

# The legacy of positivism and the emergence of interpretive tradition in spatial planning

Simin Davoudi

► **To cite this version:**

Simin Davoudi. The legacy of positivism and the emergence of interpretive tradition in spatial planning. Regional Studies, Taylor & Francis (Routledge), 2011, pp.1. 10.1080/00343404.2011.618120 . hal-00749640

**HAL Id: hal-00749640**

**<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00749640>**

Submitted on 8 Nov 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**The legacy of positivism and the emergence of interpretive tradition in spatial planning**

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2009-0273.R2
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
JEL codes:	P11 - Planning, Coordination, and Reform < P1 - Capitalist Systems < P - Economic Systems, Q48 - Government Policy < Q4 - Energy < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics, R52 - Land Use and Other Regulations < R5 - Regional Government Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Positivist planning, interpretive planning, space and place, time and future, evidence-based policy, scalar order

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 The legacy of positivism and the emergence of interpretive tradition in spatial  
4  
5 planning  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 Simin Davoudi

11  
12 Professor of Environmental Policy and Planning

13  
14 School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, Newcastle University

15  
16 Claremont Tower, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, United Kingdom

17  
18 [simin.davoudi@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:simin.davoudi@ncl.ac.uk)  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Abstract

25 This paper draws on positivist and interpretive conceptualisation of space, place and  
26  
27 time to present a framework for exploring how spatiality and temporality is articulated  
28  
29 and represented in spatial planning. It focuses on five aspects of planning: conception  
30  
31 of spatiality, spatial and scalar structuring, treatment of time and future, use of  
32  
33 evidence in plan making, and representation and visualisation. How the two traditions  
34  
35 have influenced planning, particularly in the UK, is discussed and illustrated by  
36  
37 historical and contemporary examples. The paper concludes that while an interpretive  
38  
39 approach is emerging in some areas of planning, positivism has retained its  
40  
41 dominating influence.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Key words:

50  
51 Positivist planning; interpretive planning; relational space; nested scale; time and  
52  
53 future; cartographical representation; evidence-based policy  
54  
55

56  
57 JEL codes: Z, Y, R  
58  
59  
60

## 1. Introduction

In the early 2000s, a major programme of reform was introduced by the British government which aimed to widen the scope of the planning system “beyond traditional land use planning” (ODPM, 2004a: 12), and towards what is known as ‘spatial planning’. Spatial planning has been defined in different ways but often with reference to a type of planning which acts as a coordinator of other policy sectors and integrator of policy and investment priorities (Nadin, 2007). Whatever the definition, the spatial turn in planning was a belated response to the renewed enthusiasm for spatiality in other policy areas as well as in other disciplines. By the end of the millennium, there was a growing recognition that space and place mattered in the social and economic fortunes of localities (Amin and Thrift, 1995) and in the coordination strategies of governance. As Brenner (2000:373) suggests, “space is becoming a central object of political struggle in the contemporary world; it is no longer merely the ‘medium’ or ‘theatre’ of socio-political conflicts but one of their constitutive dimensions”.

While the debate on the meaning of spatial planning is ongoing and the gap between rhetoric and reality remains wide, planners’ attempt to implement it is undisputed. What is less clear is the type of spatiality that was conveyed by the emerging plans. Within the social sciences there are two distinct ways of conceptualising space and place: the positivist and the interpretive traditions. In section two the paper draws on these two perspectives to present a conceptual framework for exploring how spatiality is articulated, represented and visualised in planning. Emphasis is placed on five key aspects of planning: conception of spatiality, spatial and scalar structuring, treatment

1  
2  
3 of time and future, use of evidence in plan making processes, and representation and  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

of time and future, use of evidence in plan making processes, and representation and  
visualisation. The ways in which the positivist and the interpretive traditions have  
influenced planning, particularly in the UK, will be discussed and illustrated by  
historical and contemporary examples. The paper concludes, in section three, that  
while some of the contemporary planning practices are moving towards an  
interpretive approach, positivism has remained highly influential in planning.

## 2. Positivist and interpretive traditions

Positivism refers to an empiricist approach to scientific knowledge which starts from  
the senses and particulars and gradually rises up to the most general axioms. It is  
based on Francis Bacon's second way of discovering truth, and rests on observation as  
the moment of truth when hypotheses are tested against the facts of the world. For  
empiricists, knowledge is a matter of bottom-up experience (*a posteriori*). This is  
what distinguishes them from rationalists for whom knowledge is a matter of top-  
down underlying theories and laws (*a priori*)<sup>1</sup>. Both, however, belong to the naturalist  
tradition of enquiry. Both consider nature as independent, reason as unprejudiced, and  
a unitary scientific method as the appropriate way of explaining causal relations in  
both natural and social phenomena (Hollis, 2003). Within the social sciences,  
positivism refers to the approaches which apply scientific methods to human and  
social affairs; conceived as belonging to a natural order that is open to objective  
enquiry. Its most extreme version, the 1930s' Logical Positivism of the Vienna Circle,  
denied the existence of anything beyond observable experience. This extreme view  
was best captured in David Hume's assertion that there is a sharp distinction between  
"matters of fact" and "relations of ideas" (quoted in Hollis 2003:42).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 One of the most radical challenges to positivism has come from the interpretive or  
6  
7 hermeneutics<sup>2</sup> tradition which has offered an alternative to the naturalist view of the  
8  
9 world; one which considers knowledge to be a matter of *understanding* rather than  
10  
11 explanation. Social phenomena are seen as distinguishable from natural ones because  
12  
13 they depend on the meaningful actions of individuals; they are intentional. This means  
14  
15 that in the social domain instead of seeking to explain the causes of behaviour one is  
16  
17 to seek the *meaning of action* (Hollis, 2003). Meaning refers to what is consciously  
18  
19 and individually intended as well as what is commonly and often unintentionally  
20  
21 significant. Within the social sciences the interpretive tradition has been associated  
22  
23 with post-modernism and its objection to the grand narratives of social theories  
24  
25 offered by naturalist approaches.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Whilst positivism has a long history in planning, the interpretive perspective is  
33  
34 relatively new to it. For some commentators its emergence has raised questions about  
35  
36 whether planning as a modernist project could operate in a postmodern time  
37  
38 (Allmendinger, 1998). The following section will discuss how these two different  
39  
40 perspectives lead to radically different conceptualisation of the five key aspects of  
41  
42 planning mentioned above, and how these varying conceptualisations have shaped the  
43  
44 evolving planning thoughts and practices, particularly in the UK. Historical and  
45  
46 contemporary examples are drawn upon to illustrate the points made.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 2.1 Conception of spatiality

