

Journal of Comparative Urban Law and Policy

Volume 5

Issue 1 *A Festschrift in Honor of Arthur C. Nelson on the Occasion of his Retirement - Agenda for Building a Changing World Responsibly: Commentaries and Reflections by Leaders in Urban Planning, Policy, and Design*

Article 24

2022

Advances in Planning Processes and Implementation

Arthur C. Nelson

University of Arizona, acnelson@arthurnelson.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/jculp>



Part of the [Land Use Law Commons](#), [Urban, Community and Regional Planning Commons](#), [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nelson, Arthur C. (2022) "Advances in Planning Processes and Implementation," *Journal of Comparative Urban Law and Policy*. Vol. 5 : Iss. 1 , Article 24, 297-298.

Available at: <https://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/jculp/vol5/iss1/24>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Reading Room. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Comparative Urban Law and Policy* by an authorized editor of Reading Room. For more information, please contact gfowke@gsu.edu.

ADVANCES IN PLANNING PROCESSES AND IMPLEMENTATION

Change can be chaotic, such as disasters, revolutions and wars, or planned, such as meeting society's needs by choreographing investments in ways that achieve multiple, though oftentimes conflicting, goals. In choosing between these options, society tends to prefer planning, though planning professionals should heed the insights of Paul Knox in "Telos and Techne." This part of the festschrift offers six commentaries ranging from the future of the comprehensive plan to reflections on the state of growth management and smart growth planning to how one organization has shaped planning discussions in an entire region of the U.S. to the role and limitations of the sustainable development code, and lastly to the role of land use dispute resolution that has been arguably perfected in one state more than any other.

David Rouse begins this part with an over-arching perspective about "The Future of the Comprehensive Plan." Pulling substantially from material and insights from the late David Godschalk along with his other works, Rouse explores how the comprehensive plan can and must evolve to address the major challenges of the 21st century.

In "Growth Management's Fourth Wave, Revisited," Timothy S. Chapin and Lindsay S. Stevens updates Chapin's earlier insights into what he calls planning's "Fourth Wave." The first three waves were The Era of Growth Controls (~1950-1975), The Era of Comprehensive Planning (~1975-2000), and The Era of Smart Growth (~2000-present). The fourth wave would be The Era of Sustainable Growth emphasizing that "land policy would require a delicate balance of remaining pro-development while also advancing conservation imperatives." The nature of the fourth wave is reconsidered in this article. Chapin and Stevens note the rise of the *development industrial complex* which opposes centralized, state, and local-directed land planning. They conclude that growth management may struggle to remain a centerpiece of the planning profession unless it embraces some new ideas and new policy models.

Smart growth has emerged as a more politically palatable approach to planning than growth management and growth controls, principally because it embraces growth per se while aiming to influence its features through a set of principles. In "The Rise and Fall of Smart Growth: An Exploration of the Appearance of Smart Growth and Related Terms in Google Searches, APA Conference Programs, and Selected Newspapers," Gerrit-Jan Knaap, Rebecca Lewis, Arnab Chakraborty, Katy June-Friesen, and Naman Molri trace the rise and fall of the popularity of the term and others similar to it in multiple modes. Not

surprisingly, the frequency of “smart growth” peaked early in the concept’s formulation during the early to middle 1990s, and tailed off since. Related terms, such as “mixed-use,” “walkable,” “redevelopment,” “gentrification,” and “land preservation,” also rise and fall in frequency of mention. The authors offer multiple explanations for this though the chief reason may be the broad institutionalization of smart growth concepts among public officials, the public generally, and the media.

Susan D. Daggett reflects broadly on the need for civil conversations about contemporary land use and natural and built environmental issues. This is done in “Land Use Trends in the Rocky Mountain West: The Role of the Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute.” She notes that the communities comprising the intermountain West are poised to lead the nation in how to “manage change, create communities, and foster local places that contribute to a very high quality of life by nurturing and valuing the natural assets that make this region so special.” Daggett identifies emerging trends and areas of focus for the future.

In “Saving the World through Zoning: The Sustainable Development Code, Regeneration, and Beyond,” Jonathan Rosenbloom and Christopher Duerksen observe that the sustainable development codes (SDCs) of the 1990s and early 2000s “did little to address climate change, energy conservation, community health, loss of biodiversity, shifting biochemical cycles, racial justice, food supply, and other key sustainability issues.” Their article reviews past promises, and mostly pitfalls, of SDCs but argue that they can be the principal instrument to achieve sustainability in ways they outline.

Craig M. Call completes this part of the festschrift with “Adventures in Land Use Dispute Resolution: Utah’s Innovative Program to Provide “Free” Legal Advice to Local Government, Neighbors, and Property Owners.” Call observes that Utah may have the nation’s most robust process allowing citizens to question local government land use decisions. This occurs through the Office of the Property Rights Ombudsman (OPRO). It was created in 1997 and charged with assisting in land use disputes in 2006. He provides an overview of the history of OPRO’s evolution. Call suggests that, as an entity that is trusted by both local government and property rights advocates, Utah’s OPRO is a useful model for other states to consider.