FROM MASTER PLANS TO DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Abstract. The article is arguing that town planning requires a new restructure of design methodologies. It is stating that the complex aspects of planning require division of the whole process and should concentrate not only on the physical development phase but on all the complex growth procedures and tendencies. It should start from visionary socio-economic ideas and restrictions which would lead to futuristic interpretations of human needs and environmental aspects. Because of the complex aspects, the approach should be divided into three tears. The complexity of urban procedures should be robust in the upper tears but flexible in detailed interpretations. This only will provide the opportunity to respond adequately to the changing circumstances in urban development tendencies. The attached maps and graphs provide clear indication of the required activities, topics and procedures for a modern approach to urban planning.
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1. The Importance of Applied Planning Methodologies

Urban planning methodologies are not very often debated. They are mainly of interest to some academics and specialized experts interested in that subject. The stakeholders, developers, investors, and the community at large are interested in the results, or the outcomes of plans. The way in which these outcomes are achieved is of lesser importance to them.

Plans are criticized or appreciated mainly for their usefulness and the level of pragmatism not the methodology they followed. This is left for a small group of professionals. That might be justified in projects related clearly to technical aspects but not to urban planning that is strongly rooted in socio-cultural and environmental issues.

Inadequacies of urban plans are strongly related to deficiencies of applied planning methods. There are of course also other reasons why plans were not implemented; like lack of political will or understanding, or simple negligence. However, the failure of many plans can be related to the inadequacy of the methodologies applied.

Until the mid of the 20th century, mainly architects and engineers developed urban plans. They focused on physical aspects of urban design. These were concepts prepared as if they were architectural superstructures supported by technical networks. These concepts were proposed by often highly skilled professionals and were simply imposed on the city inhabitants and users, as could be the case with any other architectural projects. They were treated as Master Plans that imply that development will strictly follow the design, as is the case with the construction of a building or a complex of buildings.
The main misunderstanding relates to the fact that the design of buildings is clearly defined by the functional end-state that does not change in its principal form and structure during the usable life of the building. Often after that period, they are simply demolished. City structures do not have defined end-states; they are living organisms that require constant changes in order to adjust their structures and content to new requirements and evolving circumstances. Planning, therefore, has to be understood and treated as a continuous process not a blueprint for an end product.

Because of this principal flaw in the understanding of planning, many city concepts prepared in a Master Plan model were not followed adequately and sometimes even completely rejected irrespective of their intellectual, professional or conceptual quality.

This is not to say that master planning was not successful or cannot be applied in specific circumstances, like in the design of a new city, a major housing or industrial suburb or a governmental precinct.

This however, is not the case when planning a living and developing city. Here only methods can succeed that take the changing nature of the development processes as a basic determinant. In consequence, planning has to be understood and exercised as a process covering and anticipating the requirements of the constantly changing nature of the urban environment.

This process has to acknowledge the growing complexity of present urban development and possible future social needs, economic requirements, environmental limitations, and the compound issues of managing and financing urban development. This cannot be achieved by a rigid Master Plan – blueprint but by a development strategy, robust in principle and flexible in detail that could adjust according to changing circumstances.

2. Urban Development Periods and Planning

Planning is as old as civilization. It evolved and altered as civilization progressed. Settlement systems developed reflecting the socio-cultural, ecological and economic requirements of their times. In order to serve their populations, they adjusted accordingly. As requirements changed, so did approaches and methodologies.

Cities that did not succeed in this adjustment fell into oblivion and decay. There were of course also other reasons why cities disappeared or were destroyed. However, it can be proven that planning methods had a profound impact on a city's success or decay.

In the historic process of urban growth, four distinctive periods of settlement development can be identified.

(1) The ecological city,
(2) The market town,
(3) The industrial city,
(4) The global city.

It is a very general classification, but a useful one as it can help to distinguish the relevance between the development processes of a city, and the applied planning approach or methodology.
The exact time frame of each type can only be defined in a very general manner. The first settlement system started in the early days of civilization and lasted till the start of the Roman Empire when the second system developed. The third started in the beginning of the 19th century when the industrial revolution made its impact. The last type made its slow inauguration in the mid-sixties of the 20th century when the technological revolution commenced its dynamic offensive.

