

A Comparative Analysis of Post-Modern Planning: A Case Study of Mumbai and Rosario

Hanxu Li

The Bartlett Development Planning Unit, University College London, Gower Street WC1E 6BT, UK

hanxu.li.22@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract. This paper compares the Kanjur Marg Project in Mumbai and the 26 Local Strategies: A Plan in Rosario from a globalization perspective. Despite both projects reflecting postmodernist planning characteristics, they highlight the similarities and differences in their urban planning approaches. The differences in resident participation in the two cities reflect their unique social, political, and global contexts. The Kanjur Marg Project in Mumbai combines collaborative and radical planning through deep Metropolitan resident participation. At the same time, the 26 Local Strategies: A Plan in Rosario represents a more typical collaborative planning approach through participatory workshops. This paper analyses how these planning approaches shape urban development trajectories and to what extent they achieve social justice from the perspectives of representation, redistribution, and recognition in the context of globalization. The study suggests that these cases demonstrate the multiple challenges of urban development and social justice in the context of globalization and call for further exploration of how to achieve more inclusive and just urban planning in the process of globalization.

Keywords: Post-modern planning; urban development; urban comparison; social justice.

1. Introduction

The goals and ideals pursued in urban development mostly share similarities; however, in different contexts, the problems encountered during the development of different cities possess distinctive characteristics and sometimes are even entirely distinct. Nowadays, we are situated in a world constituted by cities, and the existing cities we observe already have specific urban development outcomes. These diverse outcomes indicate the uniqueness of the entire urban development process. Therefore, when we explore global cities, a comparative perspective is naturally formed[1],[2]. In the context of globalization, apart from the typical urban cases of significant cities in the North, the theoretical system of urban studies requires more experiences from other diverse cities[1].

Therefore, this paper will select Mumbai and Rosario as two metropolitan cities that use post-modern planning as their primary planning method, and they have demonstrated different planning characteristics in the process of urban planning. Among them, the most representative are the Kanjur Marg Project in Mumbai and the 26 Local Strategies: A Metropolitan Plan in Rosario. Due to different problems, challenges, contexts, and political environments in the two cities, the two cases present distinct forms of advancement, especially the different forms of resident participation and outcomes. This paper will take the role of residents in planning as the main thread and use a globalized lens to compare and analyse the two cases, discussing how they have shaped the urban development trajectory and to what extent they have achieved social justice.

2. Cities' Backgrounds and Case Overviews

2.1 Kanjur Marg Project in Mumbai

In 1947, India's independence was accompanied by religious conflicts and caste divisions, which exacerbated the country's tendency towards division—under the governance and shaping of Jawaharlal Nehru, a centralized political landscape with power concentrated in the central government and a greatly weakened state power emerged, while their demands were challenging to

meet[3]. Mumbai, the capital of Maharashtra, is India's commercial and financial centre, with a population of over 10 million[4].

The slum problem in Mumbai has distinctive features. Due to Mumbai's geographical environment being connected by islands, a linear urban layout was formed, and therefore, the railway became the main means of transportation within the city[4]. However, due to Mumbai's high land prices, residents who could not afford housing but needed to work for a living had to live in informal settlements near the railway without basic infrastructure[3],[4]. This undoubtedly threatened the safety and health of slum residents, and at the same time, the city's transport efficiency and economic development were seriously affected[5].

In this context, the Kanjur Marg Resettlement and Rehabilitation Project was proposed in 1988 to relocate and rehabilitate 900 slum families to facilitate the construction and operation of a new railway line[3]. The project was led by the state government and the Indian Railways, with a World Bank loan providing funding, and followed the Resettlement & Rehabilitation (R&R) strategy proposed by the World Bank, ensuring that households requiring relocation were relocated before the start of railway construction and that community participation was involved in the selection of new living locations[3]. Furthermore, social organization played an essential role in the implementation of the project, with the registered non-governmental organization the Society for Promotion of Area Resource Centers (SPARC), the male-dominated National Slum Dwellers Federation (NSDF), and the female-led Mahila Milan (MM) forming an alliance to visit slums in person, establish connections with residents, and provide professional assistance[3]. Finally, the slum dwellers themselves, an important part of the project, not only participated directly in the selection of new living locations under the guidance of the R&R strategy but also worked together with social organizations to carry out a series of tasks related to the slum's profile, facilities, actual number of residents, rebuilding of the residential community, and the mobilization and empowerment of women, with women in the community being united under the guidance and training of social organizations to strengthen their management skills and organize and manage the relocation, resettlement, and savings of residents[3],[4]. Through this multi-faceted collaborative model, residents voluntarily relocated and completed the resettlement project for 900 slum families.

