

Carolina Planning

Volume 37 | 2012



Regaining Relevancy

Annual Subscription Rates:

Individuals: \$15

Current Students: \$10

Libraries/Institutions: \$35

Carolina Planning

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

CB #3140, New East Building

Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3140

For back issues and subscriptions see:

<http://carolinaplanning.unc.edu/>

carolinaplanning@unc.edu

Carolina Planning is published once a year in the summer.

Carolina Planning

Volume 37 | 2012

From the Editors	2
------------------------	---

Features

Viewpoints on Regaining Relevancy	5
<i>Emil Malizia, Lawrence Susskind, Alexander Garvin, and Nancy Grden</i>	
Making Comprehensive Planning Relevant: Raleigh's 2030 Comprehensive Plan	11
<i>Ken Bowers and Dhanya Purushothaman Sandeep</i>	
Expanding Our Influence: Embracing Controversy and Seizing Opportunity	19
<i>Benjamin Hitchings and Roger Waldon</i>	
The Twisted Sisters: Disputing Iconic Urban Design	27
<i>Jill L. Grant and Chloe Gillis</i>	
DesignRevival24: An Example of Innovative Planning and Designer Volunteerism	35
<i>Scott Lagueux</i>	
Regaining Legitimacy: Equity Planning for the 21st Century	43
<i>Oksana Mironova and Scott Larson</i>	
Reinforcing Our Relevancy in a Local Context	49
Western North Carolina <i>Judy Francis</i>	50
Winston-Salem <i>Glenn Simmons</i>	52
Research Triangle Park <i>Corey Liles</i>	54
Charlotte <i>Lori Quinn and Bryman Suttle</i>	55
UNC-Chapel Hill DCRP Master's Project and Ph.D. Dissertation Titles 2011	59
Characterizing the Air Quality and Demographic Impacts of Aircraft Emissions at the Hartsfield-Jackson Atland International Airport	61
<i>Jeffrey Rissman</i>	
Student Connection	63
<i>Kristen Langford</i>	
Book Reviews	65
<i>Peter Cvelich, Maire Dekle, Patrick Nerz, and Daniel Widis</i>	
Final Thoughts	68
<i>Thomas J. Campanella</i>	

*Carolina Planning is a student-run publication of the Department of City and Regional Planning,
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

From the Editors

David Daddio
Ashley Williams

There is an emerging sense, especially among young practitioners and scholars, that the planning field has lost its agency to incite positive change in our cities and regions. The perceived trivialization of the planning profession originates in large part from a loss of professional identity, authority, and vision beginning with democratic reform movements in the 1960s and 1970s. Many argue that rather than formulators and implementers of forward-thinking plans, the profession is now reduced to administering code and facilitating process. Others contend that the field's redefined role gives it new legitimacy to tackle to pressing challenges of the 21st century. This issue of *Carolina Planning* explores the relevancy and role of the planning profession through a rich array of analyses, case studies, and commentary.

The theme for this summer's journal was inspired by UNC-Chapel Hill planning Professor Thomas J. Campanella, who captured the aforementioned zeitgeist of the field last summer in his powerful essay entitled: "Jane Jacobs and the Death and Life of American Planning". No longer capable of "bringing about more just, sustainable, healthful, efficient and beautiful cities," he argues that the blame for the current state of the planning field rests squarely at the feet of Jane Jacobs and her contemporaries. Campanella identifies three products of this adverse legacy: a) the abandonment of physical design as the disciplinary center of the planning field, b) the prioritization of public participation over professional judgment, and c) the loss of professional courage and vision.

In promoting and soliciting articles for this issue, reactions to the journal's theme ranged from approval and interest, to surprise and objection. Some questioned whether the profession was ever relevant and had anything to regain. Others insisted that the profession's relevance was never lost. Each reaction, we surmise, reflects the different experiences and assumptions these individuals held about the planners' proper role in a democratic society, whether as facilitator, mediator, technocrat, advocate, implementer, or administrator. The pieces herein reveal these diverse, often opposing underlying views.

This issue begins with four contributions from noted planning scholars and practitioners that take on the topic of relevancy directly. Emil Malizia, Professor and outgoing Chair of UNC-Chapel Hill's Department of City and Regional Planning argues that the profession needs to rediscover its original call to action: public health and safety. He contends that planners marginalize themselves

with weak goals like "livability" and vague slogans such as "making great communities happen" instead of addressing the fundamental dimensions of public interest. In contrast, MIT Professor of Urban Studies and Planning Lawrence Susskind warns against "bold visions" and sees calls to regain "agency" and "authority" as longing for a dreamed up past. He asserts that planners should correct market failures—not impose an agenda or claim a monopoly on good ideas. Alexander Garvin, of AGA Public Realm Strategists, attributes what he calls planners' "marginal and diminishing role" to both a lack of vision and training focused on soft skills. He calls for a new cadre of technologically savvy practitioners capable of producing implementable plans that are both financially and politically practical. Nancy Grden, founder and first editor of *Carolina Planning*, concludes with a perspective from the private sector. Grden sees the planner's generalist toolbox as an asset rather than a liability and maintains that the field's "core competencies" equip the profession to influence societal change.

Following this pertinent discussion, Ken Bowers and Dhanya Sandeep examine the relevancy of comprehensive planning. Through a discussion of the process behind Raleigh's recently adopted 2030 Comprehensive Plan, they demonstrate how the City transformed its planning framework to embrace a commitment to sustainability. As Raleigh planners look ahead to a new unified development ordinance, Bowers and Sandeep emphasize the importance of implementation, monitoring, and follow-through.

