Title

Planning for People: Integrating Social Issues and Processes into Planning Practice

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1qx8s8p9

Journal

Authors

Hoernig, Heidi
Leahy, Danielle
Zhuang, Zhi Xi
et al.

Publication Date

2005

DOI

10.5070/BP318111500

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Planning for People: Integrating Social Issues and Processes into Planning Practice

Heidi Hoernig, Danielle Leahy, Zhi Xi (Cecilia) Zhuang, Robert Earley, Lynn Randall, and Graham Whitelaw

Abstract

This paper rejects the view that planners plan for use, not people. We observe that planners often see human needs and behavior to be peripheral to practice, focusing on financial, technical, material or environmental considerations. We argue that people — through social issues, social processes, and social organization — are fundamental to all planning activities. Therefore, all planners must more effectively integrate the social dimensions of planning into practice. The article first discusses several shifts in the social sciences, and second, examines three Canadian case studies: ecosystem planning and management in a UNESCO biosphere reserve; infrastructure planning in a northern resource town; and regional planning for homelessness in a medium-size metropolitan region. The paper concludes with a discussion of common strategies, successes, and challenges, highlighting the role of planners in the integration of social dimensions into planning practice.

Introduction

Urban planners frequently invoke the expression, "planners plan for use, not people." This phrase is a classic reflection of modernist assumptions about the neutral and objective planner and the homogeneous community. It is meant to conceptually separate those legitimately planned, broad community patterns ostensibly established upon principles of public interest, from the parochial tastes, values, and needs of individuals and minority interest groups. Planners, in the "use not people" approach, should adhere to principles of the former, and not yield to the demands of the latter.

One of the weaknesses of this approach is that it falsely divides issues related to people from issues related to land use. We assert the oppo-

site. In almost every case, planners plan for people, not buses, not malls, not suburban neighborhoods, not factories, not sewer lines, nor rivers. Ultimately, all planning activities serve the needs and interests of people. Yet during the modern era, reductionist tendencies have separated disciplines, professions, and thinking into distinct specializations. This reductionism permits planners to follow the "use not people" approach. It allows planners to separate out social dimensions from most planning activities, and focus decision-making on financial, technological, material, and environmental considerations, without also fully considering the underlying needs and behaviors of human beings. Modernist reductionism also prevents the effective integration of the social sciences into planning. As a result, most planning for "social" issues, including education, employment, social welfare, public health, and community development, are addressed primarily through social policy fields. "Social planning" is largely ignored by the mainstream planning profession, regarded as being at one end of the spectrum of planning as a profession. At the other end of the spectrum sit the conventional planning sub-disciplines including: land use; transportation; infrastructure; environmental planning; and urban design. Conceptually, professionally, and practically, a large gap separates the two poles (Greed 1999).

Although many planning theorists and practitioners have made significant efforts to integrate social dimensions into planning theory and practice, much work remains to be done. We challenge the perspective that the responsibility of "social planning" rests primarily with "social planners." Rather, like Greed (1999), we assert that all planners are social planners. As such, we revisit the continuing quest for a holistic approach to planning, what we call integrated planning. While accepting that comprehensiveness is an ideal rather than a readily achievable goal, we nonetheless argue that planners must continue to strive to further integrate social issues and processes into practice.

This paper is the outcome of a roundtable forum in a doctoral planning seminar course at the School of Planning, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada in the fall of 2002.[1] The roundtable brought together practitioners, researchers, and students to discuss the shifts in planning theory that address the gap between the social and physical realms. Three Canadian planning practice cases were chosen to reflect a spectrum of planning practice, drawing upon local practitioners and researchers. Through the presentation and discussion of these cases, we asked ourselves whether and how these theoretical shifts have translated into action in planning practice.

This paper expands upon the roundtable forum by discussing several broad shifts in the social sciences, and then by examining the three roundtable case examples to reflect upon integrated planning in practice. We follow Friedmann's (1987) broad definition of planning as an attempt to link knowledge to action in the public domain. In our view, integrated planning broadens the purview of planning to incorporate social issues, social organization, and social processes into the definition, research, analysis, decision-making, implementation, evaluation, and monitoring steps of planning. We begin by briefly summarizing major conceptual developments in three key fields which have contributed to integration in planning. Next, we look to the research orientations that frame the policy domains in which planners operate. Then, we turn to practice to explore three cases that illustrate integrated planning. Each case describes a scenario in which planners deliberately drew social issues and processes into their decision-making. The cases represent three different geographic locations and planning approaches: the first, ecosystem planning and management in a United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) biosphere reserve; the second, community planning in a rapidly developing northern resource town; and the third, regional planning for homelessness in a medium-sized metropolitan region. Finally, we discuss common strategies, successes, and challenges, highlighting the roles of planners in the integration of social dimensions into planning practice.

