in this chapter, many of the conditions that support integrated planning, such as cross-sectoral committees and favourable policy frameworks, can and regularly do change between administrations in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Changes in the politico-institutional context can present barriers to integrated planning when the shift is away from social justice imperatives, for example when programs became stalled or stopped. Some structures are less permeable to such changes, including legislative frameworks that support integrated planning as well as purpose-designed entities with independent financing to implement projects. The conditions identified in this chapter have provided a strong, though not failsafe foundation for integrated planning with social logics in the specific contexts of Melbourne and Buenos Aires at certain times. These conditions fail to emerge or can become extinguished because of the stronger weight of counter forces associated with the vulnerabilities and disruptions of habitually fluctuating politico-institutional settings. For example, these include fragmentation within government and in its dealings with non-government actors. In order to better understand the barriers to integrated planning with social logics these questions are explored in the following chapter. Furthermore, the next chapter uncovers some of the strategies and tactics employed by urban policy actors to take advantage of or create the windows of opportunity and combat barriers in practice for pursuing integrated planning with social logics.
Chapter 6. Barriers for planning with social logics and planners’ strategies around them

Introduction
The previous chapter explained how diverse opportunity scenarios exist to support the introduction of integrated planning to reduce disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Furthermore, it outlined conditions that sustain integrated planning practices with social logics. While these scenarios and conditions have aligned to generate lasting programs in some cases, evidence suggests that planning has generally performed weakly in redressing disadvantage in both Melbourne (Baum & Gleeson, 2010; Jones, 2012; Pawson & Herath, 2012; Randolph & Holloway, 2005) and Buenos Aires (Echevarría, 2008; Pérez, 2002; Torres, 2001, 2004). In particular, planning has not succeeded in delivering equitable urban conditions, such as access to services, infrastructure and employment opportunities. This is a major contributing factor to locational disadvantage as well as highly differential living costs between neighbourhoods and the increased clustering of households on low incomes (Echevarría, 2008; Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Pawson & Herath, 2012; Pérez, 2002; Torres, 2004).

This chapter first explores which barriers undermine planning practices aimed at reducing disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. These were uncovered through critically examining policy changes and by joining together these occurrences with interview and observational data. Then, the chapter examines what kinds of strategies and tactics have been employed by planners in attempts to counter some of these undermining tendencies and support the application of social logics in integrated planning. These were revealed entirely through interview data. Again, converging trends in the politico-institutional settings of Melbourne and Buenos Aires have created barriers of a similar character (though of different depth) and the strategies and tactics used by planning actors are of a similar nature. Findings are reported in an integrated way again for this reason. While the previous chapter explained the formal structures that support integrated planning with social logics, this chapter focuses on the informal tacit abilities and specific strategies and tactics of planning actors.

The competing rationalities behind integrated planning
This research found two types of conditions tend to undermine integrated planning with social logics. The first is the destabilising effect of competing rationalities on urban policy. In Melbourne and Buenos Aires, three main rationalities were found to interact and influence public policy and development outcomes. The strongest is a market logic, or ‘exchange’ value of urbanisation as it was referred to often in Buenos Aires (where Marxist theory tends to have a stronger imprint on urban
theory and planning parlance). The rationality here is to “think about the city in terms of opportunities to turn it into a commodity” (B13), for example through profitable residential development or a well-positioned business location. Secondly, there are also individual plans, or ‘use values’ as they were often termed in Buenos Aires. Here development is influenced by individuals, for example through their lifestyle and location choices for living in proximity to family, cultural groups or employment, or who articulate demands to government about local needs such as “more schools” (M18) or “less development” (BA4). The use and non-use values of a city “may coincide or enter into conflict” (B13), whereby a third actor emerges to mediate this interaction: the State. This third rationality of the State is defined by its multiple actors. Overwhelmingly, “political power” (BA13) was found to be the driving dynamic of the State, in particular through responding to the preferences of concentrated economic interests or citizen demands in a way that will favourably influence electoral outcomes. Overall, “each time a major decision about the city occurs these three rationalities are in movement” (BA13) and “the articulations of these three logics produce a mix in which the market is strongly determinant, but that no urban process is pure: they are all hybrid” (BA11). The nature of these rationalities, the impact of each of them on urban policy-making with social logics and the ways competition between them occurs in practice are described below. A secondary group of related operational and institutional barriers also examined below, including for example the style of leadership and the practical limits of horizontal integration in policy-making.

First rationality: market logic
Planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires described a practice reality in which market logic is the dominant force driving the pattern and conditions of urbanisation. While such factors as “academic tendencies” (BA10), general topographic features, location preferences of families, “changing household structures” (M9) play an important role in guiding the pattern of development in each city, the most important influencing factor universally identified by participants in this research was the economic rationality that drives decision-making by private investors and developers. This phenomenon has long been identified in planning literature in both Australian and Argentine contexts (e.g. Matus, 2008; McLoughlin, 1992; Neutze, 1977; Pirez, 2002; Sandercock, 1975; Torres, 1975). This literature has demonstrated how attempts to shape the form and distribution of urban growth by government have generally followed private interests, been reactive and limited, or where they are proactive, often failed to materialise under the sheer weight of pressure from vested interest groups. In line with these findings, planning practitioners interviewed as part of this research explained that urban planning in Melbourne has overwhelmingly been “a developer-led policy environment” (M6) and, similarly in Buenos Aires:

…the principal thrust behind urban development patterns comes from largescale developers and the desire to fixate financial capital. It is about orienting the savings of high income
sectors or laundering money in the case of those who have acquired wealth obscurely. Of course there are other factors, like population growth, and State interventions that are very often used to soften the impact or fill the gaps left by the market. These actions leave much to be desired as social interests are almost always subordinated and whatever the State does, such as public works or normative changes, ends up becoming profitable to the market (BA4).

For planners, the strongly determinant market logic in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires materialises to undermine the pursuit of social logics in three main ways: through lobby, coercion and direct investment. The base premise is that the objectives of integrated planning with social logics, such as social mixing through prescribed mixed tenure housing projects, tend to conflict with the profit-seeking interests of private investors and developers. For this reason, investors and developers may advocate for policy reformulation or for ‘concessions,’ ‘exceptions’ or, in Buenos Aires ‘flexibility’ in the application of planning controls and exactions. It is for this reason that development outcomes fail to meet policy goals or can bear little or no resemblance to policy aims. As one typical local government area in Buenos Aires shows, “while policy prescribes one thing, development is really oriented only through market mechanisms and speculative interests” (BA15).

The second way market logic undermines the prescription of social logics as found through this research relates to coercion. In this regard, interviewees drew attention to the power of the market in influencing interjurisdictional competition to attract investment, for example in industrial parks or residential developments, which may deliver higher local employment or tax revenue. This undermines practices of integrated planning to reduce disadvantage because governments will often make policy changes or development concessions regarding cost-incurred social objectives to secure investment, such as the requirement to incorporate social housing, open space, protect environmental values or transport infrastructure upgrades. As a planning consultant from Buenos Aires commented, “the private sector has great power of decision and threat: they will say ‘fine, I won’t do anything here and I’ll invest elsewhere, incrementally reducing policy quality’” (BA10). The final way social objectives are interrupted is through the protagonist and perpetuating role of private developers in actual investment and urban development where policy has weak(ened) social logics.

**Second rationality: individual plans**

The second rationality behind the pattern and quality of urban development in Melbourne and Buenos Aires relates to the individual plans and desires of their inhabitants. On the one hand, households make location decisions about where to live and carry out their day-to-day activities. In this regard, interviewees commented that employment location and family or cultural groups were major factors influencing where households choose to live within the limits of access to affordable housing. Others
included access to education institutions, historical ties to places and communities as well as the
search to improve their quality of life through access to better urban environments. On the other hand,
citizens may individually or collectively endeavour to change their urban environments by
participating in neighbourhood organisations and activities, or through organised protest and social
movements directed at influencing government policy (or in the case of Buenos Aires, often against
government and with the aim of constructing alternatives outside of State-led urban policy, such as in
delivering community-based infrastructure solutions).

Planners from both Melbourne and Buenos Aires explained that while individual plans may be
influenced by economic drivers; often actors are seeking to “preserve” (BA4) or “enhance their
quality of life” (M18), or “enact their rights” (BA13). While there are instances where these pursuits
come into conflict with the social logics of urban policy, for example when residents or local business
people mobilise behind regressive policy formulations (e.g. draconian homelessness initiatives) or
seek changes to progressive policy formulations (e.g. businesses against the pedestrianisation of
commercial streets to improve public spaces, or local residents protesting against public housing
inclusions), often they are in line with social objectives relating to quality of life improvements. The
contest emerges more frequently between market forces and local preferences about urban conditions,
with residents and business groups often opposing development proposals that are perceived to reduce
quality of life or impact local business activity.

**Third rationality: political imperatives**
In the competition between market forces and the desire to improve quality of life outcomes, how is it
the former tends to trump the later? Planners interviewed as part of this research suggested that this
dominance occurs because “the logic of government, or an executive leader, is basically to
accumulate political power” (BA9). This then influences the planning framework to function in a way
that is often more permissive to private interests that it is steadfast to social commitments. This
section explains the third rationality of political imperatives and its effects on the everyday practices
of integrated planning in detail, focusing on the linkages with the previous two rationalities. It
describes the influence of what Flyvbjerg calls ‘realrationalitat’ of planning: where planning analysis
and instruments are used to “rationalise politics” (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 35). In this regard, political
imperatives were reported to influence policy decision-making in a way that occurs without early or
substantial consideration or debate of criteria, including regarding social logics, to reduce
disadvantage. Policy- and project-related decisions can be rushed because there is a “need to be seen
to act, so funding programs respond to ‘shovel-ready’ projects (M4) and interventions are often
“piecemeal at best” (M4). As one Melbourne-based planner described:
I find there is a lack of courage or ability to discuss and weigh out the true costs and benefits of things, and this is political. People in government tend to think about ‘How does this look on the front page?’ rather than looking for genuinely transformative solutions’’ (M9).

Exploring the interplay of these rationalities

It is the interplay between the three rationalities that causes complexity for integrated planning with social logics, especially the predominance of a market logic. The general sentiment among planners interviewed as part of this research was that the influence of the private sector in urban policy has grown over recent decades. On the one hand, some planners commented positively on the role of businesses in self-organisation and channelling views through increasingly organised networks and groups, such as the Metropolitan Foundation in Buenos Aires and the Committee for Melbourne. In this regard, planners spoke of the need for private sector involvement in delivering policy outcomes and how their engagement throughout planning processes could facilitate greater policy uptake in time. However, many planners also commented on the way private sector involvement has weakened social norms in urban policy. The occurs through lobbying efforts that produce less courageous or even regressive reforms. Additionally, the privatisation of urban services, such as water in Buenos Aires (1993) or tram services in Melbourne (1999), were generally seen as failing to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable and have also become increasingly costly to taxpayers. In these scenarios, the social logic of redistribution has not extended to benefit those groups furthest from central city infrastructure. The promise of “better provision of the services Melbournians need” through for example private sector skills in “construction and customer service” offered in the Victorian Government’s Living Suburbs strategic policy (1995, Part 3) has not come to fruition.

Overall, economic imperatives to accumulate wealth through private uses, such as land development and service provision, limits the reduction of disadvantage through integrated planning because the application of social logics requires concessions that are unpalatable to businesses; the interests of the market are not well integrated with the welfare interests of the majority in either context.

In Melbourne, for example, many planners interviewed as part of this research were critical of the operation of the former Growth Areas Authority (GAA) (now the Victorian Planning Authority as of 2016). They commented that the GAA oversaw the preparation of precinct structure plans for growth areas in a way that “opened up significant land holdings for development, without adequate consideration of infrastructure requirements and low infrastructure charges were applied to developers” (M1). This approach was driven by a community and “media perception that there wasn’t enough land supply to keep housing affordable compared to Sydney” (M2) and “was driven through pressure from the development industry” (M4). “The property industry is the biggest funder of political parties and they ensure their message is heard, which is to lower costs and produce the same
thing they always do so they don’t have to innovate” (M9). “In Melbourne, you can play politics with evidence, you know, the building industry has so much influence over government” (M8). This experience opened large tracts of land for development, producing a “fast-paced and underfunded development pattern that favoured private interests and overwhelmed the capacity of local governments to meet social objectives” (M4). Again in this scenario, active redistributive policies don’t benefit those newest communities, whom then also bear the cost of substandard or lacking infrastructure and service provision.

A concrete example described from the Buenos Aires case includes the gradual modifications to the planning law (8912/77) which have worsened socio-spatial fragmentation by allowing the proliferation of gated communities. Often these are developed with concentrations of high income households and separate user-pay infrastructure services, many times with works processes that worsen outcomes for nearby informal settlements, for example by limiting accessibility in an area or increasing flood risks. Also, in this case, “gated communities rely on public infrastructure to be viable, such as highways and trunk infrastructure, and the State clearly transfers gains to the private sector through allowing speculative land accumulation, delivering public works and failing to regulate land valorisation processes” (BA9). Without a firm and favourable planning framework, the private sector develops land based on the highest possible return, which “mostly excludes parameters of social welfare” and “produces a segregated development patterns of haves and have nots” (BA8). In Buenos Aires, “the lobby, resources and capacity of the private sector, especially concentrated groups, make it difficult for the State to position itself against these interests” (BA15). In the more extreme case in Buenos Aires, interviewees commented how there are “opposite forces” at play between “people’s needs and the market,” (BA7) and with the market as the “main protagonist, large sectors of society are left behind and grow informally without adequate infrastructure” (BA5). In this case redistribution has regressive results and privatised suburbs generate impenetrable barriers to encounter and recognition between social groups. Overall, as a local government planner described in Buenos Aires:

> many times we propose internally a normative change to advance social objectives and then we find that there is unexpected resistance, which emerges because the Secretary has properties that would be affected by the change or people with private interests who are close to him do…in this way the State can be the guilty protagonist of land valorisation processes that are entirely avoidable and when there are more rational proposals possible. In this way, (planning) is very much anchored in the sacred notion of private property…and the most privileged (land owners) occupy a special place in the political agenda, which has a direct relationship with any real possibility to implement redistributive policies” (BA7).
The influence of private interests on political motives was attributed by interviewees to a range of factors. Political processes are accommodating of private interests because of the increased frequency of partnerships with the private sector given the “limits of public budgets and move towards collaborative models of urban governance” (M6) and a “pervasive ideology” (BA4) associated with neoliberalism that promotes and “naturalises” the role and “windfall gains” awarded to the private sector in urbanisation processes (M4). As one leading planner in Buenos Aires explained, the State is very often seen as an expensive, slow, bureaucratic machine of impediments, and private business as efficient with great investment capacity, which makes politicians and policy-makers permeable to private interests, such as the privatisation of public infrastructure… (In a context of strained public budgets and a) “strong private sector with great lobbying capacity and ability to interact with any level of the State, private businesses have freedom of movement” (BA13).

In this context, “the contemporary neoliberal governance regime characterised by networks is really, to put it simply, a way of hiding the power relationships that exist and legitimising market forces without a discussion about where we are headed” (BA22). Or as a State bureaucrat noted in Melbourne, “there is a lack of courage to challenge neoliberal orthodoxy: I’m often in meetings where the general view is that we should play no role in market intervention” (M9). Furthermore, market forces often prevail because “of a deeply fragmented system with multiple organisms and actors act at the same time without real capacity of coordination by the State” (Government of Buenos Aires, 2006, p.341).

The political imperative to accumulate electoral influence creates an uncertain and fluctuating urban policy environment. Unlike other areas of policy with secure funding, such as health or education, funding commitments to urban policy and projects, such as through revitalisation programs or large-scale infrastructure, form part of special or discretionary budget processes in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Often, project funding can be allocated to marginal electorates, or policy commitments made in response to advocacy or lobbying efforts. At times this can lead to modifications and “watering down” (M6) of social logics in policy proposals, which can be further weakened through sustained lobbying once new governments take office and policies take effect. It also presents particular challenges to operating with ‘recognition’ as a social logic because it can be politically favourable, perhaps for a short time, or detrimental to be seen working with one or some specific social or cultural groups. Like redistribution, genuine recognition requires long-term policy efforts. Overall, the logic of political power often runs against the application of social logics in integrated planning because the geographic scope of need may not align with the geography of political interest or because planning is traditionally sectoral while the system of political representation is territorial. Also, the timing required to effectively deliver policy may not match political mandates and the need
to bring together multiple actors in integrated planning is a mechanism that disperses rather than concentrates political power.