In "Expanding Our Influence: Embracing Controversy and Seizing Opportunity," Ben Hitchings and Roger Waldon explore defining moments in the planning life of a community and argue that times of controversy present an opportunity to expand the influence of the profession. The authors suggest four context-specific approaches planners should take to seize opportunity. Three case studies illustrate the challenges planners face and approaches pursued.

An international perspective is provided by Jill L. Grant and Chloe Gillis. They examine the ascendancy of new popular theories affecting planning discourse, processes, and outcomes through a case study of a development dispute in Halifax, Nova Scotia. In "The Twisted Sisters: Disputing Iconic Urban Design," the authors recount how promoters of a high-rise development in Halifax used urban design ideas and creative class arguments to weaken historic preservation. The case provided part of the context within which Halifax ultimately developed urban design policies and plan processes that substitute public participation with professional expertise.

In "DesignRevival24: An Example of Innovative Planning and Designer Volunteerism," Scott Lagueux chronicles one group of planners and designers' efforts to find inspiration during the Great Recession. He recounts an intensive, 24-hour collaborative community design

initiative in Bluefield, West Virginia, where participating planners and designers left as reinvigorated as the rural community they came to serve. Lagueux sees a future for similar, “jump start” events that both tap the passion and camaraderie of the profession and assist areas in need of revitalization.

Oksana Mironova and Scott Larson observe the planning profession through a historical perspective in “Regaining Legitimacy: Equity Planning for the 21st Century.” The authors attribute the decline of planning to the ascendance of neo-liberalism and the rising influence of private interests in planning processes. Mironova and Larson contend that the urban planning profession can regain its purpose and legitimacy only if it reconnects with the historic undercurrent of equity within the profession.

As part of our regular series of articles by members of the North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association, four contributors from across the state bring the relevancy discussion to a local context. Judy Francis (N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources) describes the Western North Carolina Vitality Index, a product of the Mountain Resources Commission, and the need for tools that give decision-makers deliberate, quantitative metrics to measure sustainability. Glenn Simmons (Winston-Salem and Forsyth County) examines the fiscal implications of different development patterns and suggests that his community should consider them in their upcoming comprehensive plan. Corey Liles (Research Triangle Foundation) analyzes the major features of the new Research Triangle Park Master Plan. Lori Quinn (Charlotte-Mecklenburg) highlights how her department’s Area Plan Implementation Program helps bring plans of the shelf.

Continuing our long-standing tradition of recognizing exceptional graduate work at UNC-Chapel Hill’s Department of City and Regional Planning, we publish excerpts from the Best Master’s Project of 2011. We also bring you the latest campus news in our annual Student Connection piece and provide four student contributed book reviews. To wrap up, we hear from Thomas J. Campanella himself on the relevancy topic, with his self-reflective and frank assessment of community opposition to a proposed train station and accompanying development in Hillsborough, North Carolina.

All disciplines go through identity crises at one stage or another, especially during periods of great societal upheaval. Whether you believe the planning field is, was, or ever will be relevant, we hope the discourse herein is refreshing, stimulating, and timely. These sorts of discussions constitute precisely the type of intellectual dialogue *Carolina Planning* seeks to promote between planning academia and practice. We hope you will continue the debate within your own offices and agencies and begin defining anew the role of planning in the 21st century.

Editors:

David Daddio received his master’s degree in City and Regional Planning from UNC-Chapel Hill this spring. While at DCRP, he focused on land use and transportation planning. He now works at the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Volpe National Transportation Systems Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Ashley Williams is a 2013 master’s candidate in City and Regional Planning from UNC-Chapel Hill. She previously worked for the Urban Institute and is interested in housing and community development.

Carolina Planning is published with generous financial support from the John A. Parker Trust, the Department of City and Regional Planning at UNC-Chapel Hill, and the North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association.

We welcome your comments, suggestions, and submissions. Please contact us at carolinaplanning@unc.edu or visit our website at:

<http://carolinaplanning.unc.edu/>



Cover photo by Kevin Rockall. Image taken of Charlotte, N.C. Retrieved from iofoto.com/bigstockphoto.com.

Printed by UNC Printing Services © 2012 UNC-Chapel Hill Department of City and Regional Planning. All rights reserved.

New Website!



After many months of work, *Carolina Planning* is pleased to announce the official launch of its new website: <http://carolinaplanning.unc.edu/>. This new web presence both extends the reach and impact of the Journal and provides unprecedented access to our archives. While *Carolina Planning* will remain a print publication, all back issues will be available online.

Our back issue pages (<http://carolinaplanning.unc.edu/back-issues/>) provide easy access to over 500 original articles, commentaries, interviews, and book reviews from some of the most formative years of the planning field. Contributors run the gamut—locally and nationally.

We encourage you to explore this vast resource and share it with your colleagues.

The screenshot shows the Carolina Planning Journal website. At the top, there's a header with the journal's name and tagline: "The nation's oldest student-run planning publication". Below this is a navigation bar with links: Home, Current Issue, Back Issues, Call for Papers, Subscriptions, History, and Contact Info. On the left side, there's a search bar with a "Find" button and a section titled "JOIN OUR ANNOUNCEMENTS LIST" with an email input field and a "Send" button. The main content area features a large image of a building with a tree in front, and a sidebar on the right with the title "2012 Issue: Regaining Relevancy" and a brief description of the issue's theme. At the bottom, there's a copyright notice and a row of thumbnail images of various journal covers.

<http://carolinaplanning.unc.edu/>