The ecological city, or better a settlement, was developed by the early civilizations. Those settlements grew slowly and were related closely to the natural environment. They developed in response to the evolutionary development of the society and the limitations of the ecological setting. In that way developed the ancient cities of the forest population or desert dwellers, the fishing villages or the military cities of the early millennia. Their structure was simple; it was organic, which means that those settlements grew as any natural objects through addition and evolutionary adjustments, as required by the progress of change and the resulting development dynamism.

The functions of those settlements were internalised, which means that they developed with little influence from the outside. The planning methods applied by the city dwellers were related to uncomplicated well-known functions. Even in the last, most sophisticated times of that era, in which the early Greek cities developed, the planning principles still were very simple. Cities grew around a central area giving prominence only to public places. The remaining parts of the city developed organically often by simple additions and inside environmental limitations.

When the division and specialization of labour became the driving force of progress, the market town developed. A new urban structure was required to provide the opportunity for exchange of goods produced by specialized craftsmen and the provisions supplied by the rural population. Dynamic growth created conflicts and demanded new arrangements. The needs of different groups had to be accommodated in those settlements. Structured subdivisions were prepared according to strict rules in order to satisfy the needs of the different types of population and the emerging urban functions.

New city management systems were introduced often under the protection of a powerful lord. In many countries specific "planning laws" were issued by sovereigns, like the Magdeburg Law that became the principle planning guide for the development of cities in central Europe. The market square flanked by the town hall (a new invention that had to serve the new administrative structure) and a place of worship was the central part of the settlement. From there, subdivisions radiated in different kinds of grids that followed very strict rules and dimensions.

The street network was arranged to cater for all: people, goods and husbandry. The population and their wealth had to be safeguarded. Defence ramparts were constructed to protect the city dwellers and the commuters that provided supplies from the hinterland. Sometimes, the city related spatially also to another node: a castle, the seat of the feudal lord that supervised the city.

The design of market cities was very successful as it responded clearly to the functional demands of the users. No wonder that in this manner most, if not all, cities
in Europe were planned and constructed over several centuries. Some were more sophisticated than others. There were imperial capitals, gothic towns of mediaeval mystery, renaissance cities with exquisite buildings and boulevards and border towns with narrow streets and extensive ramparts, and simple mountain villages. All however, followed the same general principles of a market town.

In the eighteen and early nineteen centuries, most of the American towns, particularly the so-called Border Towns, applied the principles and the designs developed for the European market town.

Similar concepts and developments occurred in the Middle East, the other part of the Middle Age civilization. The Arab City developed as a clear mono-centric structure since all religious, cultural and administrative functions were consolidated by the religious leader. Specialized precincts extended in all directions creating specialized suburbs and streets.

The city of Damascus might be one example as are many other medinas in countries surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. The round town of Baghdad might be another example; one that had the different parts of the city very clearly defined. Unfortunately, the design seemed to be too rigid and restrictive and probably did not fit the requirements of the citizens and the rulers, and disappeared nearly without a trace. One of the very examples proving that a city concept will fail when the design does not respond to the requirements and the specificity of the city's users.

The great challenge came with the industrial revolution. New technical inventions and innovative production practices demanded then the creation of new concentrations for manufacturing combines where big numbers of unskilled workers could start mass production of goods. That was instigated by technological progress and strongly supported by the easy spoils from the colonies. It took, however, quite a while until planning practices responded to this challenge.

The industrial city, with the new employment opportunities, became the destination of great numbers of migrants from the rural hinterland. In the beginning of the 19th century, the urban population was about 9% of the world total population of about one billion people. In the following 100 years, the total world's population grew by about 68%, but the urban population by nearly 200%. Until 1800, there was not one town of a million inhabitants. 100 years later, there were 17 of them, and already 157 in 1975. Between 1821 and 1851 alone, some 4 million people migrated to towns in England and Wales.

Despite that, cities developed without recognition of the fast changing circumstances. The market city principles were outgrown; however, no new principles were established to organize the dynamics of the emerging era. The principle goals were geared towards maximum economic profit achieved simply through exploitation of natural resources and biological abilities of the human being. That caused serious health problems in the cities, devastation of the natural environment, pollution and human suffering never known before.

The dawn of the industrial age provided a great challenge for planning. But, for almost 100 years, nothing happened in the development of new planning methods. Just the opposite. This was in spite of the enormous migration to the new production centres and the investment-oriented drive that called more than ever for innovative planning approaches.
Till the mid-19th century, no planning policies, plans or concepts were proposed to direct urban development. Cities, with only few exceptions (Washington, Paris...) extended unplanned and haphazardly in size and density.