53  
54 Positivism portrays an absolute view of space which is rooted in Euclidean geometry.  
55  
56 Euclid's three-dimensional geometry enjoyed uninterrupted sovereignty until it was  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 challenged in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. His ideas were accepted for a long time because “it  
4  
5 had been covertly built into Newtonian physics” (Scruton, 1996:361). The picture  
6  
7 given by Isaac Newton was of space as an infinite container; “an entity in itself  
8  
9 independent of whatever objects and events occupy it” (Agnew, 2005:83). For a  
10  
11 positivist planning, space is a neutral container which can be understood through  
12  
13 positivist science. Place is considered as objective, bounded, self-contained and  
14  
15 measurable.  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 The interpretive tradition considers space as relational; a view which is often  
21  
22 associated with Einstein’s space-time concept (Agnew, 2005). However, the idea that  
23  
24 space is relative and not absolute is far older and goes back to Leibnitz’s philosophy.  
25  
26 He suggested that, “spatial properties are relational, and the position of any object is  
27  
28 to be given in terms of its relation to any other objects” (Scruton 1996:362). In the  
29  
30 Leibnizian view space is relational in the sense that it does not exist independent of  
31  
32 objects and events and is constructed from the relations between them. It is dependent  
33  
34 on the social and cultural processes and substances that make it up (Lefebvre, 1991).  
35  
36 In the words of David Harvey (1996:53 original emphasis), “Processes do not operate  
37  
38 *in* but *actively construct* space and time and in so doing define distinctive scales for  
39  
40 their development”.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 An important feature of the distinction between the positivist and the interpretive  
49  
50 approach to spatiality is the way in which they conceptualise place. The former  
51  
52 considers space and place as either synonymous or binaries, while the latter  
53  
54 understands them as dialectically related (Lefebvre, 1991; Harvey, 1989; Soja, 1989).  
55  
56 The interpretive tradition, as manifested particularly in postmodern geography,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 attempts to expose the contingent nature of space and place and puts the emphasis on  
4  
5 “fluidity, reflexivity, contingency, connectivity, multiplicity and polyvocality”  
6  
7 (Davoudi & Strange, 2009:37). Place is defined subjectively with people living not  
8  
9 “in a framework of geometric relationships but a world of meaning’ (Hubbard *et al*  
10  
11 2004). Space and place are seen as socially and culturally produced, or as Doreen  
12  
13 Massey (2005: 61) puts it, as “simultaneity of multiple trajectories”.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 An early example of a positivist view of spatiality is the highly influential Charter of  
19  
20 Athens (CoA, 1933). Published in 1933, it became a modernist manifesto for  
21  
22 transformation of urban areas into functional cities. It was the brain child of a group  
23  
24 of avant-garde architects and intellectuals who founded Congrès Internationaux  
25  
26 d’Architecture Moderne (CIAM). Its portrayal of the city as the embodiment of four  
27  
28 functions had a profound influence on the architecture and planning practices of post-  
29  
30 war Europe and left its mark on numerous cities around the world (Davoudi &  
31  
32 Madanipour, 2012f). The ‘CIAM city’ (Dear, 1995) was to be built from scratch on a  
33  
34 blank canvas and then filled with human activity. Le Corbusier (1929:232 original  
35  
36 emphasis), the renowned exponent of CIAM principles, was of the view that “WE  
37  
38 MUST BUILD ON A CLEAR SITE!” He advocated that, “The city of today is dying  
39  
40 because it is not constructed geometrically”. The solution would be offered by  
41  
42 physical design. For example, “rational determination of street dimensions” was the  
43  
44 solution for congestions; zoning and slum clearance was the solution for “irrational  
45  
46 location” and overcrowding (CoA, 1933: no page number).

47  
48  
49 Like CIAM, the founding members of the planning movement in Britain were also  
50  
51 looking for planning solutions to urban problems. They, however, were social  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 visionaries rather than architects or planners. They considered planning as an ‘art’  
4 rather than a ‘science’. Nevertheless, like CIAM their urban solutions were  
5 physically-deterministic and utopian; and were considered to provide “a peaceful path  
6 to reform”<sup>3</sup>. Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City had to have a “fixed limit of ...32,000  
7 people, living on 1,000 acres of land...It would be surrounded by a ... permanent  
8 green belt” (Hall 2002:93) which would neatly separate it from the surrounding  
9 countryside. When the Garden City reached its planned limit, another one would be  
10 started. This tightly-planned, neatly-structured and linearly-phased socio-spatial  
11 engineering project would then create a polycentric agglomeration which Howard  
12 called the Social City (Howard 1902). Contemporary spatial planning in the UK does  
13 not use a physically-deterministic language but, the spatiality of the planned-  
14 territories is still constructed largely through quantification and factualisation.  
15 Quantitative indicators and physical attributes of the built and natural environment are  
16 often the dominant narratives that are drawn upon to signify a sense of place and a  
17 distinct place identity (see for example the Yorkshire and Humber Plan, 2006). What  
18 is less common is a social and cultural construction of spatiality around values,  
19 norms, beliefs, aspirations and memories.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 A prominent feature of the ‘spatial turn’ in planning, and one which is particularly  
44 relevant to how spatiality is conceived, is its emphasis on distinctiveness in terms of  
45 both the distinctiveness of the localities and the distinctive approach to plan making<sup>4</sup>.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The latter is frequently hampered by rigid, top-down procedural rules. In the interest  
of conformity these rules often squeeze out any attempts to originality. The former  
has been embraced as part of the plan making process. Local distinctiveness is seen as  
providing potential comparative advantage in an increasingly globalised world. Many

1  
2  
3 local planning authorities have produced ‘characterisation studies’ of their localities  
4 as part of the evidential support for their plan making (DCLG, 2007). Typically, they  
5 present detailed descriptions of the physical aspects of the areas. A particularly  
6 elaborate example has been produced by London Borough of Barnet (Barnet, 2009).  
7 Its “overarching aim ... is to analyse and map the physical character of the Borough to  
8 inform the Council’s planning policies” (ibid:4). It defines the meaning of “urban  
9 character” as “the individual aspects of a place that when combined ... make the place  
10 distinct from anywhere else” (ibid:8). It then emphasises that, “Factors that can  
11 influence and define place identity... typically include the following: Scale and grain;  
12 Land use; Network characteristics; Density; Street width; Building type, Height and  
13 massing; Architectural style; Vegetation, landscape and public realm treatment; and  
14 Topography” (ibid:8). The emphasis is clearly on physical attributes. The outcome  
15 portrays a ‘distinct’ character which is based on absolute and physical space,  
16 constructed by methods that are not dissimilar to the descriptive physical surveys of  
17 the traditional master plans. The social space and its cultural distinctiveness are  
18 reduced to a collection of statistical data on: car ownership, unemployment, index of  
19 deprivation and housing tenure (ibid).

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 An interpretive approach to planning complements these physical readings of space  
44 with social and cultural meanings. It combines the understanding of spatiality as  
45 ‘matters of facts’ with its understanding as ‘matters of concern’ (following Latour,  
46 1993 & 2005). This means paying attention to the objective and physical matters of  
47 space and place as well as the subjective and social concerns *about* space and place.  
48 Spatiality will then emerge, and continue to evolve, from the interrelationships  
49 between natural and physical characteristics, social expectations, cultural norms,  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 power dynamics, and political bargaining. Spatiality would be subject to multiple  
4 interpretations and always in the process of being made. For the interpretive approach  
5 technical rationality of indicators and assessment methods are just one among  
6 multiple (and often competing) rationalities (Watson, 2003) which together shape a  
7 continuous process of becoming. Interpretive planners value the encounters between  
8 these (Healey, 2007) rather than shying away from the complexities that arise from  
9 them. Local distinctiveness is seen as a factor that evolves from such interactions as  
10 the plan making process unfolds.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 21 22 23 2.2 Spatial and scalar order

24 A key feature of positivist planning is the aspiration to tame space and create order.  
25 This 'will to order' (Jensen and Richardson, 2004) has its origin in modernity and its  
26 eighteenth century Enlightenment project. It is based on the then dominant intellectual  
27 view of the world that considered universe as mechanically ordered, its parts  
28 susceptible to scientific discovery, and its malaise amenable to scientific solutions  
29 (Davoudi, 2012f); that science could conquer nature by discovering all its secrets,  
30 including those related to humanity (Hollis, 2002). Some commentators argue that  
31 this 'quest to control' relates to the real and perceived fears and anxieties about  
32 complexity and uncertainty (Schumaker, 1978). Yet, they add that, it not only  
33 circumvents politics and democracy, it may also mask the existence of the complexity  
34 itself. The desire to tame space has been inseparable from the search for "generating  
35 truth about the city" (Osbourne and Rose, 1999: 73), constructing 'spatial laws', and  
36 identifying spatial organising principles. Examples of the latter include: distance-  
37 decay effects, adjacency and proximity, and nested scalar hierarchies. As Foucault  
38 suggests, the demarcation of territory and the taming of space are part of 'planning  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 technologies'. They are "the precise means by which [government] rationalities can  
4  
5 be implemented in practice" (Murdoch, 2006:44).  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 In the interpretive planning the positivist tendencies of the 'will to order' would be  
11  
12 replaced with the 'will to connect' (Hagens, 2010) multiple overlapping networks  
13  
14 with continuous flows of people, resources and knowledges. Rather than controlling  
15  
16 socio-spatial complexities, the emphasis would be on recognising them and seeking  
17  
18 opportunities which may arise from them. An attitude of adventure would replace the  
19  
20 attitude of fear (ibid). In interpretive planning spatial scales are not seen as  
21  
22 hierarchical (global, national, local) but as "nodes in relational settings" where "the  
23  
24 significance and composition of the relations defines the significance of scale"  
25  
26 (Murdoch, 2006:21). Scale, like space, is conceived as socially constructed with  
27  
28 contingent boundaries which are constantly territorialized and open to political  
29  
30 contestation. While contemporary planning practices have begun to articulate the  
31  
32 complex spatial and scalar relations through, for example, notions of network city or  
33  
34 the use of 'fuzzy maps', as discussed below, they continue to be influenced by  
35  
36 positivist principles. Three in particular have proved to be indispensable in planning  
37  
38 and its quest for control. These are: spatial equilibrium, nested hierarchies and  
39  
40 systems control, and will be elaborated in turn.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 2.2.1 Spatial equilibrium