Another political question relates to the way urban policy directive can change completely and commitments to reducing disadvantage waver significantly with changes of administration. According to one State government bureaucrat from Melbourne, “there's no question that changes in government would have to be the largest threat to multi-generational or multi-year projects” (M6), or as another stated “the political cycle does impact on the continuity required” (M16). Similarly, in Buenos Aires, a State government bureaucrat commented “even with all the money you need, you can’t resolve complex challenges in short time periods…there is a need to sustain not only the rhythm of investment, but also the rhythm of work over many years…when there is a change in political direction the focus of investment often becomes a matter of debate with different criteria and many social projects lose investment and traction in this transformation” (BA5). Instead, what tends to happen is that “there aren’t genuine long term plans and planning becomes about short term actions, based on an electoral calculation and plan continuation is predicated on re-election” (BA1). Overall, there “is very little possibility of articulation between administrations” (BA19) and “many times, what is left is the hope that the structures established are strong enough to withstand the change or to walk away from projects and just hope that the work done will be enough to sustain some kind focus on the issue until the tide turns again” (BA5). Similarly, as one State bureaucrat explained from Melbourne: …you need people to go beyond what’s on paper and actually provide the symbolic leadership and the charismatic leadership as well as the intellectual leadership. And if they go before their time has reached a critical mass your project loses momentum. You know, you need to get to a tipping point, you need longevity of engagement. If there’s a big churn or if you don’t have enough people on the ground to make the change happen, that is a significant risk that can get in the way or stop good things happening (M6).

The impact of changing administrations on a planning system is varied. It produces the “loss of personnel,” (M17) the “dissolution of teams” (BA5) and loss of supportive leadership, which is problematic because “integrated planning, like all social change initiatives, needs champions” (M6). With the loss of personnel and leaders, other problems follow on including the challenge of generating sufficient trust in working environments to establish “partnerships” or a “horizontal culture” (M17), “sustaining investments over time” (BA5), “maintaining political will” (M13) and “holding an integral vision of projects” (BA8). Most significantly, its impact over time on the pattern of urbanisation is growing socio-spatial fragmentation, with parts of the city falling outside areas or market interest and policy focus to create and perpetuate areas of ‘locational disadvantage.’ This, in turn, inhibits the possibility to operate effectively with social logics because the base condition for
redistribution, recognition or encounter is already one of wide wealth gaps, opportunity differences and spatial separation.

In contemporary contexts of planning practices permissive to private interests, governments tend to “operate where the market leaves holes” (BA8) to redress particular and “localised” (BA8) questions of disadvantage, for example through social housing programs and neighbourhood improvement. What results is not an overall “deficiency” but a “poor distribution” (BA9) of the bundle of infrastructure and services across the city. This approach to planning may permit decision rules associated with encounter and recognition for specific projects, but has been limiting in terms of metropolitan or even smaller scale redistributive policies. A variety of factors combine to determine the locations for this form of targeted investments. In general, however, while instances exist where strategic investments in social programs have been made following needs-based criteria (Melbourne 2030, PROMEABA were offered as examples), very often integrated planning with social logics tend to follow a pattern that responds to electoral demands or private interests. Or as one Melbourne based executive leader suggested, when governments do make significant investments to improve quality of life outcomes, “it’s no surprise that most of it lands on marginal seats” (M8), for example “just look at the election commitments for sports facilities at each election, they don’t always follow planned pipeline of spending based on rigorous and up-to-date information” (M2).

While there was unanimous agreement that the influence of private interests was high in determining political motives, many experienced planners cautioned that a unidirectional view is superficial and fallacious. In both contexts, the State is seen in fact as the most powerful agent in determining the pattern of development and very often, public policy is shaped by “acquiescence or consensus between private and public interests that enable a certain conviviality” (BA13). Decisions to pursue integrated planning with strongly embedded social logics were described to depend on this agreement between interests. For example, private interests can align with non-use values where there is strong community pressure (as described in the previous chapter), or when there is value to be gained or costs to be avoided. As one experienced planner from Melbourne noted,

…it would be trite to comment that the market always acts against social objectives…I have watched the development industry sort of transform itself over decades, from what we used to call the cutters and runners, the subdivide and sell-off, to adopt more of an American and European-style community development…So we find developers, the good ones, run community events, get engaged, provide facilities for people – shopping, schools, childcare. Their developments are really comprehensive. And so they’re very much moving into that concept of community development. In quite sophisticated ways, really (M13).
In Buenos Aires, an example was provided of a new bus route that was supported by business interests because of increased patronage and by households that benefited from improved accessibility.

**Operational and institutional barriers to integrated planning with social logics**

The contest between competing rationalities in planning tends to drive development patterns in each city and can act as a barrier to the formation of integrated planning policy for reducing disadvantage. Additionally, other operational and institutional barriers also exist in Melbourne and Buenos Aires that create roadblocks for effective implementation of integrated planning with social logics. Planning actors interviewed as part of this research uncovered eight main challenges shared between both contexts. The first three relate specifically to ‘actor interrelations’ as conceived in the conceptual framework of integrated planning in Chapter 2 as well as the influence of political rationalities to accumulate power and electoral influence. They include pervasive ‘command and control’ approaches to vertical integration; practical limitations to horizontal integration; and ambiguous State-society relationships. The remaining barriers are indirectly related to the contemporary neoliberal malaise for planning with social norms, including weak or no legislative backing; normative inconsistencies; inadequate budgets; lack of adequate skills and training for planning actors to be effective in contemporary contexts; as well as ineffectual leadership. This section describes these operational and institutional barriers experienced in Melbourne and Buenos Aires.

**‘Command and control’ approaches to vertical integration**

In relation to vertical integration, the main barrier identified by planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires relates to the pervasive ‘control and command’ approach taken by higher levels of government in a context of frequently changing public administrations. In both contexts, lower levels of government have limited revenue-raising capacities and a lack of autonomy in terms of defining and implementing large-scale urban projects. In the case of Melbourne, State planning policies explicitly ‘delegate’ or ‘transfer’ responsibilities to local authorities, requiring that “all local councils have regard to these policies and work to implement them” (*Melbourne 2030*). According to several interviewees, some policies in Melbourne may be difficult or impossible to implement or can pursue outcomes contrary to local objectives, creating significant tensions in the relationship between local, state and federal governments. Furthermore, policies at state and federal levels can also change abruptly following a change in administration, creating a destabilising effect downward to lower levels of government. “You’ve got a situation in which the Victorian Government can override a local council and the federal government controls the purse-strings…these are uncomfortable arrangements in terms of power and control and legitimated decision-making (M6).”
One specific example often referred to in Melbourne was the approach taken by the previously mentioned GAA to growth area planning between 2006 and 2012. In this case, the Victorian Government’s planning authority set the planning framework, with associated KPIs and other metrics, which changed with each new administration, producing ever-changing goals and timeframes that hampered consistent policy implementation regarding social (and other) objectives. It was widely considered a “top-down approach in which councils didn’t have a seat at the table, it was a poorly conceived framework for delivering on social outcomes…(that) resulted in planning permits that just weren't implementable, that contradicted internally or just didn't respond to local conditions” (M1). In Melbourne, “local or state policy objectives are often in conflict with state or federal objectives (and) in this case, representatives in lower levels of government can experience ‘political-heaving’ from above (M8). As one local government planner surmised, “in Victoria, you're always at the mercy of the state government of the day” (M1). This tradition of abrupt change between administrations and occurrences of political strong-arming, combine to act as a disincentive to integrated planning with social logics over longer periods.

In the case of Buenos Aires, the national government plays a comparatively greater role in urban policy, housing and infrastructure funding and delivery. Very often the national government will formulate policies that directly connect with local governments, without state government participation. The national government will also fund state government policies and programs, under similar conditions to Australian experiences. In Buenos Aires, implementation powers are delegated to lower levels of government at times, “though it is unlikely that higher levels of government transfer much decision-making power because there is a very convenient political relationship to be maintained, even though the constitutional change of 1994 sets out municipal level autonomy” (BA23). The forms of collaboration required between levels of government in integrated planning is considered a way of “ceding power, so it is very rare that there is sufficient incentive for true integration to occur: we have not been able to identify an interjurisdictional model that understands the political rationality of these different actors” (BA19). When collaboration occurs, it is usually because, “the reality is that provincial and national governments can’t resolve specific problems or roll out programs without local governments: they need their local knowledge and benefit from the close, day-to-day contact local councils have with neighbourhoods in project delivery…if you don’t keep them on board policies can fail or have the opposite to desired effect, like taking six years instead of three to deliver” (BA5). In this context, some form of vertical relationship management is developed, but very often in ways that does not threaten the power of control of higher levels of government and in a way that reinforces command and control approaches to integration. Overall, and like the Melbourne case, this hampers long-term municipal and metropolitan-level planning efforts to reduce disadvantage because of political imperatives. Or as one planner explained:
A municipal government that has a good relationship with the national or state government has more possibilities to receive funding and public works compared to others who don’t… because of this situation, the modus operandi of local government is not to develop its own urban policy – because what is the point? - it is instead to position itself to obtain changing public works, subsidies and assistance from the state or national government based on political skill and good relations (BA19).

The practical limits to horizontal integration
Horizontal forms of integration also face specific challenges in Melbourne and Buenos Aires that undermine integrated planning practices for reducing disadvantage. In particular, respondents identified basic, practical issues such as the physical separation or “tyranny of distance” (M4) of departments within governments that reinforces silo practices, as well as operational inconsistencies, such as different methodologies for diagnosing and understanding social problems, mismatched planning, forecasting, reporting and budget cycles for infrastructure investment, lack of project definition and implementation plans, and different policy languages and criteria for measuring progress towards social objectives.

In addition to operative challenges, planners identified deep-seated practices of ‘turf protection’ because of “historical conflicts between key people” (BA24), “the way government departments and funding are sectorally organised” (BA23), “closed institutional cultures,” “budget competition” and “the fact that project budgets are set up to cover project costs without allocating funds for interdepartmental collaboration” (M3). In this regard, coordination is often seen as a burden or “costly process” not just in terms of transaction costs, but also in terms of potential loss of autonomy and the image that a particular department or area of government can operate with full control and competence. What this produces in both contexts is a kind of “defensive” (BA11) coordination style, in which only “the minimal necessary effort” (M8) in coordination is applied to avoid potential negative consequences or the cessation of control. When horizontal collaboration becomes truncated, integrated planning for reducing disadvantage is negatively effected as key stakeholders may be absent from policy debate and decision-making processes, resulting in duplications, later conflicts or missed opportunities for knowledge exchange and for synergetic and efficient implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Furthermore, planning actors in both contexts suggested that there are limits in practice to the extent policy-making can be a ‘whole-of-government’ activity. On the one hand, in Melbourne, policy documents advocate for a ‘whole-of-government’ approach, for example in Plan Melbourne (2014) to address climate change adaptation or in the recent Plan Melbourne Refresh (2015), which describes the need for an “integrated approach across government that delivers overarching policy goals, such
as delivering jobs, securing economic prosperity, and protecting environmental values.” However, when asked about ‘whole-of-government’ or ‘joined-up’ approaches, planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires pointed out that while cross-sectoral collaboration and information sharing is important, for example to take advantage of opportunities to collaborate and avoid duplication, policy-making is never actually conducted as a ‘whole-of-government’ activity as this is “impractical” (M5) or even “silly” (M10) due to the “pace of bureaucratic processes” (BA22), “the nature of power plays in planning” (M8), “the limits of budgets” (BA12) and the need to have the right people, not everyone, at the table to ‘get things done’ in a timely way.

**Ambiguous State-Society relationships**

Significant barriers to implementing practices of integrated planning for the reduction of disadvantage were also uncovered in both contexts relating to State-civil society relationships. Planners revealed that ‘responsive’ and ‘engaged’ governance was valued when considering integrated planning with social objectives logics. However, they observed many obstacles to becoming genuinely responsive and engaged. On the one hand, obstacles to State-civil society relationships occur in a cyclical-like process with some degree of variation between jurisdictions in Melbourne and Buenos Aires (described below). On the other hand, planning actors in both contexts suggested that processes of restructuring and privatisation have deepened links between government and the private sector in a way that often undermine goals to reduce relative disadvantage. Weaknesses in both State-civil society and State-private sector relations for reducing disadvantage through integrated planning are explored below in a way which highlights some of the tension between the competing rationalities of individual plans, market forces and political imperatives to accumulate power.

In terms of State-civil society relations, the starting point for impediments to integrated planning with social logics is the absence of basic opportunities to build understanding between groups and for collaboration to occur. The projects and policies studied as part of this research highlight a general lack of institutional culture or policy framework to support State-civil society integration beyond basic consultation mechanisms (governments are required to consider and provide a response to the main issues raised during the formulation of strategies and projects). Both within required consultation processes and through more informal means such as lobbying, planners highlighted that it is those with the closest links to politicians, such as the ‘development industry’ in Melbourne, or with the “loudest voices” or most “recognised and respected” (BA7) such as from large research institutes, that likely to have the greatest influence. Within this schema, it isn’t always clear how non-government actors may be involved and, in particular, how their involvement can influence policy-making or project design. For example, in the case of neighbourhood renewal programs in both Buenos Aires and Melbourne a “case-to-case or even ad-hoc” (M12) approach to engagement occurs that often facilitates project delivery, but presents confusion in community about how to become
involved, how to sustain their involvement and how to impact decision-making. While there are opportunities to broaden scope for participation by civil society groups, this can generate uncertainty for governments about the direction of planning initiatives and can raise expectations in communities. This often makes leaders wary about engagement or alliance-building initiatives. As described above, information sharing and collaboration is frequently understood to undermine political power, so policy-making often occurs with limited engagement.

In terms of State and civil society relations, the second problem relates to purpose. On the one hand, links between State and civil society actors are valued in contemporary urban governance settings with planning documentation celebrating how consultation formed a ‘central’ part of the plan development. However, in both cases there is very little detail about how decisions were made. For one Melbourne planner, strategic plans and policies are presented as if there was “universal agreement about their contents” (M18). For example, Plan Melbourne (2014) commences with the broad-brush statement that “The message from Victorians is that…” and “We have learnt that Melburnians support…” (Government of Victoria, 2014, p.1). During this process, most of the State Government’s advisory committee resigned citing a lack of rational and evidence-based planning. In Buenos Aires, the most recent Strategic Plan (2012) is described as “an instrument of planning elaborated together with the State, economic and social actors in the city” (p.3). Despite the elevation of participation in planning, its purpose is unclear and for many planners was considered superficial: this kind of agreement never exists in practice. Furthermore, many planners felt that engagement with non-State actors tended to be used predominantly for information sharing, “tweaking details” (M9) and placation, as opposed to a more genuine collaboration between actors. As one planner from Buenos Aires commented that citizen participation occurs “without conviction or meaning…it’s never a representative or fair process…(it’s like) “a pantomime that is missing the actual decision-makers” (BA4). The “agenda is predetermined and it’s often about placation” (BA23). In both contexts, though particularly in the Buenos Aires context, planners cited experiences of social or protest movements in resistance or reaction to government policy decision as far more effective at influencing policy (as described in the previous chapter) than the superficial and organised forms of engagement they were used to. For some Buenos Aires planners, this was celebrated as an alternative form of driving change through popular and “almost revolutionary processes” (BA23). This is discussed in further detail below in relation to the informal strategies and tactics of planning actors.

A range of procedural impediments can also limit the effectiveness of engagement between State and civil society actors. In this regard, planners highlighted low funding or budget allocations to engagement processes which limits the depth of discussion and debate, and fails to create lasting integrative structures. Another major operative problem is that the timeframe for engagement that leads to building understanding between actors is often at odds with policy and political processes.
which tend to favour shorter timeframes for producing results. It is also difficult for engagement processes to obtain representational fairness and mix, with a host of causal factors such as poor trust in government (including in government agencies without democratic legitimacy, such as the river basin committees in Buenos Aires or planning agencies established in Melbourne from the GAA to current VPA), poor definition of groups or representatives and busy work or care regimes of participants. Lastly, some planners who were more sceptical about the value of participation by civil society in policy-making and delivery also suggested that even when there is fair representation, budget, timeframe and support, often what people want can be contrary to reducing disadvantage or producing equitable outcomes. Examples of this were given about new social housing projects in Melbourne and stormwater management preferences in outer Buenos Aires.

