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Lately it has become clear that no economy, be it city, regional, or national, can guarantee prosperity or uninterrupted growth. As city after city and country after country faces foreclosures, bankruptcies, and decreasing productivity, we desperately look for systems that can weather the storm, that possess or discover within their borders the assets they need to stay afloat—or to rebuild what they have lost. When we find those cities that have lost only a few jobs or cancelled a small number of projects, we are tempted to believe they have an equilibrium that others lack; but in the end, are there any “resilient cities”, or only resilient people who tenaciously determine what they must maintain and what they must alter in order to adapt to changing circumstances?

This issue of Carolina Planning explores a number of lenses through which resiliency can be viewed. Pierre Clavel and Sara O’Neill-Kohl provide a study of a grassroots movement among factory workers in Chicago in the 1980’s, which recognized the forces of globalization arrayed against domestic industrial jobs, but nevertheless chose to mobilize a network of education and organizing to give workers options other than waiting for the doors to close.

At the same time, on the other side of the world, immigrants to Johannesburg found their own ways of adjusting to the laws and constraints of a legal system that heavily favored landlords, even when the injustices of apartheid gave way to more racial equity. Tanja Winkler writes of the upheaval that came to one inner city neighborhood in Johannesburg and how the vulnerable residents created their own equilibrium in order to carry on life and commerce in a zone that exists almost beyond the law.

Closer to home, five case studies survey cities and towns from the mountains of North Carolina to the Albemarle Sound. In each case, local governments have engaged residents and workers to come up with new uses for abandoned buildings, or new industries for bypassed workforces. Much more than a travelogue through distressed textile or tobacco economies, these snapshots help planners look behind the scenes at the famous success stories of the North Carolina Research Campus in Kannapolis, or the Edenton Mill Village preservation project. In both cases, individuals and organizations made choices and took risks on strategies that enabled new communities to be planted in very traditional cultural settings.

We also hear words of wisdom in interviews with two of planning’s best-known experts: Norman Krumholz and Timothy Beatley. Krumholz, the renowned Cleveland planner and champion of equity planning, shares lessons from his 40-year career and recommends new roles for planners in the 21st century. Beatley, who has traveled the world in search of innovative place-making techniques, highlights his favorite cities and discusses local and global strategies for building sustainable communities.

Honoring a long-standing UNC-Chapel Hill Department of City and Regional Planning tradition, we publish excerpts from the Best Master’s Project of 2008, in which author Michael Schwartz explores the impacts of bicycle parking facilities on Chicago’s rail system. And, continuing with last year’s new feature, we bring you the latest campus news in our Student Connection.

Finally, in our largest book review section to date, current Masters students recommend essential additions to every practitioner’s summer reading list.

Thank you for your readership and continued support of Carolina Planning.
Interview with Norman Krumholz

Carolina Planning Editors
with an introduction by Megan Lewis McConville

Norman Krumholz is a towering figure in the eyes of many planners. A proponent of equity planning—the term Paul Davidoff coined in 1965 to refer to planning for the whole city and prioritizing the needs of populations habitually excluded from the process—he pioneered approaches to improve the quality of life in disadvantaged communities. During Krumholz’s groundbreaking ten years as Cleveland’s planning director from 1969-1979, he put this theory into practice, later describing his experiences in a book entitled Making Equity Planning Work.

Krumholz visited UNC-Chapel Hill on Oct. 9, 2008, to deliver a public lecture titled “New Roles and New Status for Planners.” In the talk, co-sponsored by the Department of City of Regional Planning and the Center for Urban and Regional Studies, Krumholz described how the changing shape of cities poses new challenges for today’s planners. He dispelled several myths about industrial cities, including the belief that “the decline can be reversed and the cities restored to their former glory.” Instead of emphasizing greening efforts, New Urbanism, and blockbuster stadium projects, he said planners should focus on the basics: fixing cities’ schools, services, and safety. In an exclusive Carolina Planning interview, editors Wendy Baucom and Heather Schroeder sat down with Krumholz before his public lecture to speak about the biggest issues facing today’s planners. Given his track record, it may be no surprise that Krumholz encourages planners to continue breaking the mold.

If you were a planner today, where would you want to focus your efforts?

I think the biggest issue facing urban America is what to do with cities like Cleveland and 50 or 60 cities in the Rust Belt of the United States, how to revitalize their economies and how to get them – and particularly their people – back into the mainstream of the American economy. That seems to be, to me, the largest domestic problem we face today.

How does advocacy planning in a Rust Belt city compare to the American South, where we have a host of different problems? The number one problem we have here is sprawl, which is compounded by challenges like immigration and land use.

I think they’re all related, in one way or another. Sprawl obviously is a major land use problem, but to the extent that our cities sprawl, it seems to me that the people who are in the city are further trapped and isolated.

Do you think of sprawl as a racial issue?

Sure, I think there’s a racial dimension to sprawl. I think part of the reason for sprawl is to get away from African Americans, Latinos, and to feel safer with people of your own color and cultural affinity. But, to the extent that we have this untrammeled sprawl and no efforts are made to contain or manage it, the poor it seems to me are further and further isolated from the mainstream, and that’s unfortunate for our society.

Megan Lewis McConville recently graduated from the Department of City and Regional Planning at UNC-Chapel Hill. Wendy Baucom has served as a Carolina Planning editor for two years. She has lived in Durham since 1995. Heather Schroeder grew up in the Rust Belt city of Syracuse, NY. This summer, she is working for a traditional neighborhood developer in Durham.
The state is the key player in dealing with urban sprawl, and the state’s got to say something like, “Here’s our growth and development plan. If you build in these growth development areas that are high priorities, we’ll help with infrastructure, with subsidies—we’ll help in a variety of ways. If you decide not to, we’ll tax you, or at least we won’t help.” Some kind of inducement arrangement, in other words, to try to discourage uncontrolled sprawl.

**Can you think of any states that are doing a particularly good job of it?**

No, not offhand. Oregon, of course, comes to mind immediately as the state that’s the furthest thinking in terms of urban growth limits and sprawl control; and Minnesota, with their revenue sharing, had a good idea to reduce fiscal zoning and things of that sort. Periodically, some state under progressive leadership, like Massachusetts for a period under Dukakis, tried to focus on development in the core rather than on the fringe. And Maryland tried that too. But those are episodic, and when the governor who’s sponsoring that leaves, that seems to be the end of it. We need something that’s institutionalized.

**This sounds like your writings recounting how the planning effort changed with the different mayoral administrations in Cleveland.**

Well, that’s the challenge, really, of equity planning—or of advocacy planning, however you want to refer to it: how do you institutionalize it? And it’s not enough to have APA or AICP sanction somebody who’s not doing the right thing or throw them out of the organization—they’ve never done that, and they never will. But that’s not enough anyhow. The rewards have to be visible. I’m not saying dump big amounts of money on people doing that kind of planning—but the planner who is following the dictates of the ethical rules of his profession should be recognized. And, like I said, it doesn’t have to be a foundation grant for half a million dollars or anything like that: just a certificate. Just have his peers have a little event—buy him lunch—and say, “Here’s a paper certificate, thanks for the bold work that you did.”

**Do you feel recognized for what you did?**

I don’t think so. I think the reason that you know anything about me at all is because I wrote about it. But practicing planners—and I’m convinced many of them are involved in equity planning in one way or another—are not writing about it. And the academy, for whatever reason, is not doing the necessary research to get into that and write about it. There are lots of obvious reasons why practitioners are not writing: there’s really no payoff to that. I don’t mean in money again, I mean in terms of prestige or anything else. So it’s a hard thing to identify where practitioners are engaged in equity planning. But the academics are precisely situated to do that. And they get the rewards from writing and publishing. So there should be more of that.

**Is there nothing at the APA level? There’s the Davidoff Award…**

There’s a Davidoff Award, and there’s an AICP award for best book of the year that’s published, and all that sort of thing. But that’s about the extent of it.

**What settings today do you think are ripe for equity or advocacy planning? What’s the ideal situation in which a planner can go in and represent a community, or does it have to be from the bottom up?**

Well, it should be bottom up, obviously, but equity planning clearly is much easier to do, and is much better received, in an administration of progressive thought. It could be an African-American mayor or an African-American leader, or it also could be a white guy who is more progressive in his ideas. But it doesn’t have to be limited to that. It could be done in situations where you’d least expect it, because for one reason or another, the mayor, or the city manager, sort of has an insight which fits with equity planning. And you never know what the insights are until you test them out and try them.

That’s one of my main gripes of my profession: planners typically don’t try enough. They’re not bold enough to suit my notion of what would be better practice. They worry about being fired or being disciplined by their superior if they get too far off the reservation. But the reservation, unfortunately, doesn’t necessarily include equity as a consideration.

**Do you have any more tips for people who are just entering the planning field?**

Among other things, we’ve been too timid; planning, to a large extent, is whatever planners do. As Alan Altschuler, one of my gurus from my graduate studies, pointed out a long time ago, planning in the United States is “an exercise of extreme administrative discretion.” What that means is you can do what you want to do, within certain limits. And if you test that, you’ll find that that’s true. But nobody in City Hall, or few people in City Hall, really know what the planners are up to. They’ve got some kind of connection with planning and zoning, but beyond that, there’s not much understanding. So, to a large extent, I think planners can define their own work process, and that’s something very few planners do, I’m sorry to say. At least, defining a way that’s oriented toward equity.

**How do you think that equity planning has evolved through the years? What is the current level of acceptance for it?**
Well, it’s very hard to say. I’ve been involved with APA and AICP for 20 years or so, in pretty high positions—board member and president. I’ve gone around to many, many planning chapters around the country. My sense is there’s an awful lot of equity planning taking place, much much more than is being reported, but it’s relatively unknown—it’s under the radar. And maybe that suits the practitioners for a lot of good reasons, but we don’t know about it. Pierre Clavel and I wrote a book about equity planning [Reinventing Cities: Equity Planners Tell Their Stories], and we found undocumented equity planning in a variety of American cities. That’s why we wrote that book. We didn’t want to give anybody the idea that all this stuff in Cleveland, for better or worse, was done by a man on a horse in a highly idiosyncratic condition. What we wanted to do is demonstrate what’s going on among the cities, although not many people were reporting it.

Do the roles of developer and planner tend to work in concert, or against each other?

Again, it depends. Many planners work for developers, as you know, and many planners are more enthusiastic about development than developers are. So, there’s a wide variety. But generally, I don’t think you can get away from the fact that, at its root, planning is a critique of capitalism. It’s a critique of development taking place on an ad hoc basis. Otherwise, why would you need zoning, why would you need planners, why would you need people who raise questions about what developers want to do? So there is kind of that root of criticizing; sometimes we lose sight of that. But the oath you swear when becoming a planning director promises to do the best thing you can for the city, and all the people who live in the city—all the people who live in the city, so you’re not just working for a developer.

North Carolina has one of the fastest-growing Hispanic populations in the country. The cities are struggling to balance the needs of a new and growing minority group with the established African-American populations.

Well, I don’t think you can distinguish between the “downtrodden” in general—I hate to use that word. The people who are generally not included in the city decision-making—I think they all have to be considered as equally deserving. And parenthetically, if you could figure out a way to send some of your documented or undocumented Mexican-Americans to Cleveland, that would be very nice. We’d be very happy to get anybody.

Why do you think that Cleveland has been “missed” by Hispanic/Latino immigration patterns?

Jobs. I think that’s it, in a word, in a nutshell. And, when you come right down to it, the people who came to Cleveland from Eastern Europe in the 1880s through 1920, when Cleveland was the fifth largest city in the United States, came there not because of amenities or growth management or clean air or raging surf; they came because they thought they could get jobs and work and live, and have a chance at the mainstream -- buy a house, provide for their children. And that continues to be a meritorious objective. So, I think we’d get all the immigration we’d want if we had a big pool of jobs, similar to the one we had in the last century.

In the ’70s, did you believe that Cleveland would just continue shrinking, or was there a thought that this trend could be stopped and even reversed?

It was very very clear that what was going on was a major long-term trend. In the ’70s, the trend of decline had been going on since the ’50s. Now the trend has been going on for 60 years, so it’s not a blip on the radar screen. And you could see who was leaving, and who had money, and who was staying and didn’t have money, or affluence, or power.
Do you think that equity planning is still one of the best ways to address urban racial issues?

No, it’s just the best way I know. It would be nice if there were no such thing as anti-black sentiment. That would be terrific if no one was racist, and it would be particularly nice if, in our system, CEOs and corporate executives and mayors and presidents and all those people actually practiced what they were preaching; that would be very nice indeed. But, that’s not my business essentially; my field is planning. And in that field, that’s the best thing that I know to do.

Were you ever tempted to go into politics instead?

No. You need a level of ego—I have some ego, but not that much ego.

As you look back at your experience in Cleveland, is there anything that you would have done differently during your years in the planning office?

I don’t really think so. I think the kinds of things that we were doing during the ’70s when I was planning director were really right on the money, and I think the city should have done more of those afterwards. What the city has done, instead, has been to turn away from concerns about the basics, which are fundamental to the whole city— not only to the poor population, but to everybody in the city. “The basics” means better safety services, better educational services, better garbage services—the stuff that makes the city run. And instead, the city has invested a lot of money in downtown big-bang projects—stadiums, the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, and stuff like that. I don’t think that was a wise expenditure of public money.

What legacy is left from your tenure?

Some things, I think, have been retained; for example, almost all of the city’s $26 million Community Development Block Grant goes to the neighborhoods. And the neighborhood organizations, which have become CDCs, have become pretty proficient—many of them are as good as any development company you’d want to see. And there’s a structure there, an industry, that includes the CDCs, the intermediaries—like Enterprise Community Partners and LISC—and the city and the community are very supportive of them. And we, my staff and I, did a lot to help nurture that complex of neighborhood organizations. So that’s something to feel good about. And the notion that you could give money to CDCs and it made sense to incorporate them into the planning and the development of the general plan is, I think, an important legacy. So there’s something.

Given how big an issue environmental concerns are for planners today, how does the concept of “going green” fit in with equity planning?

One of the things that advocacy planners try to do is keep the landfills from ending up in the black neighborhood, and a whole variety of locally unwanted land uses ending up in minority communities. So there’s a big role for advocacy in the situation. And obviously other issues related to equity and the environment include sprawl and the side effects of sprawl, the need for new roads, infrastructure, the water pollution and the air pollution that goes on through sprawl.

Do the typical greening efforts serve a different audience than equity planning does? So many initiatives are targeted toward middle-income home owners for energy-efficient appliances or solar panels. Does that lessen the emphasis on serving other groups?

Yes it does; and to the extent that planners emphasize the environment over equity issues, and can’t see a way to combine the two—that could also take emphasis away. That’s always a danger, because ideas come along that sort of flash along the planning skies for a little while, and then they burn out. But some ideas, like improving the environment, I think will be a very long-lasting phenomenon. But to the extent that it detracts from equity issues, that’s unfortunate. I still come back, again and again, to the fact that it’s the equity issues that really plague our society. You’ve got to do something about the environment, clearly, but it’s fundamentally the social issues—the issues of injustice and imbalance—that are most perilous to our representation of ourselves as an equal-opportunity society.

It’s very hard for most people, I think, to say all men are created equal, and everybody should have an equal opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and see the evident discrepancy between the life chances of this person in this group and the life chances of that person in that group.

What kind of impact is the foreclosure crisis having in Cleveland right now?

Devastating. And, to an extent that I don’t deeply understand yet, it’s heartbreaking. As an example, there is a CDC named the Slavic Village Development Corporation, which has been operating for 25 or 30 years. Some of my staff members are involved there; some of our best students; some of the people coming out of the neighborhood itself are extraordinarily competent administrators. And Slavic Village is now the focal point for the foreclosure crisis in the whole United States. I mean, the extent of fraud and targeting of vulnerable populations that has taken place there, and hundreds if not thousands of homes are now abandoned there, many of which are going to ultimately end up being stripped, vandalized, and demolished—just a tragedy. But I had my neighborhood planning class in the spring working on Slavic Village, trying to do something that’ll improve things.
Will the foreclosures lead to some redesign of neighborhoods?

No question. For better or worse, there’s going to be more vacant land. There’s a ton of vacant land already. And so, what you do with the vacant land becomes a major issue, a major design/land-use planning issue, and I expect there’ll be a lot more community gardens, farms of limited acreage, paths through neighborhoods where vacant parcels exist; and a lot more diversification of the city—of lots it takes into the land bank—to abutting property owners: “You live there, Mrs. Jones, you want the parcel next to you? Here it is, it’s yours.” Other ideas that are maybe off the wall; for example, I think that one of the things that cities struggling from major disinvestments should consider is ways to sell off part of the city. I don’t expect any mayor is going to take that kind of a proposal seriously, since we’re all interested in growth, but the reality is if you’ve got thousands and thousands and thousands of vacant parcels, and they can be assembled in kind of a reasonable way, maybe you can make a case for taking those parcels and selling them to a developer, and saying “Do what you want with it” — essentially, “Buy the land from us, so that we can have some money to spend on the rest of the city, but develop it any way you want.”

I mean, the driving motivation for most political figures in our society is growth. So you’ve got to have growth. If you’re not growing, you’re declining; if you’re declining, you’re on your way to death. And nobody wants to die. We’re all into youth and vitality and so on, but the fact is, you can’t duplicate it over and over again. So the question is, “What do you do with all the vacant land?” We’re just beginning to see the innovative uses of vacant land that are taking place.

You know when I was in your situation, in graduate school at Cornell, our teachers said to us, “You’re the guys with the white hats. You control growth in the public interest, because these nasty developers in the black hats come in and try to rape the city and not pay any attention to the public interest, and you are the defenders of the public interest.” And that was very very nice, and we’re supposed to restrain the developers. But nothing I learned in graduate school prepared me for a situation where there were no developers, there were no people who were interested in buying the land and developing. It’s a different kind of situation.
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Kwere Kwere

A Story of a Resilient Inner City Neighborhood in Johannesburg, South Africa

Tanja Winkler

Neighbourhood change in Hillbrow is not concomitant with linear processes of urban decline and economic resurgence. Instead, change is shaped by the history, politics and economics of the local context, in addition to the activities of local actors. Despite severe physical decay, a history of redlining, and limited public sector support, Hillbrow remains a resilient port-of-entry neighbourhood to Johannesburg for many who desire to engage in local and transnational economies.

Introduction

Kwere Kwere traditionally is a derogatory term used by South Africans to label Other foreign Africans. It literally refers to the sound of foreign African languages now ‘flooding’ South African cities, and it is a term that I first came across in Johannesburg’s most densely populated and socially diverse inner city neighbourhood, Hillbrow. Of significance is how this term instills disrespect for, and a fear of, the Other. Referring to others as Kwere Kwere has become associated with contemporary Hillbrow because most foreign nationals from other African countries, whether documented or not, first establish themselves in this inner city neighbourhood. But Hillbrow also attracts many South African citizens who equally hope to engage in Johannesburg’s perceived employment opportunities. Hillbrow therefore functions as a port-of-entry to Johannesburg and to the country of South Africa: for the purpose of this paper, Kwere Kwere is used to recognize this role and its importance. One of the proofs that Hillbrow functions in this way is the fact that at least 39 percent of Hillbrow’s current residents are foreign-born (Leggett, 2003); 68 percent of its total population moved to this neighbourhood in the last five years; and 90 percent of Hillbrow’s current residents did not live here in 1994, when the apartheid regime was officially dismantled (Simone, 2004).

Since the ending of apartheid, neither an inclusive cosmopolitan inner city context nor a pan-Africanist consciousness has emerged to replace politics as division. Instead, the City of Johannesburg is responding to Hillbrow’s transitional character by demonizing this neighbourhood, and by implementing urban regeneration policies with the purpose of “cleaning-up” the inner city (CoJ, ICRC, 2007). Accordingly, “Hillbrow is renowned for two things: immigrants and crime. It is arguably the most feared neighbourhood in the entire country” (Leggett, 2003: 25). Immigrants and crime are thus conflated; and “dealing with” immigrants and crime entails implementing “intensive urban management” strategies via regular police raids in Hillbrow.

The Johannesburg Area Police Commissioner claims that:

The only way to stop the mayhem is to tackle criminals head-on with military-style raids on crime-ridden buildings in Hillbrow. It’s neither pretty nor easy, and it sparks mayhem of its own. Often innocent people’s rights get trampled. But, there is no other way to save the city from sliding irrevocably into the abyss. When we have returned to normalcy we won’t need to crack down anymore.

(“Financial Mail”, 2003: 13)

This media account discloses the dominant political realities at play in Hillbrow to the exclusion of any other understanding of this port-of-entry context. It buys into the prevailing perception of chaos. Only a partial reference is made to the majority of Hillbrow residents

Tanja Winkler is a senior lecturer at the School of Architecture and Planning, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. She completed a Ph.D. on resident-led regeneration in Hillbrow in January 2006 from the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, and she has worked as an urban design consultant and a municipal official on the Newtown Cultural Precinct and for the Thames Gateway London Partnership, respectively.
who are not involved in “criminal activities,” who are being placed in situations of fear and anxiety, and whose daily lives are continually disrupted by these actions.

Furthermore, this media report spotlights the City of Johannesburg’s current urban regeneration aim. Thirty years of disinvestment and white flight from the inner city of Johannesburg recently prompted the municipality to implement a plethora of investor-friendly policies to re-attract private capital and middle class households (see Winkler, 2009b). Contrary to global North experiences, however, decades of capital and white flight resulted neither in a depopulation of Hillbrow nor in a vacant, boarded-up landscape. Rather, informal socioeconomic activities coupled with a significant inward migration of job seekers have transformed Hillbrow. Today, the great majority of Hillbrow’s residents are poor. Many rely on the informal sector to survive, and many reside in physically dilapidated buildings. But informal socioeconomic activities, physical deterioration, assumed pathological problems, and a doubling of Hillbrow’s resident population are perceived by municipal officials and politicians as undesirable obstacles in achieving their “World Class African City” vision (CoJ, ICRC, 2007).

By means of an in-depth case study combined with personal observation, this paper conceptualizes Hillbrow as an ever-changing but resilient neighbourhood, in order to present an alternative understanding of this context. Despite rapid socioeconomic and political change, Hillbrow continues to thrive albeit in a manner different from state officials’ understanding of thriving. Research findings presented in this paper are based on 33 open-ended interviews with community leaders, development facilitators, residents, and senior City of Johannesburg officials.

The paper’s first section discusses the landlord and tenant responses to a series of laws that had great impact on Hillbrow, and the second section describes how the neighborhood has resisted marginalization by finding and maintaining an important role in the life of the city. The sidebar on page 11 explains well-known South African terms that may be unfamiliar to American readers.

**Revisiting Hillbrow’s History of Change**

While the 1960s saw an unprecedented boom in the construction of high-rise apartments in Hillbrow, by the late 1970s the supply of residential units began to exceed demand due to an economic recession and growing political instability (Brodie, 2008). Up until
then, Hillbrow also functioned as a desired port-of-entry location for a steady flow of European immigrants to Johannesburg. However, “in the short period between 1978 and 1982, the racial composition of Hillbrow was altered” (Morris, 1994: 821). Before the late 1970s, few landlords would have risked renting apartments to black tenants in racially segregated White Group Areas like Hillbrow. But by the end of the decade the South African economy had collapsed, and the apartheid state was no longer financially able to build houses in Coloured, Indian and African Group Areas. An oversupply of accommodation in Hillbrow, and a chronic shortage of housing in Coloured, Indian and African Group Areas, forced black households to seek alternative accommodation in Hillbrow. This prompted the first wave of white flight from Hillbrow. Additionally, the Soweto uprising of 1976 profoundly altered the political and economic landscape of South Africa. On a micro scale, Hillbrow, with its sizeable European immigrant population, witnessed a rapid exodus of white foreigners following the uprising.

The exodus of white tenants from Hillbrow was further fueled by changes in the Rent Control Act in 1978. This allowed for landlords to charge market-aligned rents to new leaseholders only, as rent control continued to apply to units occupied by original tenants. According to Morris (1994), landlords employed various covert tactics to “encourage” protected tenants to vacate their apartments. These tactics included terminating maintenance contracts on buildings to force original, white tenants to move. Landlords hoped to fill vacant apartments with tenants who would not be in a position to challenge the legality of rent increases: namely, Coloured and Indian (and later African) tenants, who were illegal under the Group Areas Act and were desperate to find accommodation. Leasing to such households, while Hillbrow was still classified as a White Group Area, resulted in the exploitation of new residents by landlords “who would charge illegal tenants considerably more than the going rate” (Morris, 1994: 826).

The municipality’s initial response to the demographic change in Hillbrow was restrained. And prior to a media exposé of “the new phenomenon taking place in Hillbrow,” tenants had not been charged with contravening the Group Areas Act (The Star, 1982). For the state, this “phenomenon” of non-white residency alleviated a housing crisis. However, once the story broke, the City Council was forced to react by issuing Coloured and Indian tenants with eviction notices. But tenants refused to move, as they had nowhere else to go. Instead, they began to organize themselves by seeking legal representation from the Action Committee to Stop Evictions (ACTSTOP). This collective community action began to change the balance of power, and by March 1981, charges against 157 households were withdrawn (Morris, 1994). Hillbrow’s Indian and Coloured tenants ultimately clinched their victory in 1982 when, in the milestone court case of Govender versus the State, Judge Richard Goldstone declared Group Area evictions unjust. “This practice has to be halted unless suitable, alternative accommodation is available,” he said (Goldstone, cited in The Star, 1982: 32). The financially strapped apartheid state found no alternative accommodation, and consequently Coloured and Indian residents secured their right to live in a White Group Area. However, this victory did not lead to the abolition of the Group Areas Act. Instead, Hillbrow was officially reclassified as a Grey Group Area, and this reclassification prompted financial institutions to redline Hillbrow. Nor was the victory of reclassification successful in preventing landlords from exploiting tenants, particularly when property values plummeted after the neighbourhood was redlined. To recoup their losses, landlords then turned to black South Africans, who were not protected under the Govender ruling. At first only a few black South Africans moved to Hillbrow. But from the mid 1980s onward, many more sought accommodation there due to the intensification of violence in segregated black townships and the scrapping of the Influx Control Act. Hillbrow offered them an improved quality of life, access to inner city facilities and job opportunities, and a “sense of escape” from implosive township politics (Gotz and Simone, 2003). Nonetheless, “landlords escalated rents significantly once black tenants moved in, and in some cases the rent more than doubled” (Morris, 1999: 517). Crankshaw and White (1995) argue that in order to meet inflated charges, many tenants had no option but to resort to subletting their apartments. Subletting practices, in turn, created severe overcrowding, and overburdened the already stressed infrastructure.

After the apartheid era ended in the early 1990s, South Africa’s border controls were relaxed. As a consequence, transnational migration from other African countries began. And for many who sought work and other opportunities in Johannesburg, Hillbrow became the preferred entryway into the new South Africa (Crush and McDonald, 2002).

A final key piece of legislation was the Sectional Titles Act of 1971. This Act enabled landlords to sell individual apartments within a building. In terms of the Act, individual apartment owners automatically became members of a Body (management) Corporate, which, in turn, was responsible for collecting levies for general building maintenance projects and for paying municipal rates, taxes and services. Converting buildings to sectional title became a widespread practice in Hillbrow, and by the late 1970s almost 70 percent of Hillbrow’s buildings were under this ownership (Morris, 1999). Initially, most units were owner-occupied, but “by the mid 1990s only 16 percent of apartments were occupied by their owners” (Morris, 1999: 515), and most Body
Corporates had disintegrated. As a result, necessary maintenance projects and municipal debts were neglected. Sectional title buildings are currently in the worst state of decay, and they are millions of dollars in municipal arrears. Moreover, many landlords have abandoned their apartments. To address this problem, the City of Johannesburg is facilitating a Better Buildings Programme (BBP), discussed in the next section.

**Conceptualizing Hillbrow’s Vibrant Role in the City**

Since the late 1970s, Hillbrow’s population has increased by 130 percent, without a complementary growth in the provision of physical stock (Statistics South Africa, 2004). Here, more than 100,000 residents try to eke out a livelihood with inadequate resources, scant public sector support, and barely discernible urban infrastructure (Tomlinson, 2003). Resident incomes vary from zero to $32,000 per annum. But 69 percent of Hillbrow’s residents earn between $130 and $500 per month, which barely covers the cost of renting an apartment as rents range from $130 to $200 per month (Winkler, 2008). Moreover, 39 percent of Hillbrow’s South African residents are officially unemployed, and at least 10 percent of the unemployed rely exclusively on the informal economy to survive (Leggett, 2003).

Hillbrow has also become an anchor for conventional and unconventional small- to medium-sized trading across the continent (Crush and McDonald, 2002; Simone, 2004). Cross-border traders from other African countries travel back and forth, often on two-week visitor visas, to buy and sell commodities (Simone, 2004). For these mobile traders, “home” in Hillbrow is often a long-stay hotel. At the same time, Hillbrow is viewed as a temporary destination by refugees from war-torn African countries (Landau, 2005). A significant number of residents, whether South African or not, are therefore transient and do not perceive this neighbourhood as a long-term investment, either financially or emotionally. Rather, Hillbrow is perceived as the place from which migrants can start to access economic opportunities that may enable them to return home with enhanced purchasing power (Englund, 2002; Gotz and Simone, 2003). But this rarely happens.

If residents happen to stay in Hillbrow for a long time, it’s not because they intend to do so. They want to improve their economic conditions to a level [from] where they can move on without investing in the place itself. Residents always talk about going home.

(Interviewee 3, community leader, 2004)

For all of these reasons, municipal officials and local politicians define Hillbrow as a “dysfunctional” neighbourhood in desperate need of regeneration. “Hillbrow really is a major problem. And because it is such a big problem it impacts negatively on the regeneration of other parts of the inner city” (Interviewee 25, municipal official, 2004). From this perspective, Hillbrow has become a threat to the City Council in

---

**SOME KEY TERMS IN APARTHEID HISTORY**

**Group Areas Act** (1950): Following on the heels of the Population Registration Act which divided residents into White, African, Asian and Coloured races, this law assigned separate residential and business areas for each race in all urban settings. Although legally subject to prosecution, many non-whites began slowly moving into White areas in the 1980s. Hillbrow was the first location to be officially designated as a “Grey Area,” where different races were allowed to live together.

**Soweto Uprising** (1976): A student strike began in the African township of Soweto, southwest of Johannesburg, when students protested mandatory Afrikaans-medium education. The protest turned violent and 23 students were killed by the police, sparking more riots and massive police response. The event galvanized the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and abroad, contributing to economic instability and a renewed international media focus on the apartheid regime.

**Influx Control Act** (1923, abolished in 1986): Officially called the Native Black Urban Areas Act, this law established cities and towns as white domains into which black Africans were allowed only as labor. All blacks were to reside in townships outside white urban areas, the only exception being domestic workers who were allowed to stay with the families that hired them.
achieving its desired “world class city” vision: “Strategic interventions, by way of zero-tolerance law enforcement, will therefore normalise Hillbrow to restore private sector confidence in the area” (CoJ, RSDF, 2003b: 75). Strategic interventions include, among a host of other urban management strategies, facilitating the Better Buildings Programme (BBP). This involves the writing-off of arrears on identified “bad buildings” and transferring the ownership of these buildings to private sector developers for renovation.

“Bad buildings” are abandoned by their sectional title owners, but they are occupied, informally, by residents who are unable to find affordable accommodation through the private housing market (Winkler, 2009a; 2009b). While living conditions in these buildings are abysmal, “they house the poorest and most vulnerable residents of the inner city” (Wilson and du Plessis, 2005: 3). At least 250 “bad buildings” have been identified by the municipality for its BBP. However, “new developers want empty occupation because they can’t fix a bad building unless we get rid of the people” (Interviewee 22, municipal official, 2004). As a result, “the City of Johannesburg exercises its power in terms of the National Building Regulations and Building Standards Act, of 1977, which empowers a local authority to order the evacuation of a property that poses a threat to the health and safety of those occupying it” (Wilson and du Plessis, 2005: 4). Hillbrow’s “bad buildings” are currently occupied by approximately 25,000 residents, and capital investments required to renovate dilapidated buildings exclude many evictees from being able to afford renovated building rents (Tillim, 2005). Of equal concern, legislation promulgated under the apartheid regime is still used to empower local authorities in performing evictions. Since 2002, 125 inner city buildings have been cleared, resulting in the eviction of thousands of residents without the City Council providing suitable alternative accommodation for evictees (Wilson and du Plessis, 2005). History repeats itself because municipal officials and politicians fail to learn from past experiences. In February of 2008, the Constitutional Court ruled in favour of inner city tenants who, with the assistance of another public interest law group (the Centre for Applied Legal Studies), took the City Council to court on the basis of unjust evictions (Winkler, 2009a). Consequently, the City of Johannesburg was ordered by the Constitutional Court to provide “the occupiers of [bad buildings] with alternative, affordable and safe accommodation in the inner city where they may live secure against eviction” (RSACC, 2008: 2).
This development suggests that Hillbrow may continue to hold out in the face of political processes based on asymmetrical power relations. This is because in spite of severe physical decay, a history of redlining, and limited public sector support, Hillbrow continues to function as a popular port-of-entry to Johannesburg for many who desire to engage in local and transnational economies. Port-of-entry neighbourhoods typically facilitate readjustment, enable some degree of normlessness, and allow diverse cultural customs to be practiced (Abu-Lughod, 1994; Wacquant, 1999). They are temporary places of abode, a place where people can “land”, find their feet, and strengthen their networks before ultimately moving. While a portion of residents may be settled in such neighbourhoods for many years, another segment will constantly be on the move (Winkler, 2008). Hillbrow is such a neighbourhood: a popular, transitional, and continuously evolving urban realm. As one resident said:

Hillbrow will continue to be popular, and it will always be the first place for whoever wants to make it. They will come to Hillbrow. Life in Hillbrow is tough. It is also a place with many foreigners. But people get the wrong information about Hillbrow. Not all foreigners are involved in illegal businesses. Most are hard working people. I like all the different people who live here: that’s what makes Hillbrow a special place.

(Interviewee 10, resident, 2004)

Theories such as Hoover and Vernon’s (1959) “neighbourhood life cycle model”, Schelling’s (1972) “invasion and succession model”, Grigsby’s (et al. 1987) “filtering hypothesis”, and Quercia and Galster’s (2000) “neighborhood threshold change model” are inadequate conceptual frameworks for a Hillbrow-specific case study. Conceptual models subscribe to a presumed linear inevitability of neighbourhood decline before an economic resurgence may be envisaged, and in the process they ignore the complexities of human affairs and situated socio-political structures. They also ignore the unjust consequences of gentrification and they oversimplify the ability of the liberal economy to rationally distribute urban populations.

Hillbrow has grown accustomed to rapid structural, demographic, political, economic, and social change. While some changes have disempowered residents, others have opened opportunities for residents to access the city and to share in its resources. For some residents, Hillbrow offers a needed anonymity; for others, more freedom of choice; and for still others, the ability to claim rights denied elsewhere. These variables alone nullify a presumed linear inevitability of Hillbrow’s future. Abu-Lughod (1994) and Wacquant (1999) argue for a ruthless deconstruction of the “one-dimensional poor neighborhood” concept, typified as a no-go zone with unbridled pathological problems. Wacquant’s (1996) study of inner-city neighborhoods in Chicago demonstrates how dominant socio-political structures systematically deny residents access to mainstream economic and political powers. Accordingly, Wacquant dismisses a “blame-the-victim” ideology implicit in “culture of poverty” discourses, which is how City of Johannesburg officials currently view Hillbrow.

Similarly, Abu-Lughod’s (1994) study of the East Village in New York provides an alternative understanding of neighborhood change. Like Hillbrow, the East Village is a quintessential transitional neighborhood, if density, heterogeneity, relative anonymity, informality, a large proportion of tenant occupiers, and geographical mobility define such a type. However, transitional neighbourhoods are usually perceived by state officials as dysfunctional, and their response to this perceived “dysfunctionality” often leads to zero-tolerance law enforcement. Zero-tolerance strategies, in turn, heighten feelings of mistrust between the local state and neighbourhood residents. In addition, like Hillbrow, the East Village has always been a port-of-entry for newcomers to the city. To some extent, the present population diversity found in the East Village represents a cross-section of temporal succession, with newer groups overlaying earlier ones. This is equally true for Hillbrow. Stability in both of these inner-city neighbourhoods has therefore always been a fragile construct. Still, diverse resident constituencies lead to shifting networks of cooperation and conflict that have their own rhythms and fluctuations (Abu-Lughod, 1994). This alerts us to seek variables other than sheer diversity to explain urban change and resilience. It also requires uncovering the underlying causes of change and resilience that are shaped by a neighbourhood’s history, politics, and economics, and by the activities (and agencies) of local actors.

Conclusion

Research findings have shown how neighborhood change in Hillbrow did not conform to free-market rationalities or to linear processes of decline and economic resurgence. Instead, change was shaped by the political and economic crisis that was taking place in South Africa during the 1970s and 1980s, and this crisis led to the reclassification of Hillbrow as a Grey Group Area. As a consequence, Hillbrow was redlined by financial institutions while public maintenance and services deteriorated. In addition, landlord greed, neglect, and the mismanagement of property all contributed to change and the subsequent physical degeneration of Hillbrow. Findings have also shown how legislation and neighbourhood change are intrinsically entwined and how legislation has profound (and destructive, in the case of Hillbrow) spatial ramifications. Some of
the underlying causes of neighbourhood change and resilience were discussed, demonstrating how history, politics, economics, and the activities of the state and residents—rather than a simple assessment of diversity—have been and will continue to be major determinants of change in Hillbrow.

Today, despite the implementation of intensive urban management strategies, property values continue to depreciate, service industries are not returning to the neighbourhood, and the exploitation of tenants by landlords persists. Regardless of these findings, Hillbrow remains a popular inner city neighborhood and the demand for accommodation continues to exceed supply. However, high rates of unemployment, residents’ chronic stress levels, xenophobia, physical decay, and crime collectively warrant a critical view of Hillbrow’s future. Although authorities persistently view Hillbrow as a dysfunctional neighborhood that can only be “saved” via zero-tolerance, Hillbrow’s strengths as a functional port-of-entry to Johannesburg are not recognized through this lens. Only by reconceptualizing this neighborhood can the city begin to support, enhance and celebrate the fact that Hillbrow provides newcomers and transitional residents alike with opportunities to access the city, share in its resources, and experience freedoms and rights unknown in their places of origin.
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Endnotes

1. For the South African state, “legal” foreign nationals are either in possession of a work or a student permit. Legal status is also awarded to refugees via the issuing of a Refugee Identity Card, while asylum seekers awaiting their refugee status are issued temporary Section 22 permits. All other foreign nationals residing in South Africa are deemed “illegal” or undocumented by the state.
2. These landlords were all white as black South Africans were precluded from owning property in designated White Group Areas.
3. ACTSTOP constituted fifty members of Johannesburg’s legal fraternity who volunteered their time to defend Hillbrow’s residents charged with transgressing the Group Areas Act.
4. The Group Areas Act was only abolished in 1990.
5. The scrapping of the Influx Control Act allowed black South Africans to move freely between urban centres (Morris, 1999).
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Local Innovation in Community and Economic Development:
Stories from Asheville, Edenton, Kannapolis, Wilson and Winston-Salem

with an introduction by Will Lambe and Tyler Mulligan

While North Carolina has realized tremendous success in economic development over the last decade, some parts of the state have fared better than others. The diverse economy of our urban corridor and the natural amenities of our state’s western and coastal communities have yielded new residents, jobs and the development of new economic opportunities. Rural communities that once thrived on the business of agriculture or manufacturing have fared less well and continue to struggle with out-migration, business closings and reduced economic opportunities.

In the middle of the spectrum, between our most urban and rural communities, there are an increasing number of cities and towns in North Carolina that have evolved from one-industry towns to communities with diverse local economies. These are what this issue refers to as “Resilient Cities.” For example, during several periods in the 20th century, Wilson was the world’s largest flue-cured tobacco market. Today, Wilson hosts a diverse mix of financial, pharmaceutical and technology-based industries. Similarly, Kannapolis was home to Pillowtex, a textile manufacturer employing thousands of local residents. Pillowtex closed its doors in 2003 and the plant was demolished in 2006. Today, the former Pillowtex property has been transformed into the North Carolina Research Campus (NCRC), which will host research facilities from seven major universities and create thousands of research-based jobs.

The process of economic evolution illustrated by case studies from Asheville, Edenton, Kannapolis, Winston Salem, and Wilson can be credited, at least in part, to innovative or new approaches to community and economic development (CED). The case studies in this issue focus on resilient towns and cities that have created diverse economies through locally-initiated CED initiatives. This introduction will describe seven characteristics of innovation in CED that have been distilled from the case studies and will provide several examples to illustrate each characteristic. It will conclude with general comments about the state or federal role in encouraging innovation in local CED.

Local Ingredients for Innovation in Community and Economic Development

Innovation in CED is a moving target. An innovative (or new) practice in one place may not be innovative in another. What makes a particular approach to development innovative depends on the context in which the practice is being implemented. There are, however, several general characteristics of innovation that can be gleaned from the resilient cities profiled in this issue. These characteristics, which address more the process than the substance of innovation, might be considered “local ingredients for innovation in CED.”

William Lambe, M.P.P., is the Associate Director of the Community and Economic Development Program at the School of Government, UNC-Chapel Hill. In addition to research and consulting work focusing on rural development, Mr. Lambe manages the Community Campus Partnership, a university-wide initiative to match the campus’ resources to the challenges and opportunities facing economically distressed communities in North Carolina.
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Proactive and future-oriented leaders who will embrace change and assume risk

Community leaders are the facilitators of, or the barriers to, innovation. Without local leaders to push and implement new ways of doing things, innovative practices, in whatever form they take, will fall short. These characteristics of innovative leadership—proactive, future oriented and risk-taking—perhaps relate to the fact that innovation often results when communities “hit the bottom,” forcing local leaders to try new things and take new risks. These leaders believe in finding the glimmer of opportunity that accompanies every crisis.

