Title
THE VALUE AND DYNAMICS OF COMMUNITY-BASED STUDIO PROJECTS IN PLANNING EDUCATION IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9wg687jf

Journal

Author
Siame, Gilbert

Publication Date
2016

DOI
10.5070/BP328133858

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

THE VALUE AND DYNAMICS OF COMMUNITY-BASED STUDIO PROJECTS IN PLANNING EDUCATION IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH

INSIGHTS FROM KALIKILIKI STUDIO PROJECT IN THE CITY OF LUSAKA

Gilbert Siame

AUTHOR BIO

Gilbert Siame is a Lecturer in Master of Science in Spatial Planning Programme at The University of Zambia (UNZA), School of Natural Sciences, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies. He earned his Master of City and Regional Planning from the University of Cape Town, South Africa, where he completed his PhD studies in Architecture and Planning in June 2016. His research interests and projects include transforming planning education in Africa, cities and climate change, participatory slum upgrading, planning theory from the South, and urban governance. His is a co-founder and current director of the Centre for Urban Research and Planning at the University of Zambia.

ABSTRACT

Urbanisation is growing in the global South, but urban planning is not keeping up to address the problem of urban growth. Many planning schools in Africa still promote ideas transferred from the global North. (The master plan of Lusaka in Zambia, for instance, was based on the concept of the Garden City, but Garden City for whom?) Most planning schools fail to adequately prepare planning students for the problems they will later encounter in African cities. In order to confront the urbanisation pressures on the continent in all its unique dimensions, fundamental shifts are needed in the way planning schools on the continent prepare planners. Responding to this challenge, the University of Zambia (UNZA) launched a Master of Science degree in Spatial Planning in 2013. Informality and studio-based teaching and learning are major components of the programme. In an effort to raise some of the inherent challenges and benefits of running community-based studio projects in Africa, this study addresses the question: How can planning studio projects contribute to the overhauling of the planning profession in Africa? The paper uses a case study to draw upon the experiences of eighteen master's students who were engaged in a community-based planning studio project in the Lusaka's Kalikiliki informal settlement. The paper concludes that community-based studio projects present an opportunity that has potential for raising the consciousness of planners and enabling them to build on post-colonial, endogenous innovation inspired by cities of the global South.

INTRODUCTION

Zambia is becoming increasingly more urban by the decade; at current population growth rates, by 2030, about one quarter (24 percent) of Zambians will live in Lusaka province alone compared to one-sixth (17 percent) of the population currently (Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (ZIPAR) 2011). One therefore tends to wonder about the country's planning ability to cope with these increasing levels of urbanisation and the subsequent challenges. It is now widely expected by many citizens that Zambia needs a town planning system that is responsive and can address contemporary urban challenges. However, it is evident "in Zambia that town planning has failed in its basic and traditional tenets of ensuring sustainable development of cities and towns, with 80 per cent of the houses being informal and/or poorly serviced" (Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) 2002, 207).

Planning laws, planning institutions and governance systems, and even planning curricula in Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa were strongly shaped by the colonial history of the sub-continent, and much of this imprint remains vivid today. The main argument is that demands on planners and planning systems have changed dramatically as Zambian cities and towns battle to cope with rapid growth, inequality, informality, and environmental change. It is against this background that planning education and the planning profession needs to reorient itself to contemporary demands and expectations (Mwiba 2002). The challenge has been the lagging of town planning in its responsiveness to the needs of the Zambian society. This is largely attributed to the unchanged and continued adherence to planning dogmas and professional philosophies that embody colonial town planning practices and beliefs at the expense of championing an engaging and forward-looking profession. This paper will discuss how planning studio could be used to fast-track unlearning of these colonial planning doctrines among experienced planners

as a way of transforming planning practice in Africa. Further, the paper seeks to show how to successfully run a planning studio in an informal settlement in an African city.

This paper is divided into six sections. Having used section one for introduction, the second section presents the case study method used in the study. The third section provides background on current planning practices in Zambia. I use the fourth section to review the use of community-based studio projects as a means of rethinking planning in Zambia. In the fifth section, I discuss the findings of the study. In the sixth section, I provide my last reflections on the value and dynamics of use of community-based studio projects in reforming planning education in Zambia.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is designed as a descriptive and interpretive case inquiry analysed through qualitative methods. The study used both secondary and primary information. Secondary information was obtained from books, journals, and internet sources. Primary information was gathered from field work that took place in May 2014. Primary information was collected mainly using semi-structured interviews, which were supplemented by filed notes and observations that I recorded in my programme journal. The study had a total of eighteen respondents drawn from the inaugural class of Master of Science in Spatial Planning Programme at UNZA. This programme was launched in October 2013, and is being supported by both the government of Zambia and the Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS). Of the eighteen students, ten are "experienced" planners who have been working as senior government officials for city, provincial, and national governments. The remaining eight are from diverse backgrounds such as development studies, civil society, and environment management practice. The researcher was both a key logistical organiser and the teacher for the Kalikiliki community-based studio project as well as a number of other courses, including planning theory and practice.

THE PLANNING PHILOSOPHY IN ZAMBIA: THE BEDROCK OF THE MISMATCH

The colonial urban policy was aimed at controlling the influx of the black Zambian population to the urban centres or discouraging their permanent residence. In 1963, "a year before independence, 21 per cent of the population was living in urban areas of Zambia" (Rakodi 1990, 144). The first town planning legislation to be enacted was the 1929 Town Planning Ordinance. The Ordinance, influenced by the British town planning legislation, was primarily concerned with the health and welfare of the European population. Stringent British-type building regulations were applied in expatriate residential areas by the local authorities, who turned a blind eye to conditions in the African locations (Rakodi 1986). In terms of content, the revised Act has been criticized for being of little relevance to Zambia (as it is based on the 19748 and 1971 British town planning legislations), very rigid, and premised on development control rather than development facilitation and, thus, unresponsive to the surging urban challenges. Though the challenges and context have changed, the philosophical underpinnings of urban planning in Zambia are still premised on colonial undertones, focusing on control rather facilitation for inclusive urban development.