The beginning of change and recognition of the new requirements started with sanitary related considerations. The first was the Public Health Act in 1848 in Britain. Others followed. The many socially oriented analyses developed slowly and gave only the impetus to the establishment of laws or regulations. The Chadwick report (1884) indicated that 'finally the appalling sanitary conditions became so grave that they were beginning to concern a number of industrialists because of the assumed links between quality of environment and labour productivity'. These were general policies; they identified problems and created rules but did not specifically design a system.

The German (Prussian) 'Fluchtliniengesetz' of 1875 (it could be translated as "setback regulations") could be considered as the first legislation in Continental Europe that directly addressed urban planning and the design of cities.

Nevertheless, nothing happened in the development of planning methodologies, as understood today, until the beginning of the 20th century when a new generation of plans was developed. They were treated as urban design proposals that started to regulate all building and construction activity in the cities.

The 1917 report of the (British) Royal Commission on Industrial Unrest saw planning activities as essentially a technical process of design and drawing unrelated in its operation to economic or political processes (Y. Rydin, 1993). Thus, the success of such activity depended on the technical skills and talents of the planner.

The environmental and socio-economic aspects were not included in the planning process as it was proposed by Geddes who argued that planning has to be based on surveys and analyses that should enable the physical environmental to adapt the changing needs of the society. Similarly Ebenezer Howard argued for the so-called Garden Cities that would combine the best elements of urban and rural life as a blueprint for healthy areas.

In that context, Master Plans for many cities were developed. In Europe Ronie (1908), Hamburg and the Ruhr (1920), Amsterdam, Prague, Berlin (1935), Paris, London (1939) got their first Master Plans. In the USA, the main planning practices started with San Francisco (1905) followed by Chicago (1909) Washington and New York (1929).

They did not go beyond physical aspects of city development. It was thought that through careful and expert design of the physical fabric of urban areas a settlement system could be created which could improve living conditions. Uses and networks were distributed according to some general principles of geometry, functionality and engineering. The location of general zones was defined and open spaces designated for public use. The street and public transport networks were defined.

Mainly architects and engineers did these plans. It might be interesting to mention that in 1909 there were only four men practicing as professional planners in the UK (Hague, 1984). In 1914, the Town Planning Institute was founded and admission was on the basis of professional qualifications in architecture, engineering or surveying.
The great transformation of the world occurred in the aftermath of WWII. In some countries, mainly in Central and Eastern Europe, only then industrialization became a driving force for migration and urban growth. In others, the devastation of many cities required immediate action, specifically in Germany, Britain and France. The United States and Canada, as the only countries that had no territorial and building losses, could then convert their great productive potential from defence to consumption products, so very needed by the post-war societies. This stimulated urban development in North America.

The pre-war experience in planning seemed to assist well the new urban dynamism. All countries understood that fast reconstruction required planning of new towns and suburbs. The Planning Acts of 1947/1959 and the New Towns Act of 1946 in Britain or the German Bundesbaugezetdes of 1955 were just some examples of the recognition of the importance of planning.

The urban problems at that time were mainly spatial and technical. In some countries new extensive housing and production areas were needed, so were transportation systems; in others restoration and rehabilitation of devastated cities were the urgent priorities. The urban design oriented methodology of the pre-war planning approach fitted very well to the immediate needs. The new or rebuilt urban concentrations still were in their basic principles industrial, or production oriented cities in which often about 40% of the labour force was employed in the second sector, i.e. production.

In the mid sixties, it became obvious that substantial changes needed to be undertaken in the planning practices. The post-war and post-colonial societies were changing from a productive to a consumptive society. The boarders between cities, countries and even continents, once very firm, were loosing their importance. New economic goals and competition required interaction and territorial freedom never experienced before in such scale.

The global city was slowly emerging. Free market ideas and economic liberalism could not fit into rigid urban design plans or zoning regulations that were preceding or restricting economic initiatives or demands of the public that now claimed a legitimate place in the planning process. This demand was becoming even more and more important as the communities started to understand the need for sustainable growth and expected solutions that could guarantee a good prospect for future generations.

The accelerating impact of information technology stimulated and supported the notion of the global city that had no physical boundaries and time restrictions. It provided information not only about market fluctuations but also about the level of the progressing devastation of the earth, if not the universe.