48  
49 Among the early examples of the will to order space the Charter of Athens, mentioned  
50  
51 above, is the most explicit one. It considered cities as being in a state of "chaos"  
52  
53 because of "the uncontrolled and disorderly development of the Machine Age" (CoA,  
54  
55 1933, no page). It warned that the development of cities "suffers from absence of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 control” (ibid). Order and neatly classified and separated functions underpinned its  
4  
5 urban solutions. CIAM’s utopian vision of a ‘good city’ was one in which there was  
6  
7 “a state of equilibrium among all its respective functions” (ibid). This was to be  
8  
9 achieved by the power of plan as epitomised in Le Corbusier’s dictum: ‘The plan  
10  
11 must rule’ (1933:7). The quest for spatial equilibrium was later given an egalitarian  
12  
13 dimension by the redistribution-based regional policy of the 1960s. Although the  
14  
15 redistributive element of the balanced development policy has been increasingly  
16  
17 undermined, its use as a spatial ordering principle has remained attractive. In  
18  
19 contemporary plans the use of balanced development has in fact been heightened after  
20  
21 the publication of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP, 1999) and  
22  
23 its promotion of polycentric development. The underlying assumption is that  
24  
25 spatially-balanced (and ordered) territories are socially more equitable. While policy  
26  
27 objectives such as ‘spreading prosperity’ (as in the Welsh Spatial Plan, 2004) or  
28  
29 ‘spreading urban-centred development opportunities’ (as in the National Planning  
30  
31 Framework for Scotland, 2004) may be considered as publically justified collective  
32  
33 goals (Healey, 1997), the means by which they are to be achieved have remained  
34  
35 physically deterministic and based on “stylised spatial options along a concentration-  
36  
37 dispersal continuum” (Murray, 2009:129). Emphasis is put on: improving physical  
38  
39 accessibility, developing complementary functions between geographically-proximate  
40  
41 places, and privileging nearby relations over distant networks.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 2.2.2 Nested hierarchies

51  
52 The idea of ordering space through scalar hierarchies goes back to the 1930s’  
53  
54 Christaller’s Central Place Theory. This was a highly influential spatial organising  
55  
56 principal which assumed that the complex dynamics of urban growth could be ordered  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in a nested hierarchy of settlements based on the uniform distribution of service  
4 centres in hexagonal arrangements. In some countries, such as Germany, the principle  
5 is still explicitly adopted in the spatial planning frameworks (BBR, 2001). In the UK,  
6 while Christaller is rarely mentioned in the plans, his idea of nested spatial hierarchy  
7 is frequently used to order spatial relations. The hierarchies are constructed through  
8 statistical analysis of functional interactions. The approach can potentially articulate  
9 the dynamics of the relational space but, its use in the contemporary plans is often  
10 highly instrumental aimed at sub-dividing space into smaller units and allocating pre-  
11 defined functions to each. The analyses are often based on reductionist measures, such  
12 as travel to work journeys, and relate to past and present functions. The outcome is  
13 used to designate some places as, for example, 'prime focus' for jobs, houses and  
14 services, others as 'local focus', and the rest as 'hinterlands'. Even less imaginatively,  
15 the planned-territories are sub-divided into: 'high', 'medium', and 'low growth' areas  
16 (as in Regional Development Strategy for Northern Ireland, 2001). The problem with  
17 this positivist approach is that firstly, the static nature of these spatial orders does not  
18 match the dynamic reality of the social and spatial interdependencies. Secondly, these  
19 allocations inevitably lead to some places gaining priority for future development and  
20 investment. However, the political nature of these allocations and their social  
21 implications are often masked by perceiving the process as a technical exercise.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 An exception to this hierarchical approach in the contemporary planning practices is  
48 the articulation of the concept of network city and its associated terms such as hubs,  
49 gateways, nodes, etc. (see for example the Welsh Spatial Plan, 2004). The network  
50 city appears to have captured the relational understanding of space and offered a way  
51 of grappling with complex socio-spatial interactions. This is probably because the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 concept has double functions. On the one hand, it portrays relational complexities. On  
4  
5 the other hand, it reconfigures these complexities into a more malleable form.  
6  
7 Therefore, a “network city is simultaneously unpredictable and organized”  
8  
9 (Beauregard, 2005:30). The concept allows planners to embrace complexity while at  
10  
11 the same time avoiding its incapacitating tendencies. Notwithstanding these emerging  
12  
13 relational understanding, physical geographies of proximity continue to be privileged  
14  
15 over relational geographies of connectivity. This is particularly the case in terms of  
16  
17 the limited attention given to the global positioning of the planned territory.  
18  
19 Globalisation, when is mentioned, is often seen as benign; as a one-way force of  
20  
21 change which the localities passively receive rather than actively shape (see for  
22  
23 example the London Plan, 2004). The global socio-economic and political relations  
24  
25 are often articulated by their association to physical infrastructure. Thus, territories  
26  
27 are presented as, for example, ‘a strategic transport cross-road’, or ‘on an axis’, or ‘as  
28  
29 global gateway’, or ‘remote’ (see for example the Yorkshire and Humber Plan, 2006).  
30  
31 Other economic, social and cultural ties hardly feature in plans. Neither do plans  
32  
33 convey the implications of these global positioning for their localities. Globalisation is  
34  
35 portrayed only as matters of facts and not as matters of concern.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 2.2.3 Systems control

44  
45 The introduction of the systems theory was the heyday of positivism in planning and a  
46  
47 response to the search for ‘spatial laws’. Derived from the science of cybernetics<sup>5</sup> and  
48  
49 imported into planning through the work of Brian McLoughlin and George Chadwick  
50  
51 in the late 1960s, systems theory conceptualised cities as complex systems whose  
52  
53 parts could be unpicked and then monitored and controlled by planners. Spatial  
54  
55 planning was considered to be a form of systems analysis and control (Taylor  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1998:62). Assisted by the quantitative revolution of the time (Barnes 2001), an  
4  
5 engineering-based spatial science emerged which aimed to develop spatial interaction  
6  
7 models capable of measuring and predicting patterns of spatial change (Haggett,  
8  
9 1965). Planners were urged to move away from the descriptive physical surveys of  
10  
11 the earlier master plans and develop general hypothesis about spatial distributions that  
12  
13 could then be tested against the reality (Magee, 1973); the very essence of Popperian  
14  
15 scientific method. An early example of a rigorous attempt to develop a “science of  
16  
17 human settlement” is Doxiadis’ ‘Ekistics theory’ (Doxiadis, 1968:317). For him, as  
18  
19 for systems theorists, regular patterns were deemed to exist in the relationships  
20  
21 between objects which could be mapped, modelled, and used as the basis for  
22  
23 predicting future patterns. The complexity of “human settlements” was reduced to a  
24  
25 series of “orderly classifications” of size, location and function (ibid: 31-35). As a  
26  
27 result, and despite its name, his ‘ideal Dynapolis’ (the growing dynamic city) was  
28  
29 prescribed to be “uni-directional” and “built on the basis of a rectangular grid network  
30  
31 of roads” (ibid:365).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The application of the systems approach through spatial interaction models spread across the western world. In the UK it became the hallmark of sub-regional studies in the 1960s and the 1970s. Sophisticated computer modelling techniques were used to generate policy choices for the fast-growing metropolitan areas. While the systems approach had developed partly in response to earlier criticisms of physical master planning, the systems view itself was confronted with similar criticisms. It was argued that many of the ‘system’ plans, including the structure plans of the 1970s which were supported by detailed ‘reports of survey’, had “a distinctly blueprint hint” (Faludi, 1973:146); that they were entrenched in the same ‘fixities’ that they were trying to