The type of planning, housing, and land policies adopted under colonial rule, together with the structure of the construction industry, "placed major constraints on the options available to the newly independent government, which lacked Zambian staff capable of questioning the underlying assumptions on which the planning system," housing, and land policies were based (Rakodi 2006, 215). The spatial structure of towns in Zambia has been shaped by the colonial ideology that was the basis for the founding of the town planning profession, that of ensuring orderly development of towns using tools such as zoning and development control. Continued application of such tools has left a rather ugly influence on Zambian urban form and land-use systems. Ebenezer Howard's original concept of a "Garden City" envisaged the creation of a balanced community, providing jobs, houses, and facilities for its entire population within

walking or cycling distance. In the case of Lusaka, one or two components of Howard's idea (e.g., generous planting, organic rather than grid-iron layouts) were lifted out of one context and utilised in another, to influence the planning of residential areas for only one section of the urban population. Rigid land-use zoning reflected early British town planning legislation (Rakodi 2006). Carole Rakodi (1986, 213) argues that town planning notions such as the Garden City, which were contemporary town planning concepts in Europe during the initial planning phases of Lusaka, where debased in the process of their transposition to the different economic and social situations that existed in colonies like Zambia. For instance, informal settlements inter alia the famous Kalikiliki and Chibolya are established in the heart of the city on pieces of land which, according to the garden city concept, should ideally have been a green belt or agricultural land.

Further, limited human and financial resources are put to managing outdated and ineffective master plans for many African cities inherited from colonial regimes (Watson 2009). This is against the reality that African cities, just like many other cities of the global South, have been experiencing a trend of rapid urbanisation and growth of informal and/or hybrid urban economies and human settlements (Simone 2001; Kudva 2009). Urban informality is dominant and is increasingly viewed as "an organising logic, a system of norms that governs the process of urban transformation itself" (Roy 2009a, 148). The key argument is that challenges currently facing cities like Lusaka cannot be tackled adequately by traditional spatial planning ideas and practices (Albrechts 2013; Watson 2014; Ahlers et al. 2014). Consensus-seeking planning concepts such as those contained in communicative and collaborative theories remain largely impractical in many cities, especially in Africa, because the planning function of the state is restrictive and seeks to engage with only a small proportion of the citizens—those living in what authorities refer to as formal or legal areas (Healey 1997a; Healey 2003; Innes 1995; Forester 1989). Thus, rather than requiring consensus be reached to validate the rationality of actions, planning needs to direct attention to the conflictual nature of policy-making and planning, and emphasise the political judgement, moral vision, and emotional sensitivities that planners require within the context of social diversity and poverty (Odendaal and Watson 2012). The current and future African urban challenges need new urban planning skills and a significant reorientation of the profession on professional values.

THE NEED FOR EVOLUTION IN URBAN PLANNING PRACTICE

Town planning has not achieved much in Zambia. Though this can be attributed to colonial legacy in terms of policy, legislation, and urban management frameworks, little has been done after independence to redefine the planning profession in Zambia (Mwimba 2002). Further, the continued over-reliance on the global North for training the majority of the planners in Zambia contributes significantly to the challenge of unresponsive planning profession today (Odendaal and Watson 2012). There have been attempts to change the inherited colonial planning systems, but little attempt has been made to reform the urban environment through "rethinking a planner" in Zambia. Traditionally, urban planning in Zambia has long consisted of making "general plan" maps or blueprints, often context-blind, which show fundamental land-use types (residential, commercial, and industrial). These urban planning tasks have been seen as scientific; thus, the profession has been thought of as an exclusive science focusing on creating beautiful drawings, a strong sense of geometry, and/or strong visions about how the world should work, but with little experience or interest in understanding the practical outcomes. In much of Africa, Zambia inclusive (Current Lusaka Master Plan), planning is carried out as a techno-bureaucratic exercise concerned with plan production and control instruments, while in reality many large urban sections remain "ungoverned" and are faced with problems for which there is little useful precedent from the West (Pojani 2011; Harrison 2006). The dominant planning practices by officials in local and national government agencies in Africa are dominated by forceful actions. People in informal settlements are categorised as illegal and are not catered to by either service providers or regulators. There exists a conflicted relationship between the majority of the citizens in the African city and state systems and agencies. The planners and municipal managers are at the centre of these poor state-society relations. These circumstances call for new urban development approaches and management, as well as appropriate communication and facilitation skills in a context ridden with deep poverty, income, and social divisions. Consensus-seeking planning theories such as communicative and collaborative planning remain largely impractical in many countries, especially in the global South, because the functioning of the state and the role of populations in contemporary urban societies are

fundamentally different. Thus, rather than requiring consensus to validate the rationality of actions, planning needs to direct attention to the conflictual nature of policy-making and planning, and emphasise the political judgement, moral vision, and emotional sensitivities that planners require within a social context.

The philosophy of town planning should be developed and interpreted in the Zambian context in order for the profession to become relevant in addressing planning problems specific to Zambia. Africa needs planners that will have the audacity to drive the new African urban agenda, which should begin with the redefinition of the town planning philosophy, urban policy, and legislation problems. In recent years, complex planning issues have come to the fore in Zambia, as cities and the national government have to figure out how to provide adequate infrastructure, facilitate and control private development, meet transportation needs, respond to automobile traffic, and protect the environment in a market economy (Pojani 2011). Thus, a new town planning philosophy and urban development policy stance needs to address specific urban problems experienced in the Zambian cities and towns, such as urban poverty (Rakodi, 2006; Odendaal and Watson 2012; Harrison 2006).

QUESTIONING THE ROLE OF TOWN PLANNERS IN ZAMBIA

The failure of town planning in Zambia to contribute to the spatial and socio-economic development of the nation is not solely attributable to the colonial town planning practices, but also to the post-independence Zambian town planners (Rakodi 2006). There is urgent need to redefine the planning philosophy, value system, and professional ethics as well as inculcation of unwavering commitment to contemporary urban challenges in Zambian towns. In Zambia, the town planning issues are apparently not being adequately addressed. The dominant work for the few employed as town planners has been reduced to demarcating plots. Unfortunately, there is a marked shift from planning towns to planning people, with a marked neglect of urban planning and concentration on socio-economic planning. This is evidenced by the number of socio-economic planning activities being supported while physical planning remains very limited. For example, planning in Zambia seems to focus on the

national socio-economic development plans, which are not spatialised. There is emphasis on social and economic activities, such as building trading spaces (markets); random allocation of plots especially for housing, water, and sanitation; and education among other activities. Out of 103 districts and cities that are planning authorities (contained in the Urban and Regional Planning Act Number 3 of 2015), less than six have approved spatial plans. This is nothing short of a crisis. The following section discusses planning studio pedagogy as a means of transforming planning education and professional practice.