Theorizing Integration

In our view, the integration of social dimensions into planning requires emphasis on three main areas: social issues; social organization; and social processes. Integration of all three components is important because planning is carried out by people, for people. Human beings act and interact in various ways that determine how planning takes place. However, human behavior is complex and dynamic. Previous conceptualizations of planning have tried to remove and protect it from the messy world of human behavior. The rational comprehensive planning model was predicated on the belief that rationality was value free and could transcend social and power dynamics (Healey 1996; Wildavsky 1973; Lindblom 1959). Practitioners of this approach understood that by following rationality, planning outcomes would serve everyone, through a single public interest. This attempt to isolate plan-

[1] The three doctoral students (Hoernig, Leahy, and Zhuang) designed and organized the roundtable. The case data were provided by two practitioners who were actively involved in the homelessness and community-based monitoring cases (respectively, Randall and Whitelaw, also now a doctoral student) and one Master's student (Earley) whose research investigated the case. The paper was written collaboratively by all six authors.

ning has not been successful. Planners cannot escape social behavior. Social issues, such as poverty, women's issues, and racial inequality, are infused into the social, political, economic, and environmental systems in which planning operates. If planners claim to address equity, they must examine how these issues are related to their practice. Similarly, planning activities typically take place within multi-stakeholder policy settings that involve participants from public and private sector organizations, non-governmental organizations, and communities. To work effectively in this environment, planners greatly benefit from an understanding of organizational structures and dynamics. Furthermore, regardless of the technical task involved in planning, social processes such as participation, collaboration, communication, and conflict management are part of planners' interactions with these diverse participants. We now turn to three broad scholarly fields which have addressed the task of integrating social issues, organization, and processes into practice.

Looking first to planning literature, we can see that over the past six decades, many planning theorists have sought to bring a better understanding of social issues, organization, and processes into the purview of mainstream planning practice, education and research. Advocacy and equity planning (Krumholz 1997; Davidoff 1965) feminist planning (Hayden 2002; Moore Milroy and Andrew 1988) multicultural planning (Burayidi 2000; Sandercock 1998; Qadeer 1997), and planning for social difference (Jacobs and Fincher 1998) have explicitly pulled social issues of race, poverty, women, culture, and ethnicity, into planning theory. Similarly, theoretical approaches such as incrementalism, (Lindblom 1959); transactive planning (Friedmann 1973), radical planning (Friedmann 1987; Harvey 1973), and communicative planning (Healey 1996; Innes 1995), and a large body of related empirical research on conflict, mediation, politics, and power have highlighted the role of social behavior, relations, and organization in planning decision-making and outcomes.

While these ideas are important to our understanding of integrated planning, planning thought has extensively borrowed from and overlapped with ideas from other fields. We draw attention to two additional parallel streams of thought from community development and organizational development. In community development, as well as related fields such as international development and public health, a set of ideas has advanced around social processes and organization as they relate to communities, beginning with the concept of citizen participation. After various failed community and international development interventions in from the 1950s through the 1970s, scholars and practitioners began to recognize that citizen involvement was criti-

cal to the improvement of social, economic, and environmental conditions (Guijt and Shah 1998; Hettne 1995; Rahnema 1995; Friedmann 1992; Phifer et al. 1980). Citizen involvement has become a key component of planning and development because community members contribute as key stakeholders providing multiple perspectives, as knowledgeable experts in their own right, and as strategic actors in implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Chambers 1997; Arnstein 1969). Not only can meaningful citizen participation improve decision-making, but it can also lead to effective and long-term social mobilization and transformation. Yet development scholars and practitioners have observed that in order for such social change to occur, community capacity must also be developed (Shirlow and Murtagh 2004; Guijt and Shah 1998). The capacity-building approach recognizes the need to develop community skills, social learning, human and social capital (Shirlow and Murtagh 2004; James 2002; Kretzmann and McKnight 1993).

The organizational development field has also shifted to place an increasing emphasis on social processes within organizations. Scientific or rational models of organizational management (Gerth and Mills 1946; Taylor 1946) have been replaced with new, horizontal models of organizational management that pay close attention to teamwork, communication, and culture (Fletcher 1997; Clarkson 1989). These organizational structures facilitate and encourage adaptability and flexibility within dynamic, often turbulent, organizational environments. This adaptability, referred to as social or organizational learning (Argyris 1993; Argyris and Schön 1978), focuses on the ability of organizations to adjust to change. Change management requires an alignment of skills, strategies, structures, and compensation mechanisms to take in new knowledge and translate it swiftly and easily into action (Waterman et al. 1980; Berger 1994). Here, the roles of leadership and organizational culture are central to how organizations enhance creativity and innovation, as means to accommodating and maximizing the benefits of change. Trends in performance management such as New Public Management, with its emphasis on accountability, citizen engagement, policy coherence, and organizational learning (Poister and Streib 2001; Canadian Centre for Management Development Policy 2000; Lindquist 1999) vividly illustrate the attempts of public sector organizations to adopt these management principles into restructuring strategies.

This brief review illustrates a spectrum of approaches to the integration of social issues, processes, and organization into practice. As planners continue to theorize how to bring in social issues, processes, and organization into practice, it is important to understand the overlap between changes in planning thought, and parallel shifts in other related fields. This broader perspective emphasizes that the challenge

of integration and movements towards developing better skills and methods to address it, are by no means unique to planning. These ideas are common to several fields. Continued inter-disciplinary exchange can assist the planning field to more effectively theorize integration and better understand and address the incorporation of community, inter- and intra-organizational issues and dynamics.