1  
2  
3 avoid. It became clear that the perceived scientific objectivity could not be applied to  
4 socio-spatial systems irrespective of how sophisticated the methods or the models  
5 were, as admitted by Britton Harris, one of the most celebrated of all systems planners  
6 (Hall, 2002).  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 The following decades saw a diminishing emphasis on lengthy and detailed data  
15 collection and an undermining of systems theory. However, since the late 1990s and  
16 with the growing concerns about climate change, the systems approach and its  
17 engineering-based spatial science has been given an increasingly prominent place in  
18 planning (see Davoudi, 2012f). Planners are encouraged to use modelling and  
19 quantitative spatial analyses as the basis for determining ‘climate proof’ urban forms  
20 (ODPM, 2004b). As Michael Batty points out, planners have begun to talk about “a  
21 science of cities” again (*Planning*, 2009:23). This implies that positivist approaches  
22 are gaining a renewed influence in shaping planners’ conception of spatiality. These  
23 technically ‘conceived spaces’ (Lefebvre, 1991:38) may serve a useful analytical and  
24 administrative purpose but, does little for creating a sense of place with which people  
25 can identify. Too much emphasis on ‘conceived spaces’ of planners and systems  
26 analysts would undermine the attempts to incorporate ‘lived spaces’ of imagination  
27 and ‘perceived spaces’ of daily routines (ibid). The latter refers to people’s everyday  
28 life experiences of engaging *in* and *with* space.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Mirroring Lefebvre’s ‘trialectic of spatiality’<sup>6</sup>, interpretive planning considers space  
50 as analytically conceived, physically lived, and culturally perceived. For interpretive  
51 planning the normative dimension lies in shifting the balance away from the abstract  
52 ‘conceived space’ to embrace the imaginative ‘lived space’ as a mechanism for  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 enhancing its potential in re-orienting the 'perceived space' of everyday life (Davoudi  
4 & Strange, 2009:38). This means drawing not just on the technical, but also the social  
5 and cultural spatial imaginations for understanding spatiality. An example of the  
6 attempts to move away from the physical arrangement of land uses and functions  
7 (things) *in* space towards capturing spatial patterns of social interactions (but not the  
8 embodied routine as suggested by Lefebvre) is the increasing use of the concept of  
9 functional urban regions or city regions which has seen an upsurge in planning in  
10 recent years. While this has enhanced the relational understanding of spatial  
11 interactions, its focus has been limited to economic interactions. The difficulties of  
12 quantifying and mapping social and cultural relations have led to their marginalisation  
13 in plan making processes, as mentioned above.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 2.3 Time and future

31 One of the most profound legacies of positivism in spatial planning is the treatment of  
32 time and future. The ability to conceptualise time is the outcome of a long  
33 evolutionary path. As societies have grown in complexity, their temporal concepts  
34 have become more abstract. The abstract time is seen as a linear time running from  
35 past to future. Like the abstract space, time is seen as separate from its content and  
36 from action; it is considered as a quantifiable entity. The concept of the future refers  
37 to a dimension which is separate from the present and distinct from the past (Leccardi,  
38 2008). In the positivist planning future is controllable and can be planned. The will to  
39 order space is coupled with the desire to control the future.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 The idea that future can be planned also has its roots in the Enlightenment project  
55 (Luhmann, 1982) and its aspiration to free the future from the constraints of divinity  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and nature and make it subject to human domination. The future is considered as an  
4  
5 'open future' (Leccardi, 2008) capable of being controlled through human choices and  
6  
7 decisions that are made at present. Planning movement in Britain was heavily  
8  
9 influenced by the optimism and utopianism of such modernist ideas and their linear  
10  
11 conception of history as progress and the ability of the Reason to guide it  
12  
13 (Madanipour, 1995:22). Planning of time is indeed an antidote to the uncertainties  
14  
15 generated by the future and a perceived insurance against its contingencies; it is the  
16  
17 desire to bridge the gap between what *happens* and what *can be done* (Bauman,  
18  
19 1995). The positivist view of linear time with a precise beginning and a fixed end is  
20  
21 still dominant in the contemporary plans. It is reflected in metaphoric expressions  
22  
23 such as "a direction of travel" (as in the Welsh Spatial Plan, 2004), and in rhetorical  
24  
25 questions such as "where will we live, where will we work"? (as in the Regional  
26  
27 Development Strategy for Northern Ireland, 2001) The time frame is pitched at two  
28  
29 decades or so and like the boundaries of the planned areas remains fixed. Ordering  
30  
31 time, therefore, is as much a feature of positivist planning as is ordering space. As  
32  
33 with spatial organising principles, planners draw on temporal organising concepts  
34  
35 such as phasing and programming to tame the time. These temporal toolkits are added  
36  
37 to planners' spatial toolkits to make up the 'planning technologies'. Quantitative  
38  
39 forecasting of past trends is used to reduce future uncertainties. However, despite the  
40  
41 efforts made to refine the methods even the most carefully calculated projections,  
42  
43 such as housing need, tend to be challenged and revised several times during and after  
44  
45 the plan preparation and not always because of access to better data or improved  
46  
47 methods. In such a state of flux, it appears that "planning is condemned to solve  
48  
49 yesterday's problems" (Tayler, 2005:157). None of this is to suggest that planners  
50  
51 should abandon quantitative projections and forecasts. It is rather to highlight the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 limitations of positivist planning and its over-confidence in planners' ability to control  
4 the future.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 For the interpretive planning, time is neither a biological nor a metaphysical given  
10 (Elias, 1992); it is, instead, socially constructed and differs for different generations  
11 and societies. For example, in the pre-industrial era the rhythm of nature and the  
12 succession of seasons constructed time. Interpretive planning acknowledges the  
13 existence of multiple times ranging from the rhythm of everyday life to the dynamics  
14 of glacial changes. Time is seen as cyclical, with past, present and future being  
15 interlinked. Interpretive planning acknowledges both the 'trialectic of spatiality',  
16 suggested by Lefebvre, and what I call the trialectic of temporality. It attempts to  
17 enhance the connection not only between intellectually conceived, physically lived  
18 and culturally perceived spaces, but also between past memories, present experiences  
19 and future expectations.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 In describing what would be an "appropriate time and space of non-Euclidian form of  
37 planning", Friedmann (1993:482) suggests that, "the time of such planning is the *real*  
38 *time* of everyday events rather than imagined future time", because "it is only in the  
39 evanescent and still undecided present that planners can hope to be effective".  
40 However, he then adds that planners' concern with everyday does not mean the  
41 abandoning of concerns with an imagined future. Yet, for the interpretive planning the  
42 notion of future time is characterised through the recognition of future uncertainty,  
43 with action taking place in unexpected ways into unknown and disordered futures.  
44 Unlike the modernist meaning of the future as open and subject to control, the  
45 interpretive approach defines the future in terms of uncertainty and contingency. The  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 image of the future as controllable is replaced with its image as indeterminate and  
4  
5 indeterminable, riddled with unforeseeable possibilities as well as unpredictable risks.  
6  
7 However, rather than putting too much emphasis on reducing uncertainties, the focus  
8  
9 is on identifying potential opportunities. This requires a shift in attitude away from the  
10  
11 fear of unknown and the recourse to conformity, towards the exploration of unknown  
12  
13 and the search for novelty. Following Unger (2007), in the interpretive planning the  
14  
15 recognition of the ubiquity of change and its potential for novelty and surprise  
16  
17 characterises the concept of future time.  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 Positivist techniques of quantitative forecasting and projections would be  
24  
25 complemented with qualitative foresights and scenario building. While the latter has  
26  
27 been employed in plan making processes in recent years, the practice has not been  
28  
29 widespread. This is reflected in a government's commissioned study which calls for  
30  
31 "more future-oriented 'scenario' work telling local authorities what is possible, as  
32  
33 well as what is already present" (DCLG, 2007:7). Furthermore, the emphasis has  
34  
35 remained on fast-forwarding the selected present (Murray, 2009). Therefore, the  
36  
37 imagined future is often not a set of possible and contingent futures capable of  
38  
39 unfolding in multiple ways, but a certain and known future whose challenges can be  
40  
41 anticipated and responded to by present decisions and actions. Yet, as Beauregard  
42  
43 (1996:192) argues, "the text of a postmodern planner, in fact, should be consciously  
44  
45 fragmented and contingent, non linear, without aspiration to comprehensiveness,  
46  
47 singularity or even compelling authority".  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