In the early sixties, the shortcomings of the Master Plan system became obvious. It was difficult to keep plans up to date and responsive to the demands of change. New approaches in planning were needed. In Britain, the 1968 new Town and Country Planning Act of 1968 gave the start to a new system of plans. A two-tier system of plans was proposed in order to speed up the plan making and approval processes, increase plan flexibility and broaden its scope.
The 1986 German Baugesetzbuch, that was developed from Baugesetz of 1960, with consecutive amendments, also introduced a two-tier planning process. The Development Plan (Bauleitplan) was divided into two parts: 'The National or General Development Plan' (Vorbereitender Bauleitplan) and the 'Binding Development Plan' (Verbindlicher Bauleitplan). All the upper level plans defined general stratégic aspects and required flexibility as a basic principle. The lower level plans (Local Plans, Specific or Binding Plans) were to detail the strategies defined at the upper tier in order to create implementation mechanisms and control systems.

Similarly in the USA, the approach to planning widened that "including the exploration of alternatives of future states of the built environment (Land Use Plans) and alternative means for achieving these future states (guidance systems)" – F. Chapin Jr.

In that context, many plans developed on all continents in the sixties, seventies and eighties. Some were more elaborate and successful, others less. In those which had a clear strategic direction and were responsive to changing circumstances, emerging values did prevail. Others that still dwelled in the urban design methodology of a rigid and static end-picture were overtaken by the new dynamism.

3. The Adequacy of Planning Methodologies

The short appraisal of the history of settlement systems indicates that planning passed through different phases. It was prosperous in the period of the ecological settlements of the early millennia and market towns of the Middle Ages. By means of physical/urban design they prepared lay-outs or plans by projecting end states that could be easily foreseen and managed.

The development processes followed principles that changed slowly, providing time for appropriate adjustment. Some concepts were very farsighted in design principles and survived centuries. Many market-cities became successful central areas of prosperous metropolises even without inflicting major distortions to the original design. That period of successful planning lasted until the end of the 18th century.

Then came the 19th century that started a hundred year period of nearly complete absence of planning. It was in fact part of a crisis of urban development and society at large. Development goals, or better imperatives, were directed not towards a balanced order but profit. The living conditions deteriorated in most urban centres to a dangerous level. Vast areas developed without any plans or planning considerations.

There were some positive examples of new capitals or colonial settlements. However, the general impression of the 19th century in regard to planning will always be negative. Not much of those negative effects can now be seen, thanks to the great efforts of the first half of the 20th century Master Plans that restructured and beautified the decaying cities of the 19th century.

Nevertheless, the 19th century instigated many surveys and policy rapports analysing the negative features of urban development. That created the foundation for the legislative proposals and acts that finally formed the basis for the establishment of principles on which the Master Plans of the 20th century were firmly instituted.
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From the beginning of the 20th century until the late sixties, Master Plans were the basis for urban development. Until the free market economy started to dominate the development scene and the emergence of revolutionary technologies and information systems, the Master Plans were very successful on all continents.

There were several reasons for that:
1) Until the sixties, the economic systems that influenced urban development operated inside national borders and could easily be controlled by the different levels of government;
2) The governments were the main, if not the only, infrastructure development agencies, they financed, planned and executed most of public works and a great amount of housing;
3) The post-war reconstruction needs demanded fast decision-making and strict implementation processes, that could be done best by a centralized system of urban management;
4) The stakeholders and the community at large were supposed to follow the goals and development programs established by professional planners for the relevant government agencies, they in turn considered themselves as the only custodians of the planning proposals;
5) The private sector was not involved in funding of public works; they were profit-making enterprises.

In such environment, the Master Plans could contribute well to the urban development processes. They established a methodology (Fig. 1) that followed a very clear linear regimen:

\[ \text{LIMITED RESEARCH} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{A) AIM OF PLAN GOALS & OBJECTIVES} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{B) URBAN DESIGN CONCEPT} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{C) PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{D) MASTER PLAN - BLUEPRINT} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{E) APPROVAL BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{F) REGULATED IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS} \]

**Fig. 1. Master Plan – a linear approach**

A. – The aim and the goals were clearly defined by the government.
B. – On that basis, a professional team of architects and engineers prepared a design concept that defined all physical features of the end-state of a future city. The research and analytical part was concise.
C. – A professional evaluation followed.
D. – Based on that, a blueprint was prepared which defined the distribution of uses and networks often supported by strict zoning regulations.