**Weaknesses in leadership and legislation**
The barriers to integrated planning design and implementation described above influence the creation of secondary limitations for practice. One limitation relates to the exercise of leadership qualities. Many interviewees in Melbourne and Buenos Aires concurred that “excellent leadership” is a prerequisite for sustained integrated planning practices at the executive level, though that this was not a common occurrence. A general absence of strong leadership qualities was evidenced by “a lack in the ability to have political influence, to understand technical questions, to accept criticism, to listen to others, to compromise, to choose their timing wisely, etc.” (BA24). While interviewees commented that excellent leaders existed, they suggested in both contexts that often their leadership qualities were quashed by political manoeuvring and constrained by a rapidly changing policy context, which produce incoherencies that are unmanageable for leaders interested in social change to process, respond to and communicate. Another weakness tied to the interplay of political imperatives was “a lack of legislative definition” (BA20) and the “superposition and inconsistencies of norms and laws that create implementation challenges” (M4). Very often policy objectives sound substantial, but the prescriptions are too vague or weak to deliver lasting or broad transformations. Weak policy and legislation prescriptions were identified as the product of a “watering down” (M8) process, whereby the grounds found for compromise meant that strong policy prescriptions became weaker through the influence of lobbying efforts as well as political trade-offs.

**Skills, training deficits and budget limits**
In addition to leadership challenges, other planners identified lack of skills and training for integrated approaches to planning as a barrier to effective practices with social logics. Policies can be “difficult to implement because of human and budgetary resource deficits” (BA15). Lack of skills and inadequate budgets create myriad problems in practice. It can produce poorly conceived projects, for example that miss critical questions for reducing disadvantage, such as “economic development”
problem relates to project scope, whereby financial and human resource shortages leave only micro-scale interventions in relation to macro-level problems. This problem was particularly acute in the Buenos Aires context, where “many government offices don’t have the budget nor the capacity, they are left to address day-to-day issues, to putting out fires” (BA19). As another explained “it’s difficult, because we can only operate at the micro-level with limited budgets…we might make a difference to one family or a group of families, but this doesn’t generate a transformation from the nucleus of the problem, it is really just mitigating pre-existing problems” (BA15). In this regard, some planners working in poorer jurisdictions described situations where budget limitations deepen inequalities because poor households access underfunded infrastructure and services like public schools and hospitals compared to the private services utilised by higher income households. “This has meant that social groups don’t cross paths in the way they used to and that our capacity of social integration is deeply diminished at the start of a project” (BA19). This problem is the product of contemporary, neoliberal planning approaches in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires, which are more strategic and spatially targeted (Albrechts, 2004) relative to past comprehensive approaches and which reduce the scope for structural transformation of social conditions because of competing rationalities.

Informal strategies of ‘missionary’ planners
The results presented above suggest that there are two kinds of barriers faced to applying social logics in contemporary integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. First, there are challenges faced in devising and delivering urban policy in contexts of competing rationalities, in particular between the dominant market logic, political interests to accumulate power and the everyday use value of cities sought by citizens in preserving or enhancing their quality of life. Second, there are operational, institutional and contextual factors that negatively affect the possibility of advancing social logics in integrated planning, such as weak institutional frames, inconsistent norms and inadequate budgets. Many of these factors remain outside the direct control of individual planners, for example the lack of legislative definition or superposition and inconsistencies of norms as well as practical limits of vertical and horizontal integration, require multiple actors and processes to be redressed. Nevertheless, planners often develop strategies to work within the limits of practice realities in ways that circumvent or help to break down some of the barriers faced.

Planning actors who are able to operate in this way, marrying technical and political skills, have been named ‘missionary’ (Hillier, 2002) planners. They are ‘virtuous actors’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) with experience in making practical judgments about what is possible. They are able to reason and act politically so that they might be able to “bend the course of events” (Matus, 2008, p. 4). Therefore, and as conceptualised in the theoretical framework (Chapter 3), effective planning action not only
requires knowing what to aim for (i.e. the pursuit of social logics), but also knowing how to move from principles to action and ‘doing’ (Davoudi, 2015). This applies in all settings in terms of broadening the possibility for integrated planning with social logics, but is especially true in contexts with competing planning rationalities and when there are multiple barriers to operating with social logics. The following section details the specific characteristics of ‘missionary’ planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, as well as the qualities that highlight their practical wisdom in action.

The characteristics of ‘missionary’ planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires

In both contexts, planners underscored that “it can often come down to individuals” (M4) or “personalities” (BA11) and their ability to think and then act “pragmatically” (BA13) and “politically” (BA19) in urban policy. These comments align with the characterisation of ‘missionary’ (Hillier, 2002) planners able to “to think and act politically” (Forester, 1989, p. 7) as characterised in the literature. When further interrogated as part of the interview process, the reasons for political actions to be made by individual planners were often attributed to “weak institutional structures” (BA24) in Buenos Aires or “weak governance arrangements” (M8) in Melbourne, including the fragility of formal structures in a highly politicised and fluctuating planning and urban policy environment. As one Argentine interviewee reflected:

…in a way we are very schizophrenic, we oscillate between denouncing institutional weaknesses like the lack of coordination and acting with political realism because coordination is impracticable… and so what is left is pragmatism, groups of planners trying to respond to specific problems and take advantage of opportunities driven by a pragmatic attitude (BA1).

In the schema of competing rationalities and institutional weaknesses for reducing disadvantage, accounts by planners shed light on four important characteristics of ‘missionary’ planning in the studied environments. The first is the ability to be a reflective practitioner, to “permanently reflect on technical and political questions” (BA11) and to take the important step, as one planner pointed out, to “ask a moral, political and ethical question, which is, why or whom do I serve?” (BA13). Once a planner decides to work “in function of the redistribution of wealth and to generate greater equality of opportunities” (BA4), it is necessary for them to be equipped with a “coherent conceptual framework” (M13) that guides their understanding of the practice reality they encounter as well as their actions. This is essential because it helps a planner to “confront and administer conflicts between competing rationalities” (BA13). Interviewees unanimously agreed in Melbourne and Buenos Aires that TSL was ideal for this conceptual basis when it was introduced to them as a possible framework for pursuing social transformation through planning.
Second, it is then necessary for planners individually and many times collectively to possess certain characteristics that enable them to act effectively. In this regard, and like characterisations made by some authors (inter alia: Forester, 1989; Hillier, 2002; Matus, 2008), planners from the case contexts described personality traits akin to creativity, persistence, ingenuity, resourcefulness and adaptability. Lastly, once an individual “realises that political strategies are extremely important” (M18) in contexts of competing rationalities, they need to be able to mobilise many ‘tools’ and ‘tactics’ in addition to traditional forms of “regulation” in planning (M1). Sometimes, as a small number of planners argued, a kind of “Machiavellian realism” is needed, a belief that “the end can often justify the means” (B10).

In terms of creatively pursuing social logics through integrated planning, one theme recurrently emerged in the stories recounted by planners in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires. There was broad agreement among the interviewees that practices of integrated planning for reducing disadvantage are generally weakened through a lack of specificity and inconsistencies on how to deliver policy goals or in what way to monitor and measure success. For example, very rarely are targets set in either context (Melbourne 2030 was one named exception). While at a general level this poses a barrier to comprehensively addressing disadvantage (for example through the lack of metropolitan-wide targets for social housing or public space), it provides an opportunity for planners to create localised mechanisms and devise projects that support specific policy implementation. This requires, “creativity and imagination and preparedness to be bold and get on with it is really important” (M13). Planners described many projects that were created in this way to further social logics. In one example, a local government planner from an outer municipality of Buenos Aires (BA9) had identified an opportunity for more households to access subsidised credits by legalising existing duplex developments, which had been excluded because only one dwelling was previously allowed on each lot. This served to formalise existing conditions, raise more revenue through local rates and ensure equitable access to the credit program. In Melbourne, planners described small initiatives like community mural painting or gardens as micro-interventions to support encounter, as well as larger programs including a local government social housing initiative achieved because planners internally advocated for public land to be donated to a community housing organisation (M11, M18). Overall, ‘missionary’ planning actors in Melbourne and Buenos Aires reason politically and act creatively and pragmatically when faced with weak formal structures for integrated planning with social logics. Their multiple strategies and tactics for effective action are described below.

Characterise the actors responsible for influencing policy-making processes
The first strategy commented on by planning actors in Melbourne and Buenos Aires relates to context. This echoes findings from planning literature, in which for example Hillier (2002) has found that “a
planner’s knowledge of a range of contextual factors is indispensable for agile phronetic action in ‘power-full’ settings” (p.22). Certainly, however, in Melbourne and Buenos Aires the most important contextual consideration is to characterise the actors responsible for influencing policy-making processes and strategise accordingly. As one leading Buenos Aires planner commented:

the most important thing is to have characterised well the actors who are responsible for administering the conflict of planning (competing rationalities), you need a very good characterisation of who the actors are and what their role is in this conflict…this will help to reveal the dimensions of power at play, like resources and legal competencies, and how they can be put to action.

Or as another from Melbourne commented, “…planning is not a technical process. Reality will hit you like a bus. You find yourself in the trenches and before getting to the technical grit you must know the actors and develop an ability to predict their plays” (M9). Through stories told by urban planners in both contexts, it was revealed that knowing actors’ “decision-making style” (BA21), their resources, “their support-base” (M8) and who they are likely to align with in decision-making, as well as to recognise their “different interests” (BA20), motivations, goals and values provides a useful basis for efficacious action. Specifically, understanding these traits of powerful actors enables planners to “anticipate” (BA7) or “predict” (M13) actions and responses. Then, when the actors are well surveyed, it is possible to act politically so as to know when to “move into advocacy mode or when to compromise” (M4) or when “to be flexible in seeking out concessions for goals like redistribution” (BA5) and to help “join-up interests between actors” (M12), as well as to know the “kind of information that can be used to make a difference” (M6) in advancing social logics. These strategies are further elaborated on below.

**Time actions opportunistically**

With broad knowledge about the actors who have the greatest influence on policy-making, the next tactic employed by planners is to be opportunistic or ‘strategic’ about the timing of specific actions to pursue social logics. As one planner from Buenos Aires commented, “it’s like playing black jack: you have a number of moves and you figure out when is the right time to play each one” (BA13). As described in the previous chapter, change is more easily pursued under conditions of opportunity. “There’s a Carpe Diem factor in all of this: You’ve got a political moment and an opportunity and you actually have to make it happen then” (M13). However, stories by interviewees suggest that the soft skill required relates to recognising and acting in fact before the opportunity arises. It is about identifying “emerging dynamics of transformation, perhaps the ideas of a leader, perhaps of the people, or something in the media, maybe a change in legislation” (BA23). Opportunities may also emerge from “rare, new and potentially fragile alliances” (BA14), for example as identified by planners between cultural, arts and commercial sectors in opposition to large-scale retail
developments in Buenos Aires, or between environmental and farming interests in the urban periphery of Melbourne.

This study observed that an experienced planner detects these trends and chooses opportune moments to act. Examples included introducing new ideas to improve existing projects or propose new projects, by interrupting a technical study to respond to new opportunities or challenges, or by increasing the scope or impact of a particular policy objective where the political appetite appears to be sufficiently great to oppose likely resistance and sustain ensuing conflicts. When favourable tendencies emerge, interviewees talked about the need to be “swift and prepared” (M16). As one senior bureaucrat in Melbourne commented, “…you should have a folder of reports and ‘shovel-ready’ projects, and numbers at hand so you can pull it out when required…I’ve got like a repertoire…and say, alright, I’ll play that card now, which might serve to refute false facts or to put something new on the table at the right time” (M9). Or as one planner from Buenos Aires commented, “success in planning is about the right person being in the right place at the right time” (BA7). In this regard, planners described experiences of responding quickly to unexpected stimulus funding in both Melbourne and Buenos Aires. In these cases, they found indirect funding solutions for social housing through family violence, refugee settlement and disability funding in Melbourne, or for infrastructure upgrading as a result of environmental management funding from international organisations in Buenos Aires.

**Communicative action: using data and language discerningly**

The issue of data quality and its use was a recurrent theme for most planners interviewed as part of this research. High quality data ensures planners can develop a “strong foundation” (BA14) and a “register of the processes at hand and their impact in the city clearly” (BA7). “Knowledge of the reality can be a source of power for you…being able to explain what is happening and what is likely to happen in the future is an important force in changing views” (BA13). In this regard, interviewees described five more conventional communicative strategies around the use of data as well as other less well known or regarded tactics.

First, it is important not to just accumulate data for analysis, but to use it in a way that is “concise” (M9) and functions to “simplify complex processes” (BA20). Secondly, and in order to shift perspectives and develop convincing arguments, it is important to employ “language, perspectives and data” (M4) that those who influence decision-makers understand and find relevant (M4). To influence public policy (BA4) it may be necessary to “use the same evidence but present it in difference ways to different audiences” (M4). Using data and language in a way that is meaningful for its audience means responding to political contexts, discourses and processes. For example, for policy decision-makers “you need to know what the headline pressure points are, for example disability, and bring
those things to the fore in your analysis...The mastery of doing this is trying to shape some things that are clunky or focused in one area and you try to shape them into something else” (M9). The third strategy is to communicate “the issues in a way that is useful for them to be able to do their job...many times they want to act, because it’s not like they don’t care, they just need to find a way and to have a rationale for doing things which will garner support and manage power (M2).”

The fourth strategy relates to developing counter-arguments. Most interviewees reiterated the importance of planners having comprehensive data, a “full understanding” (BA4), so that when false points are made or incoherent arguments presented, planning actors can be in a position to “ ask questions because what others are saying might be backed up by facts, but most of the time it’s not. Make sure you then have counter-facts to change the discussion focus...you can draw them into the issue in a polite yet very conscious way” (M9). In this regard, planners’ commentary from experiences in Melbourne and Buenos Aires highlight how communicative action can be used in an effort to equalise debate, in hope that “the force of argument can be the deciding factor rather than an individual’s power or status in some pre-existing hierarchy” (Sandercock, 1975, p. 96). The fifth tactic was to use comparison strategically. Comparison was described as a powerful way to use data for developing persuasive arguments for political gain. For example, “in Australia it’s very powerful in government world to compare states...Victoria moved on its housing strategy now for example because decision-makers were briefed on what NSW was doing and they were like “we can’t be shamed by that” (M9). Or as one senior Buenos Aires based planner suggested, comparison can be used to pose the question, “Can you see the inadequacies of what we’re doing now?...So you’re not trying to present people with something that’s a fantasy, but to say to them that the reality can be different.”

Interviewees also described more radical approaches to the use of data and argumentation. For example, a more subversive tactic used by planners is to highlight “findings that support reducing disadvantage” (M3) and “not to communicate” information which does not add to this cause (BA5). Another common tactic is to ensure that the full possible impact of not acting or continuing down a ‘business-as-usual path’ is made clear. In this regard, “it’s literally about showing them that they’re sleeping on the job in some aspects. If they don’t do something about it, you’ve got to make it a clear conscious decision for them not to do something.” (M9). Often for this to be convincing the possible cost of inaction is communicated for “shock effect” (BA16). Overall, “communication is an important strategy if you want to move from the technical to the political” (BA7). Another tactic is to use traditional and social media as tool for debate and legitimation when possible. “The role of communication mediums is now central...it is a matter of finding ways for this medium in terms of questioning and building understanding, not affirmations of the market” (BA13). Leaking materials about regressive policy initiatives to interested groups, such as welfare advocacy groups, was one
more extreme example. Another was to make information available through publicly accessible mediums, such as professional journals then social media, that clearly identifies the policy issues with “lived problems” (M17), in a way that “makes the problem visible to build interest and support” (M9). Some interviewees described personal experiences whereby convincing arguments and easily accessible information about social issues in some professional mediums or mixed journals, like The Conversation in Australia and Café de las Ciudades in Argentina, have then been translated into news stories in traditional press. Overall, the aim is to “raise awareness that becomes demands on politicians for action” (BA19). In this regard, using popular media appears to work toward what Forester once described as the “political democratization of daily communications” in planning (Forester, 1989, p.21) and may play role in 'consciousness-raising’ (Haugaard, 2012) as well as generating “counterpublic discourses which….influence public and social policy relevant to cities and their inhabitants” (Wolf-power, 2009, p.163).