2.2 Local Strategies: A Metropolitan Plan in Rosario

Located in Latin America, Argentina, like other Latin American countries, experienced a series of coups and dictatorships in the latter half of the 20th century before eventually restoring democracy[6]. Unlike India's centralized model, this history has led Argentina to form a decentralized political system. The power of the central government and the provincial government is delegated to the municipal government, which has a great degree of power over urban planning and management while citizens also actively participate in the planning process, but the primary source of funding for urban planning is still the central government and the provincial government [6],[7].

Rosario is particularly unique, as it is the third largest city in Argentina and an important agricultural and port city with a population of 1.1 million. It is also part of the Rosario Metropolitan Area (AMR) and has formed a close relationship with surrounding cities. However, the ruling party in Rosario has been the Social Party, the relationship between Rosario and other cities in the AMR is not always very close[7],[8]. Rosario has also undergone two updates to its urban planning since 1999; both have incorporated a metropolitan perspective, meaning that Rosario needs to work more closely with surrounding areas to develop a larger metropolitan area[6].

Based on this background, the Rosario Metropolitan Coordination Entity (ECOMR) launched the "26 Local Strategies: A Metropolitan Plan" to involve the communes, institutions, and residents of each area in Rosario's transition to a metropolitan area, ensuring that the transition plan is comprehensive and allows citizens to understand the complexity of the region and take responsibility for designing the approach to advancing the entire project was mainly through participatory workshops, where people from all backgrounds, including those without urban

planning experience, were invited to participate in discussions, learn and explore, and offer their opinions on urbanization and housing, public space, and infrastructure and public services[6]. After 25 workshops, 25 documents were completed, which constituted the entire urban planning, and also marked the end of this stage of planning for the AMR transformation[6].

3. Analysis of Planning Methods—Post-Modern Planning

Since the first half of the 20th century, people have gradually realized city diversity. Multiple identities, such as race, gender, sexual orientation, class, and immigration, have become visible. This apparent difference has been ignored in the traditional modernist planning framework. As a result, the radical planning concept of criticizing and deconstructing modernism was born. Based on incorporating diversity into planning, a new planning method, Post Modern Planning (PMP), has evolved[9]. Therefore, one of the most prominent characteristics of post-modern planning is the participation of residents and communities. This participation is not only a respect for different identities, but more importantly, it allows residents with different identities living in urban communities to participate directly in the planning process to truly empower residents who are more vulnerable in urban development[9].

It can be seen from this that both Mumbai and Rosario have reflected distinct post-modern planning characteristics in their cases. In the Kanjur Marg Project, the slum residents who needed to be resettled cooperated not only with social organizations to conduct field research on the slums but also, more importantly, the residents jointly decided on the new residential land, and female residents in the slums also took on management responsibilities in the project[4]. Residents' deep participation is reflected in the right to choose their future residential land and the critical role played by female residents who were more vulnerable in the past. These reflect the inclusiveness and participation of PMP.

In the Rosario 26 Local Strategies project, residents who did not participate in any organization could also participate in the planning proposal while different institutions and social organization were also invited to the discussion space[6]. In the case of Rosario, the government did not set any threshold for participation. Planning is no longer an unattainable government matter for residents, but they have the right to plan and design. The invitation to various social organizations also puts the concerns and problems of groups with different identity attributes on the table, reflecting PMP's attention to differences and participation.

However, it is worth noting that although both cases emphasize the characteristics of "resident participation", how residents participated in planning in these two cases is entirely different. In the case of Mumbai, residents were not actively invited by the government to participate in the project at the beginning. The real reason that enabled residents to participate in the project was the World Bank's R&R strategy. On the other hand, since the power of local governments is too limited, it is difficult for the project to be promoted by the government alone, so the collaboration of social organizations and local residents is necessary[3]. This allows residents to communicate with collaborators and understand each other. Their opinions and knowledge are incorporated into the planning, but more importantly, residents participate in many practical work. However, they are residents who need to be resettled, and managers and executors of the project significantly empower residents.