THE EFFICACY OF STUDIO PEDAGOGY IN PLANNING: A PEDAGOGICAL REVIEW

In this section, I argue for the pedagogical value and practical importance of studio teaching and learning environments in planning education. Most studios in the disciplines of architecture and planning are teaching and learning places that are inhabited by students and staff in various ways (Bonollo and Green 2003). The studio as a place is often characterised by "creative disorder" and a degree of messiness as the place is appropriated by the students to suit their needs (Bosman, Dedekorkut, and Dredge 2012). The planning "studio" is a pedagogical concept which is more about the physical environment in which learning and teaching takes place than it is about the modes of learning and teaching. Karen Goodnough (2006) argues that "studio pedagogy in planning is driven by the need to task students with open ended, messy or 'wicked' urban problems that require students to function in collaborative groups to find feasible solutions" (303). These modes usually endeavour to mimic the professional workplace environment. Studio curriculum seeks to focus on how to solve "real-life" problems, rather than learning a prescribed solution. Drawing on Elizabeth Aitken-Rose, Jennifer Dixon, and Marilyn Higgins (2009), characteristics of planning studios include: (1) project- and/or problem-based and experiential learning, (2) usually involving students working in groups (3) on a "live" project. Further, planning studio projects seek to identify a balance of theory and practice, as well as ensuring active independent learning.

According to Caryl Bosman, Dianne Dredge and Aysin Dedekorkut (2012), studio pedagogy has proved to deliver excellence in teaching and learning outcomes in the field of the built environment. As a learning and teaching approach, community-based studio projects shift the role of the student from passive receiver of information to active and engaged learner (Rollo and Tucker 2005). This mode of teaching is widely used in architecture, urban and regional planning, and fine arts in an effort to assist students engage in hands-on learning (Loss and Thornton 1997; Jamieson 2003). Studios are also teaching spaces that provide contexts for developing community-oriented learning and student sociality. Studio projects create opportunities for teachers and students to explore problems and identify and reflect on solutions in an iterative way. Community-based studio projects give students opportunities to learn from their peer communities in their application of concepts and, thus, develop deep understandings of planning issues through action. Likewise, facilitators gain knowledge of students and their challenges in learning, in conceptualising problems, and in engaging in the theory-practice interface (Bosman, Dedekorkut, and Dredge 2012). Accordingly, studios can provide students with confidence, self-esteem, substantive knowledge about theoretical topics, and a range of generic skills including communication skills, creative problem solving, and critical thinking. These benefits of community-based planning studio projects help change the consciousness and attitudes of planning professionals (Loss and Thornton 1997; Aitken-Rose, Dixon, and Higgins 2009).

THE NICHE IS IN THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Studio is not just about the "practical and hands-on" methods of teaching and learning. Studios facilitate reflective interaction between theory and practice, which is fundamental to planning education (Birch 2001; Banjeree and Myers 2005). In studio, students learn skills in analysis, reflection, and creativity, in addition to those skills required for professional practice. The studio is a learning environment that brings together all the strands of knowledge and experiences. Knowledge from other courses, different theoretical perspectives, and personal knowledge and experiences are all drawn upon in the act of Problem-Based Learning (PBL). To support

this pedagogy, a variety of teaching and learning approaches are necessary (Bosman, Dedekorkut, and Dredge 2012). Studio teaching and learning combines traditional lecture, workshop, and tutorial approaches in a student-centred learning strategy (Cleveland-Innes & Emes, 2005). It involves short, lecture-style presentations by staff, informal critiques of student work, student presentations, debates, small group discussions, and learning by doing. Regular feedback and one-to-one interaction with students are key elements of a successful studio engagement, as the approach encourages and supports students in their learning process and generally results in higher student satisfaction. Though practically hard to actualise, these teaching and learning approaches require longer contact hours, dedicated spaces, and higher staffing levels. However, all these prepositions for a successful studio are difficult to satisfy in many African universities, where funding towards higher education is inadequate and irregular and student and staff protests, strikes, and closures are frequent. Given limitations in funding and lack of facilities in most universities, including the University of Zambia, the capacity for effective studio methodology is limited at many universities in Africa (Coady 2000; Considine and Marginson 2000). With the exception of some universities in South Africa, many African universities, inclusive of UNZA, lack adequate transport equipment and adequate dedicated spaces that could be used for studio teaching, have fewer than required qualified academics in the field of urban and regional planning, and lack access to teaching and learning (publications) resources for both lecturers and students. University subscription to key journals in the relevant fields is not a common thing. This makes it very difficult to implement novel planning studios at many African universities.

RETENTION OF SKILLS AND FAST-TRACKING UNLEARNING PROCESSES

In Lusaka, urban development pressures have been strong, and planning practice has often favoured the interests of a few powerful land owners or government officials. Effective urban planning requires teamwork and cannot be a product of individuals, however well-trained. Tinto (2002) writes that "learning is a condition of retention, hence, intra and interpersonal engagement is of crucial significance when we discuss studio pedagogy" in planning educa-

tion (3). Planners must become the interface between private de-velopment and public interest, and act primarily as enablers and regulators, rather than as technicians who produce drawings. Thus, mimicking a real professional environment through studio-based engagements becomes crucial in training future planners who can rise to the challenge of dealing with wicked planning problems in Zambian towns and cities. Through the linked acts of drawing, look-ing, and inferring, students propose alternatives and interpret and explore their consequences. Students learn the "how to" skills as their ideas and proposals evolve on the foundation of studio culture, which asserts that every student must independently develop her own process or method of community-based planning.