#### 2.4 The planning process and the use of 'evidence'

Positivism considers planning as a rational decision making process in which value-free experts rely on evidence to solve well defined and neatly structured planning problems. Evidence is understood as synonymous with facts, and credible evidence is interpreted as quantitative, measurable, and capable of establishing a clear cause and effect relations through scientific methods. The process is seen as linear in which the data collection and analysis un-problematically lead to planning and formulation of policy solutions. Although this approach reached its height in the rational planning of the 1960s and 1970s, some of its characteristics can be traced back to an earlier time. This is when the desire to order space became entwined with "generating truths about the city" by employing "mundane techniques of gathering, organising, classification and publication" (Osbourne and Rose 1999:73). A pioneering example is Patrick Geddes's famous dictum of: 'Survey before Plan'. Although it was assumed that "the survey naturally leads to the plan" (Abercrombie 1933:132) - much as it is now assumed that the evidence naturally leads to policy- in practice a *creative* leap was taken from the analysis of the survey to the making of plan. In other words, positivist methodology was combined with rationalist intuitions, or rather with simplistic aesthetic assumptions about urban form and layout (Taylor, 1998); an approach which was criticised by Jane Jacobs as "the pseudo-science of city planning and its companion, the art of civic design" (Jacobs 1961:16).

In the 1960s and with the rise of scientism in planning the creative leap was squeezed out of the process in favour of further objectivity, which was to be achieved by applying scientific methods not only to spatial analysis *in* the plan, but also *to* the plan making itself (Taylor, 1998). The change marked the birth of the rational planning

1  
2  
3 process which considered decision making as a cycle of logical steps. The physical  
4  
5 survey of the earlier time was extended to include the collection of socio-economic  
6  
7 data in detailed ‘Reports of Survey’ which were to provide the evidence-base or  
8  
9 reasoned-justification (as was then known) for the plans’ policies. The rational  
10  
11 planning model has had a pervasive influence on planning and on policy making in  
12  
13 general. Its assumptions have been carried through in the *instrumental* approach to  
14  
15 evidence-based planning<sup>7</sup> (see Cabinet Office, 1999a). Both underestimate the  
16  
17 ‘disjointed’ and ‘incremental’ nature of the real world decision making (Lindblom,  
18  
19 1959) and the mismatch between “how the policy process should work and its actual  
20  
21 messy, uncertain, unstable and essentially political realities’ (Young *et al* 2002: 218).  
22  
23 The emphasis on evidence-based planning was founded on the argument that, prior to  
24  
25 the 2004 planning reform<sup>8</sup>, “the preparation of local plans has undervalued an  
26  
27 understanding of spatial development patterns and trends, and the generation of  
28  
29 strategic options that might flow from that understanding” (DCLG, 2007). To change  
30  
31 the practice, planners have been urged to “gather evidence about their area ... at the  
32  
33 earliest stage in the preparation of the development plan” (ODPM, 2004a:32); a  
34  
35 process called ‘front-loading’. Plans are, therefore, considered ‘sound’ if they “are  
36  
37 founded on a robust and credible evidence base” (ibid:39-40). If they fail this ‘test of  
38  
39 soundness’, which is conducted by an independent panel, they will be taken back to  
40  
41 the drawing board to be supported by “better evidence and reasoning” (ibid). While  
42  
43 the attempts to provide better grounding for planning policies is justified, the  
44  
45 underlying assumptions of the evidence-based planning are flawed. Indeed, the  
46  
47 chosen terminologies are indicative of the enduring legacy of positivism in planning  
48  
49 which considers an *instrumental* place for evidence in planning process. Its ethos is  
50  
51 Popperian, portraying an epistemic view of knowledge which claims that, “one has  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 knowledge only when one has a true belief based on very strong evidence” (Audi,  
4 1996:252). Notions such as ‘front-loading’ are symptomatic of conceiving plan  
5 making as a linear process in which evidence for well-defined planning problems or  
6 goals are gathered first before planning solutions are formulated. It mirrors the  
7 positivist assumptions about the linear process of plan making in which “the  
8 collection of evidence takes place in self-contained, pre-production stage of plan  
9 making”; as one reading of the UK national policy would suggest (DCLG, 2007:5).  
10 However, despite the rhetoric of evidence-based policy, the way evidence is used in  
11 planning is inseparable from the social and political processes in which planners are  
12 engaged. As Hoch (1994:105) suggests: “Planners do not uncover facts like geologists  
13 do, but rather, like lawyers, they organise facts as evidence within different arguments  
14 ... all engage in persuasive rational arguments ... focused and attached to value  
15 objectives”.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Interpretive planning does not consider evidence as the only contender in the making  
35 of planning policies. It stresses that often practical, institutional, ideological and  
36 political factors play a major part. Indeed, these factors may lead to what Carol Weiss  
37 (1975) calls the “problem of little effect”, referring to a great deal of research that  
38 tends to sit on the shelf unnoticed. An audit of the UK government departments has  
39 shown the patchy role that evidence plays in day-to-day policymaking. It concludes  
40 that “little of the research commissioned by departments or other academic research  
41 was used by policy-makers.” (Cabinet Office, 1999b: 36)

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 In the interpretive approach, planning process is seen as iterative rather than linear.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000



1  
2  
3 of space through discursive deliberations (Innes, 1996). Interpretive planning  
4  
5 considers places as created through imaginative visioning, learning and storytelling  
6  
7 (Sandercock, 2003). Methods such as these are seen as a way of expressing identity  
8  
9 and belonging. Interpretive planning advocates that in order to understand a specific  
10  
11 spatial practice, its historical emergence needs to be reconstructed and situated in the  
12  
13 complex web of social and political life. The professional knowledge of planners  
14  
15 would be one set of knowledge resources nestling amongst others. Such multiple  
16  
17 sources of knowledge emerge from objective analysis as well as subjective  
18  
19 experiences. In the interpretive planning, knowledge is seen as explicit and  
20  
21 systematised as well as tacit and non-codified with no sharp distinction between  
22  
23 ‘expert’ and ‘lay’ knowledge. Evidence, or indeed the ensemble of different  
24  
25 knowledges, would play an *enlightening* rather than *determining* role in the process of  
26  
27 plan making. Policy is considered to be *informed by* rather than *based on* evidence.  
28  
29 Furthermore, the emphasis would be on evidence as contributing to wider public  
30  
31 debate rather than merely the narrow domain of policy. Emphasis would, therefore, be  
32  
33 on evidence-*informed society* (Davoudi, 2006: 22 emphasis added, following Smith,  
34  
35 1996).