Understanding Integration

The integration of social issues into planning requires not only an acknowledgement of the qualities, structures, and processes of social organization and behavior, but also the research orientations which shape planning decisions and solutions. Research orientations refer to frameworks through which planners define reality, knowledge, and knowledge production. These frameworks determine the ways in which issues are conceptualized and how data are collected and analyzed, which in turn determine how issues are understood and acted upon. These frameworks also direct the skills, techniques, and processes used to make decisions, as well as to train practitioners. We identify two key orientations: the physical/technical; and the social/relational (see Figure 1). We derive these two categories from the orthodox quantitative/positivist and qualitative/interpretist research paradigms, and further expand them to examine how these orientations influence planners' definitions of planning issues and their views of experts, stakeholders and community.

Planning has been dominated by what we have termed here the physical/technical orientation to research, as it shares the same philosophical assumptions as the rational comprehensive planning approach. A second orientation, called here the social/relational, has emerged. Our central claim is that this second, complementary orientation needs to play a stronger role in order to achieve more effective integration in planning. In this way, the social/relational orientation in research corresponds with many of the concepts from community and organizational development discussed earlier. For example, participatory approaches are predicated upon an orientation that defines planning problems to include a variety of stakeholders and community members, recognizes multiple constructions of reality, and incorporates a variety of expert and citizen knowledge sources and types (Heron and Reason 1997).

However, we must be cautious in our assumptions about the kinds of planning using these research orientations. For example, social planning can be based almost entirely upon a quantitative and positivist

orientation (Courchene 1986) and seemingly physically- and technically-oriented planning exercises (e.g., watershed planning efforts) have taken significant strides in integrating community sources of knowledge and developing collaborative forms of planning and management (Veale 2003).

Figure 1: Research Orientations

	Physical/Technical Orientation	Social/Relational Orientation
Ontological orientation	Single, definable, knowable reality	Multiple, constructed, negotiated and contested subjective realities
Epistemological orientation	Positivist orientation	Interpretist orientation
Definition of issue to be addressed	Overall focus or emphasis on tangible, measurable variables	People-oriented definition including difficult to define factors such as relationships and behavior
Data used	Numeric data	Verbal/oral/narrative data
Data collection methods	Quantitative methods	Qualitative, participatory, and/or collaborative methods
View of experts	Formally educated and trained, professional experts highly valued	Includes broader definition of experts, legitimizing local and indigenous knowledge
Definition and role of stakeholders	Narrowly defined to those interests specifically related to object of planning	Broadened definition of stakeholders to include those affected by outcomes; involvement expanded to include initial planning stages
Definition and role of community	Community interests largely peripheral to planning and decision-making	Multiple community interests seen to be integral to entire process

Source: Adapted from Heron and Reason 1997; Creswell 1994

Practicing Integration

In order to examine integrated planning in practice, we draw upon three cases and ask how planning practice has changed through efforts to integrate social issues and social processes into planning activities. In all three cases, practitioners have had to respond to rapidly changing policy and funding environments. For example, government restructuring has been an important factor in the change towards a more integrated approach. Following major cutbacks to social transfer payments from the Canadian federal government in the early 1990s, the Conservative governments in the provinces of Alberta and Ontario dramatically reorganized responsibilities and funding for public service delivery (Burak 2000). Each case illustrates a strategy of adjustment that responded, in part, to these public sector changes.

CASE 1
Community-based Monitoring for Ecosystem-based Planning in the Long Point World Biosphere Reserve

The first case example examines integration through the development of a community-based monitoring program for the Long Point World Biosphere Reserve (LPWBR). Traditional, environmental monitoring is conducted by environmental planners and scientists, pursuing narrowly defined physical and environmental parameters. The LPWBR community-based monitoring initiative breaks away from this orthodox monitoring framework to address other social, economic, and political issues that are critical to the management of the reserve.

Located on the north shore of Lake Erie, Ontario, Canada, Long Point is a 32 km sand spit, designated by UNESCO's Man and Biosphere Program in 1986 as an example of the Great Lakes coastal ecosystem. The core protected area is comprised of a range of coastal habitats: beaches; sand dunes; grassy ridges; woodlands; and wetlands (Craig et al. 2003).

Biosphere reserves are intended to fulfill three complementary and mutually reinforcing functions: 1) to contribute to the conservation of landscapes, ecosystems, and species and genetic variation; 2) to foster sustainable economic and human development; and 3) to provide logistics support for research, monitoring, education, and information exchange (UNESCO 2004). The biosphere reserve is administered by the Long Point World Biosphere Reserve Foundation. The Foundation secures resources from various sources including government, the private sector, foundations, and from local communities through an annual fund-raising dinner and sponsored adventure activities.