Build like-minded coalitions
Planners interviewed as part of this research described experiences of coalition-building to grow support for reducing disadvantage as well as the role of these alliances for effecting policy change. In both case contexts, stories were recounted of the way “like-minded” (M17) coalitions have been created, such as between different non-profit organisations and neighbourhood groups to contest private development or public infrastructure proposals, but also as part of State-led initiatives, for example to respond to food insecurity in Melbourne’s west. These coalitions may form from unlikely groupings, such as between environmental activists and housing associations coming together to prosecute government inaction on informal settlement upgrading in Buenos Aires. They require already organised social groups for fast integration. Also, planners from both Melbourne and Buenos Aires described the creation of informal professional coalitions for sharing knowledge and developing tools for reducing disadvantage, such as the Growth Area Social Planning Tool in Melbourne and a planning policy review group in outer Buenos Aires. Both experiences were born out of frustration in dealing with private interests and a desire to build a shared and powerful tool for pursuing social objectives. This reprises Flyvbjerg’s argument that to be an effective political actor it is necessary to “team up with like-minded people and fight for what you want, utilizing the means which work in your context” (1998, p.236). Such groupings may occur between similar interest or diverse groups, such as government bodies, social service providers and local businesses to address localised issues. Interviewees suggested that planners may be protagonists in forming coalitions of shared interests, or interact with these groupings to facilitate collective mobilisation through formal or informal channels when opportunities arise to reduce disadvantage.
In Buenos Aires, planners commented frequently on one type of coalition that was not mentioned in the Melbourne experience. It was the role of university-led coalitions. For example, Habitar Argentina was created in 2009 as “a collective space for organisations, academic institutions, social movements and legislators working towards the objective to generate a normative framework that guarantees the right to housing, land and habitat for all” (Habitar Argentina, 2016). From this space, a Bill for Just Access to Housing 2012 was introduced and passed into law in the Province of Buenos Aires that requires a percentage of all new private developments to make a land contribution for social housing. Planners interviewed as part of this research described this kind of initiative as important to “control and guide the market” (BA9), especially from within public and free access universities that offer a “neutral and democratising space” for debate (BA4). Planners there spoke of the important “voice of authority” and the “ability to influence public policy from universities” (BA15), for example through the creation of ‘observatories’ (e.g. at the National University of San Martin) or ‘think tanks’ that study urban questions and policy, for example focused specifically on the conurbation of Buenos Aires (e.g. at the National University of General Sarmiento). The strong, practice role of universities was linked to the “fragmented” character of urban governance, in which “a State that used to tie together the threads of metropolitan planning with infrastructure, policy, public works, etc., no longer existed…Instead, where “gaps emerged” and “demands were raised” universities “became dynamic actors,” “generating social, ideological and political commitments” in society (BA1) or “legitimating social practices through research” (BA3). In this regard, “universities can play an important role in invigorating public agendas and debates” (BA1), but also in the development of urban plans and projects contracted by somewhat ‘hollowed-out’ administrations (BA3). In the case of Buenos Aires, this strategy was described as particularly important for going beyond the need for awareness-raising and engagement by universities, but also to the creation of viable alternatives where the State has otherwise been relatively absent.

Know the lived experiences of and work for the disadvantaged
Experienced planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires highlighted the unrivalled role of getting close to the reality of disadvantaged groups as a strategy for becoming an effective planner (M4, M9, M12, M14, M17; BA5, BA7, BA13, BA20, BA21). In contexts with widening social divides, it is common for planners’ lives to be very removed from those who experience entrenched disadvantage. Interviewees described learning about the lived experiences of social problems from working with disadvantaged people to inform their planning work with social logics. Experiences described included observing or assisting social organisations, in Melbourne for example through an interfaith network that brings together people from conflict torn regions or in Buenos Aires by helping informal settlement neighbourhood groups in land use planning and development, or providing information and advising workers from the many ‘recuperated’ factories. Another shared phenomenon between both
cities and the creative practices of planners was to conceive of and use different forms of policy-promoted participation in political ways that raise awareness and expectations in community about issues as well as to provide opportunities for skill transfer and social support, for example through youth engagement.

Planners from both contexts, though particularly in Buenos Aires, described how such forms of participation could occur not only within their formal roles, but also in more clandestine ways. In this regard, some such activities described appear to constitute what has been termed ‘alternative building’ (Young, 2001) and engaging in ‘direct struggles’ (Flyvbjerg, Landman, & Schram, 2012). Acting as critical agents in direct experience with disadvantaged groups will also be of use “later in your career, to know when to cede, when to negotiate, when to push and how to manage time…this is learning politics that a technocrat doesn’t normally understand” (M4). It’s also an opportunity to “form relations and form part of generational political change…by getting to know your community, galvanise support for citizen demands, even link up officially or in clandestine ways to social movements, for example through sharing information for lobbying” (BA21). This kind of ‘activist planning’ (Miraftab et al., 2015; Yiftachel, 2001) was explained by one Buenos Aires planner to occur because “sometimes the political class will accompany you, sometimes they will throw stones at you” (BA21). While this study focused on planners’ own perspectives, this final strategy raises the pertinent question of how non-professional activists view the planning process and role of the state.

Conclusion

The combination of findings presented over this and the previous chapter respond to my second research question about uncovering the formal structures and informal strategies that support integrated planning with social logics. The first major finding was a deep congruence between the cases in responding to this question because of the foundational question of deep(er in Buenos Aires) and frequent politico-institutional changes. From this basis, the opportunities that arise for integrated planning practices with social logics are often fleeting and almost always created through political and even unintended scenarios. Opportunity scenarios have included a commitment to social justice as part of a party-political agenda; the possibility to sway this agenda through external pressure; the political alignment of different tiers of government; as well as when no other alternative is available or positive outcomes are ensured for all stakeholders taking part in the integrated approach. While some conditions were revealed to support integrated planning implementation, such as special purpose entities, the challenges that exist in both settings combine to undermine the introduction and efficacy of transformative practices. This chapter (6) was dedicated to critically examining these challenges and highlighting the role of individual agency and skills in navigating around these barriers.
The major challenge for integrated planning practices with social logics relates to the interplay of distinct rationalities driving urban development. While it is commonly accepted that planning is a negotiated and iterative process that is moulded or oriented in line with diverse rationalities, the competition between these driving forces in Melbourne and Buenos Aires has unique ramifications on integrated planning practices. This is because each urban governance setting is relatively fragmented without firm politico-institutional structures for urban policy, each turbulent moment, from a change in administration to the emergence of a new reality, can destabilise integrated planning efforts and the associated social logics. Within this context, the economic rationality behind private land development interests often subverts political forces and can overpower alternative voices, including about the plans and aims of individuals, households and communities. Compounding this underlying condition are myriad operational challenges to integrated planning with social logics, such as ‘turf protection’ over horizontal integration and budget limitations. Where social logics have prevailed in creating and sustaining integrated planning practices, the ‘tacit skills’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) of ‘missionary planners’ (Hillier, 2002) have played a vital role.

This research uncovers the strategies and tactics employed by urban policy agents in navigating the fragile and fluctuating politico-institutional settings of Melbourne and Buenos Aires. The investigation distils the specific strategies and tactics that support ‘phronesis’ or ‘practical wisdom’ (Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Hillier, 2002) for creating and implementing integrated planning with social logics. It revealed the reflexive, strategic and creative characteristics of agile planning actors. Their particular strategies encompass analysing, characterising and responding to contextual features, including the decision-making tendencies and resource capabilities of key policy actors. They also are adept at strategically timing their actions and communicating their arguments to shape policy decision-making. More or less openly, they work to build coalitions of support, sometimes in direct relationship with the communities they serve and with knowledge about the lived experience of disadvantage. Given the findings presented over the thesis, I argue that there are grounds to support modifications to integrated planning practices for reducing disadvantage and to extend the theory of social logics based on applied phronesis. The next chapter offers practice recommendations to this effect while the final chapter proposes extending the decision rules for operating with social logics in urban policy contexts with shifting politico-institutional structures.
Chapter 7. Practice-centred recommendations

Introduction
This comparative study of integrated planning with social logics in Melbourne and Buenos Aires has uncovered multiple grounds for modifying practice approaches in planning. This chapter extends the discussion of the research findings presented over the preceding chapters and responds to my final research question by explicating what modifications to integrated planning practices are recommendable and practicable. The reported findings revealed the nature of everyday governance settings and the influences behind policy decision-making, as well as the specific strategies and tactics used by planners in these contexts in shaping and implementing social logics. With this knowledge, it is now possible to move beyond the explanation of these planning realities to offer insights about which formal structures and informal strategies might be effective in future scenarios of integrated planning with social logics in both cities.

Similar to the foregoing discussion, this chapter is also structured in an empirically unified way, providing critical reflections and recommendations that are generally applicable to both case contexts. The intertwined approach responds to a major, comparative finding of this research: because of similar politico-institutional dynamics in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, the process of integrated planning policy definition and implementation was found to bear many congruencies. In particular, while efficacious experiences of integrated planning for the reduction of disadvantage have occurred in both settings, they have transpired at intermittent intervals over at least the last two decades. Compared to other social policy areas, such as education and health which have predominantly fixed and continuous funding approaches in both contexts (with large, relatively fixed budgets), urban policy has proven to be irregular and often ad hoc in definition and delivery. Instead, approaches to urban policy are defined more by trending political issues, as well as individual skills and actions, than by foreseeable, intra-administrational policy processes and governance structures.

As revealed over earlier chapters, this common ground is a product of two base conditions. The first is the nature of the system of government and related organising principles of policy-making: both federal systems can be characterised by a strong vertical fiscal imbalance with entrenched ‘command and control’ approaches from higher levels of government as well as horizontal competition between governments and policy areas. Public spending in urban policy depends on the interests, commitments and agreements made often at higher levels of government in contexts which can change abruptly. Secondly, fluctuating political contexts for urban policy-making are created because policy isn’t always made within coherent ideological frameworks (in fact internal contradiction seems to characterise party political traditions in both contexts), but is instead driven by the pursuit of electoral
influence (i.e. through clientelism). While internal contradiction is common in the political traditions of both contexts, the pendulum swings far wider in Buenos Aires. Or as one Australian planning expert noted after a recent visit to Argentina:

Political outcomes seem to be the result of strange dynamics featuring personality ‘cults’ and favours brokerage, whereby independent aspirant politicians will fluidly align and disalign with particular ‘party’ agendas depending on what they can win on behalf of their local constituency and patrons. The same nominal party – for example, the Peronists – can be occupying what we might regard as opposite ends of the political spectrum when in power. That is, the Peronists have been champions of both liberal market reforms (as in the Menem period of 1989 to 1999) and highly interventionist socialist programs (as in the most recent tenure via Christina Fernandez de Kirchner (2007 - 2015)). This, one might say, sounds like the Australian Labor Party? Yes, but to a level of internal contradiction that is unfathomable even by the labyrinthine standards of the ALP (Spiller, 2017, p.7).

The influence of electoral politics has meant that administrations and political parties of different persuasions can shift positions when a new reality emerges. However, for the purposes of this discussion on recommended modifications to future integrated planning initiatives, it should be noted that the pace and depth of change between different administrations or in response to a new reality has been different in each case context. In Melbourne, change tends to be comparatively steady because parliamentary process and general law abidance often ensures that existing contracts and funded policies are delivered. Furthermore, decision-makers tend to exhibit a pragmatic approach whereby existing obligations are met and political fallout is carefully managed. In Buenos Aires, politicians benefit from their pragmatism and instead garner support more because of their political ideas and statements of intent, which in turn seems to give them licence to arbitrarily effect more abrupt change, including deeper institutional changes. Given this dynamic, one important difference then is that policy commitments to social improvement are held and delivered with more vigour in Melbourne, while in Buenos Aires they may be introduced or disregarded more abruptly.

Urban policy-making and implementation in Melbourne and Buenos Aires has been long enmeshed within a context of political traditions where interests and then policy objectives can change quickly. The nature of this path dependency in urban policy-making means that social norms can be pursued both through fleeting, individual government efforts as well as the highly efficacious practices of well-trained individuals, who are adept at responding to this fluctuating policy context when they reason and act. However, as the reflections and recommendations below suggest, the integrated examination of these contexts offers insights into two versions of the same fluctuating reality, with greater extremes in urban policy definition and implementation in Buenos Aires. They both reflect the shift towards neoliberalisation, though retention of social protection and investment has been more
steadfast and comprehensive in Melbourne. The chapter is divided into two sections with the first focusing on formal politico-institutional strategies for integrated planning with social logics, while the second describes the features of governance settings that offer opportunities for individual actors as well as the types of abilities required to pursue social logics in integrated planning. This focus acknowledges that integrated planning in both contexts is a State-led activity, offering recommendations for State-led initiatives and planning actors embedded in definition and delivery processes.

Politico-institutional strategies for integrated planning with social logics

**Background: developing and implementing operable strategies**
This section offers some principles for planning actors to devise operable political and governance strategies for integrated planning that aims to reduce disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. These strategies promote incremental change to break down or navigate around the multiple barriers found in practice settings so that the social logics of redistribution, recognition and encounter may be effected through integrated planning. More aspiring, transformative strategies are likely to fail at restructuring the underlying conditions that produce barriers to planning for reducing disadvantage because of the tumultuous traditions of urban policy in both contexts. Instead, targeted, smaller-scale strategies have proven to deliver some transformative effects in the case contexts over time. Or as one planning expert from Buenos Aires states, “here you have to win the small battles to win the war” (BA13). This section details some of these strategies to develop effective practices of integrated planning that incrementally reduce disadvantage.

Effective practice for combating disadvantage through the application of social logics requires first an understanding about where and how disadvantage is experienced (M4, M9, M12, M14, M17; BA5, BA7, BA13, BA20, BA21). As described in Chapter 3, disadvantaged households in Melbourne and Buenos Aires have low incomes and may experience other forms of social exclusion (e.g. racial discrimination). They are usually spatially concentrated in areas of ‘locational disadvantage,’ where “the bundle of services and facilities it offers its residents is substandard” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 31). Both Melbourne and Buenos Aires therefore have geographic areas that are relatively advantaged or disadvantaged, with households that are enabled or limited by their urban conditions. Because of the spatial concentration of disadvantaged households in neighbourhoods that possess conditions that reproduce disadvantage, spatial planning and urban policy broadly can be used as a tool for improving quality of life outcomes. Urban policy can deliver more equitable access to opportunities and services across cities.
For formal policy definition, one way to conceive of redressing disadvantage and delivering equitable urban outcomes, as argued in this thesis, is to develop planning policy and urban projects with ‘social logics’ (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). The first social logic is redistribution, which can be applied to redress material inequalities through planning. Planning authors have variously argued for a more equitable distribution of resources, facilities, services and opportunities (inter alia Fainstein, 2010; McConnell, 1981; Smith, 1994; Young, 1990), in a way that reflects social needs (Davies, 1968) and benefits the least advantaged territories (Harvey, 1973). More radically, others have suggested that redistribution should be used to prevent excessive concentrations of wealth and property (Fainstein, 2010; Harvey, 2001). The second social logic is ‘recognition’ (Fincher & Iveson, 2008), which promotes equitable and active participation in urban social life, including the political and policy-making aspects of city administration (Dikec, 2009; Fraser & Honneth, 2003). The aim of recognition is to promote inclusion, political equality and the capacity for self-expression of ‘multiple publics’ (Sandercock, 1998b) as well as to reduce discrimination (Fraser, 1997; Soja, 2010; Young, 1990). The final social logic is ‘encounter’ (Amin & Thrift, 2002; Fincher & Iveson, 2008), which fosters interaction between different social and cultural groups (Fraser, 1995). The aim is to support diversity without exclusion through the provision of congenial sites (Jacobs, 1961) for a range of activities and encounters between a ‘heterogeneous public’ (Sandercock, 1998b). Together these social logics provide a coherent conceptual framework to guide integrated planning action in the cause of redressing disadvantage.

