

## **Rationalist, reformist, and strategic planning in master plans of Parana state municipalities**

José Ricardo Vargas de Faria

*Professor*

*Urban Planning Postgraduate Program*

*Public Policy Postgraduate Program*

*Transportation Department*

*Federal University of Parana*

*jrvfaria@gmail.com*

Who should be considered, what institutions are involved, how planners should organize their actions (i.e. methodological question), which *rationale* guides economy and society, those are some of the questions that shape planning approaches and theories around the world. Furthermore, theorists relate planning development to democracy development (BÄCKLUND, MÄNTYSALO, 2010), or to knowledge (DAVOUDI, 2015), or even to ontology, epistemology, ideology and methodology elements (BRAND, GAFFIKIN, 2007). Frequently, the differences in those criteria are considered or classified as different schools or theories of planning. For example, in effort to classify planning theories, Souza (2004) developed a typology based on eight criteria: driving idea, aesthetics affiliation, scope, degree of interdisciplinarity, permeability in the face of reality, the degree of openness to public participation, the attitude in the face of market and political-philosophical framework. These criteria, as Souza (2004) sees, establish a framework to identify “rival” approaches of planning.

In this article, it is argued that it is necessary to consider, apart from the questions listed before, the “North” (RIBEIRO, 2007) that oriented planning practitioners and theorists, not only in terms of a political point of view (right or left wing), but also in macro ideological conceptions as Keynesianism/developmentalism, social democracy and neoliberalism. These conceptions perceive in different ways the role of state and market, not having a common definition of society and expressing distinct diagnoses of urban problems and their causes. Rightfully so, it is expected that

the visions on planning differ, not only as an epistemological or paradigmatic issue, but assuming a social and political conditioning. The implications go beyond political-philosophical framework proposed by Souza (2004), but at the same time, do not necessarily imply a competition between different approaches, as discussed later.

Facing the prevailing division approached by current planning theories – the rational-comprehensive approach, the incremental approach, the transactive approach, the communicative approach, the advocacy approach, the equity approach, the radical approach, and the humanist or phenomenological approach –, it is presented an alternative classification method. A typology associated to prevailing Brazilian sociopolitical perspectives is proposed. A rationalist planning takes place at the peak of a developmentalist/keynesianist era. Subsumed under the social democratic view, reformist planning emerges. Neoliberalism outlines strategic urban planning.

This classification method is useful to analyze the plan's content and its shape. It considers, however, the coexistence of different planning types in common processes. Even when it is expected to deal with predominant planning conceptions in their respective historical periods, plans that are designed in conflictual contexts express political compositions. These compositions are an outcome of disputes among social actors, producing results with a multi-party nature. It is possible to identify in the same Master Plan the goal to build local advantages to strengthen competitiveness and concerns to social housing policies as income distribution tool.

In this respect, participative plans do not bring a coherent ensemble in their political, economic and social dimensions, since they are products of negotiations, allowances and agreements between a variety of social actors.

Those conclusions were built from the research Evaluation of Master Plans and Urban Policies Instruments in Parana State, Brazil after analyzing the content of 389 Municipalities Master Plans. The research issue was defined as an examination about Master Plans' impacts considering diagnoses, ideological and urbanistic parties, political and administrative options, strategies and urban policy instruments in Parana State municipalities.

Due to the existence of systemized data on state level and the intense propagation of Master Plans in its territory – more than 95% of its cities have a key plan –, the state of Parana was chosen as the profile of research.

The content analysis of 389 Parana's cities Master Plans and its complementary legislations was performed according to major categories – social function of property, economic development, environment, housing, etc. These categories purposes and meanings were identified in the documents. Beyond that, the use of urban policies' instruments (such as Compulsory Installment, Compulsory Building, and Compulsory Use; gradual taxation on urban land and Real Estate Property; Special Zones of Social Interest; instruments of value capture, of land regularization and of democratic management) were studied and linked to the plans' general guidelines.

As a result, it was possible to identify and comprehend the main elements that guide the Municipal Master Plans. Banerjee (1993) proposes Market Planning, Market Planners, and Planned Markets as an opposition to Social Planning, Social Planners, and Planned Societies (DYCKMAN, 1966). In the research, it was sought to identify the following issues: the coexistence and the extent to which the Master Plans are oriented for the market and/or for the society; what is the contribution and the form of intervention of the State; and, finally, what are the goals addressed by planners and by everyone involved in the planning processes that acquire emphasis in the referred Master Plans.

It is expected from this analysis to provide a better understanding of Master Plans that took place post-City Statute (Estatuto da Cidade) in Brazil, and to allow a disruption between normative and standardized definitions that ensue Master Plans by what they should be, instead of making a theoretical and analytical effort to perceive what these plans really are.

#### **References cited in this abstract**

BÄCKLUND P. and MÄNTYSALO R. (2010) Agonism and institutional ambiguity: Ideas on democracy and the role of participation in the development of planning theory and practice - the case of Finland. *Planning Theory*, November 2010; vol. 9, 4: pp. 333-350

BANERJEE, T. (1993). Market Planning, Market Planners, and Planned Markets. In: Journal of the American Planning Association. Volume 59, Issue 3, pp. 353-360.

BRAND, R., GAFFIKIN, F. (2007) Collaborative Planning in an Uncollaborative World. Planning Theory, November 2007; vol. 6, 3: pp. 282-313.

DAVOUDI S. (2015) Planning as practice of knowing. Planning Theory, August 2015; vol. 14, 3: pp. 316-331.

DYCKMAN J. W. (1966) Social Planning, Social Planners, and Planned Societies. Journal of the American Institute of Planners Volume 32, Issue 2, pages 66-76.

RIBEIRO, A. C. T. (2007) A força do passado: nem tudo que é sólido desmancha no ar. In: FELDMAN, S.; FERNANDES, A. (Org.). O urbano e o regional no Brasil contemporâneo: mutações, tensões, desafios. Salvador: EDUFBA.

SOUZA, M. L. (2004) Mudar a Cidade: uma introdução crítica ao planejamento e à gestão urbanos. 3ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand.