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ABSTRACT

Developers from Florida to California are building Traditional Neighborhood Developments (TND’s) based on the ideals embedded in the New Urbanism. Andres Duany, an architect who helped introduce the concept, has even claimed that it will become the next model for the American suburb.

This claim, however, highlights one of the major limitations of the neotraditional model: to date, most TND projects have been located in suburban and exurban areas. And critics assert that “unless its planning ideals are implemented more widely, they could become little more than a collection of architectural clichés, rather than a working set of principles for reshaping metropolitan areas and guiding future growth.”

Recent experimentation with TND principles in already urbanized areas shows that it can indeed be implemented more widely. However, such projects are few and far between and are considered anomalies. To facilitate the broader use of neotraditional principles in urban areas, this thesis analyzes the experience of four cities that have already incorporated TND principles. The analysis includes consideration of the 1) key players and their roles, 2) planning and design processes, and 3) implementation tools and strategies each community employed.

From this analysis, this thesis develops a TND Planning Process Model. Ultimately, the Model is not necessarily unique to the New Urbanism. But the lessons learned from the case studies and the extraction of specific tools and strategies from each city’s experience are intended to offer guidance for other communities considering the incorporation of neotraditional design principles.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses several aspects of Neotraditional Town Planning. The first two sections discuss the growing popularity of the New Urbanism and trace its evolution from a dissatisfaction with postwar development patterns. The following three sections explain the vision of the Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) model, its criticisms, and its potential. The fifth section traces the evolution of this research project and discusses the need for a systematic planning process model for the TND concept.

THE POPULARITY OF NEOTRADITIONAL TOWN PLANNING

Neotraditional Town Planning, introduced in 1981 with the unveiling of the resort town of Seaside, Florida, has become an increasingly popular development strategy during the past fifteen years. The ever-growing bibliography of relevant literature belies a tremendous interest in the so-called New Urbanism -- one which spans several professions. The concept has been the subject of discussion among architects, planners, social commentators, practitioners, economists, theorists, students and teachers alike. It has been the focus of planning conferences and the subject of articles in the popular media and urban journals. It has also motivated several theses.

Seaside has proven to be a powerful hallmark of the neotraditional vision. Developers, seeing the economic potential of the idea embodied in Seaside, have launched dozens of neotraditional projects from Florida to California. Kentlands, Maryland, and Peter Calthorpe’s Laguna West, California are among the most widely recognized TND communities.² Haymount, an "environmentally responsible" development underway in Virginia, has also received much press attention.³

² Calthorpe’s approach is slightly different from the Duany/Plater-Zyberk model in that it is oriented around public-transit and is termed a "pedestrian pocket."

Proponents believe that the TND model represents a new development paradigm. Andres Duany, architect and designer of Seaside, contends: “Seaside has no enemies. Developers like it: It’s profitable. Residents love it. I think it’s going to be the next model for the American suburb. Within ten years, it will be the next model. All developers will want to copy it. I don’t think it will be too ambitious to say that.”4 Certainly the amount of attention that the New Urbanism has received gives Duany’s assertion a certain amount of credibility. At the same time, such a bold statement necessitates closer examination of the merits and critiques of the neotraditional concept. What is the New Urbanism and what are its goals?

**MODERN DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS**

Proponents of the TND model base their arguments largely on the negative impacts of modern development patterns. This pattern of sprawl is most commonly associated with postwar suburban development.

The widespread decentralization of people, goods, and services began when the federal government encouraged GIs returning from World War II to buy homes in new communities at the fringes of metropolitan areas. Armed with subsidized mortgages, veterans and their families streamed into mass produced subdivisions like Levittown, New York. Such communities thrived, at least in part, because they were economically efficient and provided the opportunity for home ownership.

---

The "American dream" of owning a single-family home accelerated the construction of thousands of outlying residential communities like Levittown. Easy credit for automobiles and generous federal government mortgage policies facilitated this trend; this post-war exodus from central cities continued for four decades. As of the late 1980's it was estimated that 45% of Americans were suburbanites.

In the early stages of this decentralization, suburbanites depended on central cities for employment, retail, and cultural needs. But the burgeoning population of suburban communities demanded closer, more convenient services. Retailers and other commercial outfits responded by relocating to the suburban areas. Then, in the 1980's, employers began to move to the outer reaches of metropolitan regions. Today, another iteration of decentralization is underway as residents have begun to leave these "edge cities" to live even farther out in the countryside. This pattern is evidenced by discussion among urbanists of exurbs, the "suburb's suburb."

Neotraditional supporters have a negative view of suburban sprawl. Developer John Clark asserts, in fact, that "the post-war North American suburb is a model of social and economic segregation."

Indeed, the economic and racial homogeneity of most suburban communities is not representative of the diversity of the American population. But perhaps more central to the argument of neotraditionalists is their assertion that suburbs have caused "a wholesale transformation of American metropolitan life, in which traditional concepts of

---


community, civic place, and neighborhood have been either overrun or severely threatened."

The "traditional" notion of community is a place-dependent idea that social connections are made through the people closest to you and in the places you frequent. At least, this seems to have been the historical pattern in most parts of the world. Today, however, with the mobility afforded by advances in transportation and information technology, Americans' social connections are often made through other channels such as school, work, or hobbies. High turnover rates and a general suspiciousness of strangers hinder suburbanites' ability and desire to get to know their neighbors.

On one hand, it could be argued that the built environment of the suburbs merely reflects the reduced role that "place" plays in the social lives of its residents. But neotraditionalists believe that the built environment discourages - actually, disallows -- meaningful social interaction. Their argument is based on two specific aspects of suburban sprawl: the postwar change in street layout and increasingly strict zoning laws.

After World War II, planners and transportation engineers began to employ a hierarchical system of arterials, collectors, and local streets reminiscent of the Radburn, New Jersey layout. This hierarchical pattern had several benefits. For engineers, limited access roadways were more efficient because they accommodated higher volumes of high speed traffic. Collector streets channeled through traffic away from neighborhoods, which reduced the risk of pedestrian-automobile collisions. From the developer's point of view, a systematic grid layout required more concrete than curvilinear streets and cul-de-sacs; as a result, cul-de-sacs were less costly to build. Given these economic and safety concerns, the curvilinear pattern eventually replaced the typical grid layout that had characterized the streetcar suburbs of the early 1900's. In today's suburbs,

---

collector streets as wide as 75 feet are common. Aside from safety concerns, pedestrian activity and inhabitation of the public realm are often discouraged by the sheer physical scale of the street.

Increasingly strict Euclidian zoning laws are the second major reason the suburbs lack a lively social environment. Enacted during the Industrial Age because of the health and safety threats that factories posed for nearby residents, these zoning laws mandated the separation of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Euclidian zoning ordinances mandating the separation of uses and low densities continued to get stricter even after industry declined in this country. They remained for several reasons. For example, Americans seem to prefer separating their public and private lives. Higher stress levels in the workplace and the perception of rising crime in both cities and suburbs have contributed to the desire to “get away” from it all and retreat to the safety and sanctity of the home at the end of the day. Suburban residential neighborhoods are often spatially segregated from services and employment centers in a deliberate effort to isolate the private realm. Second, as Clark noted, “the increasing specialization required by a technologically based society has had the effect of fragmenting our civilization.”10 In other words, the economics of specialization has led to a pattern of locating similar business activities in similar areas. High tech industries, for example, tend to be spatially segregated employment centers, usually far removed from residential and civic activities.

**THE NEOTRADITIONAL MODEL**

The spatial segregation of activities in the suburbs and the perceived social isolation of such places spurred neotraditionalists to propose a different way of building suburbs. Neotraditionalists assert that many of the ills of modern suburbs can be eliminated by returning to the kinds of places where people know one another and walk to the center of town to buy a gallon of milk at the corner store: small towns.

---

10 Ibid., p. 2.
Early 20th century American towns became a prototype for the neotraditional town planning model as places that appeared to foster an active social and civic climate. The physical characteristics of Savannah, Charleston, Annapolis, and Nantucket were fundamental to the vision of the New Urbanism. Duany combined specific physical elements present in these older, model, communities into a template for the design of neotraditional communities. Documented by a brief, illustrative set of urban design and architecture codes, these elements include a mix of land uses, building density, regularized street patterns, pedestrian circulation, open spaces, architectural character, and a sense of community.11

Figure 1 shows a plan of the “hallmark” of Duany’s and Plater-Zyberk’s (DPZ) vision, the resort town of Seaside. The town incorporated most of the important elements DPZ distilled from their study of Southern towns.

Straddling County Road 30A in Florida’s panhandle, Seaside is a greenbelt-surrounded community of 80 acres. Its streets fall into a regular grid pattern radiating from the town center. Due to its non-hierarchical nature, the grid system allows for multiple routes through town. People are often found walking on the streets; pedestrian movement is enhanced by a complex network of pedestrian walkways throughout the town. Seaside’s streets are relatively short and narrow, with public structures such as a water tower, gazebo, bathhouse, and pool terminating the vistas provided by the streets.

The proportion of building height to street width is an important element of the TND model: the streets in Seaside were carefully sculpted with fences and front porches because, as Duany explained, “[here], it’s like a long room, a roofless room. This sense of space....is a very delicate balance.”12 Fences are required on every residence in Seaside, to provide definition to the public and private realms as well as to lend spatial definition to the outdoor “room.” Front porches are also mandatory, usually within 15 feet of the sidewalk to facilitate talking with passersby.

The front porch and fence requirements were documented in Seaside’s Urban Code. This code created an interdependency between road width, landscaping, lot size, and housing type.13 It carefully regulated the spatial modeling of the street, such as requiring picket fences on homes with larger front yards. The Code was considered revolutionary by virtue of its brevity. The entire document, including yard, porch, balcony, out-building, parking, and height guidelines for eight types of buildings in Seaside, was one page long.

---


descriptions were largely pictorial, with a few specifications written in the margin. An accompanying Architectural Code established the basic guidelines for the buildings in Seaside.

CRITICISMS OF NEOTRADITIONAL TOWN PLANNING

To date, the most successful neotraditional experiments have occurred where private developers have had the most latitude to incorporate these design principles -- at the fringes of metropolitan areas. Laguna West, Seaside, and Haymount, for example, are all geographically isolated communities. However, there are significant criticisms associated with the use of neotraditional principles in such isolated contexts. The following is a discussion of some of the more salient concerns.

One critique of the TND model is that the use of the 19th century American town as a design template for new towns “invents” the physical and social elements of community. Because neotraditional town planning is generally conceived as a unified development strategy, a “gestalt incorporating certain physical, social, and cultural ideals,” it is tempting to market it as such. The developer of a neotraditional town in New Jersey, for instance, invented a fictional history for the town, complete with buildings designed to look like historic buildings converted to new uses.

Although an extreme example, the New Jersey project points out a serious drawback of the New Urbanism when used in an isolated context. Real towns evolve over time, but the success of isolated neotraditional towns depends on the ability to sell a vision of small town life -- and small town life on a blueprint is less convincing than a completed town center and community green. Developers feel pressure to invest a large amount of money and time at the front

14 Bookout, “Toward a Blending...,” p. 15.

end of a TND project so that the essential elements of the town are already in place when the marketing of the community begins. As a result, not only are neotraditional projects difficult and expensive to build in phases, but their developers may need to produce an “instant” town to ensure the financial success of the project.16

Another criticism of isolated neotraditional towns is the amount of faith that their planners and developers seem to have in the ability of physical form to influence residents’ behavior. The mix of housing types, the presence of community common spaces, and the variety of uses within walking distance, are thought to restore many of the family and social values destroyed by postwar suburbanization. But whether people want to sit on their front porch and walk to the corner store is debatable. Even if the front porch is an “urban ornament” and not necessarily intended for use, the pastoral ideal embodied by the Southern small town is far removed from the reality of modern day life in America. After all, many members of today’s society turn to television, movies, music, and the Internet as preferred leisure-time activities. Thus it is a leap of faith to believe that Americans are eager to sip lemonade on their front porches and converse with neighbors with whom they may have little in common.