Long Point's complex management framework involves 19 government agencies with administrative responsibilities, more than 22 government policy and planning documents related to its management, and over 30 organized stakeholder groups (Craig et al. 2003). A 1996 environmental monitoring inventory identified 55 ongoing programs administered by 26 agencies, departments, institutions, and environment non-governmental organizations (Francis et al. 1985). In the past, federal, provincial, and municipal governments pursued their own monitoring and research in relation to their particular jurisdictional mandates. The integration of the conservation, development, and logistic functions of the reserve has been limited and pressure from severe and ongoing budgetary cutbacks has influenced the entire management framework. Not surprisingly, within this complex monitoring, research, and management regime, linkages between research and monitoring specialists and decision-makers have been weak. As a result, the regime has failed to fully integrate research and monitoring results into decision-making processes (Craig et al. 2003).

In response to these concerns and to the downsizing and elimination of governmental monitoring programs, a group of 14 local ecosystem monitoring specialists, local municipal staff, and stewardship volunteers representing ten federal, provincial, and municipal agencies, industry, and environmental non-governmental organizations, formed to establish a community-based monitoring program. The LPWBR community-based monitoring initiative has been guided by a community-based monitoring model developed by Environment Canada and the Canadian Nature Federation, in support of the developing Canadian Community Monitoring Network. The model, based largely upon theories of sustainable development (Gibson 2001; Roseland 2000), has four main components: community mapping; participation assessment; capacity building; and information delivery (Polloch et al. 2003; Whitelaw et al. 2003).

Participants already see numerous benefits stemming from the initiative. In terms of management, they see community monitoring as a means to better integrate environmental, social, and economic issues For example, linking fishing and hunting with environmental quality or linking environmental management with educational efforts and/or economic development. The initiative has promoted collaboration among participants as peers rather than as competitors. Furthermore, the relationship-building component of the initiative has expanded the social network of participants, improved communication among participating agencies, and enhanced funding opportunities. A key feature of the community monitoring initiative appears to be its ability to pro-

vide a neutral forum where all interested stakeholders can work together.

In order to sustain these advantages, program participants are using a collaborative planning approach to address several challenges including the complex jurisdiction issues, multiple information sources, funding, and existing tensions between participant groups (Craig et al. 2003). This ongoing monitoring initiative exemplifies community leadership working towards the integration of both physical (environmental) and social issues and processes through a community-based planning and management approach.

CASE 2
Cumulative Social Impact of the Athabasca Oil Sands Development and Fort McMurray, Alberta

The second case illustrates integration through the merging of physical infrastructure planning with social services planning, namely childcare services. The case concerns the management of the social impacts of oil sands development on an isolated, resource-dependent community: Fort McMurray, in north-eastern Alberta, Canada. Here, rapid urban development has resulted in a host of social impacts, requiring a planning strategy that acknowledges and addresses the relationships between resource development, rapid urban growth, and social issues.

Before oil sands development began in the 1950s, Fort McMurray was a tiny northern town of 600 people. In 1981, following the opening of the first two major mines, the population shot up to 30,772. By 2002, the population had risen again to 47,240 (Alberta Economic Development 2003). Urban growth in the region shows no signs of diminishing due to a projected CAD $86 billion in regional capital investment in oil sands development over the next decade (*Calgary Herald*, 5 February 2002).

The development boom has caused a difficult social situation in the city. Labor shortages in the oil sands development industry have resulted in high wages that cannot be matched by other industries, such as the housing construction and government and private service sectors. Affordable housing is desperately needed for those employed by the service industries who do not receive the high wages associated with the oil sands industry. High rates of homelessness accompany summer construction months. Available housing unites are exorbitantly expensive, beyond the means of many service, governmental, and NGO employees. As a result, workers are also often in short sup-

ply. Other social problems accompanying this frenetic pace of growth include family stress and breakdown, drug and alcohol abuse, prostitution, and other crimes (Earley 2003).

Since 1995, there have been over a dozen oil sands companies operating in the region. As such, social impacts cannot be attributed to any one particular development. Through the Regional Infrastructure Working Group (RIWG), four major institutions are involved in the management of social impact of the oil sand development: 1) the regional government, the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo; 2) the provincial government, the Government of Alberta; 3) the industry regulator, the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board; and 4) the oil developers (Earley 2003).

RIWG is an industry-based working group whose primary mandate is to ensure the efficiency of oil sands development. RIWG is not a stakeholder forum. It organizes subcommittees around social and physical issues that its members identify. Government and stakeholders related to each subcommittee are brought into the process through a consultative, non-voting capacity. RIWG's purpose is to scope out the challenges in regional physical infrastructure, to identify the responsible authorities for dealing with those problems, supply them with the information required from the oil sands companies to deal with the shortfalls, and if appropriate, work with the responsible authority to solve them (Alberta Economic Development 2003). RIWG maintains an urban area population model, fed by confidential development, production, and workforce data from each of the oil sands companies that forms the basis for most planning that is done in the region today.

One example of its work is the development of the Ohpikowin Childcare Center. In 2001, RIWG formed a childcare subcommittee to address the lack of good quality affordable child care in the region due to a lack of suitable facilities and a shortage of qualified personnel. As a result of the subcommittee's research and co-ordinating efforts, a partnership was formed between two oil sands development companies (Suncor and Syncrude), the YMCA, and Keyano College. Through this partnership, the five-year lease and renovations of a unit in the Keyano College housing complex was donated, along with appropriate furniture, toys, and supplies. The Center will be operated by the YMCA and serve downtown childcare needs in Fort McMurray (Earley 2003).