However, the task of operating with these social logics in integrated planning is challenged by myriad factors (explored in Chapter 6) and is enabled only under specific circumstances (explored in Chapter 5). In particular, there are three competing rationalities that influence urban policy-making and implementation: a market logic, which seeks out opportunities to commodify urban spaces, individual plans to improve quality of life, and the rationality of the State, which is primarily to influence electoral outcomes. Urban policy-making is influenced by agreement or antagonism between these rationalities, usually with a preference for market-based approaches that limit the scope for the application of social logics in planning. They are only intermittently applied in both case contexts under certain favourable conditions, including when there is a political platform focused on reducing inequality or enough external pressure to influence the policy agenda in this direction, typically through a crisis-led tipping point. Implementation of integrated planning is then more easily facilitated when there is political alignment between different levels of government or when there is a clear win-win scenario for the actors involved (e.g. budget savings). It is not a requirement for integrated planning to occur under these opportunity scenarios, but the introduction and delivery of initiatives will be more straightforward, including through overcoming or (often temporarily) circumventing some of the barriers associated with the disparate rationalities that drive urbanisation in
both cities. The following recommendations, however, are suited to action under opportunity scenarios for integrated planning with social logics.

**Recommendation One. Provide clear policy definition of integrated planning**

There was unanimous agreement among interviewees that integrated planning is a vaguely used policy trope in both contexts and planning literature provides wide interpretations of the concept (as described in Chapter 2). Definitional ambiguity in policy hinders effective practice for reducing disadvantage because the roles ascribed to actors and the elements to support integration are unclear. Strategic policy intents frequently overstate the ambition of integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, for example from unrealistic ‘whole-of-government’ approaches to methods of collaboration that broadly include ‘the private sector,’ to deliver ‘intersectoral action’ and ‘policy integration’ that links up issues as they play out in generally defined places. For more effective practice application, policy documents should stipulate which elements of integrated planning are to be engaged (e.g. what kind of spatial integration? which actors are to be involved when and how?) following a standard framework for each setting, such as the framework developed in this thesis (Table 2.1, copied below). Inconsistencies within legislative or policy frameworks for integrated planning to reduce disadvantage should be removed and clear parameters incorporated that promote integrated planning. It should be clear in measurable ways which policy objectives or elements are to be connected (e.g. social or environmental goals, housing or transport issues), how different levels and areas of government and their resources will be involved (e.g. budgets, regulatory controls) over what timeframe as well as which stakeholders will be engaged to develop and implement the strategy in which specific geographic area.
**Repetition of Table 2.1. Basic Conceptual Framework of Contemporary Integrated Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of integration</th>
<th>Focus of integration</th>
<th>Objectives of integration</th>
<th>Integration characteristics</th>
<th>Practice examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial integration</td>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>Maximise beneficial</td>
<td>Integration between land</td>
<td>Integrated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interactions between land uses and activities.</td>
<td>uses and activities considered.</td>
<td>use and transport planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overcome territorial</td>
<td>Cross-boundary planning.</td>
<td>Standardisation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disjointedness and physical barriers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>municipal norms in metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage specific places,</td>
<td>Strategic and targeted</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes to redress</td>
<td>place-based interventions, bringing Together multiple actors.</td>
<td>renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disadvantage and segregation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrate public policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>objectives in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Actor interrelations     | Vertical             | Deliver joint action      | Downward command &         | Responsibilities |
|                          |                      | between different tiers of government. | control. | enshrined in law. |
|                          |                      |                            |                            |                  |
|                          | Horizontal           | Deliver cross-sectoral    | Cooperation and negotiation between public actors. | Cabinet or policy working committees/groups. |
|                          |                      | public policy within or   |                            |                  |
|                          |                      | between the same level/s of government. |                            |                  |
|                          | State-society        | Deliver public policy      | Two-way interactions       | Public-Private Partnerships. Ministerial advisory councils |
|                          |                      | between public, private and civil society. | between the State and non-government actors. |                  |

Source: Author, 2017

**Recommendation two. Deliver relational models of governance for long-term projects**

Despite the ambition of relational models of governance, there are few lasting experiences of integration between different government and non-government actors for integrated planning for reducing disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Interviewees from both case contexts reported experiences of connection between these actors in urban policy, such as through stakeholder engagement, contracting out of public services or through more informal routes such as lobbying. However, delivering integrated planning over long implementation timeframes through networks of multiple stakeholders has presented challenges in the urban policy settings of Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Some interviewees suggested that this was best illustrated by the many failed and ever-morphing attempts at establishing metropolitan-level planning authorities in each city (M3, M8, M10; BA4, BA11). Instead, urban governance settings were demonstrates to change quickly as a result of a new reality emerging or the confluence of different actor rationalities (Chapter 5 and Chapter 6).

This investigation found that exceptions to this reality have emerged when strong governance arrangements are in place that institute collaborative mechanisms for reducing disadvantage. The following three mechanisms have proven successful in the case contexts for supporting relational models of governance and have been more successful at supporting initiatives beyond an
administrations tenure than singular, department-led projects. They are advised together with other recommendations to promote actor interrelations for specific initiatives under current conditions:

1. give collaboration **strong project-based policy, legislative, and/or legal backing** (e.g. project specific, policy-backed collaboration as evidenced in the Revitalising Central Geelong Partnership between state and local government authorities in Victoria, and the ACUMAR in Buenos Aires that was created following the 2006 court ruling for collective resolution of planning and contamination issues along the Matanza-Riachuelo River by all tiers of government, private enterprise including manufacturing industries and civil society groups).

2. deliver relational governance modes through **arms-length, special purpose bodies**. Arms-length government bodies have delivered long-term (beyond 20 years) integrated planning projects in both case contexts because they have survived changes in administration (though not always without changes in resourcing and scope). This model has been successful in some projects implemented by Development Victoria (previously known as VicUrban or Places Victoria), such as the Revitalising Central Dandenong plan, and development corporations in Buenos Aires, especially the Puerto Madero Corporation, which was universally regarded as a successful implementation model by interviewees. Both examples offer solutions that could be tried in Melbourne or Buenos Aires for future integrated planning initiatives that aim to reduce disadvantage.

**Figure 7.1. Features that support long term integrated planning**

- Development Victoria
  - Dedicated, place-embedded, multi-disciplinary project teams (in-house).
  - Project specific working groups and boards with mixed representation (State, local governments, non-government)
  - Majority project budget allocations invested early (minimal risk / burden to future administrations). Multiple funding sources (all governments, private)
  - Social objectives enshrined in feasibility studies, legislation, master plans
  - Clear paths to regulatory approvals (e.g. streamlined processes, exceptions)

- Puerto Madero Corporation
  - Permanant governance board with equal mixed representation (Federal, local governments, private sector)
  - Strong, respected leader
  - Autonomous and wide scope to raise and manage project finance (i.e. land allocations, lending capacity)
  - Social objectives enshrined in feasibility study, legislation, master plan.
  - Clear paths to regulatory approvals, (e.g. streamlined processes, exceptions)

Source: author, 2017
3. **institutionalise working groups** tasked with flexible and collaborative working arrangements to reduce disadvantage. Experiences of working groups (e.g. inter-ministerial groups, neighbourhood action groups, regional management forums, metropolitan committees, multidisciplinary roundtables, issue advice boards) have supported integrated planning initiatives with social logics in both contexts. In particular, they have been used with government and at times non-government representatives to build understanding and find consensual solutions to specific urban, social problems (e.g. development of housing policy between State ministries or inter-faith understanding and planning religious facilities in different outer Melbourne municipalities) or to support implementation of place-based strategies (e.g. community ‘roundtables’ to participate in and monitor neighbourhood improvement program PROMEBA in Buenos Aires). This research found that it is important for leaders (i.e. ministers, directors) to promote this kind of collaborative approach, to assign budget for personnel involvement and for people with decision-making roles or influence from different sectors to be involved, such as advisors, department executives, business owners and community leaders). This multi-sectoral approach has helped build understanding, expectations and commitments between groups, as well as to safeguard collaboration on social issues when government administrations (and interests) change.

A fourth opportunity to deliver relational models of governance through formal structures relates to creatively connecting with non-State actors through new encounters and alliances. This, however, has occurred despite strong governance arrangements. Nevertheless, shifts in governance have created greater opportunities for engagement and partnerships in integrated planning with social logics. Policy prescriptions tend to vaguely support engagement and unique experiences of encounters between State and non-State actors provide inspiration for pursuing new forms of alliance-making. For example, the university-led coalition *Habitar Argentina* provides an example of the way a public university can provide a platform for debate and association between diverse groups for pursuing social change. This initiative successfully drove the introduction of new legislation for social housing and infrastructure contributions as part of private development.

**Recommendation three. Spatially target initiatives for manageable operation**

In line with urban governance trends in many Western cities, ‘spatially targeted’ (Albrechts, 2004; Healey, 2006) policy approaches have become common in Melbourne and Buenos Aires as a way “to integrate policies across sectoral, organizational and territorial boundaries” (Vigar, 2009, p. 1572). In the case contexts, ‘place-based’ approaches to integrated planning for addressing disadvantage have
been efficaciously used at specific spatial scales, including from neighbourhood to sub-metropolitan regions (i.e. river basins). Place-based approaches are not new, with early precedents of neighbourhood improvement strategies dating back at least to the early 1970s in Melbourne (under the Whitlam Government’s Preferred Development Areas program) and the early 1950s in Buenos Aires as part of the Peron Government’s ‘popular subdivisions.’ They have proliferated since the 1990s (Lawson, 2008), with planners from both contexts reporting more success at smaller scales (neighbourhood) than larger scales (there have been several failed metropolitan experiences) because the governance variables are more manageable (M3, M5; BA4, BA5 & BA18). Findings from this research suggest that the spatial ambition of integrated planning initiatives in Melbourne and Buenos Aires under current conditions should be judiciously crafted to respond to practical considerations (i.e. fragmented governance arrangements, short-term policy agendas driven by party politics).

Specifically, the spatial scope (geographic area/s) of interventions should be reconciled to:

- match realistic budget provisions (e.g. set in budget outlooks over realistic government terms, agreed contributions by non-government actors);
- respond to government and departmental jurisdictions (which differ between areas like health, education and transport);
- reflect the workable area of interest of key non-government stakeholders (e.g. catchment areas of service providers, disposable landholdings of economic actors); and
- avoid dividing communities of interest (e.g. cultural, historic).

**Recommendation four. Constructively manage vertical relationships between tiers of government**

International urban governance literature (inter alia: Colebatch, 1998; Holden, 2012; Rhodes, 2007b), policy documents in Melbourne and Buenos Aires over the last century, as well as interviews conducted as part of this research all clearly transmit the perennial problem of ‘command and control’ approaches to urban policy. It is particularly pronounced in urban policy-making for Melbourne and Buenos Aires because of the federated national systems of government within which the two cities are sited, both being characterised by a vertical fiscal imbalance between federal and state governments, and legislative and governance frameworks that limit local government autonomy. Hierarchical structures are deeply embedded and often define the way policy is debated and implemented; namely, through the downward transmission of authority. In Melbourne and Buenos Aires, the asymmetry in power to define and effect urban policy between higher and lower levels of government is further destabilised by a policy context driven by party politics. This has led higher levels of government to unilaterally change the course of policy initiatives or abolish them altogether on a frequent basis. For effective and lasting integrated planning, more cooperative vertical integration practices are needed in urban policy in both contexts, including that support decentralised and autonomous actions.
Generating the conditions for cooperative action between different levels of government depends on both political commitment and accountability as well as substantive policy development and implementation capacity. For integrated planning practice, these areas can be divided into two groups.

1. **High-level board/council with political influence**: The first group should have the authority and capacity to drive new policy agendas or projects in accord with the commitments of each level of government involved (usually two, sometimes three). In Melbourne, or Australia more generally, the Council of Australian Governments and its associated Transport and Infrastructure Council (and a previous, short-lived Cities Group) provides an ideal forum for consensus-building on general urban policy direction between all three levels of government, though particularly for federal-state cooperation. While it hasn’t been used often for this purpose, it is the most lasting structure which continues to have the commitment of political leaders and, in turn, support for ‘whole-of-government’ or vertical integration on matters of national interest. Other project specific examples of high-level boards include revitalisation strategies, from Docklands, Central Dandenong and most recently Geelong. In Buenos Aires, two successful models of this are the governance board of the Puerto Madero Cooperation, which has been in place for over twenty years, and the ACUMAR board which has been in place since 2006 and comprises an equal number of representatives from each of the levels of government involved. The Puerto Madero Cooperation was set up when there was political alignment between tiers of government and the representative structure institutionalised in anticipation of future changes in party-political alignment. This foresight to create a high-level board structure under favourable conditions for collaboration that can be sustained when politico-institutional settings change is a relevant consideration for policy-makers in both contexts.

2. **Operational level board/council with senior executive participation**: In addition to a decision-making board with political representation and status, an operational level structure for vertical cooperation is also necessary for implementing integrated planning. Generating opportunities for shared learning and skills transfer between tiers of government, and in turn better safeguarding projects from administration changes at higher levels, is essential for effective integrated planning. Operational ‘project boards’ or committees are commonplace in both contexts, though they have often required significant changes or fine-tuning over the course of a project or policy period to better support intergovernmental cooperation. It is recommended that the operational ‘joining-up’ of inter-governmental actors for integrated planning should:
   - provide clear definition of roles, powers and responsibilities, for example in funding and reporting;
• ensure transparent information sharing and content input at both project/policy design and implementation phases, including on budget matters; and
• institutionalise formal lines of regular collaboration that promote negotiation over directed conformance (as described above ‘working groups’).

An additional, though more challenging, consideration for both levels is how to better enable lower levels of government to autonomously and practicably improve their resource base (e.g. by introducing additional taxes, increasing the rate of existing rates and taxes, through the allocation of higher levels of tied and untied funding to local governments). This would ensure urban governance structures are enabled to deliver projects independently or as strong partners, attract necessary human resources, and act as peer-funding agencies.

**Recommendation five. Recognise and enable the role of individual agency**

While some urban governance authors acknowledge the role of individual agency in policy-making and delivery (e.g. Dickinson & Sullivan, 2014; Rhodes, 2007a), this study found no recognition of the ‘soft measures’ employed by individual agents in the design of integrated planning policy and projects in Melbourne and Buenos Aires (nor in literature about integrated planning). The research has demonstrated how ‘missionary’ planning actors and their tacit abilities have been indispensable in integrated planning to reduce disadvantage in both contexts. It underscores how their beliefs in social justice guide their dealing with everyday planning settings, how they conceive of their role as technical and political, and how they strategise and act in practice to shape integrated planning in directions favourable to this cause. Further research is needed to better understand the everyday settings and inner workings of planning practices in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, in particular I believe to better discover how prevalent which informal strategies are and under what conditions they emerge and flourish. Also, there is scope to extend the analysis beyond the role practitioners play and consider the interests and influence of actors such as non-professional activists in the planning process. Nevertheless, some initial recommendations can be made based on the pervasive nature of informal strategies and tactics in contemporary practice.

• First, **planning teaching** should introduce the political nature of the discipline to students and equip them with knowledge about the soft skills likely to be needed for effective public service and understood for delivering relevant consulting advice.

• Second, **executive leaders and officers** with strong knowledge about contextual factors and powerful actors should be supported to navigate the ‘realarationalitat’ of planning processes (Flyvbjerg, 1996, 1998) through informal practices such as building coalitions of support for reducing disadvantage.
Third, policy decision-makers, executive and political, should **formalise deep-rooted informal practices** that support effective policy definition and delivery, for example by institutionalising constructive working groups, supporting planners to research social problems and solutions to develop robust proposals, or facilitating networks of knowledge sharing.