The studio methodology equally challenges unresponsive but en-trenched skills and professional positions. These skills and values get into conflict with communities when doing fieldwork with com-munity residents. The challenge does not come from lecturers or books per se, but from the client- the community. In this case, the learners, who may be experienced professionals, begin to critically reflect on what they think they know are best practices of profes-sional work. When learners experience this, the ideas begin to flow bi-directionally between planning theory and practice - between professional and experiential knowledge- thus challenging estab-lished but inappropriate planning epistemologies. This, in the end, allows for reflective learning for both communities and profession-als. The following section presents findings from the Kalikiliki com-munity-based studio.

INNOVATIONS FROM LUSAKA:
EXPERIENCES AND NARRATIVES

The Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS) was formed to mitigate the dominance of unsuitable and irrelevant archetypes in planning education. AAPS is a voluntary, peer-to-peer network of over fifty African institutions that educate and train urban/city and/or regional/rural planners. The members of AAPS are drawn from all regions of Africa. The network aims to promote exchange of information between African planning schools as well as to link African and international planning schools. The principal objec-tive of the fledgling AAPS network was to ensure that future urban

practitioners were equipped to respond effectively and meaningfully to urbanisation in Africa. The gap between what planning students were taught and the urban realities they confronted after graduation needed to be reduced. In 2008, the first major AAPS conference took place in Cape Town. It was attended by academics from twenty-two member schools and focused on planning curricula. Babatunde Ag-bola and Vanessa Watson (2013) report that delegates were each asked to prepare a paper on the most significant planning issues in their city or country, setting out how local planning curricula did— or did not—respond to these. Five main themes emerged from the papers:

Informality;
Access to land;
Climate change;
Collaboration between planners, communities, civil society, and other interested parties; and
Mismatch between spatial planning and infrastructure planning.

In 2011, the University of Zambia was chosen by AAPS as a pilot school for a model curriculum in planning education. AAPS formu-lated a curriculum which was later adapted to the Zambian context and the University of Zambia. The programme was launched in Oc-tober 2013 with eighteen students coming from both national and local government planning authorities as well as from non-planning backgrounds. The curriculum explicitly requires that a local-area studio project course should always be implemented in one of the informal settlements of Lusaka. To facilitate this, UNZA signed a five-year Memorandum of Understanding that created a Partnership involving three institutions namely: The University of Zambia (an ac-ademic institution), Slum/Shack Dwellers International (SDI) Zam-bia Alliance existing as People's Process on Housing and Poverty in Zambia (PPHPZ) (a local grassroots movement), and thirdly Lusaka City Council (LCC) (a Local Authority)- to work together in imple-menting the project course and other aspects of the curriculum. Since 2013, fundamental shifts are being made through UNZA, as the new curriculum contains many global South oriented pragmat-ic components. "The University of Zambia's master's programme is the first in Africa fully to incorporate the issue of informality..." (Ag-bola and Watson 2013, 8).

The inaugural studio project, which took place in Kalikiliki, covered materials contained in the programme and used methods that would prepare potential and "experienced" practitioners to confront the new urban challenges in Zambia and beyond. The students were required to plan with, and not for, the residents of Kalikiliki community. There was a requirement to prove effective community participation and that students address the anxieties and concerns on issues of land tenure, services, community security, and environmental related issues such as perennial floods, food insecurity, quality of community environmental resources, and waste management, among others. By and large, students were to work with local leaders and residents and consult LCC officials on formulating settlement upgrading proposals for Kalikiliki. The aim was to make the teaching and learning as practical as possible using a real-life site that would lead to practical improvements in the lives of the local people in Kalikiliki and other residents of Lusaka.

The Kalikiliki community-based studio project proved to be useful in beginning to change the long and entrenched practice of planning in Zambia. Many students indicated that the programme had exposed them to the reality and challenges of planning in informal communities. The learners appreciated the challenge of balancing between people's livelihoods and the notions of clean and smart cities without informality. The expressions by students seemed to directly align with the call by Odendaal (2012) and UN-Habitat (2009) on the need for planners to address the daunting challenges of urban management, dysfunctional systems, and re-invigoration of planning as an important tool for sustainable and inclusive urban management in African cities. Mwaba Collins, who joined the programme from the Provincial Planning Office for Northern Province and is now in Eastern Province as Head of Provincial Planning Office, reflected on his experiences as follows:

Studio activities in Kalikiliki made me realize that the type of planning which does not take into consideration of social justice, equity and environmental sustainability is not worth the effort and cost. Additionally, it changed the way I look at informality from being an urban problem to being a challenge that needs due consideration by all planners in Zambia. We went beyond the ordinary sense of participation to allow the residents to define the problem and their desired future (June 17, 2014 Interview).

Through this community-based studio project in Kalikiliki, the ordinary people who are at the core of planning issues shared their indigenous knowledge and, through this, mutual learning was evident. These ultimately taught student planners about the environmental and human behavioural patterns that were crucial in assisting the learners and the community to understand and map the real reasons for the observed planning problems in the community. Moreover, planning activities and outcomes in Kalikiliki are more reflective of the needs and aspirations of the community. During the entire studio process in the community, the LCC representatives promised to make use of the studio products that were co-generated by students and communities.

The studio project equally proved useful in transforming the professional values and practices that are entrenched but not in line with what reality demands in the city. Findings indicate that Collins' views are shared by all eighteen students and are supported by the UN-Habitat (2009) argument that the unpreparedness of many urban planning systems and the graduates that work within them in rising to contemporary challenges in many African cities is dysfunctional. Thus, the new programme at UNZA is seeking to build new thinking and approaches to city and regional planning. Tembo, a Student and Principal Housing Officer at the Ministry of Local Government and Housing, said in a June 2014 interview:

The Kalikiliki community-based studio project transformed my values and ethics as a planner because we put the theories in 'graphics' and this was very useful when engaging with the community. Also, the experience put me in the 'right perspective' to begin looking at my work differently. We need to look at the city differently, and work to build inclusive cities, towns and regions.