The lack of socio-economic diversity in outlying neotraditional towns is another criticism. The separation of income levels in most postwar suburbs fostered an underclass isolated from role models, jobs, and the economic fabric of America.17 Although the mix of housing types in a neotraditional community attempts to rectify that separation, the real estate values in isolated neotraditional towns have proven to be prohibitively high for many segments of the American population. In fact, some critics have argued that, far from solving race and class issues, the New Urbanism actually perpetuates social, economic, and racial divisions. Geographer Neil Smith has argued that Seaside exemplifies “a

16 Bookout, “Toward a Blending...,” p. 18.

physical expulsion along lines of class, race, and gender that makes it quite [im]possible to indulge in the fantasy of resolving urban problems in this urbanized myth.”¹⁸

Perhaps the most paradoxical criticism of neotraditionalism is whether new TND towns mitigate suburban sprawl at all. There is considerable doubt as to whether isolated neotraditional towns can support the retail services its residents demand. To be sure, the mom-and-pop grocery store may find its niche in a neotraditional town. However, critics assert that the American predilection for consumerism and efficiency will be difficult to satisfy in Neotraditional Town USA. Marketing specialists are not certain that integrating retail activities into mixed use developments is feasible, and predict that large discount retailers and wholesalers are unlikely to locate in such isolated areas.¹⁹ As a result, residents may get in their cars and drive to the nearest Walmart, rather than spend more money and have fewer choices at the corner store.

Employment opportunities in isolated neotraditional towns face the same criticism. The phenomenon of edge cities illustrates the tendency of employers in similar employment sectors to congregate in one location, which makes the ability of isolated neotraditional towns to attract a local job base for its residents questionable. If successful, neotraditional towns may become high tech spin-offs of the company towns of the 1800’s -- a dependence which is neither healthy nor desirable. At the other end of the spectrum, the town could fail to attract a sufficiently large employment base for its residents. Neotraditional towns would then function as suburbs, since residents would have to commute to other communities to work. And by Duany’s own admission, “the threshold is when you get in the car. Once you get in the car, it doesn’t matter whether you drive


¹⁹ Bookout, “Toward a Blending...,” p. 18.
three miles or ten miles. When you need the car, you cease to be in a town or a community." 20 And suburban sprawl continues.

ADDRESSING THE CRITICISMS
As of 1992 most neotraditional projects were still on the drawing boards or in the very early stages of development, a fact which might lead one to conclude that the attention surrounding neotraditional towns has been little more than rhetorical hype. Given the lack of projects and the concerns discussed above, the future of the New Urbanism as a viable development strategy is uncertain -- and Duany’s claim that it represents a new paradigm in contemporary residential development is particularly questionable. In fact, Lloyd Bookout observed that “neotraditional planning may be little more than a marketing gimmick or passing fad, predicated on harried suburbanites’ nostalgia for a fading and simpler time.” 21

If it is merely a fad, the TND model is likely to degenerate into a set of architectural clichés, remembered as just one of many passing development schemes. Or worse: the New Urbanism could produce something even worse than the sprawl it attempts to fix. Ebenezer Howard’s city-country magnet, after all, was the progenitor of the modern suburb; Le Corbusier’s block towers spawned some of Manhattan’s most dilapidated and crime-ridden housing projects.

But given the “sound and thoughtful planning principles that are inherent in the neotraditional vision,” 22 the TND model does not have to be a fad. In fact, as Calthorpe wrote: “the problems of growth....must be resolved by thinking the nature and quality of growth itself, in every context.” 23 And “every context”


22 Bookout, “Toward a Blending....” p. 19.
means more than the open fields on which private developers have built their
eotrational visions. It includes already urbanized areas -- that is, the areas that
eotrational planners have, for the most part, bypassed.

Whether or not the use of TND planning principles meets the utopian social
goals its proponents have advanced, the principles underlying neotrational
town planning can be a valuable urban design and development tool for already
developed communities. The design strategies of careful streetscape design,
mixing land uses, requiring a minimum density of buildings, and having a
pedestrian orientation could help meet larger community goals such as
economic development, redevelopment, or revitalization. Its use could restore a
sense of identity and place to a community, which might in turn provide
residents with a greater sense of pride in their neighborhood. It could boost the
local economy, spurring businesses to relocate in previously disinvested
neighborhoods. This would also mitigate some of the criticisms leveled against
the isolated neotrational towns.

For example, building within the existing urban and historical context of a city or
town would eliminate the question of “inventing” the physical and social
elements of community. In addition, the fact that many urban areas have a
socio-economic mix that is more representative of the population would mitigate
the concern over how to attract a diverse population to a neotrational
community. Moreover, since a retail and employment base exist to some extent
in a city or town, the issue of how to attract a sufficient amount of employers
and retailers is less significant. And finally, use of the neotrational model in
urban contexts would serve one very important goal of the new urbanism:
mitigating sprawl. If cities and towns focused their energy on infilling and
densifying what already exists, there might be less need to build new residential
or commercial developments on the fringes. Accommodating greater housing
and job opportunities through neotrational development could thus lessen the

---

23 Peter Calthorpe, “The Region,” in Peter Katz, The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of
Community, p. xiii.
outward expansion of human settlement that has so frustrated neotraditional proponents.

The proposed use of neotraditional principles in urbanized areas is not a revolutionary idea. Despite their focus on shaping new development according to TND principles, neotraditional planners have not ignored its potential use in existing cities and towns. In 1989, Alex Krieger wrote that Duany and Plater-Zyberk “[had] been operating at the edge of the expanding city, persuading those with a few hundred acres of as yet undeveloped land to develop it more thoughtfully, more environmentally soundly, more urbanely. This was the logical first point of intervention. . . . however, even when inspired by notions of traditional patterns of settlement, such continual expansion, so uniquely American, harms all existing towns. . . . now we must learn to value, to maintain, and to refine those thousands of towns -- not to mention suburbs in search of ‘townness’ -- already built but languishing.”

Krieger’s attitude and the recent efforts of DPZ and other planners have inspired a handful of neotraditional infill and redevelopment projects around the country. Articles in Urban Land, Historic Preservation, and other journals have documented the experiences of a few such cities. Peter Katz’s The New Urbanism catalogs 14 projects in urbanized communities in Canada, California, Massachusetts, Texas, Rhode Island, New York, Arizona, and Florida.

THE RESEARCH PROCESS

Although my initial enthusiasm for the TND model has been tempered by the thoughtful criticisms just discussed, I have been convinced of the benefits of the New Urbanism for some time. The recent trend of already-developed communities experimenting with neotraditional principles piqued my interest, and, consequently, a desire to explore ways to use the New Urbanism in existing communities to reshape and guide future growth. Thus far the TND model has

been used infrequently in such contexts even though it seems to offer a promising solution for cities and towns facing disinvestment or other social, physical, and economic effects of decentralization.

My inquiry into a handful of cities that have incorporated neotraditional principles initially led toward a discussion of the hurdles to implementation and three criteria for overcoming those hurdles. The criteria were: 1) consistency with the city’s General Plan; 2) public participation in the planning process; and 3) flexibility of the neotraditional model. Yet those criteria were broad generalizations that could apply to the implementation of any development scheme and did not seem to offer any guidance for incorporating neotraditional town planning per se.

Upon further thought and study, it became apparent that the planning processes which facilitated the incorporation of TND principles in each of the cities I had examined could hold the key to more extensive use of the New Urbanism. After all, the substantive aspects of the TND concept have been fairly well documented and are generally understood by the planning community. Urbanists such as Duany, Plater-Zyberk, Alex Krieger, Peter Calthorpe, Peter Katz, and others have gone to great lengths to publicize the ideas behind the vision and explain the basic elements of a neotraditional community. As a result, most planners are by now familiar with the density requirements, mixed uses, and pedestrian-oriented scale of a neotraditional project, and seem to be persuaded of its benefits.

What is missing from the TND “package” is a methodological procedure for incorporating it. The planning and implementation of urban TND projects has, so far, occurred on an ad-hoc basis -- one community at a time. And given the long list of constraints for such infill or redevelopment projects, including racial tension, gentrification, economic stagnation, bureaucracy, deteriorating schools, red-line appraisals, NIMBY attitudes, slow-growth and no-growth neighborhood
groups, a more systematic approach to the planning process would be beneficial. It could help answer questions like: What participatory methods would help the community rally around a TND plan? Who should take responsibility for making decisions about the TND plan components? What public bodies and citizen groups should be involved, and in what capacity? What regulatory mechanisms should be adopted? What administrative bodies should oversee the project? How should it be funded?

The cities and towns that have already incorporated principles of the New Urbanism demonstrate that it is implementable, and an examination of their planning processes could provide guidance for other communities wishing to incorporate the principles of New Urbanism. To that end, this thesis will examine the planning processes of four case study communities, and, drawing upon their similarities, differences, and lessons learned from their experiences, will develop a TND Planning Process Model.

The case studies to be analyzed include: Mercer Island, Washington; Providence, Rhode Island; San Jose, California; and Suisun City, California. These cities were chosen largely because they have been publicized in the media and in urban design literature as “successful” attempts to integrate TND principles. They are a geographically and demographically diverse group of communities, although not necessarily representative of all the possible types of TND projects in an urbanized context. That is to say, none of the cases is from a suburban community and none of them is an infill project. They are, actually, all attempts to revitalize or redevelop core areas of their communities. This analysis of the communities’ planning processes will address three major areas: the players and their roles, the planning and design activities, and implementation tools. The extraction of specific tools and strategies from the planning processes of these four communities is intended to give the neotraditional planning model a

better chance of being fully evaluated, and used more widely in cities and towns across the country.

**ORGANIZATION OF THESIS**

The remainder of this thesis contains four chapters. Chapter Two establishes a framework for discussing the planning processes of the case studies, and it describes the general circumstances of each community. Chapter Three analyzes the cases' processes, considering in turn: 1) the players and their roles, 2) the planning and design activities, and 3) the implementation tools. Chapter Four synthesizes the lessons and commonalities of the four cases, and incorporates them into the TND Planning Process Model. Finally, Chapter Five concludes with some thoughts on the challenges of using this model and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2: THE CASE STUDIES

This chapter establishes a framework for discussing the planning processes of each case and provides background information about the case study communities.

A PLANNING PROCESS FRAMEWORK

Within the planning profession, there wages a debate as to whether planning is a process or a product. Alan Altshuler, for example, argues that a planner's job is to "propose courses of action, not to execute them." As a result, the "typical" planning process is a circular, never-ending cycle, and the constant "updating and recycling" of ideas and courses of action usually results in shelved plans that are never actually realized. On the flip side of this argument is the idea that "planners are responsible for harvesting the fruits of their labor." As a result, the planning process is strategic and specific, usually resulting in a plan that can be implemented.

Proponents of the New Urbanism have not been content to suggest the TND model as merely one of several development options. They have consistently sought to realize the neotraditional towns they envision. Thus, the Neotraditional Town Planning movement follows in the second tradition rather than the first: ideally, a TND planning process is strategic, and results in an implementable plan.

A study conducted by the MIT Urban Systems Laboratory identified synthetic and structural approaches to planning: "The synthetic approach attempts to gather pieces or issues and then fit them into a coherent whole....The structural

---


27 Bruce McClendon, Mastering Change: Winning Strategies for Effective City Planning, p. 31.

28 Ibid., 31.
approach begins at the other end with a general description of the whole and then, by careful research and analysis, tries to specify the detailed issues and themes that fit within the whole.”

TND planning is structural since the “whole” is achieved through a series of “parts.” However, its planning typically follows a synthetic planning process, during which a community analyzes its physical environment and its economic, social, and political climate.

It is worth noting that it is only when a synthetic analysis is complete that a community may deem the New Urbanism an appropriate strategy to remedy its problems in a particular area. As Boris Dramov, principal at ROMA Design Group, noted, “Suisun City did not initially intend to be a laboratory for New Urbanism’s planning principles. People came to favor New Urbanism values, not to be part of a movement, but to use the most effective means to the desired end.”

This thesis does not presume to suggest under what circumstances the New Urbanism is an appropriate development strategy. Instead, this analysis and the accompanying TND Planning Process Model begin from the point at which communities have already decided to consider or incorporate TND principles into specific areas of their communities.