When the Edenton Cotton Mill announced its closing in 1995, town leaders sought to uncover the opportunity presented by this setback. The town identified Preservation North Carolina as a partner and began to guide the community toward a strategy of preserving the mill and surrounding village. The initiative did not meet with immediate success. The town’s initial idea of a public arts facility proved infeasible. In response, Edenton leaders revised the marketing plan to attract private investment. This approach also yielded nothing, as private developers could not identify a financially-viable use for the mills. Town leaders continued to persevere, and Edenton eventually moved forward with a proposal for a residential development that was successfully completed. Asheville’s transformation from a city with a vacant and blighted downtown to one of the most popular and notable downtowns in the state was driven by risk-taking leadership that consistently invested in historic preservation efforts over a period of decades in order to revitalize downtown. The City of Wilson responded to a series of setbacks for its downtown with a positive initiative, making a forward-thinking investment in fiber-optic connectivity, even after private fiber-optic providers backed out.

Strong foundation of social and civic capital

The leaders in these innovative communities did not work behind closed doors, out of view of the citizenry, nor did they attempt to take decision-making out of the hands of the community. To the contrary, these leaders often relied upon citizens, social networks, and important civic organizations to carry out the community’s goals. These leaders leveraged existing “social capital” to gain access to broader social networks, and formed productive partnerships with strong civic organizations within the community.

The Edenton case study demonstrates the potential impact of “bridging social capital,” in which social connections are used to reach outside a community in order to bring resources or expertise into the community. Edenton leaders drew upon an existing social network to identify and secure Preservation North Carolina as a partner for the Mill Village project. That initial partnership not only provided the means for securing the mill for the town through a donation, but also was the key to developing and implementing the full scope of the mill village project. Furthermore, Edenton leaders engaged the public and benefited from civic participation. Public input provided the impetus for building a public boardwalk in the mill village. Edenton also took the opportunity to invest in the future of its rich reservoir of social and civic capital by preserving green space in the mill village to create additional opportunities for citizens to gather and connect with each other.

The Asheville case study illustrates how leaders of communities with strong social and civic capital need not take risks alone. The author of the Asheville case study explains that public officials in Asheville took a leadership role and assumed the greatest political risk for failure associated with its downtown revitalization, but also points out that “hundreds of people” contributed to the core of “leadership, vision and funding.” Asheville’s civic strength was evident as strong partnerships between public, private, and nonprofit sectors proved to be a key factor in the successful revitalization of downtown.

Widely shared local vision

Innovative communities establish and maintain a broadly held vision, including goals for all manner of development activities with measurable objectives. In CED, people (as opposed to money or other resources) are the one absolutely necessary ingredient to implementing and sustaining innovative practices. A committed group of local residents who are willing to work hard to support the community’s vision can change the fate of an otherwise hopeless community. A widely shared vision provides local innovators with a common understanding of the road ahead.

In Edenton, local leaders engaged the community in dozens of meetings to determine the future of the mill village. Perhaps the most efficient path forward in Edenton would have been to demolish the mill village and prepare the property for new development, but that is not what the residents of the community wanted. Residents preferred to focus on preservation, rehabilitation and reuse, which became the vision for community’s path forward. Similarly, in the late 1990s, and in the face of continuing layoffs at the Pillowtex facility, leaders in Kannapolis came together to plan for a more diverse local economy in a process dubbed “Weaving a Shared Future.” Leaders in Winston-Salem have reinvented the community several times over, most recently with the vision to become a hub of commerce for biotechnology with Bowman-Gray School of Medicine at the center of the hub.

Comprehensive approach—community development is economic development

If community development—compared to economic development—is generally considered to include a
broader set of activities aimed at building the capacity of a community, then these towns and cities demonstrate that capacity-building and other strategies typically associated with community development are analogous with actions designed to produce economic outcomes. In other words, these cases illustrate that sometimes the best way to attract jobs and investment is to set goals and make investments which reach beyond merely creating jobs and investment. This observation implicitly recognizes that innovative development is multi-faceted. There is no universally applicable formula for determining the right way or the most innovative way to do CED. Innovation is context-specific, and community leaders should take nothing off the table in selecting strategies to pursue. Decisions about what to do and why to do it must be based on local conditions, context, and capacity.

In Edenton, upon the announcement that the cotton mill was closing, town leaders were concerned with the blight and loss of family housing, in addition to the loss of jobs. The strategy pursued by the town was centered on job creation (a typical economic development goal) but incorporated broader community development goals as well. For example, town leaders saw the value in preserving affordable housing; restoring a wetlands creek bed to preserve and provide access to the community’s natural assets; preserving the mill village as an historic cultural asset; and connecting the site to the town center.

Likewise in Asheville, on its way to becoming the thriving and popular downtown destination that it is today, city leaders took a broader approach than simply creating a favorable business climate downtown. Rather, they spent decades building up the civic capital of the community, forming and nurturing organizations, partnerships, and future leaders that would carry the community forward. Furthermore, Asheville included housing as part of its strategy to attract the right mix of residents and small businesses, and it invested in its cultural assets, cultivating a creative class to build and sustain its arts industry. Kannapolis developed a more narrow economic development focus as part of its recovery strategy following the Pillowtex plant closing, but it still included community development investments in transportation, parks, recreation, and preservation of historic and cultural buildings.

**Broad definition of assets and opportunities**

In most communities, shell buildings, low tax rates, limited regulation, and access to trained workers, highways, railroads, or professional services are considered economic development assets and justifiably so. Innovative communities, however, define economic development assets in a much broader framework. These communities recognize that community development assets which are good for residents are also good for attracting economic development.

For example, Edenton’s century-old mill village, though in need of significant rehabilitation, was perceived as an asset, not a liability. Similarly, in Wilson, community organizations have been active in the pursuit of vacant historic properties, particularly in the downtown area, to restore luster to neglected areas and to retain a sense of the community’s shared history and culture. In the view of innovative communities, these buildings serve a larger purpose than merely commercial space. Downtown Asheville, which was nearly vacant in the mid-1970s, has built itself around once blighted and crumbling historic structures. In Kannapolis, an active parks and recreation department is recognized as an important asset by the community and contributes to the town’s vitality. Winston-Salem, which formed North Carolina’s first locally-zoned historic district, has a long history of recognizing the value of its historic properties and shared culture. Winston-Salem’s leaders also recognize the need to foster arts and cultural attractions to keep the city vibrant and attractive to residents.

**Creative regional governance, partnerships, and organizations**

Historically, development in North Carolina has been practiced as a zero-sum game. If one jurisdiction successfully attracted an investment or new employer, the implication has been that the other jurisdiction (perhaps a neighbor) lost. Innovative communities move beyond this notion to a regional or collaborative approach. Cross-jurisdictional partnerships can help communities pool resources toward shared development objectives.

In Winston-Salem, for example, the first city-county planning operation between the city and Forsyth County was authorized in 1947. The City and County have been working together on planning and development projects for more than sixty years. The Asheville Hub Alliance brings together economic development leaders from across the Asheville Metro Area to drive development in the region. Further, public-private (including not-for-profit) partnerships are emerging as the prominent organizational model for innovative development. In Edenton, a partnership between the local government and Preservation North Carolina provided institutional leverage to rehabilitate the mill village. In Winston-Salem, business and public sector leaders have come together in a variety of partnerships to advance that city’s interests.

**Creative financing approaches**

In a time of crisis, a community must be able to marshal significant financial resources to bankroll its revitalization initiatives. This requires an understanding of complex financing tools and openness to creative use of all available resources.

Leaders in Edenton understood the value of federal and state historic tax credits to prospective investors.
in the cotton mill development. They therefore sought outside expertise to guide the town through the historic designation process, enabling developers to utilize valuable historic tax credit financing. Winston-Salem civic leaders established a private foundation, the Millennium Fund, to support its efforts. Kannapolis established one of North Carolina’s earliest tax increment financing districts, so it is poised to fund infrastructure improvements as increasing amounts of private investment related to NCRC flow into the city.

**Encouraging Innovation in CED**

The case studies in this issue demonstrate that a majority of the responsibility for initiating innovative practices in CED lies squarely in the hands of local leadership. Leaders in municipal, county and multi-jurisdictional institutions at the local level know their circumstances and are best equipped to make strategic decisions about development. Often, their success will depend in some measure on their ability to reach out to their citizenry and to capitalize on existing community assets. This focus on local assets, however, does not exclude an important role for state and federal institutions. The right or wrong set of tools and incentives can have an important role in terms of encouraging or incenting innovation at the local level. The question for state and federal policy makers is how to invest strategically in the capacity of communities to innovate based on local circumstances and opportunities. For example, state and federal grant programs could be designed to require multi-jurisdictional partnerships as a criterion for funding. Research on innovation and program evaluation, including best practice case studies, could be ramped up and consolidated in an accessible data clearinghouse. Reuse strategies could be encouraged over greenfield development. Criteria for grants could require that communities seek more than just jobs and investment; or that they employ models of community participation and civic engagement to invest in social and civic capital. Training and technical assistance for the development of advanced finance mechanisms could be provided.

Additional resources could be made available to colleges and universities for not just workforce development, but also leadership development. These are a few examples of the types of policies that could encourage innovation without prescribing any particular course of action at the local level.

**Editors’ Note**

The North Carolina cities represented by the following articles range from Edenton in the northeastern corner of the state to Asheville in the western Blue Ridge Mountains. They range in size from the town of Edenton, with its 5,000 residents, to the greater Winston-Salem metropolitan area that nearly half a million people call home. Additionally, some of the municipalities represented in these articles grew on the strength of a single industry, while others have fostered diverse economies from the start. Nevertheless, each of them has had to respond to national changes in industry, corporate structure, and demographic trends by deciding which parts of their civic culture, built environment, and identity to preserve, and which to wholly readjust. Their stories of change and resilience are told here through collaborations between planners and economic developers, with help from elected officials and others involved in the processes of change. The entire assemblage was planned and marshaled by Denise Boswell, Ph.D., in her capacity as the Outreach Coordinator for the North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association.

---

**Resilience across North Carolina.** The five case-study cities span the state.
Edenton: New Life for the Edenton Cotton Mill

Elizabeth Allen Bryant, Co-contributors Claudia Deviney, Anne Marie Knighton, and Myrick Howard

In September 1995, Edenton was devastated when Unifi, a manufacturer based in Greensboro, announced that it was closing the Edenton Cotton Mill, the town’s largest employer since 1898. The loss of 100 steady manufacturing jobs was enormous for this community, whose total population was only 5,000. The employees at the Cotton Mill were tremendously productive and many were long-time employees; but their skill levels were low, as is the case with most textile jobs, and the town was presented with the daunting task of helping the displaced employees find new jobs. In addition to the increased unemployment, the closure represented a huge loss in property tax revenue: Unifi was one of the top five taxpayers in Edenton. The closing announcement also included a plan to either demolish or sell the mill houses in the Mill Village. Retirees who had lived in the Mill Village all their lives were faced with the very real prospect of being evicted from their homes. The thought of having to help relocate 25 families made many of the town leaders realize how severe the “ripple” effect of the plant closing would be.

As soon as the closing deadline was narrowed down to Christmastime of that year, officials began brainstorming their response to this calamity. Town leaders feared that the mill closing would quickly lead to a blighted neighborhood, but they had even more concerns about the demolition of the Cotton Mill and mill houses. Fortunately, a town councilman was also on the Board of Directors for Preservation North Carolina (PNC). Councilman Sam Dixon swiftly initiated contact with PNC, a state-wide non-profit, and town and county officials met with state elected representatives to solicit support for their request that Unifi donate the property to PNC. Public/private partnerships were quickly forged, and by December 1995 local leaders had convinced the owners to donate the Cotton Mill and its 44 acres to the non-profit PNC—saving the mill and Mill Village from demolition, and preserving Edenton’s strong sense of place.

Following the donation, the Town worked in conjunction with PNC to rezone the property from “Industrial Warehouse” to “Residential and Neighborhood Commercial,” retaining the mixed-use nature of the neighborhood but allowing for rehabilitation and reuse. Edenton’s Historic Preservation Commission and Planning Board worked with PNC to nominate the property to the National Register of Historic Places, so that potential buyers would be eligible for tax credits for renovation. The Town Council unanimously favored these changes, and as evidenced by the number of people attending the public hearings, there was overwhelming community support for both initiatives.

The Town and PNC worked tirelessly to entice and partner with private investors to rehabilitate the mills and Mill Village houses. In order to bring the public into decisions about the type of development that would occur in the mills, the two parties held public information sessions, entertainment events, and public hearings inviting citizen input. Proposed occupants for the Cotton Mill and Peanut Mill buildings included the Chowan Arts Council, the public library, offices, a brewery, condominiums, a café, or all of these. The Town initially thought the best use for the Cotton Mill would be a public arts facility, but this plan was not financially feasible. Shortly thereafter, PNC began marketing the mill to private developers; several developers attempted but failed to identify viable uses for the building.

In 2001, a North Carolina doctor named Thomas Wilson proposed turning the Cotton Mill into residential condominiums. Dr. Wilson had first been introduced to the situation while working in Chowan Hospital’s emergency room. When he conceived of developing the mill as residential property, he sought the advice of

Edenton Mill Village. Phillips Street, before (left) and after (right) the preservation project.
PNC President Myrick Howard and ultimately took the idea to the Town. Public input was sought regarding Edenton’s contribution to such a project, including the design and location of a boardwalk that the Town would install along Queen Anne’s Creek adjacent to the Cotton Mill and Mill Village. Edenton’s Preservation Commission and Planning Board worked with Dr. Wilson to rezone the mill and approve the proposed renovations, and the Town Council again unanimously supported the plans. Consequent to the successes with the Cotton Mill and Mill Village, a local developer submitted plans to rehabilitate the Peanut Mill for reuse as a brewery, but ultimately the building was better suited to office and commercial space.

The Town of Edenton has a long history of valuing public input and participation, and the Edenton Peanut & Cotton Mills Adaptive Reuse Project provided yet another opportunity for the town’s citizens to be involved in determining the fate of their built heritage. The aim of the Reuse Project was to put the two vacant mill buildings and the Mill Village back to viable use as commercial and residential contributors to the town’s economy. Instead of tearing down these structures and making way for new subdivisions or commercial development, the Town and its partners decided that reinvesting in the old industrial buildings and tenant houses would further strengthen the community and maintain its sense of place. In a partnership with the non-profit community and the private sector, the Town invoked smart growth principles by emphasizing the dense, fine-grained development of earlier decades. The Town Council decided that creating a mix of commercial and residential uses where industrial and residential uses had co-existed in the past was vital to maintaining Edenton’s town character, and the Council achieved this through re-zonings and conditional use permits.

Since the end of 1995, when the first decision was made to renovate and reuse the Cotton Mill, the community has felt the positive impact of this effort. The once-empty Peanut Mill has been purchased for rehabilitation; the Mill Village houses have realized a tenfold increase in value as 55 out of 57 original houses have been sold and six infill lots have been developed as well; and the Cotton Mill in its rehabilitated state represents a $13 million addition to the tax base. The community’s leap of faith into historic preservation, based on the principles of smart growth, has translated into expectations that new developments will achieve the same standards for walkability, compact design, and useable open space.

Through the reuse and rehabilitation of the mills and Mill Village, this project resulted in the preservation or creation of 23.5 acres of open space—over half of the properties’ 44 acres. Wetland areas were preserved along Queen Anne Creek behind the Cotton Mill, and the public received its first opportunity to access these areas through the construction of public boardwalks. Behind the Peanut Mill, a creek bed that had been filled and covered with an old metal warehouse was restored, and there are plans to build a wetlands enhancement area in that location. Along the rear of the Mill Village houses, easements were created to preserve 30-foot-wide open areas the length of each block; these were originally spaces for Cotton Mill workers’ tenant gardens. These easements, along with the preservation of the mill workers’ ball field, not only protect open green areas, but also preserve communal space for social interaction. In addition, the protection of the Mill Village street-grid pattern and the creation of sidewalks connecting the renovated mills and the town center help promote regular exercise as well as an
appreciation of Edenton’s historic identity.

The key components of this project’s successful implementation were:

(1) forging a partnership between local government, the non-profit community, and the private sector;
(2) focusing on preservation, rehabilitation, and reuse; and
(3) involving the local community and the community at large.

At the time, rehabilitating and reusing abandoned mills was a new concept in North Carolina, and a startlingly new idea in the northeastern part of the state. Particularly innovative at that time in this region was the idea that local governments could and should partner with non-profits and the private sector on major projects.

Viewing the abandonment of the Edenton Cotton Mill as an opportunity for economic development, town leaders were visionary in seeking partners to rehabilitate and reuse the mill and Mill Village rather than pursuing demolition of the sites. From the start, the Town and its partners felt it was important to have the community decide what type of project should be established on the mill properties, and they held information sessions and public hearings to that end. Once a strategy and idea was formed for how to reuse the properties, the partners worked to inform the larger community about the project, generating interest and fueling property sales. The success with the Cotton Mill spun off within the community as the Town, PNC, and private investors launched another initiative to rehabilitate the Peanut Mill. Outside the town limits, the Cotton Mill’s success set an example for two other mill restorations: Glencoe Mills, of Burlington (another PNC project), and Rocky Mount Mills in Rocky Mount.

**Wilson: Connected to Past and Future**

Rodger Lentz, AICP, Co-Contributors Wendy Baucom, Leigh Ann Braswell and Jennifer Lantz

Few small cities have attempted—and still fewer have succeeded—in straddling both agricultural and corporate branding. Over the course of the 20th century, and with particular agility in the last two decades, Wilson has managed to attract and retain financial, pharmaceutical and technology-based industries while remaining in the forefront of regional tobacco marketing. While its agricultural connections have

perhaps undergone the most drastic changes as a result of a globalized and politically-transformed market, the inroads Wilson has made in strategically pursuing other sectors have been no less remarkable or significant for the city’s economic prospects.

Wilson has long been known for its role in North Carolina’s agricultural economy. The city played a major role in early tobacco production and sales, with its first market sale of tobacco occurring on September 2, 1890. Twenty years later, tobacco was the third largest crop in the county, and by 1919, the Wilson market earned the title of the world’s largest flue-cured market. For half a century, Danville, Virginia and Greenville, North Carolina provided stiff competition for this market share. However, with the adoption of the 1973 Designation Plan, whereby tobacco producers chose the warehouse in which they wished to sell their allotted poundage, Wilson shot ahead of its competitors, in some years recording sales as much as twice that of second or third place finishers. As late as the 1990s, Wilson maintained as many as 12 tobacco auction warehouses.

But drastic changes in the tobacco selling system have altered Wilson’s economy in recent years. More than 80% of the tobacco yield is now sold via direct purchasing contracts, bypassing the warehouses and auctioning process entirely. Tobacco processing and distribution still remain an important part of Wilson’s overall employment picture, yet the impacts are distributed differently. Traditionally, tobacco markets provided an economic boost similar to the furniture markets in High Point, which were an occasion for socializing among visiting buyers and sellers who contributed to the local restaurant and tourism economies. As tobacco companies moved to purchase crops directly from farmers, tobacco markets lost their function as social events. The tobacco auctions and warehouses of yesterday have given way to a modern economy that is more global in its reach and distinctly less local in its indirect impacts.

In fact, tobacco farming continues to grow due to exports to China, Japan, India, Russia, Germany and other European countries. (North Carolina leads the country in tobacco exports, accounting for 38% of the US total with $292 million in foreign sales in 2005.) After the federal quota system ended in 2004, the county’s tobacco acreage grew from 5,635 to 9,130 by 2008. While Wilson no longer has the spectacular tobacco warehouse markets that often drew visits from North Carolina’s political establishment, tobacco is still an important part of the city and county’s economy.

Meanwhile, Wilson’s roots in banking predate even its first tobacco sale. Present-day BB&T got its start in Wilson in 1872, when Alpheus Branch and Thomas Jefferson Hadley launched a bank called Branch and Hadley. By loaning money and paying interest on deposits, the bank helped local businesses and cotton farmers stay profitable in the difficult years following the Civil War. The bank continued to grow as “Branch and Company, Bankers” in the 1900s due to its services to the growing community of tobacco farmers. After several name changes it became Branch Banking and Trust Company (BB&T) in 1913. BB&T continued to expand services by offering mortgages and insurance in the 1920s, and in 1971, boasting assets of $250 million (with agriculture accounting for one-quarter), BB&T constructed its new headquarters in Wilson. Ten years later, BB&T began an aggressive expansion campaign through acquisitions, starting with Independence National Bank in Gastonia, NC. Their fast-paced merger and acquisition activity continued until 2003, with the acquisition of First Virginia Banks Inc. At the end of 2005, BB&T had assets of $109 billion, 1,400 branches, and 28,000 employees, and today it ranks as the 14th largest financial holding company in the country.

