

ISSUES AND ACTIONS FOR MANAGING DEVELOPMENT

Philip Hammer, Hammer, Siler, George Associates

That the new growth management being built mainly at the local level will affect decisively both land use and transportation planning is the basic theme of this paper. New strategies, including ones that can link land use and transportation planning more closely, will be required. New directions and imperatives imposed by current events are reviewed. Triggered by the concern for the resource base, growth management plans are calling for limits on future expansion. The confusion in the emerging policymaking is discussed, and the importance of local plans and implementation programs that can respond to public opinion is noted. The visible trend in local government is toward coordination of planning and public service delivery. All plans focus on more effective control of settlement patterns. Some of the sophisticated new growth management plans call for tight controls. Two trends in this area are significant. Land use planning is becoming increasingly significant, and transportation (specifically highway planning) is losing its initiative. The courts are handling judicial review of the new plans and other land use decisions with awareness of the underlying issues. Growth management is emphasizing the determination of optimum patterns as well as levels of growth and then is turning to transportation planning to help achieve the land use objectives. The clash between suburban and city governments in exercising new policies of growth management and control is discussed. The question of how far the federal government will go in bypassing state and local responsibilities to achieve national environmental and energy objectives is asked. New directions in land use planning are discussed, and the idea that only by the effective combination of land use and transportation planning can the objectives of growth management be achieved is stressed.

●WE ARE in one of those times in the United States that can be called pivotal or transitional. We are dealing with decisive forces of change directly reflecting the sudden application of brakes on both the level and the patterns of growth and physical development that have characterized U.S. society for the past 3 decades. We knew that we were heading for trouble. We knew that we were wasting resources and putting horrible pressures on the environment. We knew that we were mishandling development by overextending services with vehicle-propelled horizontal growth patterns. But we were experiencing too much success in a consumer-oriented economy to do much about it. The politics were not right until now. And now we are forced to respond in public policy to the crises that we have created.

We will look back on this time as a period of profound reexamination of policies and programs. Hopefully we can look back on it also as a time of constructive recasting of approaches. The new Housing and Community Development Act, which was 5 years in the making, is an indicator of the new trend. It is telling us that much of what we must do in the days ahead must come from the bottom up rather than from the top down. But it is only one indicator; we can expect new approaches tailored to meet some unprecedented sets of conditions at all levels and in all branches of government.

This paper will focus primarily on the functions of land use and transportation planning and the new directions and imperatives posed by current events. The basic theme is that the new growth management being built mainly at the local level will affect decisively both land use and transportation planning. New strategies, including ones that can link land use and transportation planning more closely, will be required.

After 3 decades of pell-mell outward growth, we are now witnessing a nationwide countermovement of public pressure. This countermovement will check if not reverse past trends. It is no transitory or casual phenomenon. In the political middle of the countermovement (the middle is increasingly attracting the real community leadership) is an insistence on managing or controlling growth along some rational lines. Two sets of considerations—fiscal and environmental—are basic to the position of the nucleus of the middle. Continued horizontal growth has put immense financial pressures on suburban governments and their constituents. These pressures have been in the form of overextended utility systems, overextended transportation networks, duplications of services and facilities, excess capacities in close-in neighborhoods, bypassing of developable and potentially taxable land, rising service costs and taxes, and other forms of public and private inefficiencies. There is also the plight of the cities, which are caught in an economic backwater that has rendered them nearly helpless to deal with their problems. The negative environmental forces also are well known. They include mounting traffic congestion; physical blight; overcrowding in some neighborhoods and abandonment in others; and pollution (or degradation) of land, air, and water resources.

Damage to the resource base has triggered the loudest clamor for control and management. Over the years the warnings of the planners were not heeded. The issue of environmental protection was necessary to provide the impetus for new directions in development policy.

Growth management plans are calling for limits on future expansion and are prescribing tight definitions of settlement patterns. The first outlines of judicial review are becoming visible. It is clear that capricious and arbitrary no-growth policies will not succeed in the courts. I think it is equally clear, however, that development plans that limit and control growth within the framework of reasonable usage and resource protection will be supported. Although public opinion will vary greatly from time to time, I think that growth management will dominate local public policy in the decade ahead.

And now the energy issue will apply added pressure to the development process. Of course, no one fully knows the implications of fuel shortages for patterns of physical development and human settlement. However, the pressures can lead only toward some drastic changes in growth and development patterns in the future. Both time and distance factors in transportation must be shortened; compactness in development patterns must be sought in place of sprawl; higher densities must be given higher priorities in urban design; and the long-deferred confrontation between public transit and highways in the allocation of capital, operating, and research and development funds must take place regardless of what the automobile manufacturers do in mass-producing smaller automobiles.