The following discussion provides background information about each of the four case study communities. It covers the circumstances leading to the adoption of neotraditional principles and includes a brief description of the planning processes each city used to incorporate the TND principles. For reference purposes, Table 1 shows the acreage of the TND project areas of each case study community in relation to the total city acreage.

---


Table 1: Size and Location of TND projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Project Acres</th>
<th>TND Project Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>4083</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Inner city neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suisun City</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Old Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MERCER ISLAND, WASHINGTON**

Incorporated in 1960, Mercer Island is a predominantly upper middle class city in the Seattle metropolitan region. Its population of 21,416 is heavily dependent on the larger metropolitan region for employment and shopping; only about 10% of the Island’s commuters work in Mercer Island itself. Single family residential land uses comprise 90% of the city’s 4083 acres and multi-family units comprise 86 acres. Mercer Island contains a 76-acre Central Business District (CBD) at the northern end of the island and two small commercial zones to the east and south, which serve the needs of the local population.

The CBD has been a topic of concern for Mercer Islanders for several years. The 1994 Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan discussed several reasons for this concern:

1. The land designated for commercial retail, service and office uses is much larger than the local population can support. This has contributed to an historical pattern of relatively low private investment in downtown properties. Consequently, the business district consists of principally one story strip centers, surrounded by vast parking lots (FAR .23); a typical suburban sprawl-like development.

2. Few business developments interact with one another. Retail and office buildings are free-standing, often isolated, without a coherent, concentrated core area conducive to walking and browsing.

---

31 Ibid., 8.
32 Ibid., 1.
3. There are very few amenities for the shoppers and for social interactions. The B-zone land use designation (1993 Zoning Code), does not encourage activities which would make the business district a cultural, social and commercial heart of the community.

4. The B-zone does not provide for development flexibility, diversity and creativity. It mandates two-story high, block-like buildings surrounded by surface parking lots.

5. The CBD is poorly identified. The major entrance points to the downtown are not treated in any special way that invites people into the business district.\footnote{City of Mercer Island, \textit{Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan}, pp. Introduction-5,6.}

Given these concerns, the 1994 \textit{Comprehensive Plan} stated that “ongoing attention to urban design principles, pedestrian needs, traffic considerations and green spaces [was] essential.”\footnote{Ibid, p. Introduction-5.} In 1993 the City sponsored a visioning event, which produced a document entitled “Your Mercer Island Citizen-Designed Downtown.” This document set forth the community’s challenge and the expectations for the CBD.\footnote{Ibid., p. Land Use-1.}

As an outgrowth of this event, the City hired the neotraditional consulting team of Lennertz and Coyle in 1994 and, in November, sponsored a Town Center design workshop. The main goal of this 5-day event was to “arrive at a shared, feasible vision, plan, and code for the town center.”\footnote{Lennertz and Coyle, \textit{Town Center Plan for the City of Mercer Island}, p. 1.} Participants included citizens, the Mayor, a City Council member, city planning staff, Planning and Design Commission representatives, Metro and Regional Transit Authority representatives, engineers, landowners, developers, planners, and architects. Led by the consultants, this group “tested detailed alternatives” for the CBD.\footnote{Ibid., p. 1.}
The outcome of this process was the *Mercer Island Town Center Plan*. This report contained four components: 1) an illustrative plan (Figure 2) and an accompanying set of design codes, which were intended to show how the area could be built over time; 2) a series of “demonstration projects,” which were feasible designs based on the illustrative plan and its codes; 3) a market and economic analysis; and 4) recommendations for the “next steps.” These recommendations included creating a private “custodian” of the vision in the form of a nonprofit corporation, establishing a public/private fundraising partnership, setting up a visible headquarters, and conducting community outreach to “sell” the TND vision to Mercer Island’s residents and business people.

During the next year, the planning staff developed a set of development and design guidelines for the CBD based on the *Town Center Plan*. These guidelines were explicitly intended to “implement the policies of the Comprehensive plan and design concepts outlined in the Town Center Plan.” After a series of public meetings, open houses, and hearings, the *Town Center District Development and Design Requirements* was approved by the City Council in December 1995. As the regulatory mechanism for implementation of the TND plan, the document included not only building, street, parking lot, and auxiliary design requirements, but also administrative procedures for design review and conditional use permitting. Currently, the City Council is considering ways to create a “custodian” of the vision, as well as how to partner with a private developer interested in building in the CBD.

---

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Downtown Providence did not develop until more than a century after the town's colonization in the late seventeenth century. Shipping and manufacturing activities catalyzed downtown development in the early 1800's, and downtown Providence prospered until the mid 1940's. The city reached its
peak population of 253,504 in 1940. However, the suburbanization process after World War II depleted the central city of much of its industrial, commercial and retail activities. By 1980 the population had bottomed out at 156,804 people, a loss attributed to the growth in suburban areas surrounding Providence. This decline inevitably affected downtown Providence by draining both businesses and consumers from the central city.

To address these problems, a Zoning Commission was formed in the early 1980's. The Commission conducted a study that concluded that the downtown was “changing” and that the dense commercial C3 zoning, which allowed few other activities in the CBD, was a liability. The Commission created a D1 zoning district which allowed for more diverse uses in the downtown. At the same time, the Providence Foundation, a downtown business organization, initiated the Capital Center project which ultimately redeveloped 60 acres of land consisting of former Amtrak switching tracks on the downtown’s edge.

Yet these efforts were only a partial solution to downtown’s derelict condition. The Providence 2000 Plan identified insufficient parking, the lack of activity in the downtown retail core, and the lack of alternate modes of transportation as a few of “Downcity’s” continuing problems. The psychological effect of the decline of the 1980’s was a loss of “confidence in Downcity’s economic, cultural and civic value to Providence and to Rhode Island at large.”

The eminent opening of a new convention center downtown was one of the main catalysts for looking afresh at the area. As the 1994 Downcity Providence Plan stated, the Convention Center would not succeed “unless downtown is alive, inviting, and full of things to see and do,” and that “new investment in downtown [was] particularly needed in the current economic climate, and an

---


increased tax base in downtown [would] benefit city programs throughout Providence's neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{41}

The City's interests in economic revitalization and a renewed confidence in downtown Providence were matched by the business community. In fact, it was the Providence Foundation, led by businessman Arnold Chace, who initially asked Andres Duany to conduct a design charrette for the downtown area.\textsuperscript{42} When approached by the Foundation about the idea, the Mayor responded enthusiastically and promised partial financial support for the event.

Duany and his design, marketing, and economic consulting team came to Providence in 1992. The Planning and Development Department organized the event, offering meeting space in the downtown Fleet Center, bringing together members of the City Plan Commission, and providing names of potential interviewees. The consultants led the 5-day charrette.

The end product, \textit{Downcity Providence: Master Plan for a Special Time}, included a regulating plan (Figure 3) and proposed "small, affordable, achievable increments by both the private and public sectors" as the best means to realize the plan. It recommended a "one-stop permitting process" as well as a series of "special projects" that could "make a great difference and reverse the negative attitude many people have about the downtown."\textsuperscript{43}

The energy created through the charrette process motivated the City to appoint a Downcity Task Force to recommend code and management improvements and to stimulate investment in the old retail core. The Task Force, in turn, established eleven different subcommittees. After 16 months of work, the group

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p. 1.

\textsuperscript{42} Interview with Samuel Shamoon, April 1, 1996.

\textsuperscript{43} Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, \textit{Downcity Providence: Master Plan for a Special Time}, p. 9.
produced a document called *Downcity Providence: An Implementation Plan*. Within this document were several recommendations, including:

1. Creation of the Downcity Commission -- to facilitate and monitor the implementation plan and to act as the downtown neighborhood advocate;

2. Establishment of a fund to carry out the public physical improvements recommended in the plan;

3. Adoption of the Downcity Plan as part of the city’s Comprehensive Plan;

4. Immediate actions which could be accomplished quickly, to help support the long-term implementation of the plan.\(^{44}\)

The City followed the third recommendation, adopting the Downcity TND plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the City Council approved the Downcity Overlay District on October 24, 1991. Including land use, architecture, and design standards for the downtown, the explicit purpose of the overlay district was “to encourage and direct development in the downtown to ensure that: new development is compatible with the existing historic building fabric... development encourages day and night time activities that relate to the pedestrian...the goals of the Comprehensive plan are achieved.”\(^{45}\)

---

\(^{44}\) Downcity Task Force et. al., *Downcity Providence: An Implementation Plan*, p. 6.

Figure 3: Providence TND Regulating Plan

Source: Duany and Plater-Zyberk, Downcity Providence: Master Plan for a Special Time, Plate I.
To date, the second recommendation of the Downcity Task Force, a "fund to carry out the physical improvements," has not been established. However, the City has tapped a few sources to pay for some physical improvements in Downcity. The Redevelopment Agency, for example, funded the construction of a vest-pocket park at the corner of Westminster and Mathewson Streets and is currently building a number of liner buildings around it. The Planning and Development Department has also used ISTEA funds to improve the lighting, sidewalks, and trees along Mathewson Street, and UDAG money to finance a downtown lighting program.

SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA

Jackson-Taylor is an ethnically diverse neighborhood one mile north of downtown San Jose. With approximately 4600 residents, the Jackson-Taylor neighborhood was historically an industrial area with strong ties to the food industry. Over the years, the community suffered disinvestment due to rapid urbanization and the relocation of the region's orchards and farms to the San Joaquin and Central Valleys. When the last industrial employer, Glorietta Foods, closed down in 1985, a "vacuum" was created. Concerns about filling that void with new land uses, and the prospect of light rail service from San Francisco coming through the neighborhood, prompted the City to target Jackson-Taylor for revitalization in its San Jose 2000 Plan.

The 1987 Jackson-Taylor Revitalization Plan laid the groundwork for the neotraditional planning effort which began in 1992. The earlier revitalization plan included recommendations for converting the industrial neighborhood into a primarily residential area with supporting commercial uses. The Planning Department engaged Calthorpe Associates and appointed a Citizen Task Force to prepare a long-term neotraditional plan for the neighborhood. Chaired by the Planning Commissioner, the 16-member Task Force included neighborhood association representatives, Jackson-Taylor residents, business people, and

---

46 City of San Jose, Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy, p. 13.
housing specialists. A technical advisory committee comprised of city staff from other departments was assembled to assist in the planning effort.

The working group met monthly for nine months. The Planning Department set the agenda for these meetings and provided materials. After a short hiatus during the preparation of the state-mandated Environmental Impact Report, the Planning Department held public meetings to discuss the plan. After incorporating the community concerns raised during the public meetings, the end product was a document called the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy. It included an illustrative plan (Figure 4) and a set of design and policy recommendations for guiding future development in the neighborhood. The recommended actions for implementing the neotraditional plan included:

1. A City-initiated General Plan amendment to create the Jackson-Taylor Planned Residential Community.

2. City Council-initiated rezonings, consistent with the amended General Plan designations within the study area, should be processed as and when such rezonings might preserve or improve the potential for development consistent with the strategy. Rezonings should incorporate the design guidelines set forth in the strategy.

3. The city should come to a decision on the phasing and funding for proposed parks as soon as possible.47

The City Council approved the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy plan as an independent document and its major provisions were incorporated into the General Plan in 1992. The San Jose 2020 General Plan designated the Jackson-Taylor neighborhood as a Planned Residential Community (PRC), a designation which is generally intended to provide the private development sector with “a greater degree of flexibility in developing innovative projects while also incorporating special development and design objectives.”48

47 Ibid., p. 47.

48 City of San Jose, San Jose 2020.
Figure 4: Jackson-Taylor Illustrative TND Plan

Source: City of San Jose, Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy, p. 21
As of April 1996, one property has been rezoned for mixed use in accordance with the PRC provisions since its adoption. The City has not invested in any substantial public improvements in the Jackson-Taylor neighborhood, although the Redevelopment Agency is attempting to garner redevelopment money to help develop the property that has been rezoned.\textsuperscript{49}

**SUISUN CITY, CALIFORNIA**

Suisun City, population 26,000, is 44 miles northeast of San Francisco. Connected to San Francisco Bay by the Suisun Channel, the city flourished during the Gold Rush as a port. It remained a hub of agricultural Solano County through World War II, but when Interstate 80 opened in 1963, commercial development along the interstate corridor began to drain the downtown of its businesses.