But as with the tobacco industry, changes in the banking landscape have had costs as well as benefits. After becoming the largest bank in North Carolina in 1994, BB&T completed a “merger of equals” with another state bank, Southern National, in 1995. In the
course of this move, the bank relocated its headquarters to a site two hours west in Winston-Salem. Wilson lost not only the prestige of hosting the growing bank, but also 700 jobs associated with the main office. However, the city was able to salvage both its office space and its decades of experience: the twin towers that BB&T had occupied before the move west were kept by the bank and filled with back-office support staff, which now number 2,000. Even the original BB&T headquarters building built in 1903 has been reused as the home of the Wilson Arts Council.

This shifting of corporate headquarters was not the only force influencing Wilson’s built environment. The central business district, like many across the state and the country, experienced a noticeable decline in appearance and commerce over the years. Suburbanization and the development of shopping centers and malls on the perimeter left marks on the downtown in the form of high vacancy rates and buildings falling into disrepair. The construction of I-95 moved the main north-south artery from a mile south of the city center to a full eight miles to the west. The changing shape of the tobacco markets has had a large impact as well, leaving empty warehouses in central locations, some of which present opportunities for reuse. In 2007, Wilson lost the Smith Warehouse, built between 1928 and 1929 to a salvage company that planned to resell the bricks and timber. However, in 2008, Wilson Downtown Properties purchased another brick warehouse, the Hi-Dollar Warehouse, for renovation and reuse. Had it not been for the group’s purchase, this warehouse would have suffered the same fate as the Smith Warehouse.

The challenge for city leaders today is to develop new ways of attracting residents downtown, away from the ease of the highway and the commercial lures of the periphery. The Wilson Downtown Development Corporation (WDDC) employs a strategy that provides incentives to new businesses that locate downtown, and the City of Wilson has taken aggressive steps to improve the streetscape and essential infrastructure. Ironically, WDDC and the City attribute an influx of new businesses to the current economy. Businesses are finding that operating downtown not only provides them with a unique, historic atmosphere, but also lower renting or purchasing costs. In the past year, three new restaurants and three new retail shops have opened that are drawing visitors back to Wilson’s center. The old Belk Department store, long a premier architectural

Smith Warehouse. In 2007 the building was demolished and its materials packaged for resale to other historic renovation projects. Courtesy of Rodger Lentz.
site for the city, has been rehabbed into office space for a regional council of government, the WDDC, and the Upper Coastal Plain Business Development—an incubator offering 28,000 square feet of space to startups and small businesses in a five-county region.

Finally, a number of corporations have established industrial sites in and around Wilson in the past few decades. The trend started in the mid 1970s with a plant constructed by the Bridgestone-Firestone tire company. In more recent years, the Wilson Economic Development Council—together with the City of Wilson, Wilson County and the business community—have worked diligently to pursue manufacturing industries with a higher than average wage and a likelihood of remaining in the USA. They developed a strategic marketing plan that is updated every five years and pursues a variety of industries. Significant investments were made at both the City and County levels in land and infrastructure. These include an expansion of water and sewer treatment capacity, the construction of Buckhorn Reservoir, transportation improvements that have cut travel time to Raleigh by almost half (now 30 to 35 minutes to the Capital), and the development of a water reuse plant to serve manufacturers.

In its most recent and forward-thinking infrastructure investment, the City has installed fiber-optic connectivity across the entire city. The project began when the City Council needed to improve the reliability of its networks between public facilities. A number of businesses and residents requested that they be allowed to connect to this upgraded service, and soon the Council was exploring deals with private providers to bring high-speed fiber lines to all customers in the city limits. Since the providers eventually decided that it would not be a profitable venture in a market as small as Wilson, the Council unanimously decided to take on the project itself and to finance the operation through subsequent sale of its own cable, phone and internet services. Wilson now boasts a network that is attractive to businesses, schools and executives considering relocation to the area.

With the physical improvements begun in the 1990s and augmented in the 2000s, Wilson has been able to provide a home for pharmaceutical plants such as Merck, Purdue and Sandoz. This economic activity in turn attracted other health industry manufacturers, including LiveDo and Becton Dickinson (better known as BD), whose plant is presently under construction. By investing in its infrastructure, the City has diversified its economy and paved a road for industries that its tobacco-farming forebears could only have imagined.

**HB 1252 Level Playing Field/Cities/Service Providers**

In April 2009 a bill was introduced into the North Carolina Legislature that would require local governments such as Wilson seeking to provide Internet and other services to adjust their pricing so that it costs as much as a private company would have to charge. Supporters of the bill hold that local governments have an unfair advantage over traditional providers since they have access to cheaper municipal financing in the installation of these services. But opponents don’t have to look any farther than Wilson for an example of a city that would have been prevented under the terms of the bill from providing any telecomm services at all, even though the private companies had ruled out services to the community on the grounds of profitability. Local governments also fear that the bill would prevent them from obtaining the $4.7 billion in federal stimulus money that is earmarked for infrastructure to improve broadband Internet access.

In response, the Raleigh City Council, the Chapel Hill Town Council and the NC League of Municipalities have all expressed their formal opposition. In the legislature, the bill passed its first committee, Science and Technology, without a recommendation. On May 6 it was sent by both House and Senate committees into study committees, a legitimate choice for a controversial bill but one that can also be read as a delaying tactic to keep it out of action until at least 2010. Unsurprisingly, the bill has generated considerable web debates throughout North Carolina as well as coverage on national blogspots like Electronista, Vox and Stop the Cap!
Winston-Salem: A Study in Growth, Resilience, and Adaptability

A. Paul Norby, FAICP, Co-Contributors Frank Elliott, Mayor Allen Joines, and LeAnn Pegram

Winston-Salem is a proud city with a rich heritage. Throughout its history, it has continually overcome the challenges of modernization with forward-looking strategies based in entrepreneurship and economic diversification, which continue to facilitate the city’s growth today.

Early History

When the Moravians migrated to this area from Pennsylvania in 1753, they quickly turned to the task of carefully planning and developing the large tract of land they called Wachovia and later the central community of Salem. The peace-loving Moravians saw Salem as a place where they could be free to worship in their tradition, to welcome visitors, to work at their trades, to enjoy music, and to have real community. This community was determined to be self-sufficient, and combined farming with trades, a mill, and other lucrative business ventures—establishing a tradition of entrepreneurship that continues to this day. Salem grew steadily, and when the need to provide a courthouse became apparent after Forsyth County was created in 1849, the Moravians provided the site for the new Forsyth County Courthouse one mile north of Salem Square. The legislature eventually named the county seat that grew around it Winston, after military hero Maj. Joseph Winston. The worldlier enclave of Winston attracted a new breed of entrepreneur, known for being shrewd, ambitious, and hard working.

Winston grew from being half the population of Salem in 1870 to being more than three times the population in 1910. The Reynolds and Hanes families...
and others steadily grew small tobacco and textile companies into major firms, attracting new workers and residents in droves. Roads and streets were improved, and Thomas Edison helped inaugurate one of America’s first streetcar lines in 1890, sparking more growth. Simon G. Atkins established the Slater Industrial Academy, which eventually became Winston-Salem Teachers College—now Winston-Salem State University. Fourteen years after the U.S. Post Office combined the postal addresses as the hyphenated name Winston-Salem, the two towns officially merged in recognition of their common interests.

**Golden Age**

The 1910s and 1920s saw unprecedented growth in Winston-Salem, as evidenced by the City’s population rising to become the largest in the state in 1920. The DNA of the combined cities, described by one observer as “Salem’s conscience and Winston’s purse,” led to the emergence of Winston-Salem as the second greatest industrial city in the South, behind only Baltimore. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. and the Hanes Knitting and Hosiery Mills became national leaders in their respective industries. They were joined by many other industries that manufactured items as diverse as batteries, wagons, humidifiers, tires, furniture, bricks, and steel components. Civic and industry leaders took full advantage of existing railroad linkages from Winston-Salem to other markets, and the first municipal airport in the South was opened east of the city in 1919. Frances Henry Fries had earlier opened Wachovia Loan and Trust, and in 1911 he went on to head Wachovia Bank and Trust, which eventually became known as the largest bank in the South.

Winston-Salem grew upward, being among the first to utilize high-rise construction for the 7-story Wachovia Bank building in 1911. This building was followed by several successively taller buildings, culminating in 1929 with the 22-story Reynolds Building. Ranking as the tallest in the state until the 1950s, the Reynolds Building won the national Best Building of the Year Award when it was constructed and was used as a model by its New York architects for the subsequent construction of the Empire State Building.

The city also grew outward. Country estates and new neighborhoods led to Forsyth County’s reputation as the wealthiest county in the state. Concern over the huge growth rate and haphazard development led the Chamber of Commerce in the 1920s to encourage and fund a new city plan.
Depression, War and Rebuilding

The Depression years and World War II ushered in an era of austerity, but Winston-Salem held its own during this time. The city’s industrial base was producing goods that the population needed during the depression. During the war years, a great demand existed in the military for clothing and cigarettes, and the city was well-positioned to supply them.

At the end of the 1940s, Winston-Salem was the second largest city in the state behind Charlotte, and it was emerging from the Depression and war years shopworn but ready to rebuild. Huge changes occurred in the city over the next two decades. The first city-county planning operation in the state had already been authorized in 1947, and this joint organization went right to work writing a new comprehensive plan, subdivision and zoning ordinances. Old Salem became the state’s first locally zoned historic district. Urban renewal plans were assembled to address slum conditions, and the city was the first in the state to receive federal housing funds. The Wake Forest College School of Medicine, which had been transplanted from Wake Forest, North Carolina in 1941 and renamed Bowman Gray School of Medicine, was soon joined by the rest of Wake Forest College after the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation funded the construction of a new campus. An ambitious plan for downtown renewal was developed in the 1950s and led to redevelopment in the ’60s and ’70s of such additions as a downtown convention center and hotel, Hall of Justice, and a new 30-story Wachovia Building—at the time the tallest in the Southeast. Plans were implemented for both east-west and north-south freeways converging adjacent to downtown. Thomas Davis established Piedmont Airlines, which grew to become a strong airline with routes across the country. Winston-Salem became a giant in the trucking industry, with McLean, Hennis and Pilot Motor carriers headquartered in the city. Outside industries like Western Electric, later known as AT&T, came to town.
and opened two large plants employing thousands of people, including new transplanted residents. The Arts Council became the first umbrella group in the country to coordinate arts activities and funding.

The political structure was also slowly shifting away from what could be described as the company town “oligarchy” that came with Winston’s swift industrial rise. The temporary unionization of factory workers at R.J. Reynolds helped African Americans become more politically organized, resulting in the 1947 election of Rev. Kenneth Williams, the first African American City Alderman in all of the South. In 1949, Marshall Kurfrees was elected mayor; he was the first mayor not hand-picked by the power elite of business, and served for the next 12 years.

**Setbacks of the 1980s and Response**

In contrast with the heady rebuilding days of the 1950s and ’60s, Winston-Salem experienced a relatively calm period in the 1970s, but a series of setbacks and losses occurred in the 1980s. The 1980 Census revealed that, for the first time, the City lost population as the community expanded but the municipal boundaries did not. Then came a series of economic shocks that continued throughout the decade. Deregulation of the trucking industry in the early ’80s led to a series of changes that fostered the demise of the three big trucking companies during the decade, affecting thousands of jobs. Piedmont Airlines was a victim of its own success and grew to the point where it was bought by expanding USAir in 1987, causing Winston-Salem to lose the Piedmont headquarters. In 1988, the forced breakup of AT&T resulted in the closure of its Winston-Salem plants, again yielding thousands of job losses. R.J. Reynolds Industries, which had been diversifying since health concerns about smoking prompted the tobacco company to rethink its strategy, went through a process which turned Winston-Salem upside down: first, the company was eclipsed as the largest cigarette maker by Philip Morris; then, after a merger with Nabisco Brands, Inc, the new leadership moved its headquarters in 1987 to Atlanta; and in 1989, the company went private and experienced a leveraged buy-out.

While these changes rocked Winston-Salem to its core, the city fought back in the 1980s and ’90s with the same kind of creativity and determination that has marked its past. In response to the need to create more jobs to replace losses in the manufacturing, business, and professional office sectors, private business leaders from Wachovia, RJR, Sara Lee and other firms worked together to form the Forsyth Community Development Council and Winston-Salem Business, Inc. They sought ways to aggressively target and recruit new business, and they were successful in bringing Lee Apparel, Siecor, Southern National Bank and Pepsi to the city. Forsyth Technical Community College created custom training packages for potential employers the City was recruiting. Commercial buildings downtown were constructed or expanded, and a public-private partnership created a new downtown park and office building that became the headquarters of Southern National (now BB&T). Wachovia Bank, which had just acquired First Atlanta, decided to keep its headquarters in Winston-Salem and build a new, taller tower. Sara Lee Corp, which had acquired Hanes Hosiery and Hanes Knitting, chose to expand Winston-Salem operations and placed four company headquarters in the city.

Perhaps most interesting was a new initiative created through a collaboration among the business community, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, and Wake Forest School of Medicine to create a downtown research park specializing in biomedical science. This venture was conceived in order to take advantage of the increasing stature and reach of the medical school’s research capabilities, along with the resource of R.J. Reynolds’s unused downtown building and land resources. The idea was to couple biomedical research capabilities with new business start-ups that would make use of that research in medical applications. Amazingly, Winston-Salem ended the decade of the 1980s with more jobs and more employers than when the decade began. By the end of the 1990s, the city was pursuing a new set of initiatives and riding the momentum.

**The Challenges Post-2000**

Winston-Salem’s cycle of crisis and response repeated itself again shortly after 2000. Wachovia Bank, one of the more respected banks in the country, was acquired by First Union in 2001 in what was billed as a “merger of equals.” The merged bank assumed the name Wachovia but moved its headquarters to Charlotte, dealing another seismic blow to Winston-Salem by transplanting its namesake to another city. Winston-Salem did, however, retain Wachovia’s Carolinas headquarters, wealth management headquarters, and the data center. (Ironically, Charlotte is now experiencing similar anxiety with the demise of the merged Wachovia and subsequent acquisition by Wells Fargo.) R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co, now a free-standing publicly traded company, suffered continued decline in sales and production, forcing further downsizing. Foreign competition spelled the decline of the furniture industry and resulted in the closure of Winston-Salem’s remaining furniture manufacturing. Sara Lee was looking to divest Hanes Brands, and some questioned the fate of its operations in Winston-Salem.

As in the 1980s, civic and business leadership in the community has responded with perseverance, creativity, and financial backing. The City and County in 2001 adopted a new comprehensive plan that embraces smart growth principles and encourages more compact, mixed-use development patterns and a greater emphasis on multi-modal transportation. Business leaders formed a
new organization named the Winston-Salem Alliance and established a Millennium Fund that raised $45 million to use as seed money for three strategically designed economic initiatives: downtown residential development, downtown project and infrastructure financing, and economic recruitment/site development. A downtown plan adopted in 2002 has triggered reinvestment for downtown restaurants, over 1,500 new residential units, and much more street life. In 2003 a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy prepared for the region recommended accelerating the growth of design-intensive businesses in northwest North Carolina. The goal is to transition the economy from reliance on tobacco, textiles and furniture manufacturing toward knowledge-based services and creative enterprises. The University of North Carolina responded by establishing the Center for Design Innovation in Winston-Salem.

The Piedmont Triad Research Park developed a plan to expand from 20 acres to 220 acres with an urban mixed-use research park that will ultimately employ 20,000 and use all the old vacant R.J. Reynolds manufacturing facilities on the eastern edge of downtown. Wake Forest Health Sciences has scored major breakthroughs in human organ regeneration that have resulted in the success of new companies in the park. Current Mayor Allen Joines loves to remind audiences that within twenty years, city industries “shifted our economic development emphasis from jean—Lee Jeans—to genes”.

Controversially, some growth has been lured by incentives. In 2004, Winston-Salem and Forsyth County combined $37.3 million in public funds with additional State incentives to recruit Dell, Inc to build its most advanced and largest computer manufacturing plant in Winston-Salem on land that was targeted for business park development in a recent area plan. The incentives are linked to anticipated annual tax revenues of almost $1.2 million and the creation of 1,700 jobs. The City and County successfully recruited Lowes hardware with $3 million in economic incentives to build a new $150 million data center in Winston-Salem, and also enticed Sara Lee/Hanesbrands with $850,000 in incentives to continue their presence and expansions, which together are valued at $35 million.

The health care sector has continued to expand, as well, with major construction at both hospitals. Forsyth Technical Community College, ranked as the fourth fastest growing community college in the country, has expanded its educational offerings so that the local workforce can access the skills required for new jobs. The other five colleges and universities that call the City home have also expanded and updated their master plans. Many of these efforts were cited in the City being named in 2004 as one of America’s Most Livable Communities by the Washington-based Partners for Livable Communities.

While no one can foresee all that may come in the future, Winston-Salem demonstrates that with discipline, entrepreneurship, innovation, and determination, a community can positively face its challenges and create new opportunities. Archie Davis, a beloved Winston-Salem native who became Senior Vice President and Chairman of Wachovia Bank and Trust and was instrumental in so many positive local and statewide initiatives, perhaps said it best some time ago: “We have an enviable past and an enviable character. I’m far from pessimistic, particularly if people handle the future as they have the past. We have great momentum.”
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Kannapolis: From Mill Town to Research-Based Economy
Ben Warren, Co-Contributors Renee Goodnight, Clarence Horton and Mike Legg

Kannapolis is a thriving city of 43,115 people located along the I-85 corridor in the Charlotte region of North Carolina. It began as a mill community in 1906 when J.W. Cannon purchased 808 acres of former cotton fields and began construction of “Cannon’s model mill town,” which ambitiously became known as Kannapolis. In its first year of operation, Cannon built two manufacturing plants and 75 homes for carpenters and construction workers. Shortly thereafter, 75 additional homes were built for the first wave of textile workers who came to the area with the promise of new opportunities. By 1920, the population of the community had grown to 5,027 men, women and children, living in 821 new houses. The mill employees resided in the homes, paying low rental rates and enjoying free maintenance, low cost utilities, free garbage collection, and no taxes.

Modern Kannapolis took shape in the 1930s as the mill continued to expand and new businesses and industry moved into the community. Subdivisions sprang up around the Kannapolis mills and surrounding mill villages as the population grew to over 13,000. By the 1950s, the expansion of the mills and the influx of “baby boomers” increased the population to almost 35,000 people.
The mills continued to grow and flourish over the next two decades, registering more than $450 million in sales in 1976. But the 1980s turned out to be a decade of significant change. In 1982, David Murdock acquired the Cannon Mills Company and began a $200 million capital improvement program aimed at automating many of the plant’s operations. Two years later the citizens voted to incorporate as a city and looked forward to partnering with Murdock in the redevelopment plans he had proposed for Kannapolis. The following year, Murdock sold the company to Fieldcrest Mills, Inc. Although unexpected, the news was well received by residents, as Fieldcrest had a national reputation for producing high quality textile products. The mills remained the bedrock of the Kannapolis economy over the next decade under Fieldcrest’s ownership.

But the situation was different when the mill was sold again in 1997 to the Pillowtex Corporation of Dallas, Texas. This time the local population was fearful of the loss of jobs to automation that had accompanied previous changes of ownership. The merger placed Pillowtex in the top three American textile manufacturers, yet prior to the purchase, Pillowtex had been a much smaller company than Fieldcrest, and it took on a considerable amount of debt in the course of the deal. Furthermore, textile jobs all over the nation were being moved overseas in large numbers. City Council members, seeing that their future was by no means secure, initiated an 18-month visioning process amongst citizens to determine what assets could be built upon to assure continued prosperity, with or without the mills that had always driven the local economy.

The result of these public deliberations was a document called Weaving a Shared Future. This plan prioritized economic development above all, but it also committed the city to investing in parks and recreation, transportation and streets, and historic preservation of buildings as well as the mill culture that shaped Kannapolis. Building on an earlier decision to annex 10 square miles of land through which NCDOT built a major highway, Kannapolis pushed to extend water and sewer to the newly incorporated areas, construct secondary roads, and pave the way for business parks and planned residential developments. Additionally, Kannapolis focused on refining its image by establishing a vigorous parks department, voting to allow liquor by the drink, and investing in marketing and branding activities. The recurring theme throughout these diverse initiatives was an openness to change, in terms of image, culture, and the economic base.

At the same time, the Cabarrus County Board of Commissioners was rethinking its approach to services and retooling its administrative structure to meet future needs. The result of this process was the transformation...
of the Cabarrus County Health Department into a public health authority in 1997; the resulting Cabarrus Health Alliance was the first independent health authority in North Carolina. As such it brings together more than 30 organizations, health and human service agencies, private medical and dental providers, government officials, educators, business and faith community representatives, and residents to plan and provide appropriate services to meet local needs. Funding comes from a dedicated grant-writing program as well as Medicaid reimbursements, sliding-scale client fees, and County support for traditional responsibilities such as communicable disease control, environmental health, and vital records.