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 There are already signs of this broader view of knowledge in the contemporary plan  
44  
45 making practices in the UK. A notable example is how the evidence-based approach  
46  
47 to planning has actually been interpreted by planners. The findings from a study  
48  
49 commissioned by the UK government on the post-2004 planning practice shows that  
50  
51 there is a “tendency for different types of material to be included in the meaning of  
52  
53 ‘evidence’. For instance many (planners) referred to the responses from community  
54  
55 involvement and stakeholder events as ‘evidence’” (DCLG, 2007:5). It then adds that  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “it is entirely appropriate to use this type of material in developing, evaluating and  
4  
5 justifying choices that are made, and it does represent an important source of  
6  
7 information representing views of those individuals and organisations” (ibid). The  
8  
9 report also shows the existence of “a wide range of collaborative activity to gather and  
10  
11 interpret evidence” (ibid). Some of the concerns raised by the report are, however,  
12  
13 similar to the criticisms of the perceived gap between ‘survey’ and ‘plan’ in  
14  
15 Geddesian teaching. For example, the report states that “while many ... authorities  
16  
17 have been able to demonstrate that appropriate evidence is being used...the rationale  
18  
19 for the choices made may not be entirely clear...” (DCLG, 2007:5). From a positivist  
20  
21 point of view this may be considered as a shortcoming in the objectivity of the  
22  
23 decision making processes. From an interpretive point of view, however, the  
24  
25 perceived gap indicates the limitations of the rational perspective itself on the decision  
26  
27 making processes. The seemingly opaque nature of the link between evidence and  
28  
29 options may well be due to the influence of the cognitive, social and institutional  
30  
31 environment in which decisions, or more precisely practical judgments, are made. It  
32  
33 would be unrealistic (and undesirable) to think that such influences can be removed  
34  
35 from the process by employing more ‘objective’ methods.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 In addition to the emergence of a broader meaning of evidence, contemporary  
44  
45 planning practice also shows awareness of the iterative nature of the plan making  
46  
47 processes. Contrary to the notion of ‘front loading’ which implies a recognisable  
48  
49 moment (the front) in the process being filled in (loaded) by evidence, there seems to  
50  
51 be a widespread recognition that “the use of evidence is an integral and ongoing part  
52  
53 of preparing a local development framework” and that “evidence gathering is not a  
54  
55 self-contained stage” (DCLG, 2007:19). The government’s commissioned study (ibid)  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shows that planners' approach to what counts as legitimate sources of knowledge and  
4  
5 how evidence is used in planning is much broader than what is centrally prescribed.  
6  
7 However, it also shows that the range of evidence used in the planning process has  
8  
9 remained limited. These mainly cover "standard topic studies dealing with ...  
10  
11 housing, employment and retail" (ibid: 7). "Studies on wider quality-of-life themes  
12  
13 such as culture, green space and health are rarely conducted" (ibid: 5). The problem  
14  
15 with the dominance of topic-based technical information is that it can perpetuate the  
16  
17 understanding of space as 'matters of fact' (such as housing and employment  
18  
19 numbers) and sideline its understanding as 'matters of concern' (such as concerns  
20  
21 about place-quality and lived spaces of everyday life). As mentioned earlier, such  
22  
23 matters of concern do not feature in the 'characterisation studies', either.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 2.5 Representation and Visualisation

31  
32 "All forms of representation are abstraction from reality which bring some aspects  
33  
34 forward to the attention and leave some in background or eliminate them completely"  
35  
36 (Peattie, 1987:112).  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 The term representation differs from a positivist understanding of visualisation as a  
42  
43 communication system. It emphasises the interdependence between "the symbolic  
44  
45 structure that frame what is being said, written and shown during planning processes  
46  
47 and the political structures that frame interactions during those processes" (Fischler,  
48  
49 1995: 23). While acknowledging the significance of the plan's text, metaphors and  
50  
51 concepts in spatial representations, the main emphasis here is on the visual aspects of  
52  
53 representation in the form of cartographical maps.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The most dominant form of representing and visualising spatiality in positivist  
4 planning is static, Cartesian maps (Duhr, 2007). As Joyce (2003:52) suggests, the  
5 introduction of the Ordnance Survey maps in the 18<sup>th</sup> century- (initially for military  
6 purposes) led to new ways of visualising cities on a “microscopic scale” and from the  
7 “omniscient view of the surveyor”. It resulted in displaying land uses and data on  
8 skilfully crafted two-dimensional maps. Cartesian maps have remained a major part of  
9 spatial representations in the contemporary plans. In Latourian terms they continue to  
10 serve “as an immutable mobile”; as inscription that translate space into diagrammatic  
11 form, thereby reducing spatial relations to a single sheet of paper” (Murdoch  
12 2006:134). Furthermore, in the process of making the city ‘legible’ by clear  
13 delineation a particular spatial image emerges which “hold some things constant  
14 (notably, buildings and streets) and remove others from view (notably, the movement  
15 and fluidity of urban social interactions)” (ibid). The fixed lines and colours of the  
16 map becomes the dominant spatial imaginary. For positivist planning, map-making,  
17 like other aspects of plan making, is seen as “scientific and untainted by social  
18 factors” (Harley 1992: 234). For the interpretive planning, maps have ‘agency’. They  
19 serve as a powerful mechanism for including or excluding not only matters of  
20 concern, but also matters of fact. Cartography follows not just technical, but also  
21 social and cultural rules that govern the production of maps. As Harley suggests, “all  
22 maps are rhetorical” (ibid: 242) and work “in society as a form of power-knowledge”  
23 (ibid: 243).

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 In contemporary plans, while some maps continue to depict a positivist view of space  
53 as absolute and fixed, a new practice has emerged which uses what may be called  
54 ‘fuzzy maps’. Instead of the geometric accuracy of traditional maps which depict  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 spatiality as a mosaic of land uses, criss-crossed with roads and rail lines, the fuzzy  
4  
5 maps blur the administrative and physical boundaries to represent ambiguous ‘soft  
6  
7 spaces’ (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2009). Although the boundaries are blurred, the  
8  
9 extent of soft spaces is determined through the analyses that are based on  
10  
11 quantitatively-identified functional reach of the ‘core’ cities. Fuzzy maps have been  
12  
13 tactically used in several spatial strategies of the early 2000s to create new scales of  
14  
15 working which do not necessarily match the hierarchical scales of the UK’s formal  
16  
17 planning system. As such, they have provided a way of visualising a dynamic and  
18  
19 relational understanding of space. It is argued that the emergent of these new “soft  
20  
21 spaces” has helped planners to break “away from the rigidities associated with the  
22  
23 formal scales of statutory plan-making. (ibid:619) and represent the multi-scalar and  
24  
25 overlapping geography of spatial relations. Besides scenario building, fuzzy maps  
26  
27 can provide a useful way of representing and visualising networks and showing the  
28  
29 untidy and complicated flows. However, like other forms of representations they  
30  
31 inherently simplify reality and by doing that they amplify some aspects and  
32  
33 marginalise others. As James Scott (1998:303) points out, such “simplifications...strip  
34  
35 down reality to the bare bones so that the rules will in fact explain more of the  
36  
37 situation”. Like traditional maps, fuzzy maps also have agency and “fuse polity and  
38  
39 territory” (Harley, 1988: 281). The ambiguity of fuzzy boundaries can, for example,  
40  
41 can be tactically used to depoliticise the potential inter-administrative political  
42  
43 tensions as fuzzy maps appear to be more schematic and suggestive than precise and  
44  
45 prescriptive.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 3. Summary and conclusion

The legacy of Euclid, reinforced by a Newtonian view of spatiality, dominated planning ideas and practices in the UK in the first half of the twentieth century. It conceptualised space as an absolute, empty vessel *filled with* activities and objects. It treated place as objective, bounded and scientifically measurable. Seen in this way, space, scale, and time were to be ordered to create neatly separated categories, represented on two-dimensional, Cartesian maps to perform the conceived spaces of planners. The process was seen as linear and rational in which technical evidence, produced by experts, had an instrumental place.

Much has been written about the intellectual shortcomings and the practical limitations of the positivist approach to planning. The most radical critique has come from the interpretive tradition which conceptualises space as relational and dependent on the social and cultural process and substances that produce it. Place, in this approach, is defined subjectively by people's daily experience of engaging with it; by the perceived spaces of everyday life. Understanding of spatiality as matters of fact is combined with its understanding as matters of concern. Fluidity, contingency, dynamism and simultaneity are key characteristics of the interpretive planning. The desire to connect, rather than to control, spaces and times is what drives interpretive planners. The purpose of the interpretive planning is then two-fold. Firstly, to draw on intellectually conceived and culturally perceived spaces to shape physically lived spaces. Secondly, to draw on past memories and present experiences to shape future expectations. Acknowledging the complexities, uncertainties and contingencies of