While the oil sands developers, through RIWG, have been making significant inroads in addressing their cumulative social impacts, many issues remain unresolved. RIWG does not include a spectrum of community representatives nor does its mandate include the protection of community interests. Greater collaboration between government de-

partments, different levels of government, business, and local service providers is a necessary step in planning for a high quality of life for the citizens of Fort McMurray.

CASE 3
Planning for Homelessness in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, Ontario

Planning for those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness requires an integration of social planning and affordable housing provision. Planning for affordable housing has traditionally involved capital investment into the "bricks and mortar" of physical affordable housing stock, whereas social planning has addressed the services and supports for those at risk or in need.[2] The case of recent planning initiatives to deal with homelessness in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo[3] (subsequently referred to as the Region) illustrates a third example of how an integrated approach to planning brings together both physical and social planning.

As a result of public sector reform since the mid-1990s, both the Canadian federal and Ontario provincial governments withdrew from direct participation in social housing. Both governments delegated these responsibilities to local (regional and municipal) levels of government. This occurred during a time in which the gap between the poor and wealthy and the number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness has continued to increase in Canada (Golden et al. 1999). The root causes of homelessness are varied and complex; they include individual and systemic quality of life barriers such as poverty, increased family breakdown, poor access to services, and poor mental and physical health (Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo 2001; Bridgeman 1998). In the late 1990s, both the federal and provincial governments responded to homelessness. The federal government did so through the Homelessness Secretariat and its Supporting Community Partners Initiative[4] while the Ontario provincial government worked through the Consolidated Municipal Service Manager model.

[2] For example, drop in centres, emergency shelters, outreach services, rent bank programs, eviction prevention, and supportive housing.

[3] Ontario, Canada has a two-tiered local government system. It consists of upper tier, regional municipalities and lower tier, local municipalities. Both tiers are responsible for land-use planning, as well as planning in a number of other areas (environmental, social, transportation, etc.)

[4] The federal National Homelessness Initiative, a CAD $753 million program, began in 1999. It funds several programs designed to support local, community based solutions to homelessness. See http://www.homelessness.gc.ca.

The prosperous, growing Regional Municipality of Waterloo is no exception to national trends of increasing homelessness (Dietrich et al. 1999; Vandebelt and DeSantis 1999). The Homelessness Network, a community network of service providers and other interested parties, was established in 1998 to address this growing concern (Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo 2001). In 2000, the Network and the Region collaborated to receive funding from the federal Supporting Community Partners Initiative, aimed at addressing immediate housing needs in the Waterloo Region. Together, the Homelessness Network and the Social Planning Department at the Region worked to develop a common strategy. The strategy's objectives include: meeting immediate housing needs; increasing the supply; variety and accessibility of affordable housing; enhancing supports for special needs; building community capacity to respond to and prevent homelessness; and enhancing community awareness through information and education. Internally, this strategy was supported by various mechanisms including a new regional interdepartmental planning group with representatives from community health, affordable housing, and social planning. This group informs regional priority setting and related planning activities, as well as external planning groups such as the Homelessness Network. Externally, the Social Planning Department helps to implement the Region's homelessness strategy by providing various supports to an array of community groups.

This example illustrates simultaneous collaboration at several levels: a new federal-local relationship; a new regional interdepartmental planning group; and a pre-existing community network. In order to adjust to this reconfiguration, both Regional staff and the Homelessness Network face considerable challenges to foster system-wide thinking, to strengthen and build relationships, to re-craft roles and responsibilities, and to secure long-term financing in an unpredictable funding environment. To date, the benefits of the integrated approach to homelessness in the Waterloo region lie in improved decision-making around a very challenging service need, through more effective allocation of funds, and improved means for meeting service needs.

Reflecting on Integration in Practice

Several common themes unite these three cases, demonstrating the advantages and challenges of integrated planning, and the roles of planners in its achievement. First, in all three cases, planners expanded their definition of the problem at hand. In Long Point, the problem was broadened to include, not only the technical task of monitoring, but also the issue of fragmentation within a complex management regime.

In Fort McMurray, a regional infrastructure planning group included childcare service provision into its physical infrastructure planning. In the Waterloo region, planners identified a lack of both affordable housing stock and support services as central to the problem of homelessness.

Problem redefinition broadened the spectrum of options available in each case. It also influenced the role, number, and variety of participating stakeholders. In the Long Point case, monitoring became a multi-stakeholder exercise, expanding not only the number and range of actors involved but also the very nature of the task. Through a community-based monitoring approach, participants considered the monitoring needs of a variety of organizations, including non-scientist and non-governmental organizations. As a result, biosphere reserve monitoring will include collection of social, economic, public health, and environmental data. In Fort McMurray, planning for childcare services required RIWG to address shortages in personnel, equipment, and supplies in addition to providing a childcare site. In order to address these needs, a partnership was formed among post-secondary educators, an NGO, oil sands developers, and regional municipal planners. In the Waterloo Region, the expanded view of homelessness required a strategy that involved services and housing specialists, as well as federal, regional, and local NGO representatives. The strategy also expanded its objectives to consider housing construction, support services, and community education.