By the early 1980’s, most of the storefronts along Main Street were empty and the warehouses along the waterfront abandoned. Downtown felt the effects of the “overcrowded and crime-ridden” Crescent neighborhood nearby and the “ugly” oil-storage tanks at the head of the channel’s estuary that polluted the harbor.\textsuperscript{50} The City also had fiscal concerns. During the 1980’s the city had relied on residential development fees to meet its budget and fund capital improvements, but it was rapidly approaching buildout and could not rely on the fees much longer.

\textsuperscript{49} Interview with Laurel Prevetti, April 3, 1996.

\textsuperscript{50} Lockwood, “Suisun City, California,” p. 22.
Figure 5: Suisun City Illustrative TND Plan

1. Existing neighborhoods
2. Town Plaza
3. Civic Center
4. Yacht Club
5. Pierce Island
6. Whispering Bay
7. Wetlands
8. New residential neighborhoods
9. Intermodal station
10. Old town
11. Crescent Grammar School
12. Crystal Elementary School
13. Suisun Channel

With these concerns in mind, the City began to consider redevelopment of the Old Town area. In 1983, the City adopted the Downtown Specific Plan for the Historic Downtown and Waterfront sections in an effort to revitalize the area. Seven years later, although the construction of a new City Hall had been completed and the designation of a Redevelopment Project Area had been made, most of the recommendations of the 1983 Specific Plan had not been implemented.

A last place ranking in a 1988 San Francisco Chronicle survey of the quality of life in 98 bay area cities catalyzed community interest in revitalization. The City decided it needed to make “comprehensive revisions” to the 1983 Specific Plan, “particularly in the areas of land uses, public facilities, and circulation.” At this point the neotraditional planning process began. The Suisun City Redevelopment Agency hired the ROMA Design Group and Halcyon Limited in July 1990 to prepare a Concept Plan and Development Guidelines for specific Downtown project sites. The Redevelopment Agency appointed an eleven member Community Advisory Committee, which worked with the design consultants over a 13 month period to revise the initial concept plan (see Figure 5). The 16-person staff of the Redevelopment Agency was extensively involved in the plan development; general public input occurred throughout the process.

The regulatory mechanism for implementing the neotraditional plan and its codes was the adoption of the design and policy recommendations as Amendments to the 1983 Downtown Specific Plan and then the adoption of the Amended Downtown Specific Plan as an amendment to the Suisun City General Plan. These provisions essentially established the Downtown and Waterfront area as an overlay district whose purpose was to “implement the General Plan
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52 City of Suisun City, Suisun City Amended Downtown Specific Plan, p. 1.

53 Ibid., p. 4.
through land use designation on a map, listing or referencing permitted specific uses, standards for development and appropriate special conditions."54

The Redevelopment Agency acted as the master developer for several of the specific projects within the TND project area, bringing in developers to handle individual projects. The O'Brien group, for example, was the housing developer for the Victorian Harbor neighborhood. As of May 1995, several substantial projects had been completed. They include: demolition of the Crescent neighborhood and construction of the Victorian Harbor neighborhood, demolition of warehouses, dredging and widening of the Suisun Channel, construction of a Town Plaza, creation of a waterfront promenade, restoration of the historic Lawler House, construction of landscaped parking lots, and the installation of new water pipes and storm sewers to serve Main Street.55

SUMMARY
The descriptions just given provide a general overview of the TND planning experiences of the case studies. To be sure, these descriptions have simplified the complex political, economic, and social issues that contributed to, and influenced, each community’s experience. At the same time, however, the benefit of this bird’s-eye view is that a number of observations and comparisons between their processes can be easily made. These observations will be addressed in the analysis contained in Chapter 3.

54 City of Suisun City, Amended Downtown Specific Plan.

Chapter 3: Analysis

Chapter 2 established a basic storyline of the planning processes in each of the four case study communities. As was generally evident from those descriptions, the players, planning activities, and implementation strategies each city utilized were similar in a number of ways. It was equally evident that they approached the planning process differently in some respects. This chapter examines specific elements of their experiences in greater detail. The comparative analysis is organized into three major areas of inquiry: the key players and their roles, the planning and design activities, and implementation tools.

The key players and their roles. To date, developers and neotraditional planning consultants have played central roles in the planning of isolated neotraditional communities. The integration of TND principles into urbanized areas, however, requires additional players because the playing field, so to speak, is so much more complex. As the descriptions of the case studies' experiences in Chapter 2 showed, identifying the myriad needs and concerns of a community and garnering the resources to satisfy those needs in a TND plan required considerable involvement of the local government, design consultants, citizens, stakeholders, developers, and regional agencies.

Arguably, much of the challenge in establishing an effective planning process is involving these players at the appropriate time, and in appropriate roles. As a precursor to the examination of the cases' actual planning processes, this portion of the analysis will consider who was involved in the case studies' TND planning efforts and what roles they were playing. The roles to be addressed include Initiator, Organizer, Contributor, Technical Advisor, Designer, Motivator, Decision Maker, and Promoter.\textsuperscript{56}

The planning and design activities. These activities, of course, were the heart of the communities' planning processes. They were the vehicles from which, and through which, the neotraditional plan emerged. The main purpose of this examination is to compare the range and types of activities the case study communities used. Did a consulting team submit a concept plan? Was a public design process utilized? Public meetings? How long did it take to develop the TND plan? Was a catalytic "kickoff event" held? This comparison will address some of the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

Implementation tools. An effective planning process considers which tools and strategies can, and will, be used to bring the plan to fruition. Examining the regulatory mechanisms, funding sources, administrative bodies, and monitoring tools each community employed is intended to shed light on the most promising and effective tools for TND implementation.

Following the analysis of these three aspects of the planning processes is a summary of the analysis and a comparative look at how the cities' planning processes might be characterized.

KEY PLAYERS AND THEIR ROLES
This portion of the analysis will use the major roles that were involved in the neotraditional planning process as an organizing element for discussing the different players that were involved. As mentioned earlier, the roles to be examined include Initiator, Organizer, Contributor, Technical Advisor, Designer, Motivator, Decision Maker, and Promoter.

Initiator. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the TND planning process model to be developed begins from "the point at which communities have already decided to consider or incorporate TND principles into specific areas of their communities." Ostensibly, then, it does not matter who initiates the TND planning process.
Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that in three of the case study communities, the local government directly spearheaded the neotraditional planning effort.

The local governments exercised varying amounts of authority in beginning the process. The San Jose Planning Department, for example, was the primary party responsible for initiating the TND planning process in Jackson-Taylor. Their assessment of the changing economic climate in the neighborhood, and the opportunities it presented for new and different land uses, spurred them to hire neotraditionalist Peter Calthorpe to develop a plan for transitioning to the new land uses.

In Mercer Island the effort was formally initiated by the City. However, their decision to do so was influenced by widespread public concern for the quality and vitality of the CBD. This concern had been articulated during the public visioning event two years earlier. The goals that emerged from that event prompted the City to hire consultants Lennertz and Coyle to develop a neotraditional plan for the downtown.

The Redevelopment Agency initiated the planning process in Suisun City. Like Mercer Island, their decision was largely based on a well-articulated public concern for the Downtown/Waterfront area. A 1989 series of meetings between residents, businesses, and government officials had established the needs of the CBD, and through these meetings a number of goals for the city as a whole and Old Town in particular had been established. These goals prompted the Agency’s 1990 hiring of the ROMA Design Group.57

Providence stands out among the cases as the only one whose TND planning process was initiated by the private sector. Downtown business owners and merchants, concerned with their prosperity -- and even survival -- in the neglected downtown, viewed a public charrette with Andres Duany as an

57 City of Suisun City, Amended Downtown Specific Plan, p. 22.
opportunity to spur interest in revitalizing the downtown. The Planning Department supported the idea and later became involved in the planning process, but Arnold Chace and other businesspeople spearheaded the effort.\(^{58}\)

**Organizer.** Without exception the local planning departments took the lead in gathering people and resources to conduct the TND planning and design activities. The San Jose Planning Department was, in the most traditional sense, “in charge.” They appointed a citizens task force, provided meeting space in City Hall, furnished names of potential interviewees to the consultants, provided background materials (i.e. other planning studies and technical reports), and set the agenda for the nine monthly meetings in which the plan for the Jackson-Taylor neighborhood was prepared.\(^{59}\)

In Suisun City, the Redevelopment Agency organized the planning and design activities. Like San Jose, they brought together consultants and a citizens advisory committee to develop a plan for the Old Town. Similarly, the Providence Department of Planning and Development, responding to the Providence Foundation’s desire to hold the public charrette with Duany, organized the event by providing meeting space in downtown’s Fleet Center and furnishing names of people to be interviewed and assembled.

The Mercer Island Planning Department organized the Town Center charrette by publicizing the event and inviting community leaders and regional authorities to participate. Development Services Manager Diane White noted that the up-front time organizing the charrette was as intense as the five day event itself.\(^{60}\)

\(^{58}\) A number of publicly sponsored plans had been developed prior to the TND planning effort. The emphasis here is not so much on the lack of initiation on the part of the Department of Planning and Development as it is on the amount of energy and interest that the private sector demonstrated.

\(^{59}\) Interview with Laurel Prevetti, April 3, 1996.

\(^{60}\) Interview with Diane White, April 22, 1996.
Contributor. Citizens, stakeholders, and other members of the general public provided valuable contributions to the cases’ planning and design activities. Their modes of contribution might be divided into two “tiers.”

All four communities, for example, had the first “tier” of public participation -- an invitation to the public-at-large to offer comments at specific points during the planning process. In both Mercer Island and Providence, general public involvement took place during the design charrettes. The events were widely publicized and anyone interested in participating was invited to do so.61

In San Jose and Suisun City, the general public’s contributions took place in a more “traditional” setting: public meetings. San Jose held public meetings after the task force and consultants had prepared a plan for Jackson-Taylor. Comments and complaints registered by the public were then taken into consideration and the plan was duly modified. Likewise, Suisun City used public meetings to give the public-at-large a chance to voice their opinions. This also occurred after the ROMA group and the citizens task force had generated a plan during smaller working group sessions.

Three cities also provided a second “tier” of more structured public input -- in the form of citizen advisory committees. Providence, San Jose, and Suisun City assembled citizen advisory committees or task forces to assist directly in the planning and design activities. Direct stakeholders in the planning area were involved at this level, including residents, business owners, and landowners. In San Jose and Suisun City, these citizens’ contributions influenced the design of the TND plan itself. In Providence, the Downcity Task Force was a mix of citizens, city staff, and other professionals. Their responsibility was to develop viable implementation strategies for the TND plan Duany’s team had prepared during the charrette.

61 This is not to suggest that no public input was allowed or required after the charrette was finished. Public hearings were held during the preparation of Mercer Island’s Development and Design Guidelines, and the Downcity Task Force involved about 100 different people. Nevertheless, the most concentrated effort into public involvement occurred at the charrette level.
Technical Advisor. In all four cities, other city agencies and departments also provided input during the TND planning process. Their involvement was largely related to technical planning issues; however, the extent to which their expertise was called upon varied across the cases.

Providence exhibited, by far, the most comprehensive cross-section of technical advisors. The Downcity Task Force assembled 11 subcommittees to develop implementation strategies for Duany's TND plan. These committees drew on nearly 100 city staff and other professionals to address specific topics, including Architecture and Design Standards, Arts and Entertainment, Circulation and Signage, Code, Development, Farmer's Market, Grace Park, Management, Parking, Traveler's Aid, and Tree Planting.

San Jose also assembled a technical advisory committee, although its membership was restricted to staff from other city departments. Representatives from Public Works, General Services, Police, Fire, Redevelopment, Recreation, Parks and Community Services, Streets and Traffic, Neighborhood Maintenance, and Housing departments provided input into the design of the neotraditional plan.