E. – This blueprint was approved and adopted for implementation by the government.

F. – This became the basis for the construction of all public works by governmental agencies, and an implementation system based on a rigid control system for all private activities undertaken in the time frame of the plan.

The methodology did not consider, in principle, reviews or cyclical reworking. It usually allowed amendments, which only in some cases were fortunate, as they were usually done case by case and did not relate to the complex aspects of the whole city. Often the Master Plan was relegated to a position of a second-rate reference document.

As the circumstances changed, the Master Plan approach could not respond anymore to the new development environment. In most countries, the inflexible Master Plans were overrun by changing needs that required the application of a different approach to urban planning. The main reason for change related to new emerging circumstances:

1) The economy demanded free trade and open markets. The control by governments shifted in many aspects to international levels expressed among others by GATT agreements and creation of such organizations as WTO or EU.

Globalisation became the key word in economics; it caused the move from intra-national to international competition between cities. Foreign exchange was more and more undertaken directly between cities or activity concentrations then between countries. Powerful international organizations were not any more bound by political boarders.

2) The growing needs of infrastructure were exceeding the governmental budgets. Till the late sixties the main agency that controlled the urban development budget was the government. It provided most of the funds for all social and technical infrastructure.

Now governments were not anymore in a position to fund the ever growing needs and demands of the citizens and businesses, Some of these demands related to new standards required to ensure sustainable development; others to the changing values and expectations of the urban population. Till now the improvement of land was entirely undertaken by the government. However, the profits went to the landowner or developer; this could not be sustained any more.

3) The stakeholders’ demand for greater access to the decision-making process was accelerating. Until the late sixties, the planning process was a clear activity in which professional planners prepared plans for the government, with limited opportunity for the stakeholders to voice their own views or requirements. With the growing complexity, environmental deterioration and conflicting interests of the different interest groups, the involvement of the public (through direct or indirect representation) could not anymore be avoided.

4) The dynamic development of technological innovations created a new platform for success. They influenced all parts and levels of the society and the development environment. There were several strands of dynamically developing innovations, but primarily in electronics and information, biotechnology, molecular and genetic engineering.
Those innovations were creating new opportunities (and threats), and started to instigate exceptional organizational improvements and social change. They demanded not only physical changes in the patterns of growth but different policies and urban management structures.

The complex interrelationship and interaction of mere emerging aspects made it obvious that urban futures could not be guided by inflexible blueprints, conceptual end-states of structures that had to last for 20-30 years. A new approach was required that would be robust in principles but adaptable to detailed changes that could direct and facilitate new development dynamics.

4. Strategic Planning: the New Frontier

There is some confusion about the meaning, structure and content of strategic planning.

The terminology used in strategy is often imprecise and confusing. Strategy often means different things to different people. The truth, however, is that it is understood by everybody that it deals with issues capable of profound impacts on development.

It might be helpful to refer to some non-urban fields of activities to help to clarify the definition of strategic planning. It is now often argued that strategic planning made its beginning some thirty years ago in corporate management. This is only partly true, as the origin of strategic activities was clearly a domain of warfare for at least 300 years. Its origin could even go much further back in history. ‘Strategos’ means in ancient Greek ‘general’ or ‘leader of an army’. As such, he had to take care of the organization of the battles performed by soldiers and their cohorts.

Carl von Clausewitz, the 19th century Prussian general defined strategy as the employment of battles to gain the end of war. Further, Clausewitz states that 'strategy is the theory of the use of combats for the object of war; tactics is the theory for the use of military forces for the object of war’ (E.M. Earle at all. 1944).

This means that the goal was clear and farsighted; however, described in general terms as the final results of a victorious war can be of different nature. It, however, had to be achieved by tactics or battles. They might be of different kind and level of success as long as they ensure the final victory. In summary: the end state is clear; however, very general and described only in principle. The ways to achieve a satisfactory end result could be different; however, detailed and flexible, adjusted to the emerging circumstances and having in mind a generically defined end-result.

The beginning of strategic planning should be accredited to European planning legislation and, particularly, the British Town and Country Planning Act of 1968. It introduced a new approach to planning dividing development planning into two parts.

The system comprised at the higher tier of a structure plan that was intended to be a broad-brush exercise, describing the authority's strategic policies not only for land use and transportation, but also for economic and social requirements. The structure plans had to be written documents and their proposals illustrated diagrammatically. Those plans needed governmental approval.
At the second lower tier, there were local plans that had to elaborate in detail the general proposals of the strategic-oriented structure plan. Those local plans also set out development controls for the whole locality or for action areas. They had to be map-based in order to present all the required detail. Additionally, subject plans could be prepared to deal with specific issues. Those plans (local and specific) needed only to be adopted by the planning authority which, in the case of a big conurbation, was a specially created metropolitan authority.