In these three cases, the redefinition of planning problems, the spectrum of options, and the number and variety of participants involved, lead to the development of social capital and social learning. The planning activities involved in each case brought together agencies and stakeholders creating new networks, new communication patterns and new problem-solving strategies. United by shared interests and goals, these expanded networks brought together groups that had never worked together previously, facilitating access to new resources and untapped networks. This expansion of multi-stakeholder interaction and participation demonstrates Putnam's (2000) concept of the "bridging" type of social capital through a broadening of participants' "network of engagement" (Murray 2000). Social learning is also evident in each case. Problem redefinition, resulting in fundamental changes in problem-solving strategies and incorporating new sources of knowledge, illustrates Argyris and Schön's (1978) concept of "double-loop learning". This adaptability, in response to shifting political, social and economic climates, reflects a central characteristic of social learning (Friedmann 1987).

Key barriers to integrated planning illustrated in these three cases relate to the social and political processes required by participatory and collaborative planning approaches. These processes create a now-familiar list of issues: jurisdictional issues tied to mandates; authority and privacy; organizational culture issues such as the establishment of common language and understanding of interests, shared values, institutional memory, experience, and trust; information-sharing structures, processes and protocols; appropriate and effective communication channels; and funding arrangements (Margerum 2002; Landsbergen and Wolken 2001; Selin and Chavez 1995; Gray 1989).

What does this set of cases have to say about the roles of planners in furthering the integration of social issues and processes into practice? These cases cast the planner into two principal roles: as enabler; and as facilitator of relationships. Planners enabled integrative planning by providing various supports (e.g., administrative, personnel, and financial). As generalists, planners also played a bridging role horizontally across disciplines and fields, between public, private, and civic organizations, and vertically through national, provincial, regional, and local governments.

Practitioners in each of the cases demonstrated many of the qualities and skills required to engage in multi-stakeholder planning and management. As the vast literature on collaboration, conflict resolution, consensus-building, and facilitation discusses these characteristics at length, we would like instead to highlight two further qualities. The first quality is the ability of planners to practice *carpe diem* planning; that is, the knack to recognize and act upon circumstances that are conducive to positive change. In the above cases, government restructuring set the stage for actors to change the status quo and initiate innovative planning approaches. However, although public sector restructuring served as a catalyst, it was planners' will to take action that was ultimately responsible for these shifts in practice.

Adaptability is the second quality present in planners in each case. Given the turbulence and uncertainty that often accompanies public sector practice, planners must not only respond actively to new opportunities, but they also must be able to initiate change that is appropriate to both the context and issues at hand. Planners demonstrated versatility and flexibility in the redefinition of their practice, including collaborative problem-solving and decision-making.

Conclusion

We began this exercise by critiquing the view that planners plan for use, not people. We asserted that this view creates a false dichotomy and argued that all planning should incorporate social issues and processes into practice. We asked, to what extent does current planning practice reflect the recent turn in planning theory? We traced this shift through parallel movements in planning theory, community development, and organizational development, which emphasize the understanding and incorporation of community and inter- and intra-organizational dynamics into planning practice. We observed that a physical/technical orientation has dominated planning practice, although a social/relational orientation has been gaining currency in recent decades. Using a cross-section of three cases from Canadian planning practice, we have illustrated how a social/relational orientation can be successfully merged with a physical/technical approach to planning, leading to a more holistic approach to planning practice.

We remain cautiously optimistic in our conclusions about the status of efforts to plan with and for people. In community-based monitoring for the Long Point World Biosphere Reserve, regional infrastructure planning in Fort McMurray and in planning for homelessness in the Waterloo Region, the combination of public sector restructuring and the capacity of practitioners to reinvent their practice resulted in an integration of social issues and processes into planning. Integrative planning involved problem redefinition leading to the expansion of the strategies used and stakeholders participating in implementation. Planners participated as enablers and relationship facilitators. In order to fulfil these roles, planners' skill sets must stretch beyond the technical skills typified by rational comprehensive planning into fields such as organizational behavior and community development, to address group dynamics, conflict management, collaboration, and communication. It is also critical that planners be flexible in defining and playing out their roles in the complex policy environments that frame their work.

This paper suggests several future directions for planning research. First, while we link changes in planning theory and research orientations to the movement towards integrated planning, we did not directly investigate the ways in which these two shifts have been responsible for the integrated planning presented here. Second, due to the small number of cases examined here, we cannot comment on the prevalence of this shift among planning organizations or practitioners generally. Given the considerable financial constraints and the reduced capacity of downsized government organizations, as well as the resource- and time-intensive requirements of integrative planning, we

question the extent to which it can be sustained in the long-run. Subsequent research is needed to further investigate questions regarding the frequency and distribution of these types of changes across the spectrum and geography of planning practice, as well as to further explore the factors that contribute to and sustain integrative practice. Pedagogical research in planning can also further explore how the education and professional development training of planning practitioners can develop planners' skill sets relative to the social and organizational contexts in which planners work.