In Suisun City the ongoing cooperation of city departments proved to be as important as their technical input into the TND plan. Instead of relying on a task force for advice and input into the plan, the entire local government framework was reorganized to facilitate its implementation. The Housing, Planning, and Construction divisions were collapsed into the Redevelopment Agency, a consolidation which was intended to minimize the likelihood of duplicating others' efforts or inadvertently working at cross-purposes with other departments.62 This reorganization provided a more permanent means of assuring input from a variety of city departments.

62 Interview with Camran Nojoomi, April 1, 1996.
Of the four cases, the Mercer Island Development Services Department stands alone in its lack of organized interdepartmental assistance during the planning process. The only city staff members involved in the charrette, for example, were two planners, the Development Services Manager, the City Manager, and his assistant. The Department did enlist the help of “outside” public agencies, however. Delegates from the Regional Transit Authority, Washington State Department of Transportation, and the METRO were participants in the design charrette.

**Designer.** All four case studies retained design consultants to develop appropriate physical design strategies of the TND model in the planning areas. The consultants to Mercer Island and Providence drew up their plans directly from the conversations and activities that occurred during the public charrettes. Between public sessions, they revised their designs based on each day’s activities, and at the end of the charrette, presented an illustrative plan, codes, and implementation recommendations to the community.

In the other two cities, the consultants focused their efforts on plan production during a longer design process. Calthorpe Associates developed their plan for Jackson-Taylor during nine months of working group meetings with the citizens task force and city planning staff. The ROMA Design Group initially submitted a concept plan for Suisun City, and then revised it during the next 13 months with input from the Community Advisory Committee and Redevelopment Agency staff.

**Decision Maker.** The City Council in all four communities gave the neotraditional plan the official go-ahead by approving the TND documents containing the plans, codes, and implementation strategies. This demonstrated willingness to see the TND plan come to fruition was evidenced by active participation by Council members in the planning and design process of three cities. In fact, White noted that two Mercer Island City Council members were
so enthusiastic about the TND plan that they acted as its “caretakers” by keeping it a priority on the Council’s docket.

The City Councils exercised final decision making authority, ultimately determining whether the TND principles would be incorporated in the community. However, a myriad of interim decisions were made during the production of the neotraditional plan.

The interim decision making process was often mediated by the design consultants. During the charrettes in Mercer Island and Providence, for example, the consultants were moderators of the discussions between city staff, technical advisors, and citizens. Theirs approximated a consensus-building approach in which everyone’s concerns were reconciled to the greatest extent possible in the neotraditional plan.

Notably, in only one city did citizens have explicit decision making authority. In San Jose, the citizen task force members played a decisive role in the formulation of the neotraditional plan for Jackson-Taylor. The task force voted on one of three alternative plans that Calthorpe Associates had developed that they felt would “best [meet] their objectives” for the Jackson-Taylor neighborhood.63 Their choice, the second alternative, became the one which the consultants fully developed.64

Motivator. Key individuals offered motivation and support for the neotraditional planning effort in three cities. Prominent neotraditionalists Peter Katz and Andres Duany lent their enthusiasm to the Mercer Island and

---

63 City of San Jose, *Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy*, p. 18.

64 When constituent members of the San Jose citizen task force disagreed about the preferred density of future development in the core area of Jackson-Taylor, the consultants produced two alternative plans: one with a high density requirement and one with a slightly lower requirement. In the end, however, the Planning Department -- and not the task force -- made an executive decision to proceed with the lower density plan.
Providence charrettes. In addition, several individuals provided longer-term support for the TND plans.

As mentioned, City Council members in Mercer Island were particularly enthusiastic about the 1994 charrette and one has been extensively involved in implementation activities since then. Arnold Chace, the businessman who had spearheaded the Providence TND planning process, was heavily involved with the Downcity Task Force work, not only acting as its Chair but also serving on four of the eleven advisory committees.

The head of the Redevelopment Agency, Camran Nojoomi, and Mayor Jim Spering have provided sustained enthusiasm and support for the Suisun City neotraditional planning effort. Spering’s reelection in 1994 by a reportedly “wide” margin and Nojoomi’s promotion to City Manager reflect the sustained effort they put into the neotraditional effort. One author proclaimed them to be the “bookends of [the] resurgence.”

**Promoter.** The Mercer Island Town Center report recommended that an entity be established to serve as the “custodian of the vision.” The consultants had envisioned a nonprofit organization of residents, business owners, and citizens as the chief promoter, fund-raiser, and supervisor of the implementation of the TND plan. However, such an organization has not yet materialized in Mercer Island. In fact, in none of the case studies did an independent organization, existing or newly created, explicitly claim ownership of the vision. The closest thing to such a claim has been the continued involvement of organized business interests in Providence such as the Providence Foundation and Point Gammon Foundation.

Despite this lack of private “custodians,” some administrative roles could not be played by the private sector even if a willing organization were to come forward;

---

65 Berke, “Turnaround Town,” pp. 73, 115.
the local governments in the communities also had administrative responsibilities. From a regulatory standpoint, it was important for the government to ensure that new development in the planning areas occurred in accordance with the TND regulatory provisions. Hence, the local planning departments retained administrative control over the neotraditional plan. As stated in the *Suisun City Downtown Amended Specific Plan*, "The administrator of the Specific Plan shall be the Planning Director or other qualified member of the Planning Division staff, designated by the Planning Director who shall normally be available to the general public during regular office hours.”

**DISCUSSION**

What does the previous analysis show about the players and roles in the case studies? In some ways, the roles the actors played were not surprising. A "traditional" view holds that the local government is responsible for identifying needs and initiating broad planning enterprises to address those needs. And, in fact, the local governments in the case studies did play significant initiating, organizing, decision making, and administrating roles during the planning process.

But under the "old style" of planning, the municipal planners would have made their decisions with little public input, and their "top down" approach would have involved little meaningful public involvement in the early stages of the planning process as well as at the end. If public hearings were held, they would be token gestures done only to satisfy a state or federal mandate. And the TND plans would have been subject to public frustration, anger, and probably lawsuits. And the implementation of the TND plan would have been delayed or even stopped altogether.

---


67 See Bruce McClendon, *Mastering Change: Winning Strategies for Effective City Planning* for a discussion of this "old style" of planning.
Clearly such an "old style" planning process would have proven an ineffective means to the desired end of a community reinvented along neotraditional lines; and the case study communities clearly did not utilize the "paternalistic and condescending" old style method. Instead, as the above analysis indicates, their planning efforts were bottom-up processes involving a wide variety of players. That is to say, only one of the four neotraditional planning processes was initiated solely by the government. The general public, stakeholders, and local businesspeople generated a significant amount of the energy behind the kickoff of the neotraditional planning efforts in all but the San Jose case.

It is clear that participatory planning did not begin with the TND effort. Instead, an already-existing public participation process facilitated the consideration of TND principles. It was, in part, through other public events such as visioning, that the Mercer Island and Suisun City planning departments recognized the need to focus significant planning effort on their downtowns and to consequently launch a neotraditional planning process.

The local governments put extensive effort into making the TND planning process a truly participatory endeavor. Although the use of task forces and public meetings in three of the four communities was not necessarily revolutionary (and in fact would fall somewhere between consultation and placation on Sherry Arnstein's classic "ladder of public participation"), these forms of public participation were not "token" gestures. These participation vehicles earnestly solicited community input. The task force members had genuine advisory roles, and the public meetings were not held simply to comply with federal or state mandates. One key reason these vehicles were effective was the local government's willingness to step out of the role of absolute decision maker during this part of the process. As was clear from the analysis, the local
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governments allowed other points of view to inform and influence the development of the neotraditional plan.

To that end, the planning consultants played important roles as facilitators and enablers. As third parties to the planning and design activities, the consultants were relatively neutral players. As such, they were able to “mesh” the wish-list interests of citizens, landowners, other stakeholders, and analysts with the city’s goals and needs, and produce a physical design agreeable to everyone. That is to say, the consultants’ role during the design activities facilitated the consideration of community opinions and desires alongside the city staff’s and analysts’ concerns.

The balance between community input, market realities, and local government concerns was important. Nojoomi explained that the 1983 revitalization plan Suisun City had undertaken owed much of its failure to the fact that it was not “based on reality.” Because citizen input had been the entire basis for that plan, it “ignored” market realities and little came to fruition. In contrast to this experience, the planning processes in these communities showed a clearer balance between the players’ concerns.

Notably, private developers did not play any direct role in the case studies’ planning processes. Landowners and business owners in the planning area were involved early on, but the companies that would eventually build the structures envisioned in the neotraditional plan were not. Laurel Prevetti, Senior Planner in San Jose, and Samuel Shamoon, Director of Planning and Development in Providence, explained that they viewed the neotraditional plans as a framework to guide private development in the future. Since specific projects were not yet on the board, there were no “stake-holding” developers to enlist. Part of the reason the Suisun City Redevelopment Agency acted as master developer,
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according to Nojoomi, was because of a lack of interest on the part of developers to build what the plan called for.

In sum, the analysis of the roles played in the case study communities shows that they committed themselves to an inclusive planning process that genuinely solicited and incorporated community concerns into the TND plan. Broad support came from many city departments and politicians. Although the local governments retained some traditional roles such as organizer and "final" decision maker, they were willing to step out of their authoritarian roles for at least part of the process. Doing so seems to have been beneficial. Peter Katz asserted that the true measure of a process' effectiveness was [whether] the plan "[was] approved with overwhelming public support." The evidence in the literature and media is that the public did indeed support the TND plans in these communities.

PLANNING AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES

This portion of the analysis focuses on the specific activities each community undertook in the preparation of the neotraditional plan. Understanding the sequence and content of these activities is intended to shed light on the most promising design and planning activities in the development of a TND plan.

Figure 6 is a linear depiction of the planning activities each city undertook. Although a highly simplified view of their processes, it establishes the basic series of activities the case study communities pursued in the generation of the neotraditional plan. Mercer Island and Providence utilized a public charrette method, and arrived at a TND plan within five days of the commencement of the planning process. San Jose and Suisun City pursued a longer design process, initiated with a series of working group meetings in San Jose, and with the submission of a concept plan in Suisun City. Both communities spent several months developing the TND plan.

Public Charrettes. The charrettes were intense, five day long events that involved a series of goal-setting, brainstorming, and design activities. Widely publicized and well-attended, participants were thrown in the pot, so to speak, to work together to arrive at a shared goal, or common vision, for the area. Mercer Island targeted four groups of citizens to be involved in the charrette: public leaders, property owners, “experts,” and the media. Planning staff, the Mayor, and City Council members joined these participants in the activities. In Mercer Island and Providence, the consultants worked “round the clock” to synthesize the participants’ concerns into a coherent plan. At the end of the charrette, the TND plan had been generated.
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Mercer Island planning staff then took steps to implement the Town Center plan. After thirteen months of work on new design and development guidelines for the CBD, which included public input in the form of open houses and public meetings, the City Council approved the new requirements. In Providence, after the charrette, Mayor Cianci “appointed the Downcity Task Force to recommend code and management improvements and to stimulate investment in the old retail core.” In the ensuing 16 months, the Task Force developed strategies and tools to effectuate the TND plan. Implementation of the plan then commenced with City Council approval of the Downcity Overlay District.

**Working Groups.** San Jose and Suisun City used longer, and somewhat more traditional, processes to develop their TND plans. The San Jose Planning Department brought Calthorpe Associates together with the Citizen Task Force members during a series of group meetings. Over the course of nine months, these parties met every month to negotiate the elements of the plan. These meetings were open to the public, and members of the technical advisory committee provided expertise as needed. After the plan had been substantially designed during these “working groups,” the Planning Department held a public meeting to discuss the plan and make final revisions.

In Suisun City the process was similar, although the ROMA Design Group submitted an initial concept plan to the Redevelopment Agency before public meetings began. The TND plan was then modified and tightened through a series of public meetings over the course of 13 months. An 11-member Community Advisory Committee had “ongoing involvement” during these 13 months. In both cities, the implementation of the plan began almost immediately after the TND plans had been finalized.

---

DISCUSSION

In essence, the main difference between the two series of activities was time. The charrettes in Mercer Island and Providence compressed the entire design process into a five day event, while the working group/public meeting approach took roughly a year to complete. Each of these methods has significant advantages and disadvantages.