CHALLENGING PERSPECTIVES AND WORLD VIEWS: INCULCATING THE ART OF LISTENING

UN-Habitat predicts that 70 percent of the world's population will live in cities by 2050, most of them in the global South (UN-Habitat 2009; Pieterse 2010). The population of the City of Lusaka hovers above 2.4 million, and this is expected to almost double by 2035. Intervention in urban spaces in African cities not only needs to con-

tend with inadequate service infrastructure and housing backlogs, but also rapid urbanisation within a context of climate change and global disparities in economic distribution. Thus, a new planning agenda should involve reorientation and, perhaps (here speaking boldly), retraining of both experienced and upcoming urban planners to equip them with the necessary skills and competencies to respond to the unique African urban challenge. There is a need to respond to the everyday challenges and pay attention to the concerns of the majority city populations whose livelihoods and homes are in areas marked for demolitions by planners. Accordingly, the use of studio pedagogy would play a cardinal role in the reorientation of the planning profession in Zambia. All research participants indicated that they acquired essential skills during the Kalikiliki studio project and summarised their experience as follows:

We learned communicative skills and sharpened and tested our capabilities on how to communicate to build consensus in a socially divided community with different rationalities. We build the ability to transact with different stakeholders for a common goal. Above all, we build the ability to listen and mediate or facilitate discussion in the community. These skills are necessary in ensuring that the planning process is inclusive and that we need to plan with all stakeholders to facilitate inclusive city development. This means appreciating the lived realities of the people, protecting livelihoods for poor households and encouraging innovation among all city residents (Narrative summarised by class representative, 16 June, 2014).

Economic life in African cities is not predictable. The many who are unable to find work in the formal economy or permanent homes rely on a range of strategies to survive. Informality, as manifested in informal work and trade and settlements, is a visible feature of urban life for those at the margins. Inadequate access to shelter, work, and land causes many to rely on marginal livelihoods (Odendaal 2012; Watson 2014). In many sub-Saharan African cities, including Lusaka, the majority (70 percent) of the urban population lives in informal settlements (UN-Habitat 2009). If planning is to make any difference in the lives of all urbanites, it must begin to recognise and treat the informal sector as an integral part of African cities and city planning. Many research participants indicated that studio is a "necessary evil." They maintained that, though difficult and costly, studio fast-tracked the unlearning process of certain "olds" in planning, such as cherishing the old colonial fashioned standards that

include a complete disregard of the informal sector in the planning process:

The current planning practices in most local authorities in Zambia do not do planning for the marginalised in society. The practice regards society as homogenous such that interventions are conceptualised as "one size fits all" and planning seems to focus on the formal areas. I think there is need for poly-approach to city challenges. The Kalikiliki project gave us an opportunity to re-engage with our profession and challenge our ways of planning, especially that the majority of the people are the urban poor residing in areas that we have always considered informal (Jamie Mukwato, Student and Director of City Planning, City of Livingstone, 17 June, 2014 interview).

Zambia has no urban policy, and, worse still, the policy context to deal with surging informality is politically driven and is often uncertain. Planning systems are ill-equipped to deal with the informal economy in particular, and official intervention is unpredictable, causing many urbanites in the city of Lusaka to work in insecure conditions (Hunter and Skinner 2003). The threat of evictions and harassment by authorities are burdens traders contend with on a daily basis (UN-Habitat 2007). Through the labelling of these settlements as "unofficial" and illegal", the authorities have reasons for constant plans to implement forceful evictions of the residents. This was confirmed by many students in the new planning programme who initially believed that informality was not part of the planners' work in Zambia; thus, effort must be made to ensure that these labels are erased. Many students, especially those from government, were very uneasy about our work in Kalikiliki. They demanded reasons for our work in informal areas, as they believed it would promote illegality. For obvious reasons, the majority of the class wanted the studio project to shift to a green field and away from an informal settlement. However, with deep involvement in Kalikiliki and more readings and course handouts, all the students shifted their thinking and continue to appreciate the need to engage informality using community-based studio pedagogy. Many students continue to openly and happily proclaim that the studio project in Kalikiliki has helped them unlearn some old-fashioned entrenched practices and beliefs in their professional work, which, to a large extent, have not helped much in building good cities and regions. Changes in the perspectives among the students became clear when most of them actually disregarded Zambia's 1972 and 1985 planning regulations

to opt for the UN-Habitat proposals and other precedents to decide on what standards to use for making proposals for a Kalikiliki spatial development framework.

The outcomes of the Kalikiliki community-based studio resonate with Odendaal's (2012) argument that, despite dystopian visions, planning in Africa offers many opportunities for creative intervention, meaningful engagement with livelihoods, and the chance to make a difference (Brown, 2006). The use of the Kalikiliki community-based planning studio supports the UN-Habitat's (2009) argument that institutions must create a frame in which planning can be enabling and facilitative, rather than controlling and undermining of the urban poor. There is a need to address pertinent pressures such as poverty and informality, and this was the whole intent of the collaborative studio in Lusaka's Kalikiliki. The project had local authority, led by the area's Ward Councillor and local LCC staff participating actively during entire studio process in the community, making suggestions on solid waste management innovations. The Ward Councillor took the ideas and demands from the community to the LCC Chambers, thus allowing LCC technical departments and other councillors to incorporate the development frameworks as party of the overall strategy for water and sanitation projects by the Millennium Challenge Account Zambia. The Council further used the studio process to establish its computerised office to deal with issues of land rates, issuance of occupancy certificates to local residents, and to improve the delivery of other municipal services within the community. The project increased debate in the community and among stakeholders on issues of land tenure security, livelihoods, solid waste, effective representation by elected councillors, and the need for an effective Ward Development Committee. The project created an opportunity for the Ward Councillor to physically interact with the local people, who frequently wanted assurance from him that issues being discussed would be seriously addressed by the relevant government agencies. However, community residents regretted the fact that senior LCC officials and the area Member of Parliament never directly and actively participated in the studio activities. The feeling among stakeholders was that, had the senior leaders been present at community meetings and field excursions, some community concerns such as low police presence, the increasing incidences of violent crimes, and high ground rates could

have been addressed almost immediately. Students also expressed concerns at the failure of senior leaders to participate in studio activities. Raymond Lukomona, the Provincial Planning Officer for Central Province, lamented in an interview on June 15, 2014, that:

Lusaka City Council involvement should have been represented by very senior officers throughout the process. The representation most of time was by junior officers especially at times when the group (students) interacted with community member during the problem identification stage. Involvement of political leaders, especially the Ward Councillor, is very commendable and made the engagement more practical and easy. However, it seems the community wanted to have the area Member of Parliament present at community meetings so that support for the final plans could be fully supported by both local and national government.