From the perspective of planning actors, specific strategies and tactics can support effective agency. This research has demonstrated that while clear policy definition and well-designed formal structures can support integrated planning, including for example legislative frameworks and special-purpose delivery bodies, efficacious experiences have also relied on the soft tactics and strategies of individual planning actors (Chapter 6). Decades-old traditions of fast-changing policy settings and fragmented governance have been matched with a path dependency on individual agency, pragmatism and political action in practice. This final section synthesises the main tactics and strategies used by ‘missionary’ planners in Melbourne and Buenos Aires in advancing social logics through integrated planning. Planning actors seeking ways to strengthen their practice for reducing disadvantage may creatively experiment with the following ten techniques that were uncovered in integrated planning practices in Melbourne and Buenos Aires:

1. define a coherent and operable conceptual framework to support planning action in a way that handles conflict and drives social justice (i.e. TSL);
2. exercise reflection on technical and political questions, as well as moral and ethical questions;
3. study trends to have current assessments of relative disadvantage;
4. become familiar with contextual factors (e.g. characteristics of institutions) as well as the motives and capabilities of key stakeholders, and use this to predict decision-making outcomes and devise possible responses (e.g. for advocacy, to join-up interested actors, to be flexible);
5. study the dynamics of change in the policy setting and be strategic about the timing of actions (usually by anticipating a conducive political moment);
6. with knowledge about the social issues, context, stakeholders and dynamics of change, take advantage of opportunities (e.g. swelling community interest) and gaps (e.g. give meaning and outputs to vague policy goals) to create or expand policy to reduce disadvantage. Have a ‘folder’ or ‘tool-kit’ of ‘shovel-ready’ initiatives;
7. design analytical and propositional reports to foreground questions of disadvantage in a concise way that clearly links up with political rationales;
8. build support for integrated planning with social logics by mobilising diverse communication mediums, from traditional to social media, for information sharing, to raise awareness and invigorate debate (and support where possible);
9. create coalitions of stakeholders led by government or other perceived neutral actors, such as universities, to share knowledge, develop tools and strategies and generate commitments to integrated planning to reduce disadvantage; and

10. work directly with and for disadvantaged groups, not only to improve understandings of lived experiences of disadvantage, but to positively contribute to building alternative solutions. This requires carefully measuring what informal action is possible or desired, from information or skills sharing (e.g. explaining processes to hold a meeting with relevant political representatives) to engaging in direct struggles or ‘activist planning (e.g. protest movements or community-led neighbourhood improvement).
Chapter 8. Towards a phronetic Theory of Social Logics?

Introduction

This chapter provides the main response to the theoretical ambition of this research: it proposes extending the Theory of Social Logics (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) based on the everyday settings and ‘practical wisdom’ (Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 1998; Hillier, 2002) uncovered through this study of integrated planning across two metropolitan settings: Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Specifically, it proposes a phronetic approach to extend TSL and adapt it for operationalisation in practice settings marked by politico-institutional uncertainty and neoliberal policy orientations, particularly Melbourne and Buenos Aires. This normative scheme will aid planners in improving the social conditions of cities when contending with, as acknowledged by Fincher and Iveson, the “contests, power relations, shifts in government and governance, and the sheer inertia of old ways of proceeding (2008, p. 213). It provides conceptual bases for the blueprint of progressive planning action provided in Chapter 7 and, as a conceptual construct, it helps close the phronetic gap in planning and social justice thinking.

The chapter is structured in two main sections. The first provides a summary of the challenges found in this research to integrated planning with the social logics of redistribution, recognition and encounter. This refocused synopsis analyses the particular way that the politico-institutional contexts impinge on working with social logics in integrated planning. Here it highlights the possible variability of interpretations in practice of social norms. Then, the second section puts forward the proposed framework for operationalising social logics based on the impact of neoliberal policy agendas and fluctuating politico-institutional settings that affect the integrated approach to urban policy and planning. The proposed framework includes new decision rules to guide the actions of planners. Decision rules were developed by the authors of TSL to describe the “form of specific planning measures” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 38) to support the enactment of each social logic. Decision rules in the proposed framework apply to the operationalisation of any social logics.

The considerations and proposed theoretical extension to TSL offered in this chapter emphatically recognises the “political positioning” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 216) required in the work of planners. In responding to the long recognised imperative of political action in planning (e.g. Davidoff, 1965; Forester, 1989; Hillier, 2002), the theoretical contribution of this proposed framework is twofold: the framework expands the original architecture of TSL through considerations of practical wisdom for more powerful application and it customises it to a typology of places like Melbourne and Buenos Aires with uncertain politico-institutional conditions. In terms of engaging elements of practical wisdom, the framework pays particular attention to guiding informal action in a way that does not undermine formal structures of integrated planning for reducing disadvantage. This is especially important in the case settings given the accomplished though not even track record of
State-led planning. The framework may also be useful outside of the case contexts where urban governance settings are marked by similar, shifting conditions. Overall, the framework is conceived so that both the formal structures and informal strategies bolster integrated planning with social logics as a State-led activity, in a way that responds to uncertain policy-making environments and deals with relevant contextual factors.

The challenge of planning for redistribution, recognition and encounter

This research revealed overwhelming support among planning actors in two diverse metropolitan settings for the principles of redistribution, recognition and encounter in working for progressive social change. In Melbourne, planners interviewed as part of this research found that the concepts “elevate the right questions” (M2), “make absolute sense” (M6) and are “all present in where there are better examples of urban development” (M13). Planning actors interviewed in Buenos Aires reiterated that the principles are “pertinent” (BA4), “present in good planning in Argentina” (BA7) and “without doubt are the three basic elements of social transformation processes” (BA11). Nevertheless, and in line with findings from other cities by Fincher and Iveson (2008), there are steep challenges to their realisation in these settings. As described in detail in Chapter 6, the competition between the driving forces behind urbanisation processes in Melbourne and Buenos Aires presents unique challenges. This is because their governance settings are relatively fragmented and lack stable politico-institutional structures for urban policy, changes in administration or the emergence of new circumstances can destabilise planning efforts. Furthermore, private interests often co-opt political forces and supresses alternative voices in communities. In this context, the prevalence of market-based urbanisation and other commonplace operational challenges, such as managing vertical cooperation between levels of government, combine to impede integrated planning with social logics. This section recapitulates the specific barriers to integrated planning found in this research, though here they are summarised in direct relationship to each social logic as they appear in the existing TSL (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). It plays attention to the common challenges experienced in both metropolitan settings, but elucidates the nuances between the cases which relate to the reach of social problems and depth of politico-institutional instability; both challenges being greater in Buenos Aires.

Challenges to planning for redistribution

The authors of TSL (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) have suggested that redistribution is the hardest logic to effect in contemporary practice. This was confirmed by many planning actors interviewed in this study. Primarily, redistributive policies are thought to have limited purchase because urban policy is more targeted than universal and more efficiency- and market-based than welfare-oriented under current neoliberal settings. In both Melbourne and Buenos Aires, where inequality is a greater problem than absolute poverty, “there is a steep challenge to be met regarding the transfer of wealth
from the rich to the vulnerable” (BA21). Successful lobbying and coercion by vested interest groups leaves reduced scope for progressive policy change. Also, while planning for recognition and encounter can occur through minor changes to existing practices and are often compatible with currently favoured place-based approaches, redistributive policies that seek to equalise differences across local areas and achieve social mix tend to require large geographic scales and long temporal frameworks to have a detectable effect. The fluctuating tendencies of current politico-institutional settings make longer term policies very ambitious, and the preferences for strategic and spatially, targeted policy can limit geographic focus. Lastly, collecting and analysing evidence about redistribution presents challenges in terms of monitoring changes over time and spatial scale, as well as separating out causal factors from the simple correlation of events: “evidence of redistributive impact (is)… more difficult to determine” (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 221). Nevertheless, there was broad agreement among interviewees in this research that redistributive policies usually have the most transformative effect and should be pursued “relentlessly” and “creatively” (M13). This challenge was highlighted as particularly great in Buenos Aires, where the absolute and relative number of households living in poverty is far greater and the sources from which to raise funds are considerably fewer (e.g. rates of local tax contributions are lower, rates of government indebtedness is higher).

Challenges to planning for recognition

Multiple challenges to planning for recognition were identified in practices of integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. The first major challenge is the present baseline condition of socio-spatial fragmentation in both cities. Because large numbers of relatively disadvantaged and also relatively advantaged households are separately and spatially concentrated, the opportunities for encounter and recognition between groups have become increasingly limited. For some planning actors interviewed in this research, particularly in Buenos Aires, wealth differentiation is considered the central issue to be addressed by public urban policy and with current resource constraints “adding in additional layers of policy focus to address the needs of minority groups within the poor is quite complex” (BA7) and “can carry with it the problem of encouraging division between groups because of limited resources” (BA19). It is also difficult to find political support for working with specific groups. As one senior policy actor from Buenos Aires stated:

…I believe that when you are working on policy for an administration you really have to identify five concrete things you can achieve, the central things. So the question becomes how to include particular problematiques that aren’t necessarily germane to these central policies. I have seen this become possible with particularly grave issues, like when lives are at risk, for example with domestic violence and elevating gender-based participation and policies, but otherwise it is very polemic to be seen to favour one group. It has a political cost, so you must find a leader willing to take on this struggle (BA13).
Furthermore, implementing a ‘checklist’ or ‘cross-group’ approach to recognition requires participation by representatives from marginalised groups that are in some way organised (to identify representatives to interact both with the group and policy-makers), available (to participate outside of care or other arrangements) and who have basic education about their rights and planning processes. This often may not occur or requires long-term investment by policy-makers, which in current settings is not guaranteed. For policy-makers, uncovering and then enabling representatives from groups that experience the damaging consequences of social exclusion and stigmatisation presents challenges in time-bound and budget-restricted contexts. Overall, the condensed, targeted approach to policy-making and the influence of frequent changes to the politico-institutional settings of each context, but especially in Buenos Aires, undermines genuine ‘parity of participation’ (Fraser, 2000, 2009) between groups with steep and growing differences.

An additional issue raised by a select number of interviewees, not previously mentioned in this thesis, was how to adequately address environmental and non-human species’ interests through this approach, which were also identified as relevant in pursuing social sustainability (BA4, BA13). This appears to be an emerging though unresolved question in justice theorisations (Nussbaum, 2011). Finally, another issue raised by two experienced policy-makers from Melbourne and Buenos Aires were how to engage and support those groups operating against or despite of formal State-planning to seek recognition. In particular, this presented two conundrums for progressive practitioners. The first was how to deal with the contradictory, political consequence of institutionalising recognition, especially the risk of co-opting social movements within formal process when they may have found more traction and influence were they not contained within long-term participatory processes. Similarly, the question arises of the unintended consequence of conferring political power to those representing specific groups, such as special interest or cultural identity groups, once they are involved and have achieved perceived recognition. For this reason, one Buenos Aires based planner suggested that recognition therefore requires a nuanced operation that is “open and creative, but that manages conflict associated with institutionalisation” (BA13). The second problem is one of capacity but also at times of ethics: how to support activist groups seeking recognition outside of or in contrary with formal State processes. Further research is required to better understand the perspectives of these groups, their strategies and influence on the planning process.

**Challenges to planning for encounter**

The challenges to encounter arise from the same foundational issue of the divided social geography (Gleeson, 2013a) described by many planning authors and interviewees consulted in this research. Market-led urbanisation “tends to segment and fragment social sectors” (BA19) and delivers fewer places for everyday encounters between different social groups, for example in public spaces, schools and transport. Furthermore, and as articulated by one social planner from Buenos Aires, “producing
and sustaining encounter between social groups who otherwise live different realities is very difficult even if the space or occasion exists to mix” (BA5). For example, in terms of income equality, “the consumption practices of the rich become ostentatious and enviable, making the inclusionary capacity of urban policies limited and the confluence of these actors difficult to achieve: in many instances, it has become a fiction, a question only of provocation” (BA19). While this problem of socio-spatial fragmentation is greater in Buenos Aires, it is a growing phenomenon in both metropolitan settings.

Despite these base conditions that undermine opportunities for encounter, and by way of underscoring the challenges to planning for redistribution and recognition, other existing conditions promote the kinds of conviviality sought through this social logic. From Buenos Aires, planning actors commented that the very diverse land use mix in most neighbourhoods promotes encounter, as well as the metropolitan rail and bus services that move through different neighbourhoods, the public university system and, the public plazas and parks that have been historically used for many purposes, from “recitals and sport, as well as to make social demands heard and social protests made” (BA9). In Melbourne the boundaries between areas are more fluid and permeable and wealth inequality is less pronounced, ensuring comparatively more social mixing and overlapping of groups, for example in additional forms of public realm infrastructure such as schools, libraries, neighbourhood houses, swimming pools and even commercial centres. Planners from both contexts commented that encounter is administratively an easier logic to apply because very often the site or activity is the domain of only one or fewer areas of government, requiring a singular budget process, over shorter timeframes with less coordination between stakeholders compared to planning for recognition or redistribution. Also, encounter can be pursued through small-scale interventions with small budgets, such as community gardening projects. Overall, unlike redistribution and recognition, encounter may not require the application of multiple aspects of integrated planning for its realisation.

Overall, one conclusion to be drawn from this research is that the political system and institutional configurations of the contemporary State for planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires are inadequate to deliver equitable urban outcomes. In this regard, the comparative findings of this research reveal the generality of shifts in governance processes since the 1980s in both cities, which have reconfigured the domain of public urban policy from comprehensive to targeted, and from State-run to multi-actor approaches. A common theme, though with differentiated outcomes, is that these changes have failed to deliver universal services, infrastructure and opportunities to households, and have transferred greater responsibility onto individuals and non-government organisations, both with private and social interests. Furthermore, the inequality expressed in the divided social geographies of Melbourne and Buenos Aires has been created, embedded and reproduced through contemporary State-led approaches. Nevertheless, based on this research, it is clear that the State has the capacity, under certain opportunity scenarios (Chapter 5), to effect urban policy oriented towards the reduction
of disadvantage, including through targeted expenditure in areas experiencing locational disadvantage. Therefore, under current conditions, formal legislation, policy and process for integrated planning with social logics can be supportive but are clearly not sufficient, especially for those populations experiencing disadvantage. Based on these cross-case challenges, a new approach to conceptualising and acting in the practical world of planning is needed.

Tactical framework for a phronetic theory of social logics

Introduction

This section offers a framework for the tactical and nuanced application of social logics to overcome or circumvent some of the challenges described above. It relates specifically to integrated planning practices; a leading approach to urban policy across Western cities and in particular for reducing disadvantage in Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Integrated planning across these two metropolitan settings, and potentially others, are marked by a neoliberal policy agenda and fluctuating politico-institutional conditions. The everyday reality of these highly politicised planning environments requires practical wisdom in devising both formal and informal strategies to effectively support the operationalisation of social logics. The vital role of practical wisdom and phronesis in planning has been underscored by many urban theorists (inter alia: Albrechts, 1999; Flyvbjerg, 1996; 1998; Hillier, 2002; Thompson, 2012). The framework proposed here extends this knowledge by combining existing and new aspects of practical wisdom for the purpose of pursuing social logics in planning.

Specifically, the proposed features of this framework offer a pathway for countering or at times harnessing ‘realrationalitat’ in planning (Flyvbjerg, 1996, 1998) and effecting social change, by acknowledging the role for action under specific circumstances (e.g. opportunity scenarios and with supportive conditions) and with specific practice-responsive parameters. It unequivocally acknowledges the need for planning actors to “to think and act politically” (Forester, 1989, p.7) and to rest on their experience and capacity for agile action so as “to bend the course of events in the desired direction” (Matus, 2008, p. 4). In this regard, it is pitched for enactment by ‘missionary’ planners (Hillier, 2002), who utilise political as well as technical skills and are concerned with the moral preoccupation of pragmatically ‘doing good’ in planning (Hoch, 1984). In this way, it helps address the “phronetic gap” (2002, p.210) in theory and action for planning for progressive social change.

The first consideration for a phronetic theory of social logics relates to an ability to interpret contextual factors and assess them for opportunities and constraints. The scope for operationalisation of social logics, in theory, is greater under conditions of opportunity and reduced by constraints. Planning actors therefore must develop and wield knowledge about their operative contexts. The nature of contextual opportunities and constraints also provides the conditions for a nuanced selection
of which decision rules should be employed, when, how and in connection with whom to guide action. They also create the context for possible improvisation and experimentation. This research found four common opportunity scenarios (Chapter 5) and multiple barriers (Chapter 6) relating largely to the politico-institutional settings of Melbourne and Buenos Aires. The opportunity scenarios included the presence of a social justice agenda in policy platforms, the ability for a perception of crisis to sway policy-making, the political alignment between levels of government and the existence of a clear win-win scenario for the policy-making actors. The barriers related predominantly to the competition between the competing rationalities of market forces, individual plans and political power. It is the presence or absence as well as the nature of these opportunities and constraints that inform tactical action for a phronetic theory of social logics. The tactical framework developed for a phronetic theory of social logics is based on these considerations of context and comprises the following four elements.

**Phasing**
The first element acknowledges the simple, practice reality that not all decision rules for all social logics can be at play at once. Phronetic action requires the unequal application of these rules, depending on the policy focus and contextual parameters. The contexts of this study were found to follow a broadly neoliberal agenda, with a focus on social protection through targeted, integrated approaches to planning. These approaches are limited however by the overall dominance of the neoliberal agenda and the uncertainty created by fluctuating politico-institutional settings. Given these general conditions, the successful application of decision rules associated with each social logic is predicated on two phasing considerations.