Just as the City and County were building their assets, however, Pillowtex was losing its own. Diminishing sales left it unable to keep up with the debts it had acquired in 1997, and the company filed for bankruptcy in 2000. It carried on work at the mills and even emerged from bankruptcy for a year in 2002-2003, but the end arrived on July 30, 2003, when Pillowtex permanently closed its doors and announced that its assets would be liquidated. That day, the corporation fired 7,650 workers, and the 4,340 jobs lost in the Kannapolis plants rank as the worst one-day layoff in the state’s history.

Although Kannapolis—once the world’s largest producer of textiles—was shocked by the loss of this central industry, the Council concentrated on making its earlier plans and economic contributions known to the region. To this end, the City made heavy use of incentives to attract new industry and new jobs, and it saw some success in the development of the Kannapolis Gateway Business Park, Biscayne Business Park and Dogwood Industrial Park. The City’s demonstrated determination and cooperative spirit, as well as its asserted openness to change, may have been the factors that convinced former Mill owner David Murdock to purchase the Cannon Mills Plant One site at an auction in 2004. A year later, Murdock unveiled a plan to construct a $1.5 billion scientific and economic revitalization project called the North Carolina Research Campus. This announcement signified the transformation from a manufacturing-based economy to a research-based economy. Demolition of the mills began on March 20, 2006, and after just two years, on October 20, 2008, the grand opening ceremony was held for the first three buildings on the campus: the David H. Murdock Core Lab, the UNC Nutrition Research Building, and the NCSU Fruit and Vegetable Science Institute Building.

Murdock envisions a campus where researchers walk to work, talented high school students mingle
with internationally renowned scientists, and citizens of Kannapolis find opportunity for solid employment and growth. Shortly after Murdock announced the plans for the North Carolina Research Campus in 2005, he proclaimed:

> The most exciting part of this project is to be able to create sustainable, better-paying jobs for the people of Kannapolis and the region, and the creation of this scientific community centered on biotechnology will allow a transformation of this economy from a manufacturing-based one to one centered on scientific knowledge and research. Through the collaboration of the university scientists, the biotechnology research, and the state-of-the-art laboratories, new discoveries will be made that will further my goal of teaching people about proper health, nutrition, and wellness.

The North Carolina Research Campus is a unique project, funded by private dollars, that provides research facilities for seven major North Carolina Universities, the North Carolina Community College system, and numerous private industries. The plans include the construction of 88 buildings on the 250-acre main campus. This includes the construction of the Core Lab, university buildings, an all-girls’ school of math and science, numerous research offices, a hotel, a theater, numerous commercial buildings, and 18 parking decks.

Murdock has also proposed additional projects at off-site locations in Kannapolis. These include a biorepository facility, NCSU greenhouse facility, and infrastructure projects. In addition, the City of Kannapolis, in partnership with Cabarrus County, has implemented a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District to fund numerous improvements around the NCRC main campus. The funds will be used to improve intersections, widen streets, replace infrastructure, construct a new Health Alliance building, fund a science wing on the local high school, and complete several other projects. While it is true that the TIF district was based on the rise in property value as a result of the Research Campus, the city’s investment in its new economic base and its openness to new alliances certainly helped pave the way for the Research Campus locating in Kannapolis.

Prior to the economic downturn of 2008, analysts predicted the proposed development would create as many as 5,535 new jobs at the NCRC by 2013. The biotech jobs were expected to attract an additional 9,291 jobs to Rowan and Cabarrus County by the year 2032. As a result of the new jobs created by NCRC and the associated “spin-off” development, exponential population and household growth were also projected: by 2032, Cabarrus County was projected to increase by 26,324 residents and Rowan County by 14,161 residents. While these projections may well see some delay due to current financial realities, complete build-out and unprecedented population growth is still expected, although the counties may have more time to prepare for it than originally predicted.

This massive economic transition from manufacturing to research and technology has been well received by the majority of residents in Kannapolis and surrounding communities. To assist with the transformation, the Rowan Cabarrus Community College is developing a program, known as R3 (Refocus, Retrain, Reemploy), designed to train the local workforce for opportunities at the NCRC. Whether the new campus brings as much opportunity for lower- and upper-income households as the old Cannon Mills once did will depend on individual participation in tuition assistance programs for education and skills training. If local leaders can successfully encourage workers that feel destroyed by the loss of their livelihoods to embrace a new path for the good of the community, then the prospects for Kannapolis look extremely bright, even as the nation’s economic struggles begin to mirror the disappointment and need for change that Kannapolis residents have experienced for the last decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabarrus</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>26,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannapolis Part</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>5,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>14,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannapolis Part</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannapolis</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>6,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Population Growth in Counties Surrounding North Carolina Research Campus.** Benchmark CMR Inc.
Asheville: Resilience through Leadership, Partnerships and Diversity

Linda Giltz, AICP, Co-Contributors Leslie Anderson, Robin Cape and Judy Daniel, AICP, Stacy Merten, Tom Tveidt, and Alexandra Vrtunski, AICP

Asheville’s ability to rebuild itself and to foster a vibrant downtown in the second half of the 20th century owes much to its early history. Asheville was a booming town in 1900, an urban center for the mountain area with numerous trading-related businesses. The completion of the railway line to Asheville in 1880 had ushered in a period of increased tourism and development. By the turn of the century, the area hosted a number of health sanitariums that attracted people from far and wide. It was marketed as a beautiful place where people could rest, renew, relax, and recover from illnesses. Ever since this time, tourism has played an important and growing role in Asheville’s economy.

Asheville experienced extremely high growth rates in the 1920s, and the City borrowed heavily to pay for a grand vision of its future—city services, infrastructure, and capital projects (City Hall, County Courthouse, schools, library, etc.). The stock market crash and Great Depression hit Asheville very hard: by 1936, the City had accumulated $48 million in debt, and it made a commitment to pay off the debt over 40 years. Between 1936 and 1976, the City devoted much of its budget to debt retirement and was very frugal with other operating and capital spending. As a result, Asheville was the only city in the United States to pay off its debt in full. During this time, the city was still a center for shopping and services, and the downtown remained bustling with businesses until the early 1970s, when construction in suburban areas drew stores away from the city center and to the new mall.

By the mid 1970s, the downtown had many vacant buildings; after a few more years this area hit bottom, with just a few businesses left. At the same time, however, young people were moving into the area from outside the region. Drawn by the low cost of living, the beautiful scenery and the artsy and historic charm, some of these people became active in civic affairs and in downtown revitalization. Preservation and revitalization efforts gained city and county support though appointed commissions and elected officials.
New leaders emerged and more rehabilitation/revitalization projects were undertaken in the '70s, '80s and '90s; these types of projects continue today. But the process of choosing projects and distributing public funds was not without struggles, both political and ideological. It took leadership, vision and funding from hundreds of people to rebuild and revitalize downtown. While the City of Asheville took the lead and assumed the greatest political risk, strong partnerships emerged between the public, private and non-profit sectors during this time. A key element was the City’s attitude and interest in building an economic platform and fostering a climate where business could flourish.

Today, strong leaders and organizations in the public, private and non-profit sectors continue to work together to bring diversity to the urban core. A variety of housing opportunities in or near the downtown complement a mix of businesses. Recently, the high cost of real estate, especially in downtown, has presented a challenge to these efforts to support a fine-grained core. Although the current slump will temper this concern, at least for a time, the higher real estate values and rents that follow a successful downtown revival may drive smaller businesses out over time and make it harder for many residents to afford living downtown. Current downtown housing choices tend to have either very high or very low rents, with few units available in between.

Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of the economy, and a key to the area’s resilience, is the lack of a dominant industry or economic sector. Multiple strong sectors have been represented in roughly balanced amounts for twenty years or more. The graphic on the following page shows the top categories, in terms of employment by type of industry, for the Asheville Metro Area in 2008.

In addition to the diversity of business types, the area is also characterized by a robust small business sector. For example, in Buncombe County in 2008, a little over half of the businesses had four or fewer employees, and 95% of them had fewer than 50 employees. These small businesses are “balanced” by a handful of very large employers (over 3,000 employees) and some large employers (1,000-2,999 employees) in the health care, public education, government, grocery stores/distribution and leisure/hospitality sectors. Economic development recruitment and business support services have shifted their foci over the past five to ten years, recognizing the importance of small businesses, the creative class, and entrepreneurs in Asheville’s local economy.

A public-private partnership, the Asheville Hub Alliance, was formed several years ago at the request of the City of Asheville and Buncombe County to “identify the best ways to build a strong economy and community over the next 20 years.” Its efforts are focused on the area’s strengths and collaborative opportunities. The Asheville Hub chose a set of strategic focus areas, along with lead agencies for each area, which include technology, rejuvenation, sustainability, creativity, land/agriculture, manufacturing and enterprise. This group has developed a strategic plan that it hopes to see implemented over the next few years.

The Asheville Hub exemplifies the leadership and partnership that are imperative for moving into new ventures, and it hopes to provide a framework for addressing the changing economy in coming years. Meanwhile, the City government concentrates on the natural and cultural assets that are found in Asheville’s roots and in the diverse economy that has sheltered the population from the shocks felt in localities dominated by a single industry. Nurturing the small businesses and public-private partnerships that have kept its downtown vibrant and attractive, officials and civic leaders are planning more for sustainability than for exponential growth, in the hopes that this strategy will result in a more resilient city.

**Merritt Park.** This mixed-income residential project was built on the edge of downtown by Mountain Housing Opportunities, an important partner providing affordable housing choices in Asheville.  *Courtesy of Linda Giltz.*
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As a postscript to the case studies of community and economic development, we showcase here three views of Durham, North Carolina taken by photographer Jessie Gladin-Kramer, who shot the view of downtown Durham featured on our cover. Her move to Durham from Boston in 2008 coincided with a new chapter in the city’s history, following an era in which warehouses and factories first dominated the economic landscape of Durham and then cavernously loomed over the street layout, serving as empty reminders of the jobs and careers that vanished with the cotton mills and tobacco trade. By 2008, many of those unique brick facades were again occupied, this time with offices, shops, restaurants and artists’ studios. Golden Belt, Brightleaf Square (above, right), West Village, and American Tobacco (on our cover) are not only bringing people back downtown to work and shop; they are fueling a greater interest in Durham’s history, which includes important milestones in black-owned businesses and civil rights history, as well as the usual tales of urban renewal projects that failed to stem the forces of suburbanization. Even as Durhamites attempt to “find their cool” in renovated coffee shops and lofts, they find traces of the communities and industries that attracted people to Durham before there was a Research Triangle Park or a prestigious university.

These pictures were taken for the city guide of Durham that Gladin-Kramer wrote and photographed for the national blog Design*Sponge.
Early Warning and Plant Closings in Chicago in the 1980s

Sara O’Neill-Kohl and Pierre Clavel

Introduction

One message from the 2008 financial crisis has been a critique of the unfettered market, which was amplified as the outgoing Bush administration secured legislation for bailouts of financial firms and followed with temporary loans to support the automobile industry. Democrats responded with demands for a more consumer-oriented policy: support for mortgage holders and for a fiscal stimulus that would reach the unemployed.

The new president took the critique a step further. Barack Obama won the election with proposals to stimulate specific sectors: wind and solar energy, hybrid and electric-powered vehicles, and various infrastructure measures. Once in office, he moved to wrap these initiatives into the “stimulus package” enacted in February, and followed with additional proposals to regulate major finance industry units and subsidize particular manufacturing sectors. The stimulus promised to save or create 3.5 million jobs in 2009 and 2010, and promoted the production of non-petroleum energy and transportation.

Thus a likely consequence of the financial crisis was at least a partial policy shift away from the forty-year service-economy trend (led by the finance sectors), back toward some degree of manufacturing. “Keynesian” ideas came back, and with them returned talk of “industrial policy”—always implicit in any government support for private firms and sectors. Such policies would perhaps be augmented by additional federal government support for manufacturing and other non-service sectors.

Strong federal support for these sectors would be welcome during this time of growing economic insecurity. But if we look back to the late 1970s and early 1980s—a previous period of economic restructuring—there is evidence for the importance of local scale efforts, particularly those embodied in the cities. Specifically, we could learn from the local level response to manufacturing job loss. This history helps reveal the critical role municipal governments, activists, and community members can play in addressing today’s related challenge of job loss.

The federal policy environment of the 1980s differed from that of today, partially because the shock...
of plant closings was still recent and ongoing. The shock has faded, but it was well documented at the time (e.g. Bensman & Lynch, 1987). Less well known were the positive responses and hopes for recovery the crisis engendered. One manifestation of this was a national, if brief, call for “industrial policy” that would save the nation’s manufacturing base. Economists Barry Bluestone and Bennett Harrison (1982) were among the leaders analyzing the causes of industrial decline and calling for a national industrial policy to stem the job and productivity losses, but Business Week (June 3 1980) championed the idea as well.

On the local and regional scales, municipal governments and community labor coalitions were the primary actors. On the government side, there was a shift in local economic development practices from “smokestack chasing” to growing small businesses locally, incorporating new uses of eminent domain and zoning, and developing industry task forces. The community and labor reaction to plant closings was much more diverse, and in many places displayed characteristics of a social movement. It featured initiatives such as employee buyouts, experiments in worker management, support organizations that provided research and technical advice, and fights to pass laws requiring advance notice of closings. Among these responses, early warning systems may have been the most broadly participatory.

Plant Closings and Early Warning: Chicago

While the battle to pass federal plant closing legislation raged throughout the worst years of industrial job loss, community and labor groups across the country immediately recognized the necessity of providing early warning of plant closures. Early warning networks gathered two forms of knowledge: information from workers about what was going on inside a plant, and public domain research. This information was used to monitor a plant for signs of a potential closure (LeRoy, Swinney & Charpentier, 1986). Early warning of the intent to shut down or move a plant was crucial in order to either prevent the closure or secure a better deal for the workers and surrounding community.

Bluestone and Harrison’s 1982 book The Deindustrialization of America, while arguing for a national government response to deindustrialization, also accords great import to local early warning systems. While outlining the core tenets of a proposed program of “democratic socialist reindustrialization,” they acknowledge that the struggle ahead will be long.

The Steel Task Force presents its findings in a press conference, December 10, 1986. Mayor Harold Washington is on the far right, and Rob Mier, Commissioner of the Department of Economic Development, stands just behind the podium to the left of the presenter. Photo courtesy of the Harold Washington Archives and Collections, Chicago Public Library.
However, there is certainty about where to begin:

...in the unions, in the non-unionized workplaces, and in the labor-community-church coalitions that have sprung up in areas such as Ohio, Connecticut, California, RI. People need to systematically monitor their companies’ investment and disinvestment activities, beginning with the development of shopfloor early warning systems (263).

There were examples of local early warning networks in several locations, but our analysis begins with a review of the Chicago case. Chicago of the 1980s, similar to other rust belt cities of its time, was undergoing a painful transformation of its economic base. The city lost 13,000 jobs in the steel industry and the manufacturing sector declined 27% overall between 1977 and 1982 (Giloth & Moe, 1999).

Raymond Gutierrez was one of the 13,000 workers who lost their jobs during this time. The Chicago Tribune reported:

Gutierrez and his co-workers were pushed out of the mainstream economy on March 28, 1980, the same day they were locked out of Wisconsin Steel. “They put us out the way you put a stray dog onto the street,” he said. “They didn’t say nothing. When our shift was over, they just locked the doors behind us. It wasn’t until the next day that we found out the mill was shut down, maybe for good. It took a year before they even let us back in to clean out our lockers.

Gutierrez’s story was not atypical. At the time there was no legal obligation for companies to give their workers notice of an imminent closure. In fact, companies were loath to do so. Plans to close or move a factory were often kept secret as long as possible, so as to avoid work slowdowns or other labor unrest.

In response to the plant shutdown, workers in Chicago and elsewhere did not remain passive victims. Instead, workers and community members mobilized. In Chicago, early warning work was a key part of the mobilization against plant closures.

The two primary organizations instrumental in developing Chicago’s early warning network during the early 1980s were the Midwest Center for Labor Research (MCLR) and the University of Illinois’ Center for Urban Economic Development (CUED). In addition, the city government played a catalytic role, reflecting the establishment of a community development orientation in the Department of Economic Development (DED) under the new mayor, Harold Washington.

MCLR was founded by Dan Swinney in 1982. The organization was inspired by Swinney’s personal experience of job loss. From 1975, Swinney worked as a lathe operator at Taylor Forge. But when Gulf and Western purchased Taylor Forge, they implemented a destructive business strategy that would become increasingly common during the 1980s. Gulf and Western drained the value from the company over a period of years, with the hope of investing the capital in other sectors to make a quick profit. By 1983, Taylor Forge had been shut down.

Swinney began MCLR as an organization designed to provide research and technical aid to workers, labor unions, progressive local government and business, and community activists engaged in attempts to stem manufacturing job loss. Swinney’s analysis of the Chicago manufacturing economy directly challenged the dominant narrative of the time period. He found that the majority of manufacturing companies in Chicago weren’t large, publicly traded companies, struggling in the face of global competition; rather, they were small, often privately held companies facing the types of problems that could be solved.

The other center involved in the Chicago early warning experiment was CUED, where David Ranney was a key intellectual and activist. Ranney, like Swinney, also had experience working in factories and labor organizing. During the 1970s Ranney left his teaching at University of Wisconsin to work in Chicago factories, where he organized for better pay and working conditions. Ranney worked with steel workers on the South Side of Chicago, where he saw firsthand the effects of deindustrialization on communities.

In 1983 Ranney joined CUED to work with Rob Mier in order to study alternatives to deindustrialization. Throughout the 1980s, Ranney continued to devote his academic work to questions of job loss and economic restructuring in Chicago and beyond. In addition, Ranney continued to work with the Wisconsin Steelworkers Save Our Jobs Committee and other worker groups, seeking to increase understanding of broader economic forces (Ranney, 2003).

Starting in 1983, CUED and MCLR were funded by the Chicago DED to develop a cohesive early warning system on the West Side of Chicago. Together the two groups founded the West Side Jobs Network, a community labor coalition designed to gather
information on plants and organize community and worker support in order to implement early warning. As a result of their early warning work, the West Side Jobs Network engaged in several fights over key plant closings (Giloth & Rosenblum, 1971). The symbiotic relationship between Washington’s progressive DED and community activists was complicated, but ultimately valuable. The fact that tension between the city and community groups did exist was clear. Nonetheless, Ranney later reflected that while an early warning network is not dependent on local government for “formation or continuation,” it probably cannot operate well without local government support (Wiewel & Ranney, 1985).

Early Warning and the U.S. Economy

Chicago was an important site for organizing anti-plant-closing campaigns and early warning activities, but it was one of many. Early warning took hold across the country during the early 1970s and through the 1980s as a practical method of addressing plant closings. By the 1980s a movement was building in opposition to the waste of so many previously productive factories and communities. But early warning’s appeal was more than practical; it also represented an alternative vision for the nation’s economy.

The scholars and activists who wrote about early warning argued that it was more than just a response to the immediate event of a plant closing. Rather, it represented a broader argument about how the economy should and could work. Swinney and others maintained that by the 1970s, labor had erroneously ceded too much power to business regarding decisions about our nation’s productive capacity.

These arguments at the community level found reinforcement in academic work, most prominently from Bluestone and Harrison, whose aforementioned landmark book on deindustrialization established that falling profits from international competition, as well as emerging technologies that afforded greater capital mobility, provided a context for plant closings. By the 1980s manufacturing plants were regularly bought by conglomerates to be used as collateral to access capital for investments in other sectors, where large profits might be made quickly. Increasingly, it seemed that factory owners were not acting as benevolent stewards of the productivity and potential that their factories and workers represented. According to Bluestone and Harrison,

One possible reaction to [falling profits] would have been to try to meet the new competition in the old-fashioned way—an active search for new markets, increased research and development, and investments in more efficient technology. Some American firms took this route, but many more decided instead to abandon the competition altogether (as in electronics), to reduce their investments (as in steel), or to focus all their energies on reducing labor costs and circumventing public sector taxes and regulations. In a desperate attempt to restore, or preserve, the rates of profit to which they had become accustomed in the halcyon days of the 1950s and 1960s, American corporate managers in the 1970s went to extraordinary lengths to shift capital as rapidly as possible, from one activity, one region, and one nation to another. In the process, the industrial base of the American economy began to come apart at the seams.

Coalition Work

Organizers concluded that the economy needed a much broader set of people, particularly workers, to have decision-making roles. Early warning activists believed that in order to get more power, they needed to build broad-based coalitions with diverse groups that would be affected by the closing: labor, community-based organizations, local politicians, and city economic development representatives. At times, coalition work extended into the business realm. Many early warning groups drew distinctions between good and bad business practices, and in some cases they worked successfully with plant owners, either to avert a closing or to arrange a solution such as an employee buyout.