ADHERING TO THE IDEALS OF
THE ASSOCIATION OF AFRICAN PLANNING SCHOOLS

The University of Zambia is committed to the call by AAPS to African planning schools to be innovative and committed to the initial ideals of the profession- acting in the public interest and upholding the interests of the disenfranchised. Accordingly, the studio programme is reinvigorating the planning profession in Zambia by exposing students to the real challenges of the city in the country. UNZA, like AAPS, believes that studio is a salient component of the master's programme, and that is needed in the crusade to address the gaps in planning in Zambia and reposition planning education in relation to contemporary urban trends in Africa. The research participants agreed that community-based studio projects are essential in training planners for Zambia, as this exposes future planners and orients them towards real professional challenges. This fits within one of the key projects of AAPS, entitled "Revitalising Planning Education," which sought to address curricula reform in Africa (Odendaal and Watson 2012). The ideals of the AAPS project are being actualised in the master's programme and in the community-based studio projects.

The AAPS theme of "actor collaboration" was formulated to explore the implications of a broadened range of players in the planning process. Negotiating these in-between spaces where agency energies intersect and often collide is difficult. Community-based studio

projects in Kalikiliki helped reshape planning views of the students and reinforce the culture of discipline as urged by Odendaal (2013), who speaks of the need to reassert space as a shared platform for debate- a frame for talking through substantive developmental priorities in the community. In an interdisciplinary environment, the planner has always maintained the distinction of being able to conceptually integrate, and to put into spatial terms, the needs and desires of multiple stakeholders. For the planning graduate, this requires moving beyond "drawing space" into "talking space"—communicating with different stakeholders by incorporating local knowledge and other ways of seeing. This formed one of the key objectives of the studio project, as students were required to show proof of effective collaboration with all the stakeholders and, especially, incorporate the community's anxieties and desires about their private and communal spaces. All the research participants emphasised the value of the community engagements in both shaping their community relations skills and in garnering community support necessary for smooth engagement of the community and for ensuring smooth implementation and sustainability of the planning outcomes. Thus, the interplay between technical knowledge and interpersonal communication remained important.

In the Kalikiliki project, students learned and engaged in the theory of participation. Over half of the research participants realised that participation and empowerment are hard to actualise in real professional practice, and that the idea of empowerment is contested. This appeared vividly when community residents would engage among themselves by staging a contest of ideas on how they wanted their settlement to progress, especially in the area of solid waste management. Akin to Watson (2003), conflicting rationalities, clearly backed by a cocktail of experiences among the community residents and city officials, shaped the meaning of a "liveable" Kalikiliki. Many residents proposed that LCC should use the ground rates to deliver services like removing waste from the community. Others contested this idea, arguing that community residents needed to subscribe to community-based solid waste management enterprises that operate in many informal communities in Lusaka. Other members, who were later supported by LCC, proposed that there was need to form area-based (section-based) watch groups to guard against indiscriminate dumping of waste in the community. Such contestations

gave students a glimpse of what they should expect upon graduation, as the planning process is a contested and conflicted activity. This exposure of future planners is important because planners should not see space as a value-neutral container for their plans. Agency interests are many, resulting sometimes in conflicts over which the planner does not necessarily have control (Odendaal 2013). The theme of "actor collaboration," therefore, is not a mundane homage to "participation;" it is acknowledgement of the fact that planning processes and the spaces within which they play themselves out are informed by a multitude of agency interests, conflict, and contradiction. Thus, planners, as they did in Kalikiliki, need to possess and sharpen skills to listen, initiate, and direct community debate and manage mild conflict in a skilful fashion.

We had to listen to the community members and integrate their ideas with the planning knowledge we were acquiring in theory courses to come up with ideas on what we jointly thought was best for Kalikiliki. In order to listen and apply the practical knowledge we got during discussions and confrontations, we had to develop the virtue of patience in that the people were eager to plan with us. The communication process was bi-directional and required patience to explain to the community residents so that the planning process and product could be acceptable and realistic (Chilala Hankuku, student, 15 June, 2014 interview).

The war against poverty cannot be addressed without consideration of factors that inhibit the poor from accessing land. Methods of dealing with alternative tenure systems and limited insight into land histories frustrate delivery. Moreover, there is poor linkage between directive plans and the realm of land administration, leading to limited implementation in many African cities. Thus, the land question has a far-reaching influence on the kind of planning interventions that are possible. The implementation of the community studio project in Kalikiliki gave both students and community residents an opportunity to engage with the often difficult issue of land. Communities and students argued about what would be the best way of opening up space for providing public services, improving the settlement form, and facilitating affordable housing development. While students were bent on high-rise structures with individual households renting and owning apartments, the community residents' submissions were clear: each individual household needed to own both a structure and a piece of land for income generation.

The community residents proposed that all centres for public services needed to be high-rises to save space. Students later agreed to adopt the views of the community regarding the urban and structural design and land pressures. The majority of community members wanted to maintain the status quo (no high-rise structures) to ensure access to a piece of land so that they could maintain their backyard vegetable gardens. The value of this nature of engagement lies in getting both the future planner and the community resident to mutually engage in the central issue of land as it plays itself out in city planning and urban regeneration. Thus, community-based studio projects have the potential reorient future planners to dynamic ideas shaping informality and city development through the land lens, as land is associated with the normative goal of inclusive cities where the poor cannot be swept away (Watson 2009).