From the basis of these considerations and the research findings of this study, two decision rules are proposed for the element of phasing. In relation to phasing, the first decision rule is to *introduce policy in a way the moves from relatively superficial to deeper transformation*. For example, delivering recognition clearly requires a phased approach to move from acknowledging others, to accepting difference and finally to achieving collaboration between diverse groups, which in its superior form might include the formation of cooperatives, committees, associations and even unions that have strong influence on policy-making. This kind of phasing puts in place a realistic trajectory for social change within neoliberal settings.

The second decision rule requires planning actors to *be opportunistic and ‘strategic’ about the timing of actions*, in particular to be in a position to rapidly and effectively ramp up the application of those policy elements that seek to deepen social transformations. As described in the previous chapter, change is more easily pursued under conditions of opportunity. “There’s a Carpe Diem factor in all of this: You’ve got a political moment and an opportunity and you actually have to make it happen then”
In practice, this requires high-level observational skills to detect when a favourable trend is under development, to be in a position to develop suitable policy initiatives and know how to act to put in place supporting conditions to sustain the application of the decision rule/s in these policy initiatives. Recent examples from the case contexts include sourcing indirect funding for social housing solutions through family violence, refugee settlement and disability funding in Melbourne, or for infrastructure upgrading as a consequence of environmental management funding from international organisation in Buenos Aires.

**Long-termism**

Putting in place supporting conditions to sustain the application of the decision rule/s of social logics in policy initiatives requires planning not (only) for short-term (typically political) gains, but devising structures to support formal governance and enable individual agency over the long term, including institutional strengthening. The strategic objective of reducing disadvantage is necessarily a long-term endeavour where social polarisation is growing and the issues locational and generational disadvantage are entrenched. The decision rule associated with long-termism seeks to guide action in a way that reconciles the short-term political objective of electoral influence with the need for long-term planning. The decision rule is to *utilise the windows of political opportunity not only to instigate social logics but to introduce structures that can sustain them over the long-term*. Though not infallible, this research found a range of ways to help enshrine integrated planning practices with social logics, such as using legislation and policy for mandating practices, creating and protecting arms-length entities or even committees or boards to direct policy implementation as well as carefully targeting the spatial boundaries for effective practice. It also detected common problems to be managed and addressed for improved long-term policy implementation, such as overcoming ‘command and control’ approaches to vertical integration as well as the practical limits to horizontal integration.

Planning literature confirms that coalition-building has been a constant and important feature of long-termism in practical wisdom (Inter alia: Albrechts, 2006; Forester, 1989; Hillier, 2002). In practice, this study of integrated planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires reveals coalitions built by planners to pursue specific policy objectives, for example with the creation of university-led coalitions in Buenos Aires (e.g. Habitar Argentina) or between service providers, policy-makers and different faith groups in an outer local government area of Melbourne, as well as more informally between planners from different jurisdictions pursuing the same challenging goal (e.g. creating the Growth Area Social Planning Tool in Melbourne and a planning policy review group in outer Buenos Aires). Deep congruencies between the findings from each case context also suggest a role for coalitions regarding international comparison and collaboration, including to raise awareness about the approaches.
adopted in other settings for tackling trans-local processes. Integrated planning with social logics through alliances was found in this research to be imminently successful not only at creating urban policy with social logics, but also for sustaining policy under the tumultuous conditions of a change in administration.

**Solidarity**

Before describing the element of solidarity in this tactical framework, it is necessary to clarify its meaning given the difference emphasis in this thesis relative to current academic literature. In contemporary urban governance settings in Melbourne and Buenos Aires, not unlike other cities, there are a range of non-State actors vying for political influence and pursuing their political, socioeconomic or other aims. Some urban researchers have explored the ability of social actors to pursue their goals ‘despite’ or ‘against’ (de Souza, 2006) State-led or –sanctioned policy, as a way to build alternative scenarios in which the state is ‘decentered’ (Miraftab, 2012) and social actors may elude the ‘dark side’ of planning (Yiftachel, 1998; Yiftachel, Little, Hedgcock, & Alexander, 2002). In this scenario, solidarity has been constructed as a concept of mutual support and action between social movements, for example from the efforts of “immigrants and their allies” in the Midwest United States of America (Crane & Weber, 2012, p. 793) to alliances between grassroots movements in Athens that demonstrate “articulations of contestation ‘from below’” to the contemporary crisis (Arampatzi, 2016, p. 1). While these bottom-up processes have proven to be empowering at times, they tend to occur in settings where the State has fundamentally retreated from urban policy. While the urban policy environments of Melbourne and Buenos Aires exhibit uncertainty and fluctuate regularly, the State is still the main actor driving the urban policy process (without the same politics of fear, crisis or austerity now compared to other settings). While ‘insurgent’ (Holston, 2008; Sandercock, 1998a) or ‘direct’ (Miraftab, 2012) action with a ‘decentered’ role for the State plays a role in the case contexts, the achievements made by social actors together with the State continue to provide the most promise for progressive social transformation. For this reason, solidarity requires collaboration from both within public agencies but also between actors outside of the State.

Solidarity is conceived differently here as a decision rule for guiding action in planning with social logics. It responds to the need for pragmatic and political action by planners (Davidoff, 1965; Fincher & Iveson, 2008; Forester, 1989; Hillier, 2002) that is different to the traditional and commonly-held institutional view that planners are objective arbitrators pursuing utilitarian goals and a universal common good. Reality shows that a universal common good is growing further out of reach. Therefore, the decision rules described below privilege the notion of solidarity in all planning action to support effectual action given the contextual conditions that overwhelmingly reproduce disadvantage. Solidarity can be conceived as a rationality to contend with the complex interplay of
market logics, individual plans and political power. It provides a normative basis for ethical and
civically focused action by building on three major findings of this doctoral study.

First, the decision rules elaborated below for solidarity reflect the common phenomenon that the
opportunity scenarios for planning with social logics in both cases tend to be created through the
influence of external pressure on politico-institutional settings, including in informing policy positions
and platforms as well as through influencing changes in policy through perception of crisis or ‘tension
points’ (Flyvbjerg, 1998) (Chapter 5). Secondly, it acknowledges and works with the role of
individual agency and informal action. Thirdly, it proposes taking advantage of the diverse,
unresolved and ambiguous definition of ‘State-society relations’ in integrated planning.
Understandings of ‘state-society’ linkages in contemporary planning are diverse because of the
variety of claims for broader interaction (e.g. post-structural critiques and claims to expand the
democratic potential of planning through broader representation, described in Chapter 2 and 3). These
connections were found to be unresolved in practice because of a high degree of superficiality in
engagement (i.e. short timeframes, limited budgets, poorly constructed engagement structure) which
makes it deeply challenging to go beyond the “loudest voices” or most “recognised and respected”
(BA7) in each contexts, and is ambiguous because there is a lack of definitional clarity and a confused
institutional culture on how to engage with disadvantaged groups (Chapter 6).

In relation to the question of individual agency and informal action, there are four underlying
considerations drawn from this research to inform the scope and nature of strategies to be taken in
solidarity with disadvantaged groups. In contrast to old-standing theoretical ambitions about ideas of
justice prevailing over procedural responsiveness (inter alia: Harvey, 1973; McConnell, 1981; Rawls,
1971), acting in solidarity with disenfranchised groups requires a constant ethic of justice in informal
action where formal governance structures fail or are insufficient. Secondly, however, informal
strategies should be complementary to and not undermine the capacity of formal and State-led
transformation through redistributive and other urban social policies. Thirdly, because urban policy
has delivered regressive outcomes manifest in growing spatial inequalities, informal strategies should
be targeted to counter ‘realarationalitat’ (Flyvbjerg, 1996) in planning, by anticipating and working to
counteract the “distorted claims” (Hillier, 2010, p22) from the unfair competition between market
forces, individual plans and political power (Chapter 6). Lastly, informal action should be used to
pursue a collective project of progressive planning.

The notion of solidarity extends beyond planning for the disadvantaged under favourable and
unfavourable politico-institutional settings, to also planning in direct relationship with these actors. In
this regard, solidarity is closely linked to recognition: though while recognition is about incorporating
the views and goals of diverse groups into the project of planning, solidarity takes account of and
enables individuals and groups to realise their potential as agents of transforming the politico-institutional conditions for planning. It takes literally the ‘right to the city’ for “inclusion and political equality” (Young, 2000, p.6) and promotes the “active participation in the political life, management, and administration of the city” (Dikec, 2009, p.75). It goes against the individualist logic to accumulate wealth and influence that tends to prevail in the competition between different rationalities in planning and extends the role of the State to generate forums for genuine exchange between stakeholders. It requires constructions and creative applications of formal structures and informal strategies that raise awareness about the rights and opportunities available to people, about the benefits and costs to society of planning decisions and about what is available and what is possible. To achieve this, it may be necessary for planning actors to engage with and at times in “direct struggles” (Flyvbjerg, 2012, p.236) that agitate for change through strategies and tactics of building alternatives (Young, 2001). Their role in this “informal and direct action,” (Hillier, 2002, p.15), should be to “form part of generational political change” (BA21) and pursued without undermining State-led action by creating meaningful and lasting mechanisms of engagement between government and civil society.

The following proposed decision rules for solidarity apply to the general practice of planning regardless of which social logic or combination of social logics are pursued. It is a constant orienting frame that guides planning action when there are small or great, or even no opportunities for introducing social logics or operating with the existing decision rules. This is necessary because, as demonstrated in the research findings here, the settings for planning action can be unstable and it may be necessary for groundwork to occur prior to enacting the social logics of redistribution, recognition and encounter. In this regard, the new decision rules acknowledge the strong capacity of the State to lead social change, as well as the necessary role for the tacit ability of planning actors to do something under unfavourable conditions in a way that helps to create the possibility for redistribution, recognition and encounter. They also express an ethic of justice to support individual agency and situated decision-making under favourable conditions aimed at expanding planning’s formal structures for greater progressive social change. They have been shaped to inform the tenacious and creative practices required for engaging and working for the disadvantaged. In this regard, the combination of the following three decision rules position solidarity as a meta-logic for a collective project of progressive planning.

The first proposed decision rule to guide the formulation of solidarity-based action is to: plan for the benefit of society’s most disadvantaged. This principle is derived from the Rawlsian principles of justice as fairness and is most operable under favourable opportunity scenarios and supporting conditions for effective (integrated) planning practices. It applies to the formulation of both formal structures and informal strategies, within the State and in relation to non-State actors. It provides a
clear foundation for approaching conflict with a base ethic of social justice. The second proposed
decision rule is to devise consciousness-raising strategies that reveal and enable debate of distorted
claims. This requires the exercise of individual agency to first craft assessments, formal or non-
sanctioned, that uncover the state of existing relative disadvantage as well as the relevant contextual
factors and barriers to promoting social change (i.e. knowledge about dynamics of current politico-
institutional settings). It also requires strategic tactics for revealing truthful claims into public debate,
for example through foregrounding questions of disadvantage in formal analyses, creating coalitions
of stakeholders for sharing knowledge and generating commitments, advocacy work and by taking
advantage of opportunities to expand policy scope for social change. The third and final decision rule
suggested solidarity is to mobilise resources and offer expertise that benefit the construction of
socially progressive strategies. This final strategy involves wilfully ‘shaking things up’ to keep
‘counter publics alive’ (Wolf-Powers, 2009), for example by using different communication mediums
to share information (traditional and social media) and working directly with and for disadvantaged
groups.

Measuring
Finally, a strategic and tactical approach to pursuing social logics through urban policy requires robust
information, which is generated in practice through the measurement of relevant indicators in practice.
For justifying the application of social logics in urban policy, it is first necessary to develop socially
just methods and indicators for determining and measuring needs (Harvey, 1973). There is also a need
to measure and evaluate the successful reach or otherwise of the decision rules for social logics in
planning, such as the grade of social mixing or rate of new services delivered through redistributional
policies, as well as their impact in communities. This last point for measurement is important for
arming planning actors with sufficient information to counter distorting claims. Finally, for effective
political action it is necessary to track and measure the factors that influence policy direction,
including public opinion about social issues and any corresponding policy initiatives. As one planner
from Buenos Aires commented, “knowledge of the reality can be a source of power for you…being
able to explain what is happening and what is likely to happen in the future is an important force in
changing views” (BA13). The decision rule here is to develop and employ indicators and methods of
measurement relevant to redressing disadvantage.

Conclusion
From the opening review of justice and planning literature, TSL was shown to be a potent theory for
understanding what social justice is and the norms required to pursue social justice in planning. The
three social logics of redistribution, recognition and encounter systematically provide a normative
foundation as well as principles for framing planning action to reduce disadvantage. This chapter
offers one possible avenue to extend this theory through considering the everyday conditions that shape policy and the likely, necessary practices of ‘missionary planners’ (Hillier, 2002). It offers a tactical framework for conceptualising a phronetic theory of social logics that both promotes State-led action, but acknowledges that this is not a given and that social change requires persistent, creative and informal practices to meet the needs and aspirations of ‘multiple publics.’ This chapter responds to my final research question about extending TSL based on cross-case conclusions, in particular by developing a grounded framework for practice realities defined by neoliberal policy agendas and unstable politico-institutional settings. The proposed tactical framework for a phronetic theory of social logics is summarised below in Figure 8.1.

**Figure 8.1 Decision rules for social logics and phronetic action in planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistribution</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• equity in the allocation of expenditure in different local areas and populations; and • social mix (the intention is to ‘mix’ people of different income groups, particularly by precluding ‘concentrations’ of poor people).</td>
<td>• make a checklist of social or identity groups and allocate resources between them; and/or • devise cross-group projects and allocate resources to these.</td>
<td>• provide a variety of social and economic infrastructure (e.g. meeting places like drop-in centres, planned events or public libraries) • encourage stakeholder agency in encounter; and • create safe and transparent spaces for encounter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- introduce policy in a way the moves from relatively superficial to deeper transformation;
- be opportunistic and ‘strategic’ about the timing of actions;
- utilise the windows of political opportunity not only to instigate social logics but to introduce structures that can sustain them over the long-term;
- plan for the benefit of society’s most disadvantaged;
- devise consciousness-raising strategies that reveal and enable debate of distorted claims;
- mobilise resources and offer expertise that benefit the construction of socially progressive strategies; and
- develop and employ indicators and methods of measurement relevant to redressing disadvantage.

Source: Author, 2017 based on TSL (Fincher & Iveson, 2008)

This chapter proposes extending TSL (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) based on the everyday settings and situated practices of planners uncovered in this research. It offers a tactical framework for a phronetic conceptualisation of the way TSL might guide the type of planning practice needed for pursuing social change. The concrete elements and strategies needed by planners for integrated planning practice with social logics were elaborated in the previous chapter. The decision rules that comprise the framework developed in this chapter guide planning measures in neoliberal planning contexts with fluctuating parameters for governance. It promotes State-led integrated planning interventions that aim to reduce disadvantage through the application of both formal and informal strategies. This tactical framework broadens and I believe makes more robust TSL as a theoretical construct by engaging practical wisdom for action in urban governance settings with uncertain politico-institutional conditions, like in Melbourne and Buenos Aires.
Chapter 9. Conclusion

Introduction: reprising the research problem

This thesis examined a range of integrated planning practices that aimed to reduce disadvantage in Melbourne, Australia and Buenos Aires, Argentina. Relative disadvantage as a cause for integrated planning initiatives formed the focus of the research because it is worsening in both metropolitan settings, with growing socio-spatial polarisation. Integrated planning was selected as the vehicle to examine urban policy for redressing disadvantage because of its common application in both settings through aiming to overcome place-based or ‘locational disadvantage.’ However, the starting point for the study was one of mixed evaluations and vague interpretations of integrated planning. For example, while previous evaluations have recorded some net-positive outcomes from integrated planning in terms of reducing disadvantage (inter alia: Shield et al., 2011; Wood & Cigdem, 2012), other studies have reported negative outcomes, such as gentrification in Melbourne (inter alia Fincher et al., 2016; Porter & Shaw, 2009) or for failing to lift quality of life outcomes in Buenos Aires (Wagner et al., 2004). Definition were found to vary considerably in policy documentation and in academic literature. From these base considerations, the aim of this research was to improve critical understanding of contemporary integrated planning practices in Melbourne and Buenos Aires oriented towards the reduction of disadvantage. The research questions formulated were:

1. Based on contemporary characteristics and socio-historical influences, how is integrated planning understood in Melbourne and Buenos Aires?
2. In these contexts, what are the formal structures and informal strategies that support social logics for reducing disadvantage through integrated planning?
3. Are there grounds to support modifications to integrated planning practices and extend the theory of social logics based on cross-case conclusions? If so, in what way?