The long-term sustainability of planning practice that incorporates social issues and processes may lie in the degree to which this approach results in benefits for planners, planning organizations, and/or the communities that they serve. Ultimately, any true movement towards integrative planning will be largely dependent upon the societal recognition of the value of such an approach. Nevertheless, as planning practitioners, researchers, and educators, we all have a significant role to play in its endorsement and realization.

References

Alberta Economic Development. 2003. *Oil Sands Industry Update*. Edmonton: Alberta Economic Development.

Argyris, Chris. 1993. *Knowledge for Action: A guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, Chris and Donald Schön. 1978. *Organizational Learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Arnstein, Sherry. 1969. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35: 216-224.

Berger, Lance. 1994. Change Management. In *The change management handbook: A road map to corporate transformation*, edited by Lance Berger, Sikora Martin, and Dorothy Berger. New York, New York: Irwin Professional Publishing.

Bridgeman, Rae. 1998. A 'City' Within the City: A Canadian housing model for the homeless. *Open House International* 23(1): 12-21.

Burak, Rita. 2000. *The Challenges Facing the Ontario Public Service*. Paper presented at Governing Ontario: New mandate, new challenges. Public Policy Forum, February 7 and 8, Toronto, Ontario.

Burayidi, Michael. 2000. Urban Planning as a Multicultural Canon. In *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society*, edited by Michael Burayidi. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Burton, Brian. 2002. Big oil goes where size still matters. *Calgary Herald*, 5 February, Sec. A, p3.

Canadian Centre for Management Development Policy, Strategy and Communications. 2000. *A Policy Discussion Paper: A public service learning organization from coast to coast to coast*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development Policy, Strategy and Communications.

Chambers, Robert. 1997. *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the first last*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Clarkson, Max B. E. 1989. Values: Moving from old paradigm to the new. In *Learning Works: Searching for organizational futures. A tribute to Eric Trist*, edited by Susan Wright and David Morley. Toronto: The Adapting by Learning Group, Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University.

Courchene, Thomas J. 1986. *Social Policy in the 1990's: Agenda for Reform*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Research Institute.

Craig, Brian, Graham Whitelaw, Jeff Robinson, and Paula Jongerden. 2003. Community-Based Ecosystem Monitoring: A tool for developing and promoting ecosystem-based management and decision making in the Long Point World Biosphere Reserve. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference of Science and Management of Protected Areas Association, May 11-16, Victoria, BC.

Creswell, John W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davidoff, Paul. 1965. Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 31(4): 331-336.

Dietrich, Suzanne, Scott Morton-Ninomiya, Dan Vandebelt, Shelley Adams, Gloria DeSantis, Arli Klassen and Trudi Beaulne. 1999. *Understanding Homelessness in the Waterloo Region: A backgrounder*. Waterloo Region, Ontario: Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo, Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries; Waterloo Region-Wellington-Dufferin District Health Council.

Earley, Robert. 2003. *DISCONNECT: Assessing and Managing the Social Effects of Development in the Athabasca Oil Sands*. Waterloo, Ontario: School of Planning, University of Waterloo.

Fletcher, Shirley. 1997. *Competence and Organizational Change: A handbook*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Francis, G. R., A. P. Lino Grima, Henry A. Regier, and Thomas H. Whillans. 1985. *A Prospectus for the Management of the Long Point Ecosystem*. Technical report 43. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

Friedmann, John. 1992. *Empowerment: The politics of alternative development*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

_____. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From knowledge to action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

_____. 1973. *Retracking America: A theory of transactive planning*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/ Doubleday.

Gerth, Hans and C. Wright Mills. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gibson, Robert B. 2001. *Specification of Sustainability-Based Environmental Assessment Decision Criteria and Implications for Determining 'Significance' in Envi-*

ronmental Assessment. Ottawa, Ontario Canada: Research and Development Monograph Series. Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency Research and Development Program.

Golden, Ann, William Currie, Elizabeth Greaves, and E. John Latimer.1999. *Taking Responsibility for Homelessness: An action plan for Toronto*. Toronto, The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force; City of Toronto.

Gray, Barbara. 1989. *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greed, Clara. 1999. Introducing Social Town Planning. In *Social Town Planning*, edited by Clara Greed. London: Routledge.

Guijt, Irene and Meera Kaul Shah. 1998. Waking Up to Power, Conflict and Process. In *The Myth of Community: Gender issues in participatory development*, edited by Irene Guijt and Meera Kaul Shah. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Harvey, David. 1973. *Social Justice and the City*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hayden, Dolores. 2002. *Redesigning the American Dream: Gender, housing and family life*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Healey, Patsy. 1996. The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory and its Implications for Spatial Strategy Formation. *Environment and Planning B* 23: 217-234.

Heron, John and Peter Reason. 1997. A Participatory Inquiry Paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry* 3(3): 274-294.

Hettne, Bjorn. 1995. *Development Theory and the Three Worlds*. Second Edition. Harlow, UK: Addison Wesley Longman.

Innes, Judith. 1995. Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14(3): 183-189.