The four parallel theory courses provided a useful frame for understanding the limitations and challenges of planning in a city that is divided into world-class enclaves and sites that depict what has gone wrong with Zambia's city planning and urban governance. As Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin (2001) argue, the City of Lusaka is splintered, with formal planning systems paying no due attention to "unattractive" areas in the city. The debates over land and livelihoods exposed students to crucial questions of urban development, livelihoods, and poverty. The students had to listen to community logic on land, and this meant that the project had potential to produce professional ambassadors to champion the moral project of planning in liberal economic systems (Winkler 2012). Many research participants admitted that community engagements through studio projects made them rediscover the meaning of planning in an environment that is highly liberalised and where demand for land is shaped by mega-infrastructure developments and a decade of economic growth, with the poor usually forgotten. There is an over-appreciation by many city governments of what Watson (2013) calls "urban fantasy," seeming to operate under the illusion that the current African urban crisis will be solved by the super modern infrastructure development that speaks to the rich few and separates planning from the public good. If anything, however, these super modern infrastructure projects are fuelling inequality in many respects in Lusaka.

ADHERING TO THE IDEALS OF
THE ASSOCIATION OF AFRICAN PLANNING SCHOOLS

The Kalikiliki community-based studio project emphasised a pedagogical approach that enhances students' experiential engagement with the context within which they will pursue their careers. As Odendaal (2013) argues, planning curricula for the twenty-first century need to introduce new "sensibilities" and values to students, and ultimately professionals. Planners need be more "enabling" rather than control-focused, able to do creative problem-solving rather than just apply the rules, more flexible, more empathetic, and open to difference (Sandercock 2000). This was achieved in the Kalikiliki studio project, as the course required students to see community problems using a community lens, thus building a sensibility that sees planning through a lens that departs from and contradicts entrenched professional traditions. This leads to knowledge co-production and demands that planners are flexible with their world views and willing to acquire new skills to deal with new challenges. To ensure knowledge co-production, the students worked with communities to establish community challenges and made proposals for upgrading the settlement. Knowledge co-production happened in non-patronising way as both students and community residents made contributions and sacrifices (attending meetings, joint plan drawing, joint cooking at the meeting place, eating together among others) to make the knowledge generation process mutually beneficial.

Interaction with civil society and exposure of students to the realities of life on the margins for the urban poor is necessary to raise consciousness among student planners. To entrench this as part of the official curriculum requires innovative pedagogy and sacrifice, as the execution of such a curriculum requires going beyond content and normal university operations and systems. The Kalikiliki collaborative project essentially entails a process whereby students worked together with community residents on a community-upgrade project. Neither the community nor the students joined the project with the aim of domineering and overstating particular knowledge perspectives, as there was room to engage and challenge entrenched ideas and standards by both groups. The aim was for experiential

learning processes to shift the mind-sets of students, whereby they begin to understand the realities of life in informal settlements and the importance of producing plans that respond to the everyday dynamics, needs, and aspirations of the urban poor (Odendaal and Watson 2012). The overall objectives are lasting engagements and pedagogical shifts that ultimately empower community residents. By giving real spaces for communities to assert their voices and direct the course of planning and upgrading programmes, the process begins to shift the meaning of community empowerment to an inclusive planning process that involves community production of layout plans along with the professionals. Ultimately, what is produced is lasting knowledge and experience that continue to shape the community in arguably better ways. The success of such initiatives requires that students are well prepared and briefed, and SDI-affiliate members need to be organised, trained, and ready to lead the way accordingly.

CONCLUSION AND FINAL REFLECTIONS

Change of professional values, perceptions, and skills will not occur overnight and cannot be caused by innovations in one course. The use of real-life projects in teaching planning (project courses) and the use of case studies in teaching non-studio courses (Urban Infrastructure, Planning Theory and Practice, and Environmental Management, among others) is key to augmenting the successes recorded in community studio projects. In the first weeks of the studio engagement in Kalikiliki, over half of the practising students found the level of involvement in an informal settlement bizarre and contrary to the so-called "esoteric knowledge and values" that they had relied on throughout the many years of their careers. However, during the review of the community-based studio project at the end, all of the students revealed that Zambia's planning practices and standards reflect a blatant disregard for those pursuing livelihoods in the absence of housing and employment opportunities. Many African cities are now predominantly informal, and this is unlikely to change in the near future. For planners to reposition themselves as necessary players on the road to sustainable urban development, they must remain true to the ideals of the "public good" and be committed to inclusive city-development frameworks. This calls for

planners to be alive and accommodating to the needs and aspirations of all the players in urban development.

The use of studio projects to engage with issues of informality has important implications for the training and retraining of planners. Community-based studio projects present an opportunity to raise the consciousness of future planners and enable them to build on postcolonial, endogenous innovation inspired by cities of the global South. Thus, African planning schools could make a lasting mark, redefining planning education and practice on the continent. The Kalikiliki case shows that running a community-based planning studio project is not an ordinary undertaking. It requires constant innovation, handwork, and a mutual and dynamic partnership among stakeholders to motivate the urban poor to stay interested in what may be seen as a futuristic project, and thus less relevant to daily, pressing needs. The project must be designed in a manner that allows it to achieve both ends- community improvement and well-being, on one hand, and student learning on another. Student satisfaction in such projects may be an issue worth investigating in future studies.

REFERENCES

Agbola, B., and V. Watson. *Who Will Plan African Cities?* London: African Research Institute, 2013.

Ahlers, R., F. Cleaver, M. Rusca, and K. Schwartz. "Informal Space in the Urban Waterscape: Disaggregation and Co-production of Water Services." *Water Alternatives* 7, no. 1 (2014): 1-14.

Aitken-Rose, E., J. Dixon, and M. Higgins. "The Pedagogy of the Planning studio: A View from Down Under." *Journal for Education in the Built Environment* 4, no. 1 (2009): 8-30.

Albrechts, L. "Reframing Strategic Spatial Planning by using a Co-production Perspective." *Planning Theory* 12 (2013): 46-63.

Atlay, M., and M. Jankowska. "Use of Creative Space in Enhancing Students' Engagement." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 45, no. 3 (2008): 271-279.

Banjeree, T., and D. Myers. "Toward Greater Heights for Planning: Reconciling the Differences Between Profession, Practice, and Academic Field." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71, no. 2 (2005): 121-129.

Birch, E. "Practitioners and the Art of Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20, no. 4 (2001): 407-422.

Bonollo, E., and L. Green. "Studio-Based Teaching: History and Advantages in the Teaching of Design." *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education* 2, no. 2 (2003: 269-272.