The first contribution of the research was in reducing the definitional opacity of integrated planning with the aim to reduce disadvantage in the contexts of Melbourne and Buenos Aires. From reviewing relevant literature and developing a genealogy of integration in local practices, integrated planning was found to comprise two main features: spatial integration and actor interrelations. Spatial integration brings into focus the role of space in public policy, including through considering land use interactions, addressing territorial unevenness and through specific area-based initiatives. Actor interrelations involve vertical integration, between different tiers of governments persist, horizontal integration, which links together policy areas, and State-society relations. The research found all these dimensions of integration present in planning between the study period of 1920 and 2015, though a greater emphasis on place-based approaches and a more diverse participation of non-State actors in
policy processes since the 1980s. Table 2.1 offers a basic conceptual framework for understanding integrated approaches to planning based on these findings.

**Repetition of Table 2.1. Basic Conceptual Framework of Contemporary Integrated Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of integration</th>
<th>Focus of integration</th>
<th>Objectives of integration</th>
<th>Integration characteristics</th>
<th>Practice examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial integration</td>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>Maximise beneficial interactions between land uses and activities.</td>
<td>Integration between land uses and activities considered.</td>
<td>Integrated land use and transport planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial</td>
<td>Overcome territorial disjointedness and physical barriers.</td>
<td>Cross-boundary planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standardisation of municipal norms in metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-based</td>
<td>Manage specific places, sometimes to redress disadvantage and segregation. Integrate public policy objectives in place</td>
<td>Strategic and targeted place-based interventions, bringing together multiple actors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor interrelations</td>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>Deliver joint action between different tiers of government.</td>
<td>Downward command &amp; control.</td>
<td>Responsibilities enshrined in law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal</td>
<td>Deliver cross-sectoral public policy within or between the same level/s of government.</td>
<td>Cooperation and negotiation between public actors.</td>
<td>Cabinet or policy working committees/groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State-society</td>
<td>Deliver public policy between public, private and civil society.</td>
<td>Two-way interactions between the State and non-government actors.</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships. Ministerial advisory councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author, 2017

From the basic framework for understanding integrated planning, the research proceeded by examining the social potential of contemporary integrated planning through investigating the characteristics of multiple embedded cases from Melbourne and Buenos Aires. Chapter 5 was dedicated to revealing the opportunity scenarios and formal structures for supporting integrated planning with social logics. In this regard, the key factors that were found to generate opportunities for integrated planning with social logics related to the politico-institutional conditions for urban policy-making. It was demonstrated how social logics can became embedded in urban policy under administrations with a clear social justice agenda and policy platform and through external pressure from non-government actors, such as the media, private sector and civil society groups. Another opportunity for enhanced integrated practices is the relevant tiers of government are politically aligned and share a common agenda. Lastly, where no other alternative or a clear ‘win-win’ situation emerges integrated planning with social logics can prevail. Once the opportunity arises to introduce integrated approaches for reducing disadvantage, several conditions were found to support their implementation. These included a prescriptive legislative or policy framework for integrated approaches to reducing disadvantage; identifying an appropriate scale (typically with smaller geographic areas); establishing ‘arms-length,’ special purpose bodies for delivery purposes; utilising
horizontal integration to support interaction between urban social policy areas within government and well as creative State-civil society engagement practices. The most significant finding here is that integrated planning with social logics occurs perchance and not in a lineal or predictable way in either setting. Therefore, existing structures can support but do not guarantee its introduction nor its survival and planning actors must therefore be very attuned and responsive to the (largely political) opportunities for integrated planning with social logics.

From this point, the barriers to effective integrated planning action with social objectives were identified as well as the specific tactics and strategies used by planners in navigating these challenges. The major challenge for integrated planning practices with social logics relates to the interplay of distinct rationalities driving urban development, including market forces, individual plans and the political rationality to accumulate electoral influence. The ramifications of the interplay between these rationalities is an uncertain politico-institutional environment for urban policy and frequent destabilisation of integrated planning efforts and their associated social logics. Compounding this underlying condition are myriad operational challenges to integrated planning with social logics, such as ‘turf protection’ over horizontal integration and budget limitations.

Where social logics occur in integrated planning practices the ‘tacit skills’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) of ‘missionary planners’ (Hillier, 2002) play a vital role. This research uncovers and explains specific strategies and tactics that support ‘practical wisdom’ (Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Hillier, 2002) in integrated planning with social logics. The specific strategies encompass analysing, characterising and responding to contextual features, including the decision-making tendencies and resource capabilities of key policy actors. Other tactics include strategically timing actions and using different communicative strategies to shape policy decision-making in a way that privileges social logics. Coalition-building and working in direct relationship with disadvantaged communities were also reported to be essential for phronetic action. The findings presented in Chapter 6 validate the common understanding that planning is political and that pragmatism is an essential aspect of practice (Davoudi, 2015; Flyvbjerg, 1998; Hillier, 2002). They extend this, however, by specifying the strategies and tactics used by planning actors in two metropolitan settings. It also extends current understandings by explaining why and how these strategies can emerge based on the common politico-institutional phenomena of uncertainty and instability.

Based on the formal structures and informal strategies uncovered in this study that support integrated planning with social logics, recommendations are made for practice in a way that strengthens the possibility for social change. Five recommendations were made regarding formal practice strategies and ten suggested techniques for effective and agile individual agency in integrated planning for reducing disadvantage. The five practice-centred recommendations include:
Recommendation 1. Provide clear policy definition of integrated planning
Recommendation 2. Deliver relational models of governance for long-term projects
Recommendation 3. Spatially target initiatives for manageable implementation
Recommendation 4. Constructively manage vertical relationships between tiers of government
Recommendation 5. Recognise and enable the role of individual agency

The ten techniques recommended were:

1. define a coherent and operable conceptual framework to support planning action in a way that handles conflict and drives social justice (i.e. TSL);
2. exercise reflection on technical and political questions, as well as moral and ethical questions;
3. study trends to have current assessments of relative disadvantage;
4. become familiar with contextual factors (e.g. characteristics of institutions) as well as the motives and capabilities of key stakeholders, and use this to predict decision-making outcomes and devise possible responses (e.g. for advocacy, to join-up interested actors, to be flexible);
5. study the dynamics of change in the policy setting and be strategic about the timing of actions (usually by anticipating a conducive political moment);
6. with knowledge about the social issues, context, stakeholders and dynamics of change, take advantage of opportunities (e.g. swelling community interest) and gaps (e.g. give meaning and outputs to vague policy goals) to create or expand policy to reduce disadvantage. Have a ‘folder’ or ‘tool-kit’ of ‘shovel-ready’ initiatives;
7. design analytical and propositional reports to foreground questions of disadvantage in a concise way that clearly links up with political rationales;
8. build support for integrated planning with social logics by mobilising diverse communication mediums, from traditional to social media, for information sharing, to raise awareness and invigorate debate (and support where possible);
9. create coalitions of stakeholders led by government or other perceived neutral actors, such as universities, to share knowledge, develop tools and strategies and generate commitments to integrated planning to reduce disadvantage; and
10. work directly with and for disadvantaged groups, not only to improve understandings of lived experiences of disadvantage, but to positively contribute to building alternative solutions. This requires carefully measuring what informal action is possible or desired, from information or skills sharing (e.g. explaining processes to hold a meeting with relevant political representatives) to engaging in direct struggles or ‘activist planning (e.g. protest movements or community-led neighbourhood improvement).
The thesis concludes by proposing a tactical framework for conceptualising and enacting a phronetic TSL. Whilst TSL in its original form offers a comprehensive conceptual framework for exploring the social potential planning, the proposed new decision rules for guiding planning action broaden the conceptual reach and strengthen the operability of this theory. The decision rules cover four umbrella themes: phasing, long-termism, solidarity and measuring. They support planners to take measures in neoliberal planning contexts with fluctuating politico-institutional conditions. Together, they promote State-led integrated planning interventions with both formal and informal strategies. This suggests a shift from the institutional and traditional views of planning as objective in following universal notions of public good, to a conceptualisation of the active, political and pragmatic role of planners in contemporary practice. The proposed tactical framework for a phronetic TSL is included below.

**Repetition of Figure 8.1 Decision rules for social logics and phronetic action in planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistribution</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• equity in the allocation of expenditure in different local areas and populations; and • social mix (the intention is to ‘mix’ people of different income groups, particularly by precluding ‘concentrations’ of poor people).</td>
<td>• make a checklist of social or identity groups and allocate resources between them; and/or • devise cross-group projects and allocate resources to these.</td>
<td>• provide a variety of social and economic infrastructure (e.g. meeting places like drop-in centres, planned events or public libraries) • encourage stakeholder agency in encounter; and • create safe and transparent spaces for encounter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2017 based on TSL (Fincher & Iveson, 2008)

**Research limitations**

There are two main research limitations relating to the depth and breadth of this doctoral study. Given that the study sought to uncover a comprehensive range of commonly found features (formal structures and informal strategies) in multiple experiences of integrated planning between two metropolitan settings, it focused on identification, characterisation and frequency of these features in planning policy and stories. This delivered robustness in claims about the generalisability of the results due to the repetition of factors such as opportunity scenarios, barriers and the nature of strategies in practice. However, more information could be uncovered about the particularities of each experience of integrated planning through further in-depth investigations, including the differences
between the case experiences. For example, not just in highlighting the importance of characterising context and actors to make prudent decisions and actions, but actually characterising these contexts and actors and how decision-making and actions respond to them in individual cases. This study of two metropolitan contexts with similar governance settings supported moving between general and particular considerations of theory and practice. However, the general conclusions and recommendations made in this thesis would gain greater validation through one or more additional investigations of metropolitan settings with integrated planning aimed at reducing disadvantage. Other methodological challenges were described in Chapter 3, including the difficulty in containing the focus of interview discussions to few experiences of integrated planning and in experimenting with comparative techniques in analysis.

Recommendations for further research

The purpose of this section is to outline four possible areas of future research inspired by the findings of this doctoral study. The first and second respond to the specific limitations identified above. The first relates to strengthening the cross-case conclusions by extending the comparative reach of study. In this thesis, conclusions were drawn about the formal structures and informal strategies that characterise integrated planning with social logics from cross-case conclusions between the two metropolitan settings of Melbourne and Buenos Aires. For example, arms-length, special-purpose bodies have been relatively more successful than department-led initiatives at delivering long-term integrated approaches with social logics in both cases because of the instability created by fluctuating politico-institutional contexts. Another strong cross-case finding is that alliance- and coalition-building have formed central strategies by individual actors in order to influence and ultimately implement planning initiatives. The findings could be strengthened and broadened by examining the features of planning practices in other like settings with uncertain politico-institutional conditions and neoliberal policy ambit. Repetition of any findings would bring greater robustness to the claims and recommendations pertaining to contemporary integrated planning practice as well as the proposed new decision rules for operationalising TSL. Similarly, variations would offer new insights that may further extend knowledge and test the universal applicability of some findings.

In line with calls about deepening comparative urban research, further studies of metropolitan contexts would help deepen understandings about the “generality or particularity” (McFarlane, 2010, p. 730) of the features revealed in this thesis, for the nature of opportunity scenarios and barriers to operating with social logics. It would provide stronger grounds to make general claims and potentially develop a typology about the way integrated planning for reducing disadvantage arises and can be sustained over time. In this regard, I agree that an extension of comparison should bring to the fore the
experiences of diverse cities and continue to bridge the ‘North-South’ comparative gap in urban research (Clarke, 2012; Dear, 2005; McFarlane, 2010; McFarlane & Robinson, 2012; Nijman, 2007; Robinson, 2004, 2006). This would benefit from engaging with the work of researchers from these diverse places (Robinson, 2004, 2006), including those that don’t share equal access to dominant publication sources, for example because of language barriers. Specifically, it should aim to address the “absence of arguments and perspectives from Africa, Asia and Latin America” (Peck, 2015).

The second area of interest for further research is to generate more detailed evidence about specific practices that have accomplished positive social change. Through the process of identifying and examining common structures and strategies for integrated planning with social logics across Melbourne and Buenos Aires, remarkable individual stories of transformation were discovered. While this research uncovered which conditions, structures and strategies support planning with social logics, more detailed and contained case studies have the potential to generate more nuanced findings about these factors in situated contexts, for example on the staging, cause and effect of the political actions of the actors involved. These individual stories would have the potential to highlight the nature of localised strategies, such as alliance-making and coalition-building, and to better understand their role in positively or negatively helping each venture. Deep case studies could also measure the reach of transformation achieved through the application of social logics in integrated planning through quantitative and qualitative methods. Furthermore, it would be possible to engage and incorporate diverse voices outside of professional planning, for example from advocacy or community groups, non-professional activists or business people.

For this, case studies could be selected with a greater or lesser focus on formal or informal strategies. For example, specific studies conducted on the multiple experiences of neighbourhood renewal, revitalisation or improvement programs introduced and led by the respective state governments in both metropolitan settings would foreground details about the critical formal structures to support policy definition and implementation. The structures that have brought about cooperation between levels of government, areas of policy and different actors would be of interest, including the operation of special-purpose entities. On the other hand, research focused on the role of tacit skills in planning might examine more rare and unusual experiences of integrated planning with social logics. This has the potential to illuminate the unique, localised characteristics of situated decision-making in the cause of social justice. In contrast to the traditionally introduced and more stepwise formal structures, the latter focus on informal strategies do not form the focus of any public evaluations. Four distinctive grounded experiences of delivering socially just outcomes with prominent reliance on informal strategies and individual agency were considered in this research. They provide great potential for future case studies of greater depth because of their lasting action (over one decade), the multiple
actors engaged in the process, their intertwined stories of State and non-State action (including fluctuating State-involvement) and their reported successes in achieving social justice outcomes:

1. Building food security in Melbourne’s west through sustained external pressure and collaborative actions between the Victorian Government, local governments, businesses, housing associations and civil society groups;
2. Planning for neighbourhood renewal with a specific focus on social inclusion of multicultural and interfaith groups in Hume City Council, outer Melbourne, Victoria.
3. Driving policy and legislative change for social housing and infrastructure exactions by the university-civil society alliance Habitar Argentina; and
4. Delivering alternative, community based solutions to housing, infrastructure and health services in Tres de Febrero through local cooperative actions over three decades, in a story that has transitioned from transformation despite the (absent) State to transformation together with the State and Local Governments.

Overall, I believe that dedicated case studies have the potential to produce more exhaustive accounts of transformation processes that occur as a result of combining particular formal structures and informal strategies.

The third area for potential future research that extends the findings of this doctoral study relates to the paradigm shift from comprehensive to targeted, place-based planning. Place-based planning is commonplace in both metropolitan settings, having become a normalised approach to redressing disadvantage with multiple policy focus points. This phenomenon is treated as somewhat exceptional to contemporary settings in planning literature (Albrechts, 2004; Lawson, 2008; Reddel, 2002). My research tentatively shows that they are unexceptional when considered as part of the historical traditions of planning in Melbourne and Buenos Aires: contemporary place-based approaches have at least century-old roots back to concerns around ‘territorial disjointedness’ and targeted slum removal and social housing projects. I believe what is more exceptional and therefore of interest for further interrogation is how the comprehensive ambition of planning has been peeled back around a constant though growing place-based approach to delivering urban policy. Given the unbroken issue of finite budget outlooks for urban social policy since post World War I, to what extent and in what combination do place-based approaches and comprehensive planning policy means deliver social transformation?

The fourth and final area recommended for further research relates to the role of universities and, in particular, of hybrid planners who move between applied and research settings to put in motion trajectories of social transformation. The influence and contributions of universities and hybrid planners appears to be more common in Buenos Aires compared to Melbourne where there are relatively more static communities of practice and research. There are some examples of this in
contemporary planning in Melbourne and others in previous eras post-World War I, though not to the extent it occurs in Buenos Aires. Further research into the conditions that create this fluidity, including negative contributing factors such as deeper fluctuations between administrations and more widespread employment insecurity, is needed. Research into enabling conditions for this fluidity is also required, as is its capacity for generating effective planning practices. Future investigations might examine the transformative potential of universities as perceived neutral arenas for debate and idea generation, in capacitation and through partnerships for instigating integrated planning with social logics.
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