This approach is very much in parallel to the military concept of strategic planning. It defines robust principles for the whole campaign but relates the implementation details to the specific circumstances. In such an approach, the complex issues of urban planning are processed at two levels: (1) the policy strategic level, where the most important aspects are defined in general and (2) the implementation tactical level, where the relevant details are resolved.

In order to make an urban development strategy effective, the following has to be observed: urban planning is a continuous process. The complexity and the fast changing values and requirements cannot be handled by an end-state blueprint. It has to be a cyclical process. It starts with an extensive analytical process that is followed with the establishment of a strategic framework forming the basis for a detailed implementation process.

This then is followed by a monitoring system that gives the beginning for a cyclical updating and review process. The level and extent of such review and updating will depend on the character and level of the changing circumstances. Accordingly, the planning process (Fig. 2) can be divided into 5 parts that form a continuous cycle:

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 2. Developing strategy cyclical planning process**

In a strategic approach, it is imperative that analyses are comprehensive but the strategic framework targeted and the implementation detailed. As it was proven, the present development problems are very complex. It is impossible to resolve everything. However, in order to identify the critical issues that have to be resolved by the strategy,
there is a need to embrace and analyse all aspects (socio-economic, environmental, cultural, technical, aesthetical...).

The strategic framework, however, has to target important issues, those that can instigate change of the most crucial aspects of urban development. Once resolved, they will indirectly influence and support the resolution of the remaining. The military concept "to secure strategic positions" is the very analogous example for such approach.

The implementation has to be detailed as much as is needed to start direct development activities.

To ensure success of this type of approach there is the need for a robust but not rigid framework that defines the principles for binding local plans.

The framework has a long-time horizon and, therefore, has to be general; however, firm enough to provide guidance. The detailed plans have to be prepared not in advance, but when required for definite initiatives or developments.

**Interaction and public participation** is a key element in any development strategy. This interaction and participation can be organized in different forms. It can be related to representative groups, specialized forums, agencies, communities or individuals. A development strategy without some kind of public participation will be prone to absolute failure.

The need for public participation and well-structured interaction is required in order to deal not only with the complexity of issues but also with the complexity of attitudes. The definition and classification of values, goals and objectives are subject to individual interpretations by the stakeholders: communities, individuals, businesses and agencies.

The planner or the planning organization cannot be considered as the only caretaker of the objectives on which the strategy is based. He, however, should instigate and animate interaction not as a favour to the public but as an absolute requirement.

The specific character and function of development strategies requires an adequate **organizational structure.** The main element of this structure is a two-tier system of organization.

The upper tier is responsible for the strategic framework with all its parts: the policies, the structure plan, and the management structure. These, after consultation, have to be approved by the appropriate authority. In a complex urban settlement system, it is usually a Metropolitan Authority. This Authority is also responsible for the update and review of the Strategic Framework.

The lower tier is responsible for the preparation of local plans, which have to define all implementation. Instruments, like development controls, action programs, local structure plans and subdivision projects: that tier also should undertake the monitoring of the development process and prepare proposals for review of the Strategic Framework.

The substance and status of those two tiers cannot be mixed up. It could, on one hand, compromise the powerful directions establish by the strategic policies, and, on the other hand, diminish the binding nature of detailed controls established in the local or implementation plans.
5. A Model Approach

Development strategies should embrace the above presented components. However, the detailed structure of the planning process could relate to the particular project in question. The content and the procedures adopted could be very extensive or simplified. The presented approach specifically relates to complex urban development projects undertaken in major agglomerations or metropolitan areas. However, for less complex or for subject specific projects, like housing, infrastructure development or transportation similar (if not identical) approaches have to be used. Fig. 3 presents a model approach.

(A) The process starts with the definition of the aim of the project. In principle, it describes the time frame, the planning area and the expected outcome.

ANALYSES

(B) The analytical part is a very important part at the start of the process. It has to be as comprehensive as possible. Because of the complexity of problems, it is very important that all sectors of urban development are analysed. Here, also the major environmental limitations and thresholds should be established and the alternative demographic forecast outlined. This is the only way to ensure that all exogenous and endogenous development determinants are defined for consideration. Plans without proper analyses of the subjects in question have very little chance to produce a required outcome.