A public charrette, for example, can be a useful tool to help “jump start” the planning process. In particular, because it is such an intense experience, it can garner community support in a way that is unlikely to occur in a less stimulating environment. The broad range of participants in a charrette lends a certain energy to the effort, and can produce an array of ideas that may not occur in a smaller group setting. These benefits were apparent in Providence, where the final presentation was described as “exhilarating, a declaration of hope in the face of one of the state’s most depressing years. Mayor Vincent A. Cianci, Jr. dubbed it ‘urban group therapy;’ the Providence Journal declared ‘downtown has found its voice.’ Business executives and artists, college students and senior citizens, preservationists and advocates for the homeless all sat enraptured for over two hours as Duany and his team of experts used slides to explain Downcity’s overlooked assets and potential for a comeback.”74

However, because of the extremely short time frame in which a charrette takes place, it may not be a thorough planning approach. Even if participants from every conceivable group of stakeholders are present, a five-day event is not likely to unearth every issue that may come to bear on the plan. In the excitement of the moment, some issues may be skipped over and “rash” decisions may be made. There may be public expectations that all of the ideas from the charrette will be realized, and if the municipal agency later realizes that an important issue was not addressed, making changes to the plan may be politically difficult.

74 Ibid., 1.
Thus come the advantages of a longer design process. Developing a TND plan over the course of several months provides an opportunity to be more thorough in considering various design issues, to conduct research or gather additional information that may make decision-making easier. Participants of a working group have time to consider the options on the table and to develop alternatives based on more complete information.

Of course, a major disadvantage of a longer process is that lacks the energy of a charrette. The excitement over the possibilities of the area can be lost simply due to the amount of time it takes to develop the plan. Another disadvantage is that a longer process does not typically involve as many players as a charrette. Community representation is more strategic (i.e. appointing citizens to a task force). As a result, some voices may be lost. Even if working group meetings are “open to the public,” they are not likely to attract as many citizens as a five-day, well publicized event.

IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS
The following is an examination of the regulatory, administrative, and funding tools that the case studies used to implement their neotraditional plans.

Adoption of the TND plan. Three of the four communities incorporated the consultants’ design and policy documents into their city-wide comprehensive plans. In Providence, this incorporation occurred explicitly: the 1993 Providence 2000 Comprehensive Plan stated as one of its downtown policies to “review [Downcity Providence: Master Plan for a Special Time] for conformance and [to] adopt [it] as part of this Comprehensive Plan.” The Suisun City Amended Downtown Specific Plan, which included the TND plan and its design guidelines, was adopted by ordinance of the City Council in July 1991. The San Jose General Plan explicitly incorporated the major features of the Jackson-Taylor Residential

75 City Plan Commission, Providence Comprehensive Plan, p. 119.
Strategy, although the background, vision, and community character for the neighborhood as well as more detailed levels of implementation remained separate in the Residential Strategy document.

Mercer Island stands out as the only community that did not directly adopt the consultants' Town Center Plan for the City of Mercer Island report into their Comprehensive Plan. Their major act of incorporating the reports' design and code recommendations occurred when the City amended its design and development guidelines for the CBD in late 1995. This amendment was anticipated by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan: "A new set of guidelines will be written which promote the design vision for the CBD..."76

New zoning and design requirements. As mentioned, Mercer Island adopted new development and design requirements in December 1995 to implement the major ideas of the consultant report. The purpose of the 71-page document, prepared by the Planning Department, was "to implement the policies of . . . the design concepts outlined in the Town Center Plan."77

The Providence City Council adopted the Downcity Overlay Zoning District in October 1991. As the major implementation tool of the neotraditional plan, the enabling legislation deleted the Downtown Historic District and created the Downcity District. It included design regulations and a design review body to "carry out the purpose of the District."78

The development guidelines contained in the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy became the "law of the land" in San Jose. In Suisun City, the Amended Downtown Specific Plan became the guiding document for development in the Old Town. It

76 City of Mercer Island, Comprehensive Plan, p. Land Use -12.

77 City of Mercer Island, Development and Design Requirements, p. 1.
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included land use, public facilities, parking, traffic, and general use regulations as well as design standards and guidelines.

**Monitoring conformance to the TND plan.** Even though Suisun City invested a significant amount of money into specific projects in the TND planning area, the emphasis in the communities was on private developers building projects according to neotraditional principles. Such reliance on the private sector required some means of ensuring that developers actually complied with the design and development guidelines that each city had established. To that end, all four communities instituted, or broadened already existing, design review provisions.

In Mercer Island, Suisun City, and San Jose, this monitoring occurred through existing design review bodies. Providence created a new body to monitor development in Downcity. During the 1991 charrette, Andres Duany had recommended “one-stop permitting” to simplify the development process. At the time, the Historic Commission and the Capital Center Commission had overlapping jurisdiction in various parts of downtown, which was confusing and frustrating for developers. The Planning Department followed Duany’s suggestion and the Overlay Zoning District legislation mandated the creation of the Downcity Design Review Committee to “regulate development in the Downcity district.”

**Funding mechanisms and public investments.** The level of public investments made by the cities varied widely. Suisun City was by far the most ambitious in this regard. In addition to the Redevelopment Agency’s budget for projects in the Old Town, it captured tax-increment funds from $80 million worth of investments throughout the city by declaring the entire city a Redevelopment Zone. The city also floated a $58 million bond to finance projects.

---

79 This was made possible by a 1991 zoning enabling act allowing agencies other than the Zoning Review Board to review development.
Providence had the next greatest level of public investments, funding the construction of Freeman Park, streetscape improvements, and a downtown lighting program. According to Shamoon, however, the only reason they were able to fund these projects was because the money unexpectedly became available. The City had not counted on ISTEA funds or UDAG money to finance Downcity projects.

San Jose and Mercer Island are at the opposite end of the spectrum as far as funding and public investments go. Although the Redevelopment Agency has partially funded one project in the Jackson-Taylor neighborhood, the City of San Jose has not invested in any other improvements in the area.80 Ostensibly, the economic activities are replacing the industrial uses that once dominated the local economy appear to be sufficient; the city has not felt the need to invest municipal funds in the revitalization effort. To date, Mercer Island has not invested in any public improvement projects in the CBD.81

**DISCUSSION**

The regulatory tools each city used to implement the TND plan were more a function of the institutional framework within each city than any special requirement of the TND concept. For example, it was not out of the ordinary for Providence to create a Downcity Overlay District because the City had previously utilized overlay districts to alter zoning and design requirements in specific locales. San Jose's incorporation of the *Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy* into the Comprehensive Plan was a normal procedure. The City had Planned Residential Communities in several other neighborhoods, with accompanying policy documents similar in purpose to the *Residential Strategy*.

---
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The basic legislative and administrative implementation measures were consistent across the cases, even though they used different specific tools. Notably, two of the four case study communities did not incorporate all of the implementation recommendations the consultants had made. Mercer Island has yet to establish the private "custodian" of the neotraditional vision. Providence has not created a management entity for Downcity, and many of the public investments recommended by Duany's team have not been realized. While this is probably due to a combination of lackluster follow-through efforts, timing, funding, or the infeasibility of the recommendation in the first place, one wonders whether those recommendations are truly effective. Given that they were not used, perhaps the basic regulatory, legislative, and administrative tools are sufficient.

Table 2: Summary Matrix of Planning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mercer Island</th>
<th>Providence</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Suisun City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Departments / Agencies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Business Interests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders in Planning Area</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Consultants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Individual(s)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Design Charrette</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Illustrative Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Changes/Overlay Districts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Investments</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

The preceding analysis has considered the players and their roles, the planning and design activities, and the implementation strategies that each community used during the TND planning process. Table 2 summarizes these aspects of the communities’ approaches. Furthermore, the points of comparison and commentary that were made can be distilled into the following observations about their planning processes:

- **Broad-based planning efforts.** There were no fewer than six groups of people involved in each community’s planning process. See Table 2.

- **Government leadership.** The local planning departments played a significant organizing, and usually initiating, role in the planning process.

- **Participatory attitude.** Although accomplished in different ways, all four communities demonstrated a commitment to incorporating citizens’ concerns.

- **Reliance on consultant expertise.** The consultants offered not only design expertise but also played the role of facilitator and enabler in all of the communities.

- **Willingness to change ordinances.** All four communities instituted new zoning and/or design guidelines to incorporate the TND principles.

- **Public/private partnership.** All four relied, to some extent, on economic and development activity within the private sector for the successful realization of the TND plan.

- **Commitment to public investments.** Although Suisun City stands out as being the “most” committed to public investments, San Jose and Providence have attempted to invest public funds in the TND areas.

These observations provide the foundation of the TND planning process model to be described in Chapter 4. However, they are based solely on a disaggregated analysis, which precludes the lessons that might be gleaned from a more general view of their processes. The following considers some of the insights that a definitive characterization of their planning processes offers.
Of the case studies, Mercer Island and Suisun City can best be characterized as the “Pioneers.” Mercer Island, as a city, had a clear emphasis on public participation and a decision-making structure that incorporated public input. When it came to the development of the TND plan, then, there was an already-embedded interest in involving the public very closely in design and planning activities. As a result, the public charrette was a natural tool for the city to use. It ensured that a broad constituency of Mercer Islanders would have input into the early stages of the planning process. However, the City was not terribly vigorous in its implementation of the plan. Approval of the Town Center Development and Design Requirements is the only tangible evidence of its implementation to date. This may well be a timing issue -- there are, reportedly, more implementation measures in the works. Nevertheless, Mercer Island’s experience suggests that disproportionate attention on the public participation piece can result in a less aggressive and less expeditious realization of the plan.

In contrast, Suisun City’s pioneering spirit sprang from a belief that implementation was crucial. Their public participation methods consisted of rather traditional citizen’s advisory committees and public meetings. Instead, the city’s emphasis was on garnering financial and organizational resources to realize the completion of specific projects in the Old Town. The reorganization of the city government and use of tax-increment financing from the entire city were two manifestations of this pragmatic attitude. And yet, the fact that Suisun City focused on the implementation side more than the public participation side raises a similar concern as did Mercer Island’s experience. Mabel Harder, a disgruntled Suisun City resident, wrote that she was unhappy with the amount of money being poured into the Old Town redevelopment effort, perceiving that all of the city’s resources were going into the redevelopment effort.\(^\text{82}\)

The Providence planning process can most easily be characterized as “Grassroots.” The Department of Planning and Development was involved to a

significant degree, but the TND planning process would not have gotten off the
ground without the efforts of Arnold Chace and the business community. In
fact, it is likely that the continued involvement of organized interests has kept
the Downcity plan alive. During our interview, Shamoon struggled to
remember what the City had undertaken to implement the TND plan: in fact,
most of the recommendations contained in the Downcity: An Implementation Plan
report have not been realized. Shamoon pointed to the private sector as the
driving force behind the implementation.\footnote{Interview with Samuel Shamoon, April 1, 1996.} Certainly the city’s reliance on the
private sector eased its economic burden of channeling public funds into specific
Downcity projects. At the same time, Providence’s reliance on private business
interests has resulted in sporadic and piecemeal implementation of the TND
plan.

Finally, the San Jose TND planning experience can best be described as
proceeding “by the book.” By far the most structured and organized approach
of the four cases, San Jose had an organizational structure already in place that
could accommodate the TND planning process. Almost no innovative
participatory or process measures were taken to develop and implement the
TND plan for Jackson-Taylor. In one sense this is an encouraging sign, because
it indicates that TND principles can fit into highly structured bureaucratic
frameworks. However, San Jose also exhibited the least amount of significant or
ongoing public support for the plan, and there was virtually no public
investment in the Jackson-Taylor neighborhood as a result of the TND plan. The
City Council member who was involved was not from the Jackson-Taylor ward,
and there seemed to be no internal “engine” or players specifically prodding the
local government to implement the TND plan. While this passivity was partly
due to the sheer size of San Jose and the limited ability of the City’s planning
staff to throw their energy into one neighborhood TND project, San Jose’s lack of
dynamism highlights one of the dangers of reliance on existing bureaucratic
structures. Without a charrette to spark community interest, and without city
staff committed to the long-term realization of the plan, implementation of a TND plan can stall out indefinitely.
CHAPTER 4: THE TND PLANNING PROCESS MODEL

The TND planning process model that follows is based not only on the similarities between the case studies, but also on the differences, lessons, and insights gleaned from their experiences. The similarities among the cities' experiences suggest that some process elements are indispensable to an effective TND planning process model, while the differences between them provide a range of tools and strategies from which other communities can draw. The proposed model attempts to synthesize both the common and the different elements of all four cities' processes, keeping in mind the concerns and cautions discussed at the end of Chapter 3.