However, in the case of Rosario, things turned around. Since the local government of Rosario has considerable autonomy in urban planning, decentralization and citizen participation are the political traditions of Rosario[7]. Therefore, when Rosario needed to transform into a metropolis, the 26 Local Strategies proposed by ECOMR to coordinate multiple parties and encourage citizen participation were actually closer to Rosario's political tradition, and the form of citizen participation was concentrated in the 25 workshops held. Residents and representatives of institutions and organization carried out discussions, learning, dialogue and debate with the assistance of the government and the committee[6]. This has led to mutual understanding among

various stakeholders and the voices of various groups being heard. The successful completion of the planning schemes by 25 localities after the local workshops represents the project's success. However, it must be addressed that the involvement of residents in the project was limited and compared with the control of the project by residents in the Mumbai case, residents in Rosario had very little direct involvement in the organization of the project. Additionally, although they completed the proposal, the uncertainty about the follow-up made it harder for residents to confirm the actual effects of participating in the planning process.

The differences between the two cases reflect the connection between the two types of collaborative planning and insurgent planning in PMP. From the perspective of participation, collaborative planning focuses more on communication, debate and explanation, so that more knowledge can be incorporated into the planning process; insurgent planning means undermining the stability of the existing neoliberal hegemony, which is more reflected in the redistribution of power and resources in practice[10],[11]. This is not to say that the two divide PMP into two completely unrelated categories. The two concepts present a spectrum-like form, not two binary oppositional types. This correlation is particularly reflected in the case of Mumbai, where the collaborative communication between residents and social organizations deepened their understanding of each other, and the power of residents to execute and make decisions in the entire project deconstructed the top-down power system model to a greater extent. In comparison, the case of Rosario focuses more on inviting residents into the dialogue space, but it is difficult to judge to what extent residents of different identities have regained power. Therefore, the combination of the two planning forms can be seen in the Mumbai case, and the characteristics of collaborative planning are more prominent in the case of Rosario.

4. Analysis of Social Justice

However, no matter which planning method or type of planning, it is only a form rather than a tool[12]. What we who live in the city pursue is always to use the urban rights we should have to shape a just city[13]. Therefore, the ultimate goal of comparing urban cases and analyzing planning methods is to evaluate the realization of social justice. The core of social justice is that people participate equally in the social process without encountering institutional barriers, and its evaluation is carried out from three dimensions: representation, redistribution, and recognition[14]. Among them, representation emphasizes that people speak and participate in decision-making equally, which is also the core and premise of the framework; redistribution refers to the structural fairness of resource allocation; and recognition is to change consciousness, recognize and accept diverse cultures and identities, and the ultimate goal is to achieve equal participation[14]. Through these three dimensions, we can evaluate how planning can achieve social justice in the cases of Mumbai and Rosario.

In the cases of Mumbai and Rosario, we can see the embodiment of representation. In the Kanjur Marg Project, residents, especially women, were deeply involved in the management of the project, which changed the power relationship between the operation system jointly built by social organizations and residents and the government. In 26 Local Strategies, almost everyone in each area was given the opportunity and right to participate in the planning process. They each represented their unique identity and cultural background and participated in a vast urban planning design. Although the forms were different, people expressed their opinions and made decisions together in the planning, shaping a more just city. However, this process was challenging. In the case of Mumbai, although the World Bank's participation supported local residents' participation, the cumbersome procedures and requirements also created obstacles to participation[4]. In the case of Rosario, although people's participation was not an obstacle, only one workshop in each area still had an implicit participation threshold, not to mention that the local mayor canceled the meeting of one area in the originally planned 26 area plans. Full participation is not realistic. It is too difficult to ensure that everyone's voice is heard. Furthermore, whether the voice will be distorted after being

heard, these issues should be reflected in democratic participation[15]. Both the forms and results of participation in Mumbai and Rosario face hidden problems that must be considered.