1  
2  
3 these connections, the emphasis of interpretive planning is not on reducing these but  
4  
5 on seeking opportunities and expanding the space for novelty and adventure.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 The discussion presented in this paper shows that although positivism has retained its  
11  
12 powerful influence on planners' conception of spatiality, an interpretive approach has  
13  
14 emerged in some aspects of contemporary planning practices in the UK. This is  
15  
16 manifested in for example: the network city approach to spatial relations which  
17  
18 challenges the traditional hierarchical way of organising space and scale; the attempts  
19  
20 to challenge the fixed administrative boundaries by focusing on functional  
21  
22 interrelationships; the use of fuzzy maps to visualise the un-bounded nature of flows;  
23  
24 the articulation of uncertainties and contingencies through qualitative scenario  
25  
26 buildings; and, the use of experiential knowledge in plan making processes in a non-  
27  
28 linear way. However, these developments are taking place in parallel with pressures  
29  
30 which tend to strengthen positivism in planning. The rhetoric of evidence-based  
31  
32 policy is one such pressure. Although it has been interpreted in much broader way  
33  
34 than was intended initially, it continues to push planning practices towards the out-  
35  
36 dated technical rational approaches of the mid-twentieth century. Another pressure  
37  
38 comes from the rise of systems approach in planning with a claim to reduce the  
39  
40 uncertainties in climate change and its impacts.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 The exploratory nature of the discussion presented in this paper does not lend itself to  
49  
50 a decisive conclusion. However, it is possible to speculate that the interpretive  
51  
52 approach will find it difficult to offer planners alternative ways of articulating  
53  
54 spatiality in the face of the renewed influence of positivism. As suggested by Pagden,  
55  
56 it seems that, "as we move into a new century with its own share of conflicts ... the  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 fascination with ... Post-modernism is fading. In its place a new scientificism is on the  
4 rise" (2005:17). The warning is not about the escalating scientific and technological  
5 advances which are to be celebrated. It is rather about the over-emphasis on  
6 rationality and objectivity, and the over-confidence in the power of Reason to control  
7 time and space. For planning this is particularly alarming given its depth of affiliation  
8 with positivism, as reflected in Friedmann's (1993:482) remark that, "The  
9 conventional concept of planning is so deeply linked to the Euclidian mode that it is  
10 tempting to argue that if traditional model has to go, then the very idea of planning  
11 must be abandoned".  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 This indicates the enormity of the challenge for planning discipline and profession to  
26 embrace the interpretive approach to spatial thinking. Translating a new relational  
27 understanding of space and time into the realm of planning practice requires a  
28 'paradigm' leap with implications that are more far-reaching than the 1960s'  
29 introduction of systems theory which changed planning from a design-based to a  
30 social science-based activity. There are some encouraging signs, as pointed out  
31 earlier, but for a shift to happen a more concerted action by planning academics and  
32 practitioners is needed.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 Acknowledgment

46  
47 This paper draws on the contributions to the edited book: Davoudi, S. and Strange, I.  
48 (eds) *Conceptions of space and place in strategic spatial planning*, London:  
49 Routledge. My thanks to: Nick Bailey, Gordon Dabinett, Neil Harris, Greg Lloyd,  
50 Michael Murray, Graeme Purves, Huw Thomas, Ian Strange, and Jim Walsh for their  
51 contributions to the book which in turn provided this paper with the insights into  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 contemporary plan making practices. I would also like to thank the anonymous  
4  
5 referees for their constructive comments on an earlier version of the paper.  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 References

- 11 Abercrombie, P. (1933) *Town and Country Planning*, London: Thornton: Butterworth
- 12  
13 Agnew, J. (2005) Space: Place, in: Cloke, P. and Johnson, R. (eds), *Spaces of*  
14  
15 *Geographical Thought*, London: Sage
- 16  
17  
18 Allmendinger, P. (2002) *Planning Theory*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- 19  
20  
21 Allmendinger, P. and Haughton, G., (2009) Soft spaces, fuzzy boundaries, and  
22  
23 metagovernance: the new spatial planning in the Themes Gateway, *Environment and*  
24  
25 *Planning A*, 41:617-633
- 26  
27 Amin A. and Thrift N. (1995) 'Globalisation, 'institutional thickness' and the local  
28  
29 economy', in P. Healey, S. Cameron, S. Davoudi, S. Graham, A. Madanipour (eds),  
30  
31 *Managing Cities*, Chichester: John Wiley, 91-108
- 32  
33 Audi, R. (1996) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge Press,  
34  
35 Cambridge
- 36  
37  
38 Barnes, T. (2001) 'Rethorizing economic geography: from the Quantitative  
39  
40 Revolution to the Cultural Turn', *Annals, Association of American Geographers*  
41  
42 91:546-565.
- 43  
44  
45 Barnet (2009) *Characterisation Study of London Borough of Barnet, Draft Final*  
46  
47 *Report, Section I: Introduction*, Barnet London Borough
- 48  
49  
50 Baumann, Z. (1995) Searching for a centre that holds, in: M. Featherstone, S. Lash  
51  
52 and R. Robertson (eds) *Global medernities*, London: Sage: 140-154
- 53  
54  
55 BBR (Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning) (2001), *Spatial*  
56  
57 *Development and Spatial Planning in Germany*, BBR, Berlin, 15
- 58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Beaugregard, P. (2005) Planning and the network city: Discursive correspondences, in  
4  
5 Albrechts, L. and Mandelbaum, S (eds.) *The Network Society: A new context for*  
6  
7 *planning*, London: Routledge, 24-34

8  
9  
10 Brenner, N. (2000) The urban question: Reflections on Henri Lefebvre, Urban Theory  
11  
12 and the politics of scale, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*,  
13  
14 24(2):361-378

15  
16 Cabinet Office (1999a) *Modernising Government*, Cm 4310, London: Stationary  
17  
18 Office

19  
20 Cabinet Office (1999b) *Professional policy making for the 21st Century*, London:  
21  
22 Cabinet Office.

23  
24 Charter of Athens (1933) <http://www.planum.net/archive/charter.htm>; accessed  
25  
26 1/9/2010

27  
28  
29 Davoudi, S. (2006) Evidence-based Planning: Rhetoric and reality, *DISP*, 165(2)14-  
30  
31 25

32  
33  
34 Davoudi, S. (2012f) Climate risk and security: new meanings of the 'environment' in  
35  
36 English planning system, *European Planning Studies*, forthcoming

37  
38 Davoudi, S. and Madanipour, A. (2012f) The Charters of Athens and two visions of  
39  
40 utopia: functional and connected, *Built Environment*, forthcoming

41  
42 Davoudi, S. and Strange, I. (2009) Space and place in the twentieth century planning:  
43  
44 An analytical framework and an historical review, in S. Davoudi & I. Strange (eds)  
45  
46 *Conceptions of Space & Place in Strategic Spatial Planning*, London: Routledge 7-42

47  
48 DCLG (the Department of Communities and Local Government) (2007) *Using*  
49  
50 *evidence in spatial planning*, London: DCLG

1  
2  
3 Dear, M. (1995) 'Prolegomena to a post-modern urbanism', in P. Healey, S.J.  
4  
5 Cameron, S. Davoudi, A. Graham, A. Madanipour (eds) *Managing Cities, the new*  
6  
7 *urban context* Chichester: John Wiley, 27-44.

8  
9 Doxiadis, C. (1968) *Ekistics*, London: Hutchinson

10  
11 Duhr, S. (2007) *The visual language of spatial planning*, London: Routledge

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Ellias, N. (1992) *Time: an essay*, Oxford: Blackwell

ESDP (*European spatial development perspective*): *Towards a balanced and sustainable development of the territory of the European Union*, (1999) Luxembourg: Office for the Official Publications of the European Communities.

Faludi, A. (1973) *Planning Theory*, Oxford: Pergamon

Fischler, R. (1995) Strategy and history in professional practice: Planning as world making, in H. Liggett and D.C Perry (eds), *Spatial Practices*, London: Sage 13-59

Friedmann, J. (1993) 'Toward a non-Euclidean mode of planning', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 59 (4): 482-485

Hagen, J.E. (2010) *Branding, bonding, bringing about... The performance of landscape concepts in spatial planning*, Wageningen: Wageningen University

Haggett, P. (1965) *Locational Analysis in Human Geography*, London: Edward Arnold

Hall, P. (2002) *Cities of Tomorrow*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, Oxford: Blackwell.

Harley J.B. (1992) Deconstructing the map, in T.J. Barnes and S.J. Duncan (eds) *Writing worlds: discourse, text and metaphor*, London: Routledge, 231-247

Harley, J.B. (1988) Maps, knowledge and power, in D. Cosgrove and S. Daniel (eds) *Iconography of landscape: essays on the symbolic representation, design and use of past environment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 277-312

Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Post-modernity*, Oxford: Blackwell.