The TND Planning Process Model has three parts: the Necessary Players and Roles, Suggested Planning and Design Activities, and an Implementation Toolbox. Each will be discussed in turn.

NECESSARY PLAYERS AND ROLES

One of the hallmarks of all four communities' experiences was the involvement of a broad constituency of players. Even San Jose, which was ostensibly the most bureaucratic and "traditional" of the cases, had at least six different groups of people represented during the planning process. Based on the analysis of these players and their roles as they played out in the case studies, a community considering the implementation of neotraditional principles should include the following actors in the planning process.

Local Government. The active participation of the local government is indispensable to an effective TND planning process. At all stages of the process, one or more departments should be involved. The planning department, for example, should count on having a large organizational and administrative role in the process. As enablers and facilitators of the decision-making process, planning staff should schedule meetings, gather supporting reports and
analyses, target and contact community members for involvement, and be committed to long-term implementation of TND plan. In addition, planning staff should be willing to suspend their decision-making authority during parts of the planning process, which will help to foster genuine community involvement and input.

Other governmental departments should be involved, as well. Apart from Mercer Island, the case studies involved Housing, Building, Redevelopment, Parks and Recreation, Police, and Fire departments in the planning effort. In the absence of a complete reorganization of the government à la Suisun City, this interdepartmental support may best be applied in the context of technical advisory committees. However, department representatives should be willing to attend planning events as well as provide technical expertise and encouragement for the TND effort.

The Mayor should be a catalytic player in the process, and not merely the bearer of signatory power. Like Suisun City’s and Mercer Island’s experience, the Mayor should, ideally, participate in planning events, and openly support and “sell” the TND planning effort to the community at large.

Finally, the City Council, as the ultimate decision-makers, needs to be 100% sold on the idea of the neotraditional plan. Although this was not so evident in San Jose, the other cases demonstrated strong Council support for the idea. One wonders whether San Jose’s relatively lethargic implementation of the TND plan is partly a consequence of a lack of unified City Council (and other departmental) support.

Citizens. The second major group of players to be involved is citizens. Again, this requirement is based on the demonstrated interest in all four case studies in having community input in their planning processes. Three groups of citizens should be targeted for involvement: organized interest groups; landowners and stakeholders in the planned area; and citizens from the rest of the community.
This triad of players is important, insofar as it covers the range of citizens who might care what happens in that area. For instance, organized interest groups may be interested and willing to take on the roles of initiator or supporter. Like the efforts of the Providence Foundation, such interest groups can lessen the burden on the government as the sole organized advocates of the TND plan. Of course, citizens in the community can be mobilized into organized groups promoting the TND plan. But it is important to not overlook the potential resource of existing interest groups.

The second group of citizens -- stakeholders in the planning area -- are an obvious sector to involve in the planning process. All four case studies involved stakeholders in their planning processes. As the people who will be most directly affected by the plan, their approval and "ownership" of the vision is vital to its success.

The third group of citizens -- those from the rest of the community who may not have such a direct stake in the planning process -- is also indispensable. Suisun City and San Jose seemed to lack significant public-at-large involvement. Their input was not specifically targeted during the planning process. As a result, Harder's dissatisfaction with the level of funds being spent on the redevelopment effort may not have been heard during the planning process.

**Design Consultants.** The consultants are critical players in the TND planning process. As enablers and facilitators of decision-making process, their design skills can be brought to bear on the citizens' and government's interests and needs for the planning area. As such, they can play a mediating role between what are often considered the "opposing" voices of citizens and government. It may not be, therefore, advisable for communities to develop a TND plan using in-house expertise. It is not that public sector planning is not possible. However, engaging an outside consultant can bring a new and fresh perspective to the community and bring to light options and possibilities that may not have occurred to the community's residents, citizens, politicians, or even planners.
Developers. This group of players was largely left out of the planning processes in the case study communities. It was, for example, only after the planning and design activities in Suisun City had concluded that the O'Brien group was brought on board to develop housing in the Crescent neighborhood. The fact that the Redevelopment Agency assumed the role of master developer, in addition to the relative paucity of developers undertaking projects in the other three communities suggest that other communities considering the use of TND principles ought to exercise the foresight to involve potential developers in the planning process. Doing so ensures that once the regulatory and administrative pieces are in place to implement the TND plan, there will be developers on board, ready to build projects according to neotraditional principles. Nojoomi mentioned that developers actually laughed at him when he explained the neotraditional design principles they were to follow.84 Like the citizens of the community, developers also need to have “ownership” of the TND plan. Their involvement in the planning process is one way to ensure that they do.

SUGGESTED PLANNING AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES

As the analysis discussed, the two major approaches to the development of the TND plan were public charrettes (five day events) and working groups (9 to 13 months of meetings). Given the advantages and disadvantages of each as discussed in Chapter 3, the following suggested planning activities are a hybrid of these approaches that are intended to capitalize on the most comprehensive and catalytic aspects of each method.

A five day “kickoff” event. The energy and enthusiasm that were harnessed during Mercer Island’s and Providence’s public charrettes would difficult to replicate without some sort of intensive, catalytic event at the beginning of the planning process. Hence, a public charrette or visioning event is the recommended jumping off point for the process. As mentioned earlier, the local

84 Interview with Camran Nojoomi, April 1, 1996.
planning department is likely to play a significant organizing role of this activity.

Based on the case studies’ experiences, the planning staff’s responsibilities will include four major elements. First, planners should assemble any relevant studies or analyses of the planning area that were completed in the past. Such reports provide valuable technical information from which to work, as well as a snapshot of the attitudes or views of the planning area when the reports were completed. Second, planning staff should actively recruit the Mayor, City Council members, and other departments, to participate in the event. Third, the planning staff should target specific community members to be involved in the planning process. Mercer Island, for example, sent engraved invitations to 32-40 specific people that they wanted to participate in the public charrette. Fourth, planning staff should hire consultants well versed in neotraditional principles as well as in conducting catalytic events such as charrettes. Consultant experience in mediation, moderation and facilitation is particularly valuable. The planning department can help lead the charrette event, although there is considerable value in having the consultants play a leading facilitation role. Fifth, planning staff should ensure that the event is well publicized, and that the entire planning process, including the methods and extent of public participation, is explained during the charrette. The charrette/visioning event itself may include: a goal setting session, a visual preference survey, brainstorming sessions, and public design opportunities. The planning consultants will be valuable resources in planning the most effective activities -- those to which the community’s citizens may best respond.

The end product of this catalytic event should include an articulated set of goals for the planning area, an illustrative plan, design codes, and/or implementation ideas. However, it may be advisable to focus more on establishing a set of goals before delving into detailed planning stages. 

Lampkin argues that Regional Urban Design Assistance Teams (R/UDAT), which conduct four day interventions in various cities and often utilize public design charrettes, are most effective at “improving the cooperation of development actors.” Her case studies show that the schemes produced during the four day visits do not often become a reality. She concludes that the R/UDAT...
community goals than on nailing down the other products, since the next piece of the planning process will more methodically develop the TND plan and codes.

**Working Groups.** After the kickoff event, it will be important to have a longer planning process to more carefully consider the issues that were raised during the charrette. At this stage, the planning department should appoint a Citizens Advisory Committee comprised of representative stakeholders in the planning area, as well as a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of other city staff, professionals, and regional agencies. Over the course of nine to 12 months, these two groups, along with planning staff and design consultants, should develop the illustrative site plan, codes, and implementation tools in full. All meetings, which may occur on a monthly or bi-weekly basis, should be open to the public and publicized throughout the community. “Open Houses” or other non-traditional strategies to solicit general public input may be effective tools at strategic points during this longer process. Certainly this process is not likely to occur in such a linear fashion -- informal discussions in the office and between individuals are sure to happen. But every effort should be made to have this stage of the process open to the public.

The end product of the planning and design activities just described should be a final version of the TND illustrative plan, an accompanying set of urban design and architectural codes, and an implementation schedule -- all of which can be readily approved by the City Council.

**AN IMPLEMENTATION TOOLBOX**

The local government’s involvement in the implementation of the TND plan was consistent across the case studies insofar as legislative and administrative strategies were concerned. However, the extent to which public funds were invested in the TND plan varied. This variation was due in part to differences in

---

program improves a city’s design process, and not necessarily its future form. (See Lampkin, *Intervention in the City Building Network...*, p. 71.)
available funding mechanisms and bureaucratic frameworks among the communities. Some approaches worked in one community, but not the others. In recognition of the fact that such differences will also exist in other communities considering TND principles, the following suggestions can be considered a “toolbox” of implementation strategies.

Legislative. Despite the fact that Mercer Island did not adopt the Town Center plan, the other cases suggest that adoption of the TND plan as part of comprehensive plan is a necessary first step. The adoption of design and development guidelines and zoning changes in the planning area is likewise an important piece of the implementation story. Like Providence and Suisun City, an overlay district may be an appropriate tool to incorporate these changes. Whether overlays are used or not, the provisions of the TND model should be incorporated, in some form, as legal development requirements.

Administrative. It was mentioned in Chapter 2 that the consultants to Mercer Island and Providence suggested that a private corporation or group assume administrative control of the TND plan. Although a good idea, and certainly one worth pursuing, the fact that it has not been realized in either community suggests that the planning department must be ready and willing to assume administrative responsibility over the area. That is, assuming those responsibilities over and above their intrinsic responsibility of overseeing the permitting process, monitoring design review, and handling complaints, amendments, and revisions to the TND plan. The planning department must be ready to act as advocate, fund-raiser, and motivator of the TND plan unless and until a private group assumes those roles.

Public investments. No matter how resource-poor a community incorporating TND principles may be, or how much it intends to rely on the private sector to bring the plan to fruition, the local government must invest in the TND planning area in some significant way. Even if a “private fund” can be established to generate most of the revenue needed to fund projects in the TND area, there
should be a public financial commitment to the neotraditional vision. Whether public investment occurs through street improvements or by funding private development projects, the local government must generate the momentum for the project. If it does not, the TND plan will become a back burner item, and its realization will likely be slowed.

To that end, there are a number of sources that can be tapped if the local coffers are empty. The case studies, for example, relied on tax-increment financing, Redevelopment Agency funds (available in Suisun City because the Agency had a separate budget from the City), or federal transportation-linked funds such as ISTEA. Communities may also consider tapping in to federal or state programs such as Main Streets, Enterprise/Empowerment Zones, Urban Revitalization Demonstration Project money, and Community Development Block Grant funds. Some of these programs are highly competitive and time consuming to apply for; in the interim, less costly public investments may be the way to go.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

Neotraditional town planning, a concept which has enjoyed increasing popularity in the 15 years since its introduction, has been used almost exclusively by private developers to build new communities on open land. The criticisms associated with these isolated neotraditional communities, however, have rendered its benefits somewhat less seductive. Some critics even believe that the TND model, as embodied by outlying towns like Seaside and Kentlands, is no more than a fad. But existing communities provide a promising arena of application for the TND model, and in recent years, some communities have begun to incorporate its principles. Their experimentation is an encouraging step toward a viable model of the New Urbanism; to facilitate the continued use of the TND concept in urbanized areas, this thesis has examined the planning efforts of four cities that have incorporated elements of the TND model and developed a TND planning process model from their experiences.