Worker Participation

Worker participation was the foundation of community and labor-led early warning systems, and distinguished them from advance notice plant closing legislation. While the organizations that built Chicago’s early warning system benefited from support from Mayor Washington’s administration, government-only early warning systems were limited. Early warning community leaders agreed that there was a core element of these systems that had to come from below (Nissen, 1991, 1995; Wiewel & Ranney, 1985; and Giloth & Rosenblum, 1987). Employee knowledge was essential for understanding the nuances of the workplace and the work itself.

In addition to practical concerns about gaining access to insider knowledge, early warning leaders expressed a normative commitment to building early warning networks around workers. Lynn Feekin, Director of the Calumet Project for Industrial Jobs in Northwest Indiana in the 1980s, believes that a core idea behind early warning was to instill a sense of a worker’s right to participate in decisions about the economy. Part of the Calumet Project’s early warning training included asking workers to envision the future
of their region’s economy. Asking questions about who makes the decisions about a region’s economy, and who bears the consequences, helped to reveal structural forms of injustice.

Dissemination

The ideas behind early warning, and the diversity of local groups involved in fighting plant closings, were well represented in the stream of publications issued on the topic between 1981 and 1994. The publications were authored by university study groups, community-based organizations, progressive research and technical organizations, and labor unions. Several of the publications were linked to conferences or other events that had drawn activists together under the umbrella of broader progressive agendas, such as the Conference on Alternative State and Local Policies.

Many of the publications included checklists designed to help workers spot indicators that a plant might be in danger of closing. They often included how-to sections, with aids such as sample legislation, drafts of letters to the editor, and instructions on how to locate public records, as well as the names of individuals and organizations to contact for further resources. These tools conveyed the idea of working documents, intended for the hands of those who wanted to take action.

The Chicago-based publications of the time period were representative. The MCLR’s 1986 pamphlet, “Early Warning Manual: Against Plant Closing,” is a “how-to” manual addressed to unions, workers, community-based organizations and economic development officials. It defines the early warning system as a labor and community-based network of information sharing and research, combining information from the shop floor with every possible public source in order to anticipate a company’s shutdown or disinvestment plans while there is still time to intervene. The authors pay special attention to both the difficulty and potential rewards of coalition work, emphasizing union participation as an essential element of gaining institutional knowledge. The manual goes step by step through early warning indicators, includes case studies, gives instructions for forming an early warning network, and provides methods for fighting the closing.

David Ranney’s 1988 article “Manufacturing Job Loss and Early Warning Indicators” reviews the literature on plant closings to identify 16 local management practices that can be used as early warning indicators by those concerned with industrial retention. Ranney emphasizes the need to understand the broader context of the plant and its location, ownership structure, and industry in order to make sense of the indicator.
If one of the early warning indicators regarding local management practice is present, particularly in combination with conglomerate ownership or a local ownership succession problem, then further research is advised. Ranney also provides a list of reasons why management would close a plant, which could assist workers in understanding the larger economic landscape. Ranney stresses the importance of accessing worker knowledge, as local management practices may not be visible otherwise.

**Common Principles**

The core ideas behind early warning were shared throughout the country. In 1985, when Swinney founded the Federation of Industrial Retention and Renewal (FIRR), Chicago became a base for those involved in early warning efforts to meet and communicate ideas and strategies. At its peak, FIRR had 40 member organizations. While FIRR’s membership probably represented the nucleus of early warning work, additional groups around the country used a parallel approach.

In addition to a national network, there were regional groups that met to share information and resources. These included the California Coalition against Plant Closures, which drew together groups across the West Coast, and regional meetings organized by MCLR Research that enjoyed participation throughout the Rust Belt. Organizers described these coalitions as presenting crucial opportunities to share strategies, stories, and resources. After attending regional and national meetings, leaders would return to their base organizations with a renewed sense of solidarity.

Along with discussing ideas about how and why early warning work should be done, many organizations across the country shared an intellectual foundation. Interviews with organizational leaders, as well as the publications of the period, reveal the influence of writings such as Bluestone and Harrison’s insights on deindustrialization and Luria and Russell’s 1981 book *Rational Reindustrialization*.

**Effects of Early Warning**

Early warning systems produced both concrete and intangible effects. Lynn Feekin wrote that early warning as implemented in Indiana had concrete success in preventing plant closures and saving jobs. Other positive effects included clean-ups of contaminated sites, commitments of more training dollars, and services for displaced workers, all of which came out of the community pressure that early warning created. Another immediate effect of early warning was that by calling attention to the crisis of plant closings and the resulting devastation of communities, early warning and the resulting anti-plant-closing campaigns set the stage for attempts to pass local and national legislation designed to protect workers. Most prominently, the 1988 federal “Worker Adjustment Retraining and Notification” (WARN) law required that any plant with 100 or more employees give a 60-day notice of a scheduled closing.

**Transformative Effects on Participants**

But other effects, equally important, were less tangible. Many organizers involved in early warning evaluated their success broadly, not only in terms of plants saved. Early warning had significant potential for transformative effects on participants. While early warning work did not directly address structural issues, it did provide an entry point for workers to begin exploring questions of economic justice.

Swinney describes the potential of early warning work as a process of transforming “civic consciousness.” A worker can go through his or her entire career and never be asked his or her opinion regarding the management of the company. However, when a worker is consulted, be it through the vehicle of early warning or not, it can be a powerful experience and confirm that his or her knowledge on the topic is essential.

Early warning work required training sessions and meetings, where workers engaged with each other and developed stronger community links. Through interactions with both peers and formal educators, workers often developed a richer understanding of how the economy worked and why a profitable plant might be shut down. This knowledge could help them to channel the anger and despair of job loss.

Several groups developed international links and solidarity with foreign workers. This was particularly important as a method for combating potential xenophobia among U.S. manufacturing workers. Ellen Teninty, Director of the Plant Closures Project in Oakland, described a regional conference in Los Angeles in 1982 that drew diverse groups together:

> We rented ourselves a bus, and planned a conference—we joined the LA coalition with the Bay Area Coalition, and the Northern California, the Eureka people, and the Modesto-Salinas people. We all went to Los Angeles. We had a two-day conference. One thing that was really fabulous about it was that we all had simultaneous translating headsets. That really blew everyone away! …And that experience—like a little UN or something! …And people were trying to understand the economic basis of the crisis. This was the beginning, I mean people were saying, our plant was making money, why did it need to close? We don’t understand that… It was really the beginning of this whole coalition’s
education about globalization, and how you can’t just think it’s the Japanese, because of the US investment that’s there and how production is being chopped up and divided out, and who gets what, and there’s reasons for that, that have to do with controlling labor costs.

By engaging in this type of worker education, early warning groups sought to shift the manner in which the crisis of deindustrialization was understood, thereby dispelling false blame from foreign workers.

**Effects on Local Development Practice**

In Chicago, early warning efforts had a strong effect on local economic development policy under Mayor Washington’s administration. As noted above, the city’s DED provided support to MCLR and CUED in the city’s West Side beginning in 1983; but the interactions between organizers, community members, labor, and factory owners further energized city officials on behalf of industrial retention. One of Robert Mier’s first actions as DED Commissioner was a lawsuit designed to support the effort to save the Playskool facility. The campaign to save Playskool had originated in the West Side Jobs Network’s early warning work. Parallel efforts included the creation of task forces aimed at retaining jobs and firms in printing, apparel, and steel; and the successful campaign led by community activist Donna Ducharme to create planned manufacturing districts protecting small manufacturers from development pressures in prime real estate. Mier (and others) cited the Playskool campaign—and the Chicago early warning network—as the key to the city’s efforts on other fronts to support its manufacturing jobs base (1993).

In addition to encouraging an official city response, early warning work led many organizations and individuals to become involved in developing standards for local economic development practices, in particular the use of public money. For example, Feekin described the Calumet Project’s evolution toward advocacy for worker-friendly economic development policies as a realization that behind much of the early warning work

…was the fact that a lot of companies were using public dollars and were threatening either closure or moving—and they would get the public dollars and it wasn’t just a rip-off where they were exploiting the workers and the community but now (in addition) the public dollars were being used and stolen. So we tried to think how we could get a handle on it.

While the objectives and outcomes were not always parallel to, or derivative of, the history of early warning work, many figures in what became a campaign for increased corporate and government responsibility reveal interesting linkages with the early warning movement.

**Conclusion**

Our conclusions are twofold. First, while the local response to industrial decline was ultimately limited by the lack of a cohesive national agenda, such a national agenda would not have been a substitute for local action. Both the national and local levels were important.

Second, regarding the legacy of local institutions and policy innovations developed during this time, we believe that they remain a powerful resource, and one that can be built upon to address contemporary challenges. The local capacity developed in response to the manufacturing job loss of the 1980s still exists.

The two organizations discussed in the Chicago case—CUED and MCLR—are still working to make Chicago’s economy stronger and more just. MCLR has further evolved, creating the Chicago Manufacturing Renaissance Council, a coalitional organization with the mission of strengthening Chicago’s manufacturing sector, as well as Austin Polytechnical Academy, a public high school in the Austin neighborhood that prepares students for four-year colleges and careers in high-technology industry and entrepreneurship.

Other organizations across the country are working from a foundation of local innovation, activism and research reminiscent of early warning. The Steel Valley Authority, a regional development authority focused on revitalizing the Monongahela Valley, depends on its Strategic Early Warning Network (SEWN) as a major component of its ongoing fight to save jobs. The Ohio Employee Ownership Center at Kent State University (OEOC) provides outreach and technical assistance for workers and business owners interested in employee ownership, as well as general support for employee-owned businesses. The Center on Wisconsin Strategy (COWS) is a policy center that focuses on “high-road” economic development, and it has founded other innovative ventures in workforce development, such as the Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership (WRTP). The COWS also co-founded the Apollo Alliance, a partnership between labor and environmentalists working for clean energy and good jobs across the nation. A further example is Good Jobs First, a national policy research center that focuses on keeping the development practices of government and corporations accountable, as well as on “smart growth for working families.”

These worker-oriented and coalition-based approaches to local economic development represent an important piece of the national memory. As the federal government crafts a response to today’s epidemic job loss, ideally organizations like the ones listed will have
an important role to play in the recovery. Their worker-centered approach can help keep government spending and corporate actions accountable, and may lead to a more participatory economic recovery process and more equitable outcome.
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Interview with Timothy Beatley

Christa Wagner

On February 19, 2009, the UNC-Chapel Hill Department of City and Regional Planning (DCRP) sponsored a lecture by Timothy Beatley, Teresa Heinz Professor of Sustainable Communities in the Department of Urban and Environmental Planning at the University of Virginia. A DCRP graduate himself (MA ’84, Ph.D. ’86), Beatley has co-authored books with Prof. David Godschalk and Prof. David Brower on hazard mitigation and coastal zone management, although he is best known for his work on the theory and practice of sustainable communities (see a review of his latest book on page 65). During his visit to Chapel Hill, Christa Wagner spoke with Beatley about new (and old) meanings of sustainability, roles for planners in reimagining cities, and going “glocal.”

You are a member of the planning department faculty at the University of Virginia, where you have taught for more than twenty years. Have any of the “take home” lessons about the field changed for your students over your tenure?

Obviously in some ways—in many ways—the conditions of the world have changed and the problems we’re facing, the magnitude of the problems, is that much greater. The need to move forward with solutions is more pressing than it might have been twenty years ago. But on the other hand, the solutions are not all that different and the message is not all that different.

The sense of concern about the environment and sustainability, and the support for things like green building, local food, bicycling, physical activity, and getting people outside—those things have risen in importance. As the problems become more serious, there’s a lot more activity, but the planning solutions are not necessarily all that different from the ones we were talking about 20 years ago.

The language has changed, of course. But the message still is to planners that we, as a field, have a tremendous opportunity to help shape the future.

Whatever happens with the current economic situation, there will be growth and change of some sizable magnitude. The built environment will change. Planners have a tremendous opportunity to shape that, and profoundly reduce its ecological footprint, at the same time that we’re creating enjoyable, livable places. It’s probably the key reason that people get into planning in the first place: they want to make a difference in the world.

Are planning professionals still defining “sustainability” in the same way, now that the concept has entered the public consciousness and is a kind of marketing strategy for branding products and places?

I think the meaning has changed over time. It’s interesting to think back on the environmental history of our country; you can argue that many of the green building ideas are not especially new—such as design features that were necessary in a period without fossil fuels, abundant energy, and electricity to power air conditioners and so on.

The early definitions of sustainability had more to do with land protection and conservation, which are still important concerns. The early conservation movement emphasized that we have a resource we shouldn’t waste; we have to steward over it and manage it. One notion of sustainability is living off of that ecological interest and not eating into that capital, whether forest, or fishery, or topsoil.

Fast-forwarding to 1960s and 1970s, we begin to see an application of sustainability to the built environment. I’ve just had my students read Ecotopia [the 1975 utopian novel by Ernest Callenbach], in part because I wanted them to think of the idea of vision as...
a planning tool. It’s an amazing foreshadowing of the sustainable cities that we’re talking about today.

We’ve gone from sustainability being primarily about a wetland or a fishery, a natural resource or natural system, to something that’s much more urban and about the built environment. Now sustainability has moved beyond a narrow constituency to address the whole range of things that affect people’s lives.

We see the application of this idea to how you think about an urban neighborhood. The conservation agenda was applied in more affluent communities and often to higher-end developments and projects. There was a concern that this agenda doesn’t connect to the way that average people live, more disadvantaged communities, or communities of color. That’s changed dramatically. We’re seeing that green rooftops, tree plantings, and community gardens aren’t just amenities for rich neighborhoods; they are things that generate jobs, incomes, livelihoods, and hope. We haven’t moved far enough in that direction, probably, but the emergence of increasingly good examples of affordable green design, for example, is a good thing.

Can you talk about your concept of resiliency?

Resilience is the new sustainability. That might be overstating it. Resiliency is a particular lens within that larger framework (of sustainability). It emerged in my thinking in my career in the natural hazards area, working with [UNC emeritus faculty] David Godschalk, David Brower, and Ray Burby.

We used to talk about hazard mitigation, and then resilience came on the scene. It seems to describe what we’re worried about. It allows [communities] to adapt to changing circumstances and shocks of various kinds, so that they can bend and not break. The term seems to allow people to support programs and policies. There’s something intuitive about the term resilience or resiliency; maybe unlike sustainability, it has a common meaning. Such as, you want to make that building resilient, or that neighborhood or economy resilient.

The simple idea is that we can design and plan places that have the qualities that allow them to quickly and easily adapt to changing circumstances. There’s a kind of perfect storm winding up, especially for cities. Everything from declining global oil supply to global climate change will be a big challenge for cities. Drought, water availability, coastal communities will experience sea level rise, hurricanes, and an increase in severe weather events. Layer on to that all of the economic shocks that are being experienced now, and what that means in terms of the resilience of families and individual lives.

With so many things happening at once, it really makes sense for us to think comprehensively about what a resilient city might look like.

Greenhouse at Abanitu Organics. Photo courtesy of Bountiful Backyards, an edible landscaping business in Durham.
One of your recent books, *Native to Nowhere*, examines the competing forces of globalization and localization in the efforts by communities to define themselves. Can you characterize your sense of that relationship?

It’s a huge issue for us to try to sort out. We’re now in a period where we’re maybe rethinking the benefits of globalization. For the last couple of decades, we accepted globalization as this natural good thing that will bring many benefits, economic and otherwise. But we are and we ought to be rooted in actual places, the places we live.

I have always argued that planning is about finding, understanding, and appreciating those local roots, and nurturing them, fostering them, and finding creative ways to build commitment to place and to each other. There is a quality of life and meaning to life that can only be gotten at that local level.

We’re at this interesting time where we’re trying to navigate our commitments to global and local. Some are using the term “glocal,” or “glocalism.” The challenge is to find the right balance. To support glocalism means a kind of melding of the local and global. In the production of food and building materials, many things can be supplied locally or regionally. But our commitment to the local should not reflect disinterest in the larger world, or caring or commitment to the larger world.

A *Native to Nowhere* agenda is not about disconnecting from the world. Exactly what that balance will look like will depend on the place. There are lots of potential glocal futures. One is to support the people and cultures of other parts of the world through responsible consumption, like the fair trade idea but much more broad.

There are probably a thousand and one new ways to foster local-global relationships, like ecological sister cities, exchange programs, long-term contractual relationships that supply certain kinds of goods and services from another region, where it’s not about buying at the cheapest price, but about buying a product or service that reflects long-term care about that place. Glocalism represents a new kind of philosophy for doing commerce in the world.

**Your ideas are rooted in the city or the local place, and a great deal of your work responds to the places you have encountered across the globe. What’s your favorite city?**

There are two places where I have spent a lot of time and that I have written about. Leiden, in the Netherlands, has become a kind of second home for us. This is a place that combines a city looking to the future but rooted to its place and in the past, with virtually all of the qualities that I could ever have imagined that I would love, and enjoy living in, and would be sustainable. It has everything from walking to bicycling to transit, with urban form that delights the eye, full of sensory experiences and smells and sounds.

The more recent place is a community where we lived in Australia, called Freemantle. It has many of the same qualities as Leiden, but with a different history and architecture.

**I notice they’re not in America. The question kind of implied international places.**

The second part of the answer is about where I live here, Charlottesville, Virginia, my home of more than 20 years. It shares many of the qualities of these two international examples. Implicit in your question is almost this bias we have to seek out and identify places that are doing things that are progressive, or exemplary.

We spend a lot of time talking about best practices. But I think it’s also important to recognize that a place doesn’t have to rise to that level to deserve to be cared for and cared about and committed to. There will be something unique and something special anywhere. There will be a history to that place and that landscape that’s worthy of knowing and exploring. No matter where you are, and how degraded—in some ways, those are the places that need the care and attention.

We don’t talk enough about loving places. It may be hard to hug a place. But there are lots of ways we can show our commitment to and affection for places. One is simply by saying, “I live here. And I’m going to do what I can to intimately know this place, nurture and care for this place.” That doesn’t mean the buildings have to have photovoltaics on the roof or a sophisticated transit system. It’s something we have to be careful about: we recognize the intrinsic value, and the possibility of a deep relationship to home, wherever we are and wherever we are living.

In planning, we’re often looking at the best places, implying that the place you live in, if you live in Akron [Ohio], or Virginia Beach [Virginia], or Beaumont, Texas, can’t be quite as special or important. But there will be a sacredness to those places, or there could be, if we only took the time to develop that sense about them. That’s a long-winded way of saying that Charlottesville is as important as any other place to me.

**What ideas or practices in the field, new or not, are currently exciting you?**

There are so many right now, and so much potential to apply them, in navigating our way through this thicket of really severe challenges we’re facing. Many of the things that are exciting to me are new ways to think about cities. Reimagining, for example, our energy
production systems. Moving from this antiquated notion of fossil fuel-dependent energy production that’s hugely inefficient, to a different model integrated into buildings and neighborhoods using many renewable energy technologies we have now. We need to take charge of energy production, incorporate it into where we live, and rethink everything in the built environment—every rooftop, façade, sidewalk, lighting structure. We should see everything as a potential opportunity to generate power. We need to design everything in the city based around an organic model—“Buildings like trees, cities like forests,” as [UVA architecture professor William] McDonough says.

Creative food production and vertical farming are promising ideas. Creatively rethinking about the land around buildings, such as the Boulder, Colorado farming of 12 suburban home lots—a “yard farm” idea. Churches, schools, and institutional land represent lots of opportunities to grow food. Edible landscaping. Urban orchards. This is really re-envisioning what cities are about; cities aren’t just sucking in resources but are actually bountiful, and can grow more food than we need.

All the rethinking about infrastructure: a road becomes redefined as something that’s not just about conveying traffic, but collects and treats storm water, and can grow food, and restore habitat. [It’s] this concept of infrastructural nodes that are distributed across the city and can do many different things at once. You’d have a combined heat and power plant with a park on top and a facility for collecting and treating wastewater from a neighborhood and extracting biogas that becomes a fuel. Doing all those things to cool the urban heat island effect.

Just as in nature: what can we learn from natural systems in designing and planning cities? Most things in nature don’t do just one thing; they are able to do lots of different things, and that’s partly what resilience is about. We have to begin to think about infrastructure in that new way, partly because we just can’t afford it any longer. We need to layer different functions into a single space.

There will be a lot of new things we haven’t thought of that will respond to our changing circumstances. We have to deal with amazing, biophysical forces, like sea level rise. It’s a huge opportunity to rethink how we might design buildings, and creatively adapt to those changing biophysical conditions, finding new ways to use natural systems to do the work for us.