(C) The extensive research and diagnosis provide the right opportunity for the establishment of a vision statement that is futuristic, but still properly rooted in the existing socio-cultural system. Only now, the goals and objectives for the project can be defined.

(D) To ensure that the vision meets the stakeholders' expectations, a discussion forum has to be organized to open the debate on the future of the city. There are also other approaches that could be used, like newspaper questionnaires, competitions, and school assignments. The results of such consultation will provide a valuable input in the definition of goals and objectives.

(E) Based on the research and the definition of goals, it is now possible to identify the critical issues. This is one of the more important sections of the analytical part of the development strategy. It is the first time when the total number of issues is narrowed down to those that have strategic significance.

(F) Because of the complexity of issues, and the different interpretations of what is critical and what is not, consultation meetings should be organized. This usually will be a 'brain storming' workshop, as the perception or understanding of problems is intuitive. There are no tangible computerized methods that could be used in a real life project.

CONCEPTS

(G) Development of alternative strategies starts the conceptual part of the planning process. It usually is an extensive process, as it has to devise proposals for subjects and areas that not always are compatible. Some might be in contradiction, some in support to each other. At that moment, however, these alternative strategies should be
developed in an autonomic approach, it means they should consider mainly or only the advantages they have to ensure for the given subject, sector or area.

(H) An evaluation will now be undertaken that should provide the opportunity to classify the developed alternatives and propose a small number that present the optimal results. In such evaluation in principle will be two types of criteria or measures. Those that are numerical and those that are subjective but measurable by comparison of the level of conformity with the goals and objectives.

(I) This evaluation should be supported by a consultation with stakeholders. They might provide technical advise through their personal experience and their perception of the expected advantages or disadvantages of the debated alternatives.

(J) The selection of the Preferred Strategy is the crucial part in the conceptual stage. The selection process has to go back to the very beginning of the analyses and the different comments received from agencies and stakeholders in the process of consultation. The final selection has to relate to socio-political aspects and the level of implementability.

(K) Once the Preferred Strategy is selected, the preparation of the Strategic Framework is very much a professional activity. The Strategic Framework in principle is a policy document. This has to be reflected in its content and the level of detail. It has two major components: (1) Policy Statements and Documents and the (2) Structure Plan that show in a diagrammatic form all spatial aspects related to the policy documents.

(L) The final public comments should have a professional technical character as the major aspects of the plan were already adjusted in the evaluation and selection process of the Preferred Strategy.

(M) If all the above elements of the planning process were adhered to, the approval by the relevant Planning Authority should be rather smooth. The main aspect of debate is the level of government that will approve the project. A Metropolitan Development Strategy usually needs high level approval, as it has to involve in the implementation many central government agencies. The approval concludes the conceptual part of the planning process.

IMPLEMENTATION

(N) The implementation process starts with identification of leading issues. The analytical process and the conceptual part presented clearly the complexity of the strategic project but also provided enough information about the major, leading issues that have to be specifically addressed in the implementation process.

The leading issues might be of different kind. In some cases, it might be housing, in others infrastructure or pollution. There will be a hierarchy of those leading issues.

(O) The main parts of the implementation process concentrates in principle on preparing Local Plans, Action Programs. They all have to be detailed and map-based. A very important part, mainly related to action programs, is the financing and coordination aspect. Without firm commitments in this regard, these programs will be of little use and sometimes even destructive to the planning process.
Fig. 3. Developing strategy model approach

Part of the implementation process is the Regulatory System. It defines roles, responsibilities of relevant agencies or departments. The most important part of the regulatory system is the Zoning Plan. It will be supported by detailed development provisions and detailed zoning maps based on the general or diagrammatic zoning, prepared as part of the Strategic Framework.
Because of the very practical use of those plans, programmes and regulatory systems, they are usually done at the third tier of development, i.e. by local governments, often under the supervision of the second-tier authority.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, it needs to be stated that Development Strategies have to be contributing factors in the development process. They have to be exercised as a continuous activity. They have to be proactive and in support of development. The planning methodology has to be structured accordingly.

The complexity of urban development determinants requires the establishment of instruments that are robust in principles but flexible in detailed interpretations. This only will provide the opportunity to respond adequately to the changing circumstances and in the same time ensure the safeguard profound values.
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