- 1  
2  
3 Harvey, D. (1996) *Justice, Nature and Geography of Difference*, Oxford: Blackwell  
4  
5 Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative planning: shaping places in fragmented societies*,  
6  
7 London: Macmillan Press.  
8  
9 Healey, P. (2007) *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies, Towards a relational*  
10  
11 *planning for our times*, London: Routledge.  
12  
13 Hoch, C., (1994) *What planners do: Power, politics, and persuasion*. Chicago, IL:  
14  
15 Planners Press  
16  
17 Hollis, M. (2003) *The Philosophy of Social Science: An introduction*, Cambridge  
18  
19 University Press: Cambridge  
20  
21  
22  
23 Howard, E. (1902) *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, London: Swan Sonnenschein  
24  
25 Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R. and Valentine, G, (2004) 'Editors' introduction' in: P.  
26  
27 Hubbard, R. Kitchin, and G. Valentine (eds) *Key Thinkers on Space and Place*,  
28  
29 London: Sage  
30  
31  
32 Innes, J. (1996) Planning through consensus building, a new view of the  
33  
34 comprehensive planning ideal, *American Planning Association Journal* 62(4): 460-  
35  
36 472.  
37  
38  
39 Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Harmondsworth:  
40  
41 Penguin (1964 end)  
42  
43 Jensen, O. and Richardson, T. (2004) *Making of European Space: Mobility, power*  
44  
45 *and territorial identity*, London: Routledge  
46  
47  
48 Joyce, P (2003) *The Rule of Freedom: Liberalism and the Modern City*, London:  
49  
50 Verso  
51  
52 Latour, B. (1993) *We have never been modern* (translated by C. Porter) Weatsheaf:  
53  
54 USA  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Latour, B. (2005) *From realpolitike to dingpolitik, or how to makes things public*,  
4  
5 <http://www.bruno-latour.fr/expositions/96-MTP-DING.pdf> accessed 15/9/ 2010  
6

7 Le Corbusier (1929) *The City of Tomorrow and its Planning*, London: John Podher  
8  
9 (translated by F. Etchelle from *L'Urbanisme*, 1924, Paris: Edition Cres).  
10

11 Le Corbusier (1933) *La Ville Radieuse*, Paris: Freal et Cie (English translation by P.  
12  
13 Knight, E. Levieux and D. Coltman, published as *The Radiant City*, London: Faber &  
14  
15 Faber, 1967)  
16

17  
18 Leccardie, C. (2008) New biographies in the 'risk society'? About future and  
19  
20 planning, *the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Society, the Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences*,  
21  
22 3(2) 119-129  
23

24  
25 Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Blackwell (translated from the  
26  
27 original edition, 1974, by N. Donaldson-Smith).  
28

29  
30 Lindblom, C.E (1959) 'The science of 'muddling through'' *Public Administration*  
31  
32 *Review*, 19:79-88.  
33

34  
35 *London Plan: Spatial development strategy for Greater London* (2004) London:  
36  
37 Greater London Authority  
38

39  
40 Luhmann, N. (1982) The future cannot begin: temporal structures in modern society,  
41  
42 in: N. Luhmann (ed) *The differentiation of society*, New York: Columbia University  
43  
44 Press: 271-289  
45

46  
47 Madanipour, A. (1995) Reading the city, in: P. Healey et al (eds) *Managing Cities:*  
48  
49 *the new urban context*, John Wiley, London, 21-26.  
50

51  
52 Magee, B (1973) *Popper*, Glasgow: Collins/Fontana  
53

54  
55 Massey, D. (2005) *For Space*, London: Sage.  
56

57  
58  
59 Murdoch, J. (2006) *Post-structuralist geography*, Sage, London  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Murray, M. (2009) Building consensus in contested spaces and places: The Regional  
4 Development Strategy for Northern Ireland, in S. Davoudi & I. Strange (eds)  
5 *Conceptions of Space & Place in Strategic Spatial Planning*, London: Routledge 125-  
6  
7  
8 147  
9  
10  
11 Nadin, V. (2007) The emergence of the spatial planning approach in England,  
12 *Planning Practice and Research*, 22(1): 43-62  
13  
14  
15  
16 *National Planning Framework for Scotland* (2004) Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.  
17  
18 ODPM (2004b) *The Planning Response to Climate Change: Advice on better*  
19 *practice*, London, ODPM.  
20  
21  
22 ODPM (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister) (2004a) *Planning Policy Statement 12:*  
23 *Local Development Frameworks*, London: ODPM  
24  
25  
26 Osborne, T. and Rose, N. (1999) 'Spatial phenomenotechnics: making space with  
27 Charles Booth and Patrick Geddes', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*,  
28 22:209-28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Pagden A, (2005) What sparks intellectual movements? *The Times Higher Education*  
35 *Supplement*, 29 April, 16-17  
36  
37  
38 Peattie, L. (1987) *Planning Ciudad Guayana*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan  
39 Press  
40  
41  
42  
43 *Planning* (2009) Centre extends science of planning, 19 June, 23  
44  
45  
46 *Regional Development Strategy for Northern Ireland 2025: Shaping Our Future*  
47 (2001) Belfast: Department for Regional Development.  
48  
49  
50 Sandercock, L. (2003) Out of the closet: the importance of stories and storytelling in  
51 planning practice, *Planning Theory and Practice*, 4(1) 11-28  
52  
53  
54 Schumaker, P.D. (1978) The quest for control: A critique of the rational-central-rule  
55 approach in public affairs, *The Journal of Politics*, 40(1) 239-242  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Scott, J. (1998) *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve human*  
4 *conditions have failed*, New Haven CT: Yale University Press  
5  
6  
7 Scruton, R. (1996) *Modern Philosophy: An introduction and survey*, London:  
8  
9 Mandarin.  
10  
11 Soja, E. (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social*  
12 *theory*, London: Verso.  
13  
14  
15  
16 Smith, A.F.M., 1996, Mad cows and ecstasy: chance and choice in an evidence-based  
17 society, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, Vol. 159(3): 367-383  
18  
19  
20 Taylor, N. (1998) *Urban Planning Theory since 1945*, London: Sage  
21  
22  
23 Taylor, P. (2005) Time: from hegemonic change to everyday life, in S. Holloway, S.  
24 Rice and G. Valentine, *Key concepts in Geography*, London: Sage, 151-164  
25  
26  
27 Unger, R. 2007, *The self awakened: Pragmatism unbound*, Boston: Harvard  
28 University Press  
29  
30  
31  
32 *Wales Spatial Plan: People, Places, Futures* (2004) Cardiff: Welsh Assembly  
33 Government  
34  
35  
36 Watson, V. (2003) 'Conflicting rationalities: implications for planning theory and  
37 practice', *Planning Theory and Practice* 4(4): 395-407  
38  
39  
40 Weiss C. H. (1975) Evaluation research in the political context, in: E. S. Struening  
41 and M. Guttentag (eds) *Handbook of Evaluation Research*, Volume 1, London: Sage,  
42 13-25  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 *Yorkshire and Humber Plan* (2006) Wakefield: Yorkshire and Humber Assembly  
48  
49  
50 Young, K.; Ashby D.; Boaz, A.; Grayson, L. (2002): Social science and the evidence-  
51 based policy movement. *Social Policy and Society*, 1(3): 215–224  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

---

57 <sup>1</sup> Based on Francis Bacon's *first way* of discovering truth  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 <sup>2</sup> From the Greek word *hermeneus*, an interpreter

5 <sup>3</sup> This was the sub-title of the Ebenezer Howard's book as published in 1898. It was  
6 later republished under the most commonly known title of: *Garden Cities of*  
7 *Tomorrow* (Howard 1902)

8 <sup>4</sup> See for example Plymouth Local Development Framework website  
9 <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageId=110212#contents-1> , accessed  
10 1/9/2010

11 <sup>5</sup> This was developed by Norbert Wiener in 1948

12 <sup>6</sup> Or triple dialectic, meaning a three way interactions between these spaces

13 <sup>7</sup> For the distinction between the instrumental and the enlightenment models of  
14 evidence-policy interface see Davoudi (2006)

15 <sup>8</sup> Through the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60