One big idea, in the vein of biomimicry, is this notion of seeing the city in terms of its metabolism, inputs and outputs, analogous to an organic system or a human body. We need certain things to run, and increasingly those things are often coming from very far away. That will have to change. Historically, we’ve seen these systems in very linear ways; the new idea will connect those inputs and outputs in a more circular, metabolic system closer to Nature. There’s no concept of waste in Nature. That’s a big idea: to use the principles of biomimicry to plan the city.
More and more transit agencies are incorporating cycling into their programs through bike to transit initiatives such as indoor bicycle parking at rail stations, as well as bicycles on buses and trains. In spite of the popularity and success of these programs, little research exists on whether this influences travel behavior, and transit planners and decision makers do not have a reliable way of gauging demand for bicycle facilities. In the Master’s Project excerpted here, annual counts of bicycles parked at Chicago Transit Authority rail stations and neighborhood GIS data were used to estimate longitudinal models of the environmental determinants of bicycling to rail stations. Results indicate that increased use of bicycle parking at rail stations was associated with higher station boardings, more bicycle parking facilities, lower residential density and crime, and fewer bus options, even while controlling for neighborhood demographics.

Introduction

Transportation professionals are increasingly looking for nontraditional options to help complete transit and non-motorized networks, and many have turned to the complementary aspects of cycling and transit. A number of agencies in the United States and abroad have adopted policies in the last 15 years aimed at increasing the use of the two modes (Schneider, 2005), such as indoor bicycle parking at rail stations and allowing bicycles on buses and trains. The public benefits of these programs are numerous, as both bicycling and transit can improve health, increase access to jobs and services, promote equity for underserved populations, and reduce environmental impacts.

Bicycle to transit programs have been largely successful, and research has documented significant use of bicycle facilities provided by transit agencies (Federal Transit Administration, 1999; Martens, 2007; Schneider, 2005). King County Transit estimated more than 40,000 bicycle-carrying passengers in 1999, while Caltrain reported that more than 2,000 cyclists a day brought their bicycles on board the passenger rail line between San Francisco and Silicon Valley during the same year (Federal Transit Administration, 1999). San Diego Metropolitan Transit System estimates nearly 600,000 bicycle trips served annually through its facilities (Schneider, 2005). Despite the emerging appeal of the programs, bicycle to transit behavior has been overlooked in research, and little has been written on travelers who use the facilities and their environments (Schneider, 2005).

Case Study: Chicago Transit Authority’s Bike and Ride Program

In 1999, the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) initiated a program to encourage people to combine bicycling and transit. The program, called Bike and Ride, has three major components: allowing bicycles on “L” trains except during rush hours, equipping all 2,000+ buses with racks that carry up to two bicycles, and providing indoor bicycle parking at more than 75 rail stations on the system. Bike and Ride is part of a larger mission by Mayor Richard M. Daley and the Chicago
Department of Transportation to “make Chicago the most bicycle friendly city in the United States” (Mayor’s Bicycle Advisory Council, 2006).

This paper assesses one component of the Bike and Ride program. There are 143 rail stations in the CTA system. We used annual counts of bicycles parked at the 75 indoor facilities, combined with geospatial land use, demographic, and policy data in 1-mile buffers around each of the 143 rail stations, to elucidate possible influences on the use of bicycle to transit programs. Understanding environmental characteristics related to Bike and Ride participation can help policymakers better leverage resources to maximize the use of facilities and can help researchers better understand the role of the built environment in transportation decisions.

Analytical Methods

Regression Models

Because Bike and Ride participation variables are based on count data which vary over time, we estimated a number of count models, using panel methods. Using Stata®/SE Version 10, we first estimated three longitudinal negative binomial regressions (xtnbreg function), using demand counts as the outcome variable (Cameron & Trivedi, 1998; Hausman, Hall, & Griliches, 1984; Liang & Zeger, 1986). The longitudinal function is similar to a cross-sectional negative binomial regression, but it accounts for the use of the same stations over time. Each station used in the analysis had non-missing values for all input variables and the outcome variable (n=129, with 510 observations). The first model used demographic and transit variables as the input variables.

The second model used the input variables that had a coefficient with p<0.15 significance in the first model as well as the built environment variables. We employed those variables that had a coefficient with a p<0.15 significance in the third, preferred model, along with the policy variables (bicycle lanes and crime). We ran random effects and fixed effects models for each procedure, and a Hausman test determined the appropriate model for analysis (Noland & Karlaftis, 2005).

For the percent occupancy outcome variable, conditional on having supply, we estimated three longitudinal linear ordinary least squares regression models (xtreg command in Stata) (Baum, 2006; Dwyer & Feinleib, 1992). Stations used in the analysis had non-missing values for all input variables and the outcome variable (n=62, with 159 observations). Since parking supply is already accounted for in the outcome variable, it was not used as an input variable in these models. We generated random and fixed effects models, and a Hausman test determined the appropriate model for interpretation (Baum, 2006). We only used those variables that had a p<0.15 significance in each model in subsequent models.

Results and Discussion

(Note: The specifics of the results have been taken out of this section for space considerations. To find the full documentation of the results, please visit our website at www.planning.unc.edu, and scroll down under “Department News.”) Both the number of indoor bicycle parking spaces and their use grew significantly during the data collection period. The number of spaces increased by 225% over that time period, and parking at those spaces increased by 400%. However, the increase in use of the facilities was uneven. For example, an aggregation of values at Orange Line stations, located on the southwest side of the city, show a greater than 80% occupancy during each count while a similar aggregation of values for Green Line stations, located on both the due west and due south sides of the city, revealed less than 25% occupancy each year.

Our results indicate that several environmental characteristics are related to Bike and Ride behavior, even when accounting for demographic variation between neighborhoods. In accordance with previous work, Bike and Ride participation, as measured in two ways using counts of parked bicycles, was higher at stations with higher numbers of train riders, fewer bus options and more bicycle parking spaces. Surprisingly, participation was lower in areas with higher residential density and higher percentages of African American residents. Despite theoretical and empirical support for the importance of other environmental factors, we found no significant associations between program participation and land use, miles of road or density of bicycle lanes. However, post-estimation analyses do indicate that a combined policy approach, focused on multiple factors related to Bike and Ride participation, will generate the most efficient increase in program use.

Explanations of Environmental Influences

Assuming ridership is an indication of “attraction,” the relationship between weekday boardings and facility use supports the idea that the “attraction” of high transit use stations could increase cycling in the area (McNally, 2000). Increasing bicycle parking at stations with high ridership and a number of popular nearby destinations may further enhance use of the mixed modes of transport. The association of higher Bike and Ride use with lower levels of bus service and longer distances to rail stations supports the idea that people will choose bicycling when walking and taking the bus are more onerous options. While our analysis was not designed to determine whether these Bike and Ride participants would commute in personal cars if the program was not available, it does allow for this supposition on certain days, and provides an avenue for future research.

The inverse correlation between buses and cycling in this context reveals the complex relationship of the two modes. In one component of the Bike and Ride program,
buses carry bicycles on racks. In this way, they are complementary, and policies promoting one mode will support the other. However, in terms of arriving at rail stations, riding the bus and bicycling may compete with each other in mode choice decision. High bus density in a neighborhood may make it difficult to bicycle, and create conflicts between cyclists and buses. Thus, policy-makers and transit professionals should search for context-sensitive solutions in different neighborhoods. In areas where there is significant bus service, they should search for ways for bicycles and buses to more safely coexist. In areas with minimal bus service, bicycle supports and facilities may be a much more cost effective way to promote alternative modes of transport.

The inverse relationship between residential density and Bike and Ride usage was surprising, particularly because the input variable is an indication of total population in the buffer. This finding may highlight the specific needs of bicycle trips, which could be better fostered by a less dense or urban built environment with fewer impediments and dangers (Barnes & Krizek, 2005). The negative association of crime with number of bicycles parked at stations supports the premise that people are less likely to feel safe leaving their bicycles at a station in neighborhoods with significant crime, even if it is within view of station attendants. Thus, attention to safety at and around stations is important for policymakers.

The significant negative association of the percent of African Americans living in a station neighborhood with both variables describing Bike and Ride use was also unexpected given previous findings which showed that African Americans are more likely to use transit (Pucher & Renne, 2003). However, the negative association of median income with Bike and Ride demand supports previous studies (Barnes & Krizek, 2005; M. Winters et al., 2007). These findings may reflect the complex interaction of demographics with bicycling and transit. Characteristics of a neighborhood (and people living within that neighborhood) that are conducive to taking transit may not apply to cycling. Similarly, the reasons a person might enjoy cycling in her neighborhood might not be the same as why she would choose to ride transit. In addition, the high collinearity between percent African American and a number of the input variables (e.g., bus density, residential density, crime, median income, urban mix) could mean that the variable is an indicator of other environmental influences negatively associated with the outcome variables.

Our use of the environment (neighborhood characteristics) instead of individual characteristics may also help explain the demographic influences. The independent variables in this study do not describe the Bike and Ride users, but rather the neighborhoods
surrounding stations. Even though African Americans are more likely to use transit and thus be amenable to Bike and Ride (Pucher & Renne, 2003), the environment in higher percentage African American neighborhoods may be less conducive to the behavior independent of individual preference. Since the outcome count variable is very small in comparison to the population, it is hard to test this hypothesis with these data. However, these findings do provide evidence of the importance of separating environmental influences from individual preferences in future research.

Not surprisingly, we found a significant correlation between bicycle parking supply and demand. Initially, CTA built bicycle parking facilities at stations based on perceived demand, equity across stations, and sufficiency of space (Malick, 2008). The Chicago Department of Transportation installed the parking facilities at no cost to CTA if the stations were located inside the city limits. After 2003, CTA prioritized stations based primarily on space, and a concerted effort was made to install racks at all stations with sufficient area. If demand and space were sufficient, additional parking facilities were added to stations with previously existing spaces. Since the rationale for installing the facilities was largely independent of perceived demand in later years but was related to demand in earlier years (which we found to be related to demand in later years), there could be a causative association between supply and demand that could be further investigated. With the current analysis, we cannot isolate whether the supply of parking racks generated demand or not.

The lack of a significant association between any of the land use percentage variables or road miles with either outcome variable is consistent with previous findings which only found a moderate effect of the built environment on cycling (Moudon et al., 2005). The non-significant relationship between bicycle lanes and the use of indoor parking can be partially explained by studies which found that people will only use bicycle lanes if they live quite close to them (Krizek & Johnson, 2006; Schneider, 2005). Since the one mile buffers are relatively large, the majority of residents in each one likely do not live adjacent to the on-street bicycle lanes, perhaps diminishing their impact in the analysis. In addition, the Chicago Department of Transportation Bicycle Program created on-street bicycle lanes based on a combination of demand, neighborhood equity, and opportunistic collaboration with street improvement projects (Gleason, 2007). In recent years, prioritization has focused on completing a citywide bicycle network, independent of demand. Since the network may not necessarily go near every station, the completion priority may be more effective for longer distance cycling that does not necessarily include stations as destinations. Furthermore, the influence of bicycle lanes on traveling to transit may grow over time, once the network is more complete. Transportation professionals should consider the proximity of stations when planning the construction of bicycle lane networks.

1+1=3: The Effects of Simultaneous Solutions

In spite of the statistical significance of many of the influences we examined, small coefficient values and post-estimation analysis reveal that each individual variable has a limited impact on the total number of bicycles parked at stations. For example, if all variables are held at their mean values, our analysis predicts that adding four parking spaces to a station with only two spaces generates an increase of 0.4 bicycles parked at that station. Our results, however, also suggest that the influence of parking supply on demand is enhanced as more parking spaces are added. If we add ten parking spaces instead of four, we would predict an increase of nearly three parked bicycles.

Furthermore, a comprehensive suite of solutions, targeting multiple factors, may yield even more impressive results. If our addition of ten parking spaces were accompanied by an increase in bicycle lanes to the 80th percentile level and a decrease in crime to the 20th percentile level, our analysis predicts an increase of nearly six, rather than three, bicycles parked at the station. The same changes, when occurring at a “high attraction” station (80th percentile for ridership) with limited bus access (20th percentile for bus diversity), yields nearly 11 additional Bike and Ride users, more than the increase in parking spaces. The success of approaches which change multiple factors at once is consistent with previous findings (Pucher & Buehler, 2006). This indicates that there may be a critical mass that must be reached in bicycle facilities and other factors in order for significant results to occur.

In Chicago, indoor bicycle parking is just one component of the Bike and Ride program. It is likely that as the other two parts of the program (bikes on buses and bikes on trains) become more popular, more people will use the parking spaces. For example, in 2006, there were two bicycles parked at the O’Hare station, where there is no road to access the station via bicycle. Thus, the travelers must have bicycled to a station other than O’Hare, perhaps one without indoor parking, brought their bicycles on the train, and then parked them at the O’Hare station after alighting. This indicates the appeal of a complete alternative transportation network with benefits that increase exponentially with time.

Limitations

Even though CTA collected data over four years, the analyses involved a relatively small sample size of only 62 unique stations for the linear regression models, due to the high number of “0” values for supply, and 129 stations for the negative binomial regression models with a count outcome. Only 19 of the stations had indoor bicycle parking facilities.
parking in 2002, and still less than half of all stations had facilities for inclusion in the regression analysis in 2006. In addition, demand counts were relatively low, with a maximum of 19 parked bicycles and an overall mean of less than one. Nevertheless, the stations included in all analyses cover every rail line and geographic directions of the city; thus, we feel they are representative of the varying neighborhoods in Chicago.

In addition, while the longitudinal nature of the data in this study provides a new contribution to the literature, the time frame for the analysis was only four observations over the five initial years of the existence of the facilities. Barnes and Krizek (2005) noted that the relatively large confidence intervals of single observations combined with small sample sizes of cyclists can skew models. Follow-up studies with more years and observations could examine the long-term effects of the program which might not be revealed in a short time frame with few observations. Since CTA and CDOT have prepared a Bike and Ride marketing plan and program, we recommend this type of follow-up study to evaluate their results.

There was not a consistent counting methodology between years at CTA, and some observations were lost due to this inconsistency. Nevertheless, the demand count of bicycles parked at CTA stations provides an objective outcome variable for use of the parking spots and bicycling behavior. This is unique in bicycling research, which mostly relies on subjective recall data to determine the number of cyclists using facilities (Dill & Carr, 2003; Hoehner et al., 2005; M. Winters et al., 2007).

Furthermore, we do not know if people who parked their bicycles at the stations on the days of the counts actually did take the train, though CTA’s surveys had indicated that most people who parked their bicycles do ride the train. Many of the parking spots are located after the turnstiles, and it is likely safe to assume that nearly all of these travelers would not pay the train fare simply to have a space to park their bicycle.

A final limitation of the study was the lack of bicycle lane and crime data outside the City of Chicago. This caused the values of 14 different stations (56 observations) to be excluded from all analyses. Most importantly, a few of the terminal stations were excluded from the analysis which may have biased the contribution of this variable to the models. When estimating the preferred negative binomial regression model while dropping the bicycle lane and crime data, the terminus variable is longer statistically significant (p>0.2), and the direction of the coefficient becomes positive.

**Conclusion**

This study shows that complementary policy efforts can increase the rates of bicycling to transit and ensure more consistent use of this mode of travel across different neighborhoods. When the environmental context is sufficiently conducive to bicycling to transit, the presence of indoor bicycle parking facilities appears to increase the catchment area of the station. Thus, programs like Bike and Ride should be strongly considered by transit and DOT planners and other policy decision makers, especially given the significantly lower cost of installing bicycle parking versus extending the transit network. Indoor parking facilities at rail stations seem to make the most impact in less dense neighborhoods conducive to bicycling, especially if the rail station is well utilized.

However, these facilities will be more successful if implemented in tandem with other policies supportive of bicycle to transit behavior. When extending the network of on street bicycle facilities, planners should ensure that they are built near rail stations to fully leverage both the bicycle lanes and any transit related facilities. In addition, crime in neighborhoods around stations should be addressed in order to further cycling and transit use.

Finally, this study shows a cost-effective way for transit agencies to collect longitudinal data. Planning practitioners should take initiative in monitoring and evaluating programs to strengthen arguments for alternative modes of transportation. Researchers should continue to explore the built environment’s potential influence on bicycling to transit.
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The two following reports provide an overview of the many activities within the City and Regional Planning Department at the University of North Carolina. Katherine Hebert touches on the events of the past academic year, while Julie Lawhorn highlights the work of the Diversity Committee. This group is one of a number of committees on which master’s students routinely serve, seeking to facilitate communication with faculty, enhance the curriculum with speakers and trips, and help plan for the future of the department.

DCRP Experiences Unprecedented Growth
Katherine Hebert

The 2008-2009 academic year for the UNC Department of City and Regional Planning (DCRP) was characterized by phenomenal growth and change. In August 2008, DCRP opened its doors to the department’s largest group of Master’s students in the history of the department. With 55 first-year students, 47 second-year students, and 23 new and returning Ph.D. candidates, the department is simply bursting with student activity.

Prompted by a record 235 applicants this year—due in part to the national economic crisis and to UNC’s ranking by Planetizen.com as the nation’s #3 graduate planning program for the second consecutive year—DCRP launched an intensive faculty search. After candidates from across the nation were selected for an extensive interview process, which included individual and group meetings with faculty, a presentation to students and faculty, and informal sessions with students, the department hired Nikhil Kaza for a tenure-track position within the Land Use and Environmental Planning specialization. Kaza was trained in architecture and mathematics before earning his Ph.D. in Regional Planning at the University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign. He has a particular interest in complex systems and decision making.

In addition to the presentations made by faculty candidates, the DCRP Speaker’s Committee sponsored numerous additional presentations by leaders in the field of planning, including:

- Norman Krumholz, New Roles and New Status for Planners, on October 9, 2008 (See the exclusive Carolina Planning interview on page 3)
- Cliff Rosenthal, Community Development Finance in a Changed World, on February 12, 2009
- Dr. Timothy Beatley, Planning for Resilient Cities, on February 19, 2009 (See our exclusive interview on page 47)
- Daniel Douglas, Processes, Places and Spaces for Creative Economy, on April 6, 2009

Katherine Hebert has completed the first year of the master’s program in the Department of City and Regional Planning at UNC-Chapel Hill. She is specializing in Land Use and Environmental Planning. Katherine is also the UNC student representative to the NCAPA.
DCRP also co-hosted a panel discussion on “The Politics of Planning” with the North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association, introducing students to statewide leaders in the public and private planning sectors.

Other student activities this year included another successful Diverse Communities Bus Tour in Durham, the March Open House for prospective students, a visit to the historic Stagville plantation, and a Habitat for Humanity volunteer day.

DCRP students have also garnered impressive recognitions this year: Erin Deignan kicked off the fall semester with a presentation at the NCAPA conference entitled “Sturdy, Homegrown Economic Development: Theories Behind the Success and Limitations of HandMade in America.” A few months later, two first-year students, Robert Edgecombe and Paul Winn, placed first and second, respectively, in the Transportation Research Board Conference’s poster competition in Washington, D.C.

As our second-year students look forward to graduation and the daunting task of finding employment in less-than-ideal economic conditions, DCRP continues to grow stronger, expanding the DCRP family and continuing its tradition of high-quality education in the field of urban and regional planning.

DCRP Diversity Committee Update

Julie Lawhorn

The Diversity Committee at DCRP aims to increase awareness about issues of equity, race, and poverty in the planning discourse at UNC. While planning theory increasingly takes notice of communities that have traditionally been marginalized, the profession itself is not yet reflective of a wide range of backgrounds. Two ways of addressing this shortage are to support departmental efforts to hire minority faculty, and to improve recruiting strategies to attract and retain diverse applicants to the graduate program. Currently the department receives a modestly diverse applicant pool, but struggles to attract

Julie Lawhorn grew up in Raleigh, North Carolina and earned an undergraduate degree from UNC-Chapel Hill. After working in the Triangle non-profit community for several years, including Public Allies North Carolina and the Food Bank of Central & Eastern NC, Julie returned to UNC to complete the master’s program in City and Regional Planning in 2009. Her specialization was Housing and Community Development.
minority students for final admission decisions.

The Diversity Committee decides upon a few key projects each year based upon student and faculty interests. Although students are usually involved for only one or two years, Professors Mai Nguyen and Phil Berke have provided consistent leadership and helped guide students’ energy into concrete actions. This year, in an effort to publicize the department and its high national ranking, as well as its diverse faculty members and their research interests, the Diversity Committee designed a poster for the intentional recruitment of diverse applicants. The poster will enhance the program’s visibility and promote the planning profession. In Fall 2009, it will be used to recruit potential students from the UNC undergraduate community as well as from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) within North Carolina. The Diversity Committee selected this strategy based upon the assumption that local students from North Carolina and the surrounding region may be more likely to stay in state, and that DCRP could benefit from encouraging these students to apply. The poster design was provided by Professor Thomas Campanella and adapted by DCRP students Erin Gillespie and Megan Cullers.

Other Diversity Committee activities during the 2008-2009 academic year included:

• Organizing the Second Annual Diverse Communities Bus Tour of Durham in January for approximately 50 students, faculty and staff
• Sponsoring a field trip to Historic Stagville
• Building relationships with the UNC Graduate School and regional planning leaders concerned about diversity in planning issues

The students of the Diversity Committee would like to thank Professors Mai Nguyen, Thomas Campanella, Phil Berke, Emil Malizia, and Roberto Quercia for their continued guidance and support.