Jacobs, Jane M. and Ruth Fincher. 1998. Introduction. In *Cities of Difference*, edited by Ruth Fincher and Jane M. Jacobs. New York and London: The Guilford Press.

James, Rick. 2002. *People and Change: Exploring capacity building in NGOs*. Oxford: International NGO Training and Research Centre.

Kretzmann, John and John McKnight. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out*. Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research.

Krumholz, Norman. 1997. Urban Planning, Equity Planning and Racial Justice. In *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the shadows*, edited by Thomas, June Manning and Marsha Ritzdorf. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Landsbergen Jr., David and George Wolken Jr. 2001. Realizing the Promise: Government information systems and the fourth generation of information technology. *Public Administration Review* 61(2):206-220.

Lindblom, Charles. 1959. The Science of "Muddling Through". *Public Administration Review* 19: 79-88.

Lindquist, Evert 1999. Reconceiving the Center: Leadership, strategic reform, and coherence in public sector reform. PUMA/SGF 99(5). Paris, OECD

Margerum, Richard. 2002. Collaborative Planning: Building consensus and building a distinct model for practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21(3): 237-253.

Moore Milroy, Beth and Caroline Andrew. 1988. Introduction. In *Life Spaces: Gender, household, employment*, edited by Caroline Andrew and Beth Moore Milroy. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Murray, Michael. 2000. Social Capital and Health Communities: Insights from the Colorado Healthy Communities initiative. *Community Development Journal.* 35(2): 99-108.

Phifer, Bryan, M. E. Frederick List, and Boyd Faulkner. 1980. History of Community Development in America. In *Community Development in America*, edited by Jerry W. Robinson. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Poister, Theodore and Gregory Streib. 2001. Performance Measurement in Mmunicipal Government: Assessing the state of practice. *Public Administration Review* 59(4): 325-335.

Polloch, Rebecca M, Graham Whitelaw, and David K. Atkinson. 2003. *Linking Community-Based Ecosystem Monitoring to Local Decision Making and Policy Development on Sustainability*. Ottawa, Canadian Nature Federation, Environment Canada, Ecological Monitoring and Assessment Network Office. Voluntary Sector Initiative Project

Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Qadeer, Mohammad. 1997. Pluralistic Planning for Multicultural Cities: The Canadian practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 63(4): 481-494.

Rahnema, Majid. 1995. Participation. In *The Development Dictionary*, edited by Wolfgang Sachs. London: Zed Books.

Roseland, M. 2000. Sustainable Community Development: Integrating environmental, economic and social objectives. *Progress in Planning* 54: 73-132

Sandercock, Leonie. 1998. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for multicultural cities*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons.

Selin, Steve and Deborah Chavez. 1995. Developing a Collaborative Model for Environmental Planning and Management. *Environmental Management* 19(2): 189-195.

Shirlow, Peter and Brendan Murtagh. 2004. Capacity-Building, Representation and Intracommunity Conflict. *Urban Studies* 41(1): 57-70.

Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo. 2001. *Waterloo Region Community Homelessness Plan*. Kitchener, Ontario: Waterloo Region Community Homelessness Working Group; Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo.

Taylor, F.W. 1946. *Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Row.

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). 2005. Frequently asked questions on biosphere reserves. Man and the biosphere programme: people, biodiversity and ecology. [Available online http://www.unesco.org/mab/nutshell.htm] Accessed February 15, 2005.

Vandebelt, Dan and Gloria DeSantis. 1999. *Homelessness in Cambridge*. Cambridge, Ontario: Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries.

Veale, Barbara J. 2003. *A Review of Watershed Planning and Management: Best practices, legal tools and next steps*, Commissioned research for the Leading Edge Stewardship and Conservation in Canada 2003 Conference, British Columbia.

Waterman, Robert Jr., Peters, Tom and Phillips, Julien R. 1980. Structure is Not Organisation. *Business Horizons* 23(3): 14-26.

Wildavsky, Aaron. 1973. If Planning is Everything, Then Maybe it's Nothing. *Policy Sciences* 4: 127-153.

Whitelaw, Graham, Hague Vaughan, Brian Craig, and David Atkinson. 2003. Establishing the Canadian community monitoring network. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 88: 409-418.

Heidi Hoernig is a PhD candidate at the School of Planning, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. She can be reached at hjhoerni@fes.uwaterloo.ca

Danielle Leahy is a PhD candidate at the School of Planning, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. She can be reached at danielleleahy@hotmail.com.

Zhi Xi (Cecilia) Zhuang is a PhD candidate at the School of Planning, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. She can be reached at gzfanxi@yahoo.com.

Robert Earley, MES (School of Planning, University of Waterloo) currently teaching English in China. He can be reached at robjearley@yahoo.ca.

Lynn Randall, MHSA, is Director of Social Planning, Department of Social Services, Regional Municipality of Waterloo. She can be reached at lrandall@region.waterloo.on.ca.

Graham Whitelaw is a PhD candidate at the School of Planning, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. He is an Honorary Director of the Canadian Biosphere Reserves Association and a volunteer with the Long Point World Biosphere Foundation. He can be reached at grahamwhitelaw@thegreenpages.ca.