The emerging policymaking is a welter of crisscrossed lines. On one hand, the new Housing and Community Development Act is testimony to the acceptance of a new federalism that admits the limitations of top-down approaches to the management of physical development. On the other hand, the new Environmental Protection Agency and Federal Energy Administration regulations are startling in their reassertion of federal force in the face of new environmental and energy crises. These stringent federal regulations undoubtedly will be loosened during the current battle with recession and economic instability, but this means only that their implementation will be deferred. Now the states, for the first time in U.S. history, are asserting their constitutional powers over land use and settlement patterns. Most important are the emerging actions of local jurisdictions and their plans and implementation programs dealing with management of growth. The local level, of course, is where most action will take place. This is where the implementation devices are available and where the pressure points can respond to public opinion.

The visible trend in local government is toward the kind of coordination between planning and public service delivery that land use planners have been advocating for years. Some of the new growth management plans are sophisticated. They call for tight controls (through planning-programming-budgeting-system techniques) over capital expenditures for water and sewer facilities, and for transportation (both highways

and transit); innovative revisions of zoning and subdivision regulations; coordinated administration of open space and park development programs; and initiation of new public mechanisms for joint public-private efforts in land development. At all levels of sophistication, interest in growth management focuses on the same thing, which is more effective control of settlement patterns.

For the last 30 years, as we all know, land use and transportation planning have not been concerned with managing or controlling growth. Their primary concern has been with accommodating suburban growth overspill. Although both planning disciplines made attempts to influence development along rational lines (with due regard for design, environment, and efficiency), their essential achievement was to accommodate the torrent of growth that was generated. The powerful areas of all levels of government and public opinion were in favor of growth. One result is that virtually all regional transportation and land use plans look alike. They all have different types of growth accommodated within a circular highway framework. This is not the way planning will be done in the future. New restraints and demands will be incorporated into the development process.

In this new process, 2 other significant trends need to be noted. One is that land use planning is taking on an increasingly significant role as an integral part of the growth management movement. The other is that transportation planning (more specifically, highway planning, which has dominated the transportation field) is losing much of its initiative in the local arena. These countertrends will call for major adjustments in the relationships between the 2 disciplines.

The land use planner is being thrust into the front lines of public policy and is being asked to weave local powers over land use and public facilities into comprehensive local plans to control growth. It will be for many planners an uncomfortable position. Even though the public's directives are pushing them to the front, they will be increasingly exposed to public criticism. This is the planner's new role. The requirement for comprehensive plans as a basis for land use control, of course, was called for in the model-state-zoning enabling acts of the late 1920s. However, this requirement was brushed aside in the fervor for growth during the 1930s depression and lost in the growth flood during the years after World War II. Now, however, it is being firmly reestablished in response to the new mood. More important, comprehensive planning is emerging as the clear demand of the courts. The courts, although they still exercise due judicial deference to local legislative judgment on land use control, appear to be approaching judicial review of new growth management plans and other local land use decisions with an increasing awareness of the underlying issues posed by settlement patterns and by governmental attempts to influence them. The comprehensive plan becomes the courts' common safeguard of the various rights of person and property that they are seeking to protect. The highway planner, on the other hand, currently is enjoying no such support, either governmental or judicial. Over the years, of course, highway planning has had a high degree of independence and has exercised broad initiatives in providing the transportation response to urban growth. It has had the money sources to guarantee its independent role. However, its strong influence on development patterns now may be waning.

Dozens of highway projects have been stopped in the courts after citizen suits on environmental impact. There are numerous uncompleted urban segments of the Interstate Highway System and other primary road networks. Questions are now being raised (not by extremists but by responsible citizens and public officials) about the preponderant role that highway planning may have played in the development process in the past. Communities that found they could exercise little control over state highway departments (which often pursued their single-purpose missions with minimum regard for either local needs or desires) have turned to the deployment of water and sewer facilities rather than transportation to control their growth patterns.

What is happening is that growth management is putting primary emphasis on determining optimum patterns as well as levels of growth, then turning to transportation planning to provide only 1 of the major tools for achieving the land use objectives. Highway plans that have already been projected are no longer being automatically taken as "givens" but are being subjected to reexamination in light of the new values and

priorities of public policy. In theory, of course, this always has been the joint approach of land use and transportation planning. However, it has rarely been brought into sharp focus because of the overwhelming momentum of growth pressures.

Clearly, it is only through the effective uniting of land use and transportation planning that the objectives of growth management can be achieved. It is the pressure for this unification that this paper stresses. The pressure is to do things we have been talking about for years. The United States has always had crises (without them the country rarely has been able to fashion programs or set new policies) but it now faces an accumulation of issues and forces that is going to push it rapidly into new policies.

I am not predicting any massive change in U.S. physical development patterns in the foreseeable future, despite the strength of the forces of change. It took 60 years to build this nation's utter dependence on the automobile. Anyone with common sense knows that alterations in the system and the development patterns that the automobile produced will come slowly. Half of the nation's employment depends on the automobile industry in some way. With recessionary forces posing critical issues for the economy, there is little chance that the U.S. predilection for the automobile will be curtailed sharply. Even with a zero population growth rate, the momentum of growth will continue to put heavy expansionary pressures on most urban areas for a long time. The household formation rate is still the highest in U.S. history. And, despite the heartening signs of the new federalism, any drastic shift in the overall operations of the government is not likely. The increased development capabilities of local government will be matched by new levels of centralized federal power in environmental and energy fields. The states will approach the land use problem cautiously, at least in the next few years. Governmental fragmentation at the local level will continue; the dream of regional government is likely to remain a dream. In short, we will continue to be a decentralized bargaining bureaucracy.

The forces of change in development patterns, level of growth, and governmental machinery are real and powerful. The mood of the people is changing. The power to implement community development programs is shifting to local hands. The approach of local government to land use is moving from growth accommodation to growth management. The courts are beginning to switch from their traditional deference to local legislative judgment to an insistence on comprehensiveness and equity in planning. The crisis issues of environment and energy are being given emergency priority in public policy. At the operating level where land use and transportation planners are working, these forces are indeed creating a new set of imperatives. The rules are changing, and a new method of operation is being developed.

We will be facing these forces of change in an institutional and political milieu, which at best can be described as confusing. Suburban governments attempting to exercise new policies of growth management and control will be in conflict with one another. The clash between suburban and city governments is likely to be exacerbated. Suburban growth management plans will have a tendency to become exclusionary despite what the courts say, and minority political control in the central cities will be setting some new directions for urban policy. New federal edicts in the environmental and energy fields can have decisive effects on local development policies. No national land use policy exists to guide federal actions that will affect local development, and I doubt if there will be any in these years of economic crisis. The future is unclear with regard to what may happen to the regional machinery. Most interrelated land use and transportation problems are regional in scope. How will regional plans be implemented in face of the new exercise of control powers by the local jurisdictions? Will the state provide new mechanisms with power behind them? How far will the federal government go in bypassing state and local responsibilities to achieve national environmental and energy objectives?

On the most basic level, the main imperative for land use and transportation planning will be its tight integration, with maximum interplay and feedback between the 2 disciplines. Innovative approaches to transportation will have to be explored as part of the growth management planning process. Highways will play a different role in this process than they did in the past; mass transit bus operation and the use of rail facilities are likely to be put in an entirely different perspective. New approaches to financ-

ing as well as operations will have to be explored. New definitions of economic viability will have to be applied to transportation systems. New technologies will have to be explored more vigorously if transportation systems are to effectively serve new development patterns.

In land use planning, there will be some obvious new directions including tighter patterns of development, higher densities, use of excess capacities, development of multipurpose enclaves and corridors, conservation of critical areas, protection of resources, preservation of community values, efficiency of land use relationships, and new opportunities for private enterprise. There will be equally obvious new concerns in transportation planning if transportation systems are to provide the necessary mobility to achieve all of these land use goals. These new concerns include cutting travel time and distances, speeding up delivery services, protecting the integrity of existing neighborhoods, saving fuel, and bringing transportation services to all segments of the population.

We need to learn how to deal with "no-build" alternatives in specific projects. We have to work together within new environmental, energy, legal, and political constraints to formulate workable plans to accommodate new physical development patterns. We have to work for central city revitalization under the stimulus of new community development money held by municipal governments. In these and other joint endeavors, we will be in the forefront of new and controversial public policies.

This is a challenge that we have never faced before. The challenge is not to respond to a new set of forces in the way that we have responded to the forces of the growth syndrome over the past 30 years. One cannot respond to problems, such as the conservation of fuel, that have not yet been fully defined, to implementation powers that are still being delegated among competing jurisdictions, to judicial demands that are yet to be fully developed, or to public opinion that is vocal but may become disordered when that which is ultimately essential is challenged. The challenge facing us is not to respond but to innovate, to take the lead in bringing the problems into focus and in setting new directions for development that are practical and reasonable. That is a challenge that is quite different from that which we have faced in the past, and it makes an entirely different demand on our intellectual and political resources. I hope that land use and transportation planners are up to the task.