

**Boston University**

**OpenBU**

**<http://open.bu.edu>**

---

Seidman Research Papers

Workshops, Notes and Papers

---

# Comments on the Research Report on the Town & Country Planning Bill

---

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/34847>

*Boston University*

August 30, 1999

## COMMENTS ON THE RESEARCH REPORT ON THE TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING BILL

-oOo-

**1. Form and style.** (a) *Sentences.* See notes on first two pages of text.

(b) *Connectives.* (i) Summary paragraph; description of methodology. The Introduction should include (in either a single paragraph, or two separate ones) a summary of the contents of the Research Report, and an explanation of the methodology used. Your second paragraph on p. 1 performs the former function, but nothing explains the methodology.

(ii) Conclusion to the Report. This is missing altogether.

(iii) Mini-introductions and mini-conclusions. You should provide these for each major section of the Report. For example, in the Explanations section, you have a sort of mini-introduction, but it should go further to (a) summarize the contents of the section, and (b) to explain where in the problem-solving methodology the Explanations fit. Only so can you keep the reader informed about the state of the argument. (The same comments go to mini-conclusions, which should also summarize what you have just said in the body of the section involved. The mini-conclusion for the Difficulty section on p. 3 is very well done indeed; the Report needs more of, them!)).

**2. Research.** In the final version, when you have had more time to work on the report, surely you can develop more factual information to support your statements.

**3. Introduction.** I liked the use of the Nepal experience, on p. 1. You need, I think, some description of the larger problems of land use in Bhutan, and where your bill fits into that problem. See also the discussion above concerning the summary paragraph and the description of the methodology.

**4. Difficulty.** The description of the superficial manifestations of the problem seems well done. So also with the description of whose and what behaviors are involved -- although, again, with more time surely you can flesh out these statements with some evidence. I thought the description of the implementing agencies too brief. From it, I could not really understand what behaviour of theirs you regard as problematic. -- Your 'winners and losers' section (p. 3) seems well done.

**5. Explanations.** In general, these need a great deal more detail. For example, in the case of residents (p. 4), you say only that the agencies enforce the rules slackly. What are the rules that they flout? In the final draft, these should be described with some care, explaining in some detail what the residents are supposed to do, and how (if at all) the rules themselves on their face contribute to the behaviours you have identified earlier. Or again, under 'land speculators' you

mention "weak planning regulations and building standards in peri urban areas." Much better than so conclusory a general statement would be a detailed description of those regulations, pointing out how on their face they help explain land speculator behaviours. So also with the statement on the top of p. 5 that because the rules are not clear, the implementing agencies have applied the rules differentially. It would help to specify the sections that lack clarity, and how the agencies have used these to apply different treatment to people similarly situated. On the whole, however, you seem to have thought through the ROCCIPI factors and found some interesting hypotheses upon which to build your bill.

**6. Solutions.** You will want to spell out the alternatives in somewhat more detail in the final version; those here are so short that I could not understand exactly what the alternatives were. (I plead ignorance, too, of GLD, LR and LP! Your solution must also be described in more detail; for example how will the municipal boundary be extended, and what provisions will your bill make for the phased urban development? (You need to tell us who does what to make these things happen). Also, much more detail is needed on costs and benefits, especially, out-of-pocket costs to government of your solution, and the consequences of your bill for disadvantaged groups and weakly represented interests. You need a paragraph showing how your solution addresses the causes detailed in the Explanations section-- The monitoring provisions seem well considered.

**General comment:** For a very hurried first draft, this is really quite good indeed.. Mainly, it needs not structural change but more detail and more evidence -- matters that the short preparation time available made impossible.