Bosman, C., A. Dedekorkut, and D. Dredge. "The First Year Experience in Higher Education and Planning Studio Pedagogies: An Australian Case Study." *CEBE Transactions* 9, no. 1 (2012): 3-19.

Brown, A. *Contested Space: Street Trading, Public Space, and Livelihoods in Developing Countries.* Rugby, United Kingdom: ITDG Publishing, 2006.

Cleveland-Innes, M., and C. Emes. "Principles of Learner-Centred Curriculum: Responding to the Call for Change in Higher Education." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 35, no. 4 (2005): 85-110.

Coady, T. *Why Universities Matter: A Conversation About Values, Means and Directions.* Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2000.

Considine, M., and S. Marginson. *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance, and Reinvention in Australia.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Forester, J. *Planning in the Face of Power.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989.

Fournier, E., M. Haigh, O. Muniz, E. Pawson, J. Trafford, and S. Vajoczki. "Problem-Based in Geography: Towards a Critical Assessment of its Purposes, Benefits and Risks." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 30, no. 1 (2012): 103-116.

Goodnough, K. "Enhancing Pedagogical Content Knowledge Through Self-Study: An Exploration of Problem-Based Learning." *Teaching in Higher Education* 11, no. 3 (2006): 301-318.

Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ). Transitional National Development Plan (TNDP) (Draft). Lusaka, Zambia: Ministry of Finance and National Planning, 2002.

Graham, S., and S. Marvin. *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition.* New York: Routledge Press, 2001.

Healey, P. "Collaborative Planning in Perspective." *Planning Theory* 2, no. 2 (2003): 101–123.

Healey, P. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies.* London: Macmillan, 1997..

Harrison, P. "On the Edge of Reason: Planning and Urban Futures in Africa." *Urban Studies* 43, no. 2 (2006): 319-335.

Hunter, N., and C. Skinner. "Foreign Street Traders Working in Inner City Durban: Local Government Policy Challenges." *Urban Forum* 14, no. 4 (2003): 301-319.

Innes, J. "Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14, no. 4 (1995): 183–9.

Jamieson, P. "Designing More Effective On-campus Teaching and Learning Spaces: A Role for Academic Developers." *International Journal for Academic Development* 8, no. 2 (2003): 119-133.

Kudva, N. "The Everyday and the Episodic: The Spatial and Political Impacts of Urban Informality." *Environment and Planning A* 41, no. 7 (2009): 1614-1628.

Kotval, Z. "Teaching Experimental Learning in the Urban Planning Curriculum." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 27, no. 3 (2003): 297-308.

Loss, R., and D. Thornton. "Students Model Professionals in Information Technology-Rich Learning Environments." Paper presented at ASCILITE 1997, Curtin University of Technology, Sydney, 1997.

Mwimba, C. "Planning Africa." Paper to the South African Planning Institution International Conference on Planning Africa 2002, 18 – 20 September 2002, Copperbelt University, Durban, Kitwe, Zambia.

Odendaal, N. *Increasing the Relevance of Urban Planning Education in African Cities. Cape Town*. School of Architecture, Planning and Geomatics, University of Cape Town, 2013.

Odendaal, N. "Reality Check: Planning Education in the African Urban Century." *Cities* 29, no.. 3 (2012): 174-182.

Odendaal, N., and V. Watson. "Changing Planning Education in Africa: The Role of the Association of African Planning Schools." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20, no. 20 (2012): 1-12.

Pieterse, E. *Urbanisation Imperatives for Africa: Transcending Policy Inertia*. Cape Town: African Centre for Cities, 2010.

Pojani, D. *Urban Planning Education in a Democracy with a Market Economy: Learning Economic, Political and Social Skills*. Epoka, Albania: Epoka University, 2011.

Rakodi, C. "Colonial Urban Policy and Planning in Northern Rhodesia and Its Legacy." *Third World Planning Review* 8, no. 3 (1986).

Rakodi, C. *Colonial Urban Policy and Planning in Northern Rhodesia and its Legacy*. Cardiff, United Kingdom: University of Wales Institute of Science and Technology, 2006.

Rakodi, C. "Policies and Preoccupations in Rural and Regional Development Planning in Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe." In *Third World Regional Development* edited by D. Simmons. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd, 1990.

Rollo, J., and R. Tucker. *Fair Assessment and Blended Learning in Collaborative Group Design Projects*. Sydney: Deakin University, 2005.

Roy, A. "Why India Cannot Plan Its Cities: Informality, Insurgence and the Idiom of Urbanisation." *Planning Theory* 8 (2009a): 76-87.

Sanercock, L. "When Strangers Become Neighbours: Managing Cities of Difference." *Planning Theory and Practice* 4, no. 1 (2000): 13-30.

Simone, M. "Straddling the Divides: Remaking Associational life in the Informal African City." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25, no. 1 (2001): 102-117.

Tinto, V. "Establishing Conditions for Student Success." Paper presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the European Access Network, Monash University, Prato, Italy, 2002.

UN-Habitat. *The Habitat Debate 13*. Nairobi, Kenya: UN-Habitat, 2007.

UN-Habitat. *Planning Sustainable Cities—Global Report on Human Settlements 2009*. Nairobi, Kenya: UN-Habitat, 2009.

Watson, V. "African Urban Fantasies: Dreams or Nightmares?" *Environment & Urbanization* 26, no. 1 (2013): 1-17.

Watson, V. "Conflicting Rationalities: Implications for Planning Theory and Ethics." *Planning Theory and Practice* 4 (2003): 395-408.

Watson, V. "Co-Production and Collaboration in Planning- The Difference." *Planning Theory and Practice* 15, no. 1 (2014).

Watson, V. "Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe's Central Urban Issues." *Urban Studies* 44, no. 11 (2009): 2259-2275.

Winkler, T. "Between Economic Efficacy and Social Justice: Exposing the Ethico-Politics of Planning." *Cities* 29 (2012): 166-173.

Zambia Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (ZIPAR). The Urbanization Dilemma: How Rapid Population Expansion Could Clog Up Zambia's Main Cities. Lusaka, Zambia: ZIPAR, 2011.