Earl Phillips, Northeast Central Durham Executive Director, leads a tour of Golden Belt. The 1900 structure was renovated in 2008 and houses the Durham Office of Community Development as well as artists’ studios and lofts. Photo by Jock Lauterer.
Book Reviews

A Better Way to Zone: Ten Principles to Create More Livable Cities
Review of Donald L. Elliott
Reviewed by Trey Akers

Elliott’s comprehensive account of zoning practice diligently chronicles the evolution of code theory, development and implementation throughout zoning’s brief but complex history. Like other authors, Elliott often describes the increasingly complex nature of regulations as the legal detritus from several decades of amendments that have clogged the process. In this way he shows that, more often than not, zoning tends to be evolutionary, not revolutionary (4). To sort through this growing mass of legalese, he provides an in-depth description of every main zoning category—Euclidean, form-based codes, PUD developments, performance codes and hybrid codes—as well as the legal background of each model. In fact, Elliott’s legal background enables him to conduct detailed analysis of each zoning method’s statutory repute. Equally impressive, he distills the byzantine patchwork of these laws into straightforward, cogent summaries. The interesting and high-quality writing that marks the pages masks what would otherwise be a very dry read.

Though lacking a pre-stated theme or thesis, the book’s chapters effectively carry several common ideas through topically-distinct sections. In one regard, this pattern serves the book well—each section explores a topic thoroughly and enables the author to critique from various angles the categories established in the historical overview. Perhaps most often, Elliott stresses the difference in regulations needed for developed versus greenfield areas. His self-acknowledged bias toward mature urban areas (he is in favor of them and has worked extensively in many) leads him to conclude that regulation in mature areas should be treated as a land management issue, not as a land design issue (48). For instance, he points out that the rules of many urban areas prefer a use-based regulatory system whose preference for function inhibits rehabilitation; such prejudices create barriers to much needed reinvestment opportunities (51). Instead, Elliott argues, cities should adopt framework plans that clearly tie detailed policies to a particular place. He cites Denver’s “areas of stability” versus “areas of change” and the accompanying agenda for each as lucid symbols concerning the redevelopment potential of each sub-market (56). This argument works well from both regulatory and free-market standpoints, with the government targeting specific areas for growth and allowing market resources to follow this lead by directing private investment into the same areas.

To achieve the aforementioned policies, Elliott proposes a series of responses to the current zoning framework. He lists three general principles for code reform, premised on the notion that zoning should group uses based on each city’s priorities (131). According to his principles, municipalities should combine their lists of uses into fewer, broader categories; control the scale of activity for each site/district; and adopt performance-based standards that regulate building operation, not use, by managing the external use impacts of land-use activities (such as limiting business hours in a mixed-use neighborhood) (141). As evidenced by this list, Elliott favors a revamping of zoning within the existing land-based classification system. He maintains that communities should focus on making changes from an established baseline rather than completely redesigning an entire area (164). He also suggests that communities should “lighten up” on nonconformities in older areas, many of which include mixed-use neighborhoods developed prior to Euclidean templates. Elaborating on this point, Elliot writes, “Most investments in mature areas involve piecemeal, not wholesale, redevelopment,

Trey Akers is the 2008-2009 Stipe Fellow in Design & Preservation at UNC-Chapel Hill, where he has specialized in sustainable development, form-based codes, and LEED-ND. He has worked for urban design, development, and preservation firms, including the Davidson, NC-based Lawrence Group, TND-Partners of Durham, NC, and Preservation NC of Raleigh.
and regulations need to address the predominance of incremental changes to an established pattern of development” (55). In practice, rules should be flexible where impacts are small—such as a roof renovation on a house adjacent to a warehouse district.

Elliott closes the book with several topical headings under which he proposes specific changes. Under “Negotiated Large Developments,” he encourages large, character-defining developments to be negotiated between developers and cities, though he cautions that, in small projects, this approach is a time-consuming waste of staff resources (184). Turning to the need to “Depoliticize Development Decisions,” he urges municipalities to break the public perception that it is fair to change the rules at the end of the game if the voices are loud enough (194). Though these disparate suggestions resist a common heading, their concurrent implementation can produce a promising, unified approach to growth management issues.

Summarizing Elliott, the goal of zoning should be to realize a community vision by providing limited discretion and clear criteria (43). Augmented by flexibility, codes should be responsive to changes in the urban fabric. The author gives numerous ways in which municipalities may move to implement these ideas while supplying the appropriate legal grounding for each method. The countless examples drawn from real-world experiences further enrich this text and lend credibility to the suggestions. This thoughtful, progressive work is a worthwhile read for those seeking a more full and realistic understanding of zoning’s messy future.

**Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change**

Reid Ewing, Keith Bartholomew, Steve Winkelman, Jerry Walters and Don Chen

*Reviewed by Jeffery Brubaker*

The past two decades have seen a fortification of the chain of evidence regarding humankind’s influence on climate change. In 1990, when the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) produced its first assessment report, scientists were unsure whether the 0.3 to 0.6°C warming observed over the previous 100 years was due to natural variability. A subsequent 1992 report concluded that the “unequivocal detection” of the effect of human-induced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in raising the Earth’s thermostat “is not likely for a decade or more.”

Fifteen years of additional observations, fine tuning of climate models, and sharpening of scientific understanding led to the bold, central statement of the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment Report in 2007, which said, “Most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic GHG [greenhouse gasses] concentrations” (emphasis in original). The verdict is in: humans are a main cause of climate change and we have to cut emissions globally, substantially, and soon to avoid the worst risks.

As climate scientists fortified their understanding of the human role in global warming, planning researchers were amassing evidence on “the most heavily researched subject in urban planning”: the relationship between the built environment and travel behavior. It became increasingly clear that the research vindicated our common sense: compact urban form—when well designed and featuring a mix of uses—tends to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), particularly through shorter trip lengths and viability of alternative travel modes.

Given the urgency of responding to climate change, and the fact that the transportation sector emits 28 percent of total U.S. GHG emissions, the time is ripe for a book like *Growing Cooler*. The big question that Reid Ewing and his co-authors ask is how much can compact urban form reduce transportation-related emissions of the main climate change culprit, carbon dioxide (CO₂)? Their answer is seven to ten percent. If this number seems small, keep in mind that this is only the reduction due to compact urban form alone. Concurrent strategies such as road pricing, pay-as-you-go insurance policies, parking fees, and better vehicle fuel efficiency can effect further reductions. The popular press has lionized increased fuel efficiency as the way to combat climate change, but this strategy cannot do the job on its own—a point the authors make in the first paragraph of the book and expound upon in Chapter Three, “The VMT/CO₂/Climate Connection.”

While Chapter Three connects VMT to climate change, Chapter Four (“The Urban Development/VMT Connection”) is a thorough review of the “causal pathway” between urban form and travel behavior, drawing from and updating Ewing and Robert Cervero’s 2001 meta-analysis of travel and the built environment. Four types of travel behavior studies, from the household to the regional level of analysis, “provide a consistent picture”: compact urban form can reduce VMT by 20 to 40 percent. The picture may be clearest when viewed with a regional lens. There is a strong correlation between metropolitan “sprawl index” and per capita VMT. (The sprawl index, developed for EPA and Smart Growth America, takes into account four factors: density,
land use mix, presence of employment and/or population centers, and street accessibility. Unfortunately, Raleigh-Durham is pitted against Portland as an example of differing sprawl index values. At the neighborhood level, development that reduces VMT is not just dense; it tends to feature diverse uses, pedestrian-friendly design and street connectivity, and access to transit and trip destinations.

The impact of urban form on VMT comprises the central current of Growing Cooler, but other impacts are also discussed, such as induced traffic and development, residential energy use, and residential self-selection. For example, it is often overlooked that homes in compact urban areas tend to have lower energy requirements—roughly 1.4 million fewer British thermal units (Btus) per year. And what reductions can be expected if other VMT reduction strategies are added to compact development?

Using a structural equation modeling (SEM) method, elasticities generated from historical data show that increasing density, decreasing highway lane miles, nearly doubling transit revenue miles, and increasing fuel prices could lead to a substantial reduction in GHGs in the future, compared to “business as usual.”

Like the research presented throughout the book, the policy recommendations at the end are both timely and refreshingly specific. Growing Cooler digs deep into a topic that has experienced burgeoning interest but has received mostly cursory research treatment. It certainly leaves a number of questions to be answered. For example, it does not go into detail on the emerging question of climate change adaptation in transportation planning: how will future climate changes compromise transportation infrastructure and restrict travel options?

The book admits that planning alone cannot get us to 80 percent GHG reductions by 2050. But Growing Cooler gives planners good reason to believe we can play a major role in lowering climate change risks—if we are not bound by business-as-usual thinking. This book has the mark of a defining publication for the new climate change mitigation era of the planning field.

A Legal Guide to Urban and Sustainable Development for Planners, Developers and Architects
Daniel Slone and Doris Goldstein with W. Andrew Gowder Jr.
Reviewed by Bill Bishop

This newly published book is much more than the title implies. More than a legal text or reference detailing the various requirements, pitfalls and strategies associated with contemporary development patterns, it is a survey of real-world design, development, operating and management experience from a wide range of professional perspectives. As the authors write, “This book is mostly about the practical application of real-world legal solutions to typical problems encountered in building urban and sustainable development.”

In his forward to the book, Andrés Duany observes, “There is hardly anything more complicated to create than a real community. The most important qualification of someone involved in the design of community is the ability to be a generalist.” The authors have, in fact, crossed the boundaries of their legal disciplines to address many of the related and interrelated issues that arise during the course of community development. They address a broad range of development patterns or philosophies, but these themes occupy space within a consilient spectrum. The themes include neotraditionalism, New Urbanism, traditional neighborhood development (TND), real urbanism, sustainable development, smart growth, place making, urban infill, and greyfield and brownfield development.

The authors integrate a variety of legal concepts and principles into the design philosophies that underpin New Urbanism and related development. There are a number of useful ideas that recur throughout the text; among these are the ideas that “public forums regarding land use decisions rarely present an opportunity for informed discussion or balancing competing social interests,” and “if we want to stop the sprawl of humans across all habitats we must build great human habitat that attracts with its quality of life as well as with its efficient sustainable design.”

The book is rich with specific design details, illustrations, and references to master planning, site planning, streetscape and civic design, and architecture. Naturally, the authors bring their own various pro-density, urbanism, and stylistic biases, prejudices, and predispositions to the work. Building on experience with infill, greenfield, urban, and sustainable community development projects, including the seminal Seaside project, the authors describe visions, concerns, implications, and reflections on such aspects as scale, streetscape, design, and the centrally important dynamics of human community. Moreover, they describe a synthesized and perhaps hybridized body of law which they refer to as “urbanist law.”

Urbanist law, as conceived by the authors, is different than other bodies of law because it synthesizes otherwise isolated, segregated, and perhaps even antagonistic bodies of law. Its advantages are best expressed by observing the

Bill Bishop is a retired master-planned community developer now enrolled in the Ph.D. program of the UNC-Chapel Hill Department of City and Regional Planning.
frustrating results of “design by fire truck.” Specifically, roadways built to specifications that can accommodate large firefighting equipment may achieve a lot in terms of public safety when life-threatening emergencies arise, but they do not address other communal needs, like connectivity or pedestrian accessibility. Responding to these deficiencies, urbanist law is inclusive rather than exclusive and seeks to integrate problems and conflicts rather than to isolate them. It embraces a regulatory structure that is more affirmative than negative, and more enabling than prohibitive. It provides for greater emphasis on community rather than private interests, and it exercises and expresses itself in terms that are well-stated and approachable.

The book is written in a similarly approachable, easy—to-digest style. It combines the various perspectives, disciplines, and dispositions of the contributing authors into an elegant work that contributes to substantive understanding of the community design philosophies outlined above. The title of Chapter Five is rather illustrative: “Fiefdoms and Fire Trucks: Overcoming Impediments in the Subdivision, Plat-Review, and Site-Plan Process.” Experienced developers will no doubt recognize the pain and frustration associated with the issues outlined in this chapter, and others may find the material useful and eye-opening. The fact that the road through green fields, like the road to hell, is paved with good intentions is surely no excuse for codifying that road for all to travel down—especially if better paths or paving materials can be found.

It may be all but reckless for planners, public officials, serious students or developers undertaking one of the new forms of community development to overlook this book. The authors represent an enormous depth and breadth of experience across a vast and complicated landscape of development-related issues. Where the text itself does not answer specific development-related questions, it certainly guides one in the direction of those answers. Students and novice developers cannot afford to miss the opportunity to share in the authors’ collective experience, while experienced developers, planners and architects can broaden their insights and understanding—and avoid significant opportunity costs—by referring to the book and using its authors as resources.

Native to Nowhere: Sustaining Home and Community in a Global Age

Timothy Beatley

Reviewed by Dana Archer-Rosenthal

With nearly two decades’ experience writing on urban sustainability issues, Timothy Beatley has established himself as a preeminent proponent of local action as the determinant of true sustainability. Keeping with this theme, Native to Nowhere transforms eight years of fieldwork—and an enviable travel itinerary—into an exhaustive set of examples showing successful urban sustainability efforts from cities and towns throughout the United States, Canada and Europe.

In his ninth book, Beatley approaches the idea of sustainability through the lens of place-making. He begins with an argument that we have created a built environment modeled in the image of the world’s largest corporations and sustained by the prevailing ethos of sprawl. This “march of sameness” has made America devoid of real places—“distinctive places worthy of our loyalty and commitment, places where we feel at home, places that inspire and uplift and stimulate us and that provide social and environmental sustenance.” Reversing this trend, by creating places that respect and embrace local resources and communities, is a crucial step towards addressing the social, environmental and economic challenges that we face today.

While many authors might have chosen to tackle the subject of sustainable place-making using a structure based on the three E’s of sustainable development (environment, economy and equity), Beatley presents ten categories of actions that play a role in transforming—and localizing—the places and ways in which we live, work, and socialize. While some of these categories cover familiar ground for planners—for example, decreased automobile dependence through design, historic preservation, adaptive reuse and local food production—others touch on areas less frequently included in the sustainable planning agenda: multigenerational communities, shared ownership of property and institutions, public art and celebrations, and creating opportunities for education in nontraditional venues.

These departures from the usual urban sustainability literature are what make this book stand out. By presenting such a range of endeavors under the umbrella of sustainability, Beatley accomplishes two important things. First, he gently provokes the reader to think about what the premise and promises of sustainable development really mean. If sustainable development is supposed to have a temporal aspect—respecting the rights of past and future generations—it should follow that making places safe and accessible for a community’s youngest and oldest members should be a key issue in place-making. If sustainability is about reducing the footprint of what
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we consume, can a model of development that remains rooted in individual ownership and consumption really be considered sustainable? One example, beautiful for its simplicity, features a lending “library” for tools that operates in Takoma Park, Maryland and saves residents the money and space it takes to buy and store infrequently used items.

Second, with his broad agenda and diverse examples, Beatley begins to answer the question that seems to daunt many students of planning: How? How do we overcome the numerous obstacles that stand in the way of a sustainable world, including but not limited to social isolation, a lack of individual and political will, and a deeply ingrained culture of wasteful consumerism? Beatley himself acknowledges how daunting these obstacles can be. Furthermore, and somewhat paradoxically, his 200 pages of examples of successful initiatives are at times overwhelming for a reader trying to digest, distill and in some way act upon Beatley’s message.

Yet he includes the role of education and the importance of building inclusive political coalitions as components of sustainable place-making, providing two potential answers to these hard questions. Examples of initiatives to train real estate agents to market houses in historical neighborhoods or to talk to their clients about the important ecological qualities or historical merits of their new communities were strikingly logical and creative strategies, pointing to the necessity of including an ever-wider spectrum of actors in the local sustainability project.

From Beatley’s many examples, the reader realizes that the shift to sustainability is bound to be a process of fits and starts, with success built more from grassroots initiatives than from public policy—and that this incremental approach to change is not bad. America may not, as a society, be ready for a widespread shift from private to shared ownership, but many individuals might be easily convinced to borrow expensive or bulky tools instead of buying them. These small changes foster lasting habits, trends and movements, and a movement built from local efforts, slowly and inclusively, ensures its own continued success and relevance.

Two problems that stood out within the text were poor copy editing, which served to distract a reader from the points being made, and an over-reliance on certain places and examples to the exclusion of the hundreds of others that exist. Indeed, even with all the examples the book provides, any readers who keep their eyes and ears open to their surroundings or to the media could come up with additional examples of the successful place-making techniques that Beatley highlights. Perhaps this is the most encouraging element of the book. Many articles have been written about the success of Paris’ bicycle-sharing program, which provides an environmentally-friendly mode of transportation for locals and tourists alike. But undoubtedly more common are the multifaceted initiatives helping to reconnect people to the places where they live and the natural and social networks that surround them—initiatives that have not yet found a publicist like Timothy Beatley.

The Option of Urbanism
Christopher Leinberger
Reviewed by Michael Skena

Christopher Leinberger’s The Option of Urbanism: Investing in a New American Dream is an eminently readable account of the re-emergence of “walkable urbanism” as an alternative to the dominant “drivable sub-urbanism” of late-20th-century America. Combining pop culture references, urban form history, and recent research, Leinberger entertains as he leads a general audience of readers through the possibilities and difficulties presented by this new version of the American dream. Although architects and historians such as Andrés Duany, Peter Calthorpe, and Kenneth Jackson have covered the subject in popular and broadly read books, Leinberger’s background as both a real estate scholar and a developer of mixed-use projects allows him to address this issue from a unique and relevant perspective. Planners, developers, and all those interested in sustainable real estate development will find this book an engaging and valuable addition to their library.

Leinberger portrays the history of development in America as a pendulum, alternately swinging from density and concentration in the central cities to depopulation through dispersion to the suburbs. He cites an exhibit at the 1939 New York World’s Fair as a harbinger for the strong postwar swing to drivable sub-urbanism. The Futurama exhibit, sponsored by General Motors, depicted the ideal city of the modernist movement, replete with superhighways, dispersed downtowns, and a house and lawn for every family. Rather than retreading worn conspiracy theories that blame government and industrial collusion for the spread of suburbia, Leinberger instead makes the case that “Americans willingly engaged in it.” The aggregate of countless individual decisions found its complement in a government willing to heavily subsidize the Futurama vision, and together they created an unprecedented suburban housing boom and a blithe
abandonment of traditional walkable urbanism.

Other authors have more thoroughly described the social or physical change brought by this new suburban form of development, but Leinberger earns high marks for his description of the parallel transformation of the real estate industry. He describes an industry finally awakened to the advantages of specialization, economies of scale, and “Wall Street” finance. Leinberger follows the market’s evolution from the roaring home building of the 1950s through the savings and loan failures of the 1980s to the rise of real estate investment trusts and commercial mortgage-backed securities of the 1990s. Each innovation further entrenched the machine of the modern real estate development market, enabling it to more efficiently produce the homogeneous, auto-dominated suburban landscape of early 21st century America.

While Leinberger’s descriptions of the negative (and positive) consequences of this drivable suburbanism are familiar to planners and even to most casual observers of the built environment, his prescription for increasing walkable urbanism stands out from the current planning dogma. Without relying heavily on government programming or doctrinaire normative planning theories, Leinberger argues that if the “playing field” were level and all development options were supported equally, the market would respond with an increased number of dense, mixed-use, and pedestrian-friendly projects. Using demographic trends and data from consumer preference research, he argues that a strong pent-up demand for these types of projects exists across America, and developers free from the shackles of Euclidian zoning and standardized real estate financing are eager to create a supply. He cites studies that show anywhere from 29 to 54 percent of Americans prefer to live in walkable neighborhoods, and he estimates that in some locations, these densely-knit communities have a sale price premium of 40 percent over similar housing in non-walkable neighborhoods.

For an author aiming to reach the general public, Leinberger does an excellent job describing what many planners see as an impossibly difficult and time-consuming problem. His five-step program for “leveling the playing field” is tidy and simple compared with other, ideologically rigid approaches that entail so many regulations they risk alienating potential residents and planners alike. However, Leinberger acknowledges the challenge in implementing his own prescriptions: rarely do instituting overlay zones, ending subsidies for drivable sub-urbanism, and investing in rail transit qualify as quick policy solutions. Yet it is perhaps telling that his prescriptions for leveling the playing field are concise: in his confident brevity, he reveals a strong belief that market forces will supply walkable urbanism as long as the proper infrastructure is in place, projecting a sort of “if you build it, they will come” mentality. While this may strike many observers as naïve or short sighted, the success of walkable urbanism projects in places with proper zoning, access to public transit, and a strong market demand seems to corroborate Leinberger’s argument.

The Option of Urbanism succinctly presents relevant research on the rise of walkable urbanism. Unfortunately the book was published in 2008 before the inchoate recession and the collapse of the American financial system, and it is unclear whether these recent events would alter any of Leinberger’s prescriptions for increasing choice in the market. However, his own account of the real estate industry’s history suggests that this recession will likely produce significant innovations in the products delivered by developers and their funding sources, just as recessions in the past have done. Time will tell if such innovations ease the process for developing walkable communities and bring about this vision of a new American dream.
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