In terms of redistribution, in the case of Mumbai, after resettlement, the residents of the slums have the infrastructure to ensure their lives, and the safety of their living lives is also guaranteed. In addition, the residents, especially women, received training during the project and gained more abilities and skills to ensure their future lives[3]. However, resettlement also means that residents must bear more living expenses and may face inconvenience in using other facilities such as transportation[16]. Whether they can afford to live without falling into poverty again and whether redistribution has been truly achieved needs further discussion. Although the redistribution is not evident in the Rosario case, the three dimensions of planning in the project involve minimal redistribution. Therefore, even if people of different identities and classes participate in the discussion, it is difficult to change the uneven distribution structurally.

Regarding the embodiment of recognition, in the Mumbai case, the most vulnerable residents organized together to complete the project in their way and with their knowledge, and the leading role of women represents that different perspectives are respected in the project process. However, since the participation of residents is not their self-awareness, social justice needs to be further shaped. In the case of Rosario, the spontaneous and active participation of various social organizations and residents represents a social consciousness of multicultural coexistence. However, the degree of tolerance for cultural diversity still needs further evaluation.

5. Conclusion

This paper takes the lens of globalism and compares and analyses two urban planning cases of Mumbai and Rosario from the perspective of resident participation and action. Although both cases mainly adopt post-modern planning methods, they show completely different forms of participation. In Mumbai, due to residents' deep involvement in the project's management, it can be seen that the planning form combining collaborative planning and insurgent planning is adopted in this case. In the case of Rosario, however, residents participate more in discussions and making decisions; therefore, the planning form reflects collaborative planning. In further analysis of social justice, it is not difficult to find that both cases have achieved social justice to some extent in urban development from three dimensions. However, participation itself has never been the result of democracy. How to avoid the appearance of participation and shape urban justice should be further discussed and explored as a starting point.

References

- [1] ROBINSON, J. 2011. Cities in a World of Cities: The Comparative Gesture. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 35, 1-23.
- [2] ROBINSON, J. 2015. Thinking cities through elsewhere: Comparative tactics for a more global urban studies.
- [3] BURRA, S. 1999. Resettlement and rehabilitation of the urban poor: The story of Kanjur Marg. University college London (UCL). Development planning unit (DPU).
- [4] PATEL, S., D'CRUZ, C. & BURRA, S. 2002. Beyond evictions in a global city: people-managed resettlement in Mumbai. *Environment and Urbanization*, 14, 159-172.
- [5] BURRA, S. 2001. Resettlement and Rehabilitation of the Urban Poor: The Mumbai Urban Transport Project. SPARC, Mumbai.
- [6] GALIMBERTI, C. 2022. Citizen participation in multiscale planning: the case of "26 Local Strategies: A Metropolitan Plan" in the Rosario Metropolitan Area, Argentina (2016–2020). *Environment and Urbanization*, 34, 229-246.
- [7] ALMANSI, F. 2009. Rosario's development; interview with Miguel Lifschitz, mayor of Rosario, Argentina. *Environment and urbanization*, 21, 19-35.

- [8] HARDOY, J. & RUETE, R. 2013. Incorporating climate change adaptation into planning for a liveable city in Rosario, Argentina. *Environment and urbanization*, 25, 339-360.
- [9] SANDERCOCK, L. 1998. The death of modernist planning: Radical praxis for a postmodern age. *Cities for citizens: Planning and the rise of civil society in a global age*, 163-184.
- [10] HEALEY, P. 1992. Planning through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory. *Town planning review*, 63, 143-162.
- [11] MIRAFTAB, F. 2009. INSURGENT PLANNING: SITUATING RADICAL PLANNING IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH. *Planning theory* (London, England), 8, 32-50.
- [12] FREDIANI, A. A. & COCINI, C. 2019. 'Participation as planning': Strategies from the south to challenge the limits of planning.
- [13] HARVEY, D. 2003. The right to the city. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 27, 939-941.
- [14] FRASER, N. 2008. *Scales of justice : reimagining political space in a globalizing world* / Nancy Fraser, Cambridge, Polity.
- [15] ALFASI, N. 2021. Why public participation isn't a tool for democratizing planning. A comment. *Planning theory* (London, England), 20, 175-178.
- [16] Dickson, E. (2007) 'Community participation in resettlement: an alternative to forced evictions', [Online], Available at: https://icfc.ws/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/2007-11-04_EricDickson_Paper-CommunityParticipation-in-Resettlement.pdf (Accessed: 14 January 2024)