As forecasted at the outset of this thesis, the proposed model is not necessarily unique to the TND concept. After all, the public participation tools of citizens advisory committees, public meetings, Open Houses, and even design charrettes are not particularly revolutionary ideas. Thus, the value of the model is not in its ingenuity. Instead, its merit rests on the fact that, as a package, it provides direction for other communities interested in incorporating neotraditional principles. Based on the actual experiences of cities that have implemented TND principles, it answers some basic questions about what players should be involved, what types of planning and design activities to undertake, and what implementation strategies to use.

The proposed TND planning process model will be helpful to communities similar in nature and attitude to the case studies. Recall that all of the case studies had identified problems within the planning areas -- disinvestment, underutilization, changing land uses -- to which TND principles were then
applied. Towns and cities that are committed to a proactive planning tradition and have demonstrable “ills” associated with specific places may benefit most from the proposed planning process model.

The mere existence of the model does not eliminate the challenges to applying TND principles in existing communities. Those that are lacking a strong commitment to urban design or a citizenry that cares deeply about its built environment may be slower in responding positively to the ideals of the New Urbanism and applying the process model. The “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it” mentality still presents a significant hurdle in the myriad of sprawling communities in this country. It may prove to be particularly challenging to implement TND principles in a community that has no explicit, widely recognized, or identifiable problem to which the TND model would be an obvious solution. Suburbanites are likely to feel threatened if their local government proposed increased densities, mixed uses, and pedestrian-oriented development in their neighborhood for no apparent reason.

One way to overcome this hurdle would be to extend the evangelistic efforts of the neotraditional proponents. Communities will not turn to neotraditional design principles unless convinced of its benefits. And they cannot be convinced of its benefits if they have not heard. Commentators have often invoked religious imagery to describe Duany’s work, and certainly the “crusading and evangelizing” neotraditional “missionaries” should continue their work -- but with particular emphasis on targeting the general public and the local governments making land use decisions.

Another way to overcome this barrier would be to expand the scope of this research. This thesis produced a model that can aid local governments in using the principles of the New Urbanism. But it yielded little of value for regional governing bodies. As Lee Epstein, lands program director of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, asserted, “[n]eotraditional densities are fairly intensive; the idea is to put them here and not here and here and here forever and ever......[s]ome
governmental structure needs to make a contextual decision, starting with the premise that there are going to be parts of our rural landscape that will remain rural...the government has to take the next step because the private sector can't do it."86 The development of a regional planning process model would highlight effective strategies and tools to use at this broader level as well as mitigate the criticism that isolated neotraditional development is merely a new form of sprawl.

The pragmatic nature of this investigation opens the proposed model to criticism. It lacks grounding in various theories of planning and participation because it is based so exclusively on empirical data. As a result, the model must be evaluated in light of the fact that the case studies' approaches are not the only strategies and approaches available for the implementation of neotraditional principles. Nor are they necessarily the most effective or failsafe methods. This deficiency in the research methodology suggests another direction for future research. A more secure grounding in planning theory and participatory methodologies might yield a better approach to the implementation of TND principles. Future research could dovetail the results of this empirical study with theory-based approaches to arrive at an even more effective model for implementation.

This analysis has not explicitly addressed the relationship between economic development and urban design. The success of an architecture-based neotraditional plan depends upon a healthy economic growth rate. Comments made in the beginning of this thesis alluded to this interdependency but it was not treated in the analysis. The economic viability of the TND model would be another fruitful area for future investigation.

An assumption carried throughout this thesis was that the process would produce a particular outcome. That is, the proposed planning process model

---

would result in settlement on a TND plan. This model was to begin from the point at which communities had already decided to implement TND principles. But knowing the desired outcome at the beginning of a planning process is really quite a silly proposition. A community does not usually know (or agree upon) what it wants before an extensive planning process begins. So, what if a community follows the proposed TND planning process model but determines that it wants a Garden City and not a neotraditional community? Is the planning process any less valid? Would it be a truly participatory process if a TND plan was the predetermined outcome? Such questions are a continual tension for planners. That is, balancing community sentiment with professional judgment is a skill which all professional planners should exercise. In particular, neotraditional advocates (such as myself) must be aware of the ethical issues associated with foisting the TND model on a community that has not genuinely expressed interest in it.

Having said all that, I do believe that TND principles are simply good urban design strategies, and find it unfortunate that good urban design requires a "package" at all. Planners should be practicing it anyway. But as long as the "revolutionary" TND strategy occurs in fits and starts around the country, the concept of a pedestrian-oriented, mixed use community needs to be packaged as a coherent and implementable strategy. And, thus, packaging the TND planning process, as was done in this thesis, will be a valuable aid to its implementation -- at least until the neotraditional ideal and its methods of implementation are so entrenched in planners' and citizens' minds that good urban design no longer needs a jump start from TND evangelists and graduate student theses.
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APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDIES

MERCER ISLAND, WASHINGTON

Consultants
Lennertz & Coyle Architects and Town Planners: Bill Lennertz (Principal-in-charge), Stephen Coyle (Principal), William Dennis (Project Designer), Laurence Qamar (Designer).

C.R. Douglas (Seattle Commons), Randall Imai (Imai/Keller Inc.), Mark Hinshaw, Marcy McInelly, Gary Schaefer, Michael Steffen, Bill Williams (ZGF Partnership), John Boroski (Portland State University), Greg Easton (Property Counselors), Norman Peterson (CPD Estimating).

Public Agencies
Madeline Clemann (Regional Transit Authority), Bill Dues (Washington State DOT), Sondra Earley (METRO).

Mayor and City Council
Mayor Judy Clibborn, Councilmember Gordy Edberg.

City of Mercer Island Staff
Paul Lanspery (City Manager), Richard Conrad (Assistant City Manager), Diane White (Development Services Manager), Anna Kolousek (Principal Planner), Lisa Wilmeth (Planner).

Citizens of Mercer Island
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Consultants

Michael Kinerk (Miami Beach, FL), Tom Kohler (Orlando, FL), Alex Krieger (Cambridge, MA), George Rolfe (Seattle, WA), Jonathan Rose (New York, NY).

Mayor and City Council

Department of Planning and Development
John F. Palmieri (Director), Thomas E. Deller (Deputy Director for Planning), Samuel J. Shamoon (Associate Director for Planning), Michael S. Van Leesten (Director 1991-1992), Kathryn J. Cavanaugh, Salvatore Galea, George Turlo, Martha Aramian, Soo-Dip Chin, Linda DiCiccio, Joan Fleming, Edward Grant, Joseph Lackey, April Lapee, Michael Lepore, Ronald Mercurio, Bruno Mollo, Beverly Moirera-Schechtman, Joanne Penta, Richard Piscione, Mary Packard Turkel.

City Plan Commission
Jane Sherman (Chair 1985-1993), George Calcagni (Chair), William Collins, Susan Esposito, James H. Leach, James A. Petrosinelli, Louis Smith.

Contributing Organizations
Providence Foundation, Providence Preservation Society, Rhode Island Historical Preservation Commission, Providence Historic District Commission, Point Gammon Corporation.

Downcity Task Force
Arnold B. Chace (Chair), Christopher Delsesto, James H. Dodge, Leslie A. Gardner, Richard Gilbane, Donna Meierdeierckx, John F. Palmieri (Ex Officio), John Rao, Thomas Skala, Jane Sherman (Ex Officio), Michael S. Van Leesten (Ex Officio), Reverend Daniel Warren, Dr. John A. Yena.

Downcity Task Force Advisory Committees
Architecture and Design Standards: Leslie A. Gardner (Chair), Sean Coffey, Christopher Delsesto, Jay Fluck, Robert Gilbane, John Hartley, Karen Jessup, Williama Jordy, Alex Krieger, David Presbrey.
Arts and Entertainment: Donna Meierdiercks (Chair), Peter Bramante, Johnnie C. Chace, Umberto Cernica, John Custer, Mark Lerman, Teresa Level, Robert Rizzo, Susan Taylor.


Code: Christopher Delesesto (Chair), Merlin A. DeConti, Jr., Robert Douglass, Barbara Feibelman, Kenneth J. Filarski, Edmund A. Restivoo, Jr., Didier Sartor, Stanley Weiss.


Farmer's Market: Donna Meierdiercks (Chair), Guy Abelson, Fred Brown, Helen Drew, John En-Wong, Kenneth Filarski, L. James Williams, Richard Zigas.

Grace Park: Arnold B. Chace (Chair), John Palmieri, Paul Pawlowski, John Rao, Daniel Warren, Stanley Weiss, Dr. John A. Yena.

Management: Arnold B. Chace (Chair), Mary Kozik, Gerald Lavallee, Charles Mansolillo, Robert McMahon, David Monti, Michael Mulhearn, Kenneth Orenstein, B. James Suzman, L. James Williams.

Parking: Richard Gilbane (Chair), Charles Earlee, Robert Freeman, Thomas Hayden, Charles Meyers, Thomas Moses, Anthony Thomas, John Rao, Richard Zigas.


SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA

Consultants
Calthorpe Associates: Peter Calthorpe (Principal), Shelley Poticha (Project Manager), Rick Williams (Urban Designer), Cindy Sterry (Designer), Catherine Chang (Draftsperson), Joseph Scanga (Draftsperson).

Mayor and City Council
Mayor Susan Hammer, Vice Mayor Pat Sausedo, Councilmembers Blanca Alvarrado, James Beall, Joe Head, Nancy Ianni, Trixie Johnson, Shirley Lewis, David Pandori, George Shirakawa, Judy Stabile.

Planning Department
Gary Schoennauer (Director of Planning), Kent Edens (Deputy Director of Planning), Pat Colombe (Principal Planner), Laurel Prevetti (Senior Planner), Christine Gimmler (Planner II), Suparna Saha (Planning Technician).

Technical Advisory Committee
Ron Conn (Public Works) Stuart Damey (General Services), Mike Dowdle (Police), Chief John Flatley (Fire), Hector Guerra (Redevelopment Agency), John Guisto (Recreation, Parks and Community Services), Leon Kimura (Redevelopment Agency), Calvin Matsui (Streets and Traffic), George McKissick (Neighborhood Maintenance), Joel Slavit (Recreation, Parks and Community Services), Diana Whitecar (Redevelopment Agency), Marina Yu (Housing Department).

Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy Task Force
Manny Diaz (Chair), Aram Amerian (Amerian Brothers), Ken Ashizawa (Japantown Business Association), Bob Brownstein (Mayor’s Office), Stan Davis (Metropolis West), Ron Harper (Hyde Park Neighborhood Association), Ron Johnson (Jackson-Taylor Neighborhood Association), Richard Kogura (Hyde Park Neighborhood Association), John Lococo (Affordable Housing Network), Art Lopez (Jackson-Taylor resident), Steve Malone (Northside Neighborhood Association), Mark Mariani (Mariani Packing Partnership), Gloria Rose Ott (San Jose Nihonmachi Corporation), Jerry Pendleton (Hensley Historic District), Bea Robinson (Jackson-Taylor resident), Dale Yoshihara (Japantown Business Association).
SUISUN CITY, CALIFORNIA

Consultants
ROMA Design Group: Boris Dramov (Principal-in-charge), Jim Adams (Associate Principal, Urban Design), Bonnie Fisherr (Associate Principal, Landscape Architecture), Burton Miller (Associate Principal, Architecture), Rick Barrett, Henry Chaikin, Sean Chiao, Jim Leritz, Frederika Moller, Tom Sargent, Jean Schaffeld, Bruce Teel.

Maffatt & Nichol: Rick Dornhelm (Principal), Emy Carpenter (Engineer).

Mayor and Redevelopment Agency Board
Mayor James Spering (Chairperson), Jane Day (Vice-Chairperson), Boardmembers Steve Dodini, John Rundlett, James Sargent.

City of Suisun City
Redevelopment Agency: Camran Nojoomi (Executive Director), John Coyle (Legal Counsel), MarieBeth Adams (Administrative Assistant), Steven Baker (Project Manager), Thomas Bland (Deputy Director), Nancy Britt (Housing Specialist), Linda Hobson (Administrative Assistant II), Arlevia Livingston (Housing Specialist), Larch Ann McNeill (Senior Planner), Patricia Nickolas (Housing Specialist), Anita Skinner (Administrative Assistant), Susan Zialcita (Relocation Specialist).

Citizens Advisory Committee