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(Vice) President’s Message

By Damian Syrnak, OAPA Vice President

Your regularly scheduled column from Brian Campbell is on hiatus while Brian enjoys a much deserved vacation. This Vice President’s message will be a brief report on current Chapter activities and what’s coming later this year.

Legislature

Yes, it’s true, the Oregon Legislative is in session again; and it’s going to be active! Oregon APAs LPAC (Legislative and Public Affairs Committee) is already hard at work tracking the progress of bills going through the legislative process in Salem. You can find OAPAs 2013 Legislative Priorities at www.oregonapa.org by clicking on the “Legislative Updates” tab.

Big Ideas Forum and 40th Anniversary Gala Dinner

OAPA is co-sponsoring, with the national American Planning Association, the Daniel Burham Forum on Big Ideas in Portland on May 29, 2013 at the Oregon Convention Center. The forum will focus on emerging issues that Oregon communities will have to grapple with in the future. For more information about the Forum on Big Ideas series, please visit APA’s website – http://www.planning.org/burnham. The Forum will be followed by our Gala Dinner Event celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Oregon Statewide Planning Program. The Gala is also this year’s major fundraising event for OAPA, and all proceeds will support Chapter programs and activities. Registration is required for both events. For more information and to register, please visit www.oregonapa.org/ORVision40.

Awards

Like past conferences, this year’s conference will include a celebration and recognition of those planners and plans that stood out over the last year.

PSU and APA Past-President Mitch Silver.

The PSU Planning Club, following on the recent re-accreditation of the PSU School of Urban and Regional Planning, is planning on hosting an event with APA Past President Mitch Silver. Please look for more details at the OAPA website.

What’s coming down the pike?

APA is looking at consolidating election cycles for national and state chapter elections. We’re recruiting for a new Chapter Administrator to begin work before Pat Zepp retires at the end of June 2013. When you have the opportunity,
please do remember to thank her for making the Chapter look good over the years. We’re interviewing finalists to replace Pat Zepp who retires in June.

Check out our website – www.oregonapa.org – for almost everything you need to know about Oregon APA and what we’re doing to support the art and science of planning.

Damian Syrnyk, AICP, is Vice President of the Board of Oregon APA. When not selflessly working on behalf of all planners in Oregon, he also tries to plan for the City of Bend as a long range planner. When not planning, he’s writing articles for the OPJ and tries his hand at pithy comments at the end of the article to see who’s read this far.

---

**REGISTER TODAY!**

Visit [www.oregonapa.org/ORVision40](http://www.oregonapa.org/ORVision40) for:

- Conference Schedule & Session Descriptions
- Registration Information
- Sponsorship Opportunities
- Reduced Rate Scholarships Available – Deadline is March 29

**May 29, 2013**

**BIG IDEAS FORUM**

Climate change, demographic change, economic upheavals — what emerging issues will Oregon communities have to grapple with in the future? In following the words of planning visionary Daniel Burnham, “make no little plans,” APA is sponsoring the Daniel Burnham FORUM ON BIG IDEAS that will examine the ideas, emerging issues, and challenges facing Oregon communities over the next 40 years.

**40th ANNIVERSARY GALA DINNER**

Please join OAPA and organizations from around the state to celebrate the 40th Anniversary of SB 100, Oregon’s landmark land use law. Governor John Kitzhaber (invited) will talk about the impacts of Oregon’s planning program and how far we’ve come since 1973. Proceeds from this event will help fund OAPA’s programs to promote planning in Oregon.

**May 30-31, 2013**

**CONFERENCE SESSIONS & MOBILE WORKSHOPS**

Oregon Convention Center • Portland, Oregon

Make your room reservation now!

DOUBLETREE by HILTON • Phone: 800-996-0510

Located near the Convention Center at 1000 NE Multnomah, the DoubleTree by Hilton has a special room rate for conference attendees – $129.00 plus tax single/double. Ask for the APA Conference room rate. Room block will be released April 29, 2013.
Planning the Good City: Smart Growth — New Urbanism and compact city — Urban Villages Movement

PhDr Geogr. Andis Kublačovs, University of Groningen, University of Latvia

Analyzing works of different scholars it is possible to recognize two types of discourse about the good city ideas. On type is predominately about the meaning and social qualities of the city, and also about utopian approaches, while the other type is concentrated more on the physical tissue of the city debating on a good city form. This article will give an insight into both of these discourses.

Social form of the good city

One may question for what purpose do cities exist, and is it possible to describe this purpose in a general way by not going too much into detail of specific circumstances in time and space. Lewis Mumford brings an excellent example for an affirmative answer to the previous question. He writes that "the final mission of the city is to further man's conscious participation in the cosmic and the historic process. (...) Magnification of all the dimensions of life, through emotional communion, rational communication, technological mastery, and above all, dramatic representation, has been the supreme office of the city in history. And it remains the chief reason for the city's continued existence." Mumford clearly speaks about the meaning and the important role of the city for development of humanity (in other wording but also the Ancient Greek philosophers described meaning of the city in a similar way). We may assume that such a city contains certain identifiable qualities, which quite often are referred to the notion of the good city. But prior starting to describe the good city it is worth to mention John Friedman’s article “The Good City: In Defense of Utopian Thinking” where he poses 3 questions that should be addressed when discussing about the good city:

1. In setting out an account of the good city, whose city are we talking about? Can we legitimately assume the possibility of a „common good for the city?"

2. Are we concerned only with process or only with outcomes, or should outcome and process be considered jointly?

3. How is a normative framework such as we are considering to be thought of in relation to professional practice?

Friedmann himself tries to give answers to these questions, firstly admitting that "the city is ultimately the people, and the cliché ‘notwithstanding, it is the people who must find a way among themselves to define, time after time, in what specific action agendas the common good of the city may be found.” He also denies separation of ends and means, outcomes and process saying that "process is no less important than desirable outcomes". And the outcomes should be broadly acceptable in the longer term. Friedmann claims that the good city requires...
a committed form of political practice. There should be leadership (preferably by a group) but also the process drivers should have the material, symbolic and moral power sufficient to overcome resistance to its projects. The ideas of identity, diversity, harmony, inclusion, inter-relation and co-habitation in an urban environment form the essence of the contemporary planning practice. However, many of those ideas are not new but embedded in the classic, medieval or modern writings about what should city be and how to organize a good city life. Amin supports this observation writing that “the history of practical effort to improve human life in cities is one that has worked the fine grain of circumstance and place”. However, he mentions also a paradox that “this history has also been influenced by universalistic imaginaries of the good life, with cities placed at the very heart of the various projections on offer. For example, utopian thought in its various iterations through time, from the ideas of Plato, St Augustine and Thomas More to those of de Sade, Bellamy and le Corbusier, has imagined the logos of utopia to be an ideal city, a visible emblem of order and harmony.”

Fainstein, on her turn, prefers to substitute notion the good city with the just city as the appropriate object of planning. Her reasoning falls within the Rawlsian tradition, wherein social justice becomes that value that everyone would choose if one did not know where one was going to end up in the social hierarchy (the veil of ignorance). Leonie Sandercock’s definition of the just city is one that is socially inclusive, where difference is not merely tolerated but treated with recognition and respect. Also Amin writes that “the good city has to be imagined as the socially just city, with strong obligations towards those marginalized from the means of survival and human fulfillment.”

To a large extent being a utopian thinker Friedmann comes up with one general founding principle of a good city: “Every human being has the right, by nature, to the full development of their innate intellectual, physical and spiritual potentials in the context of wider communities.” He calls this “the right to human flourishing,” and regards it as the most fundamental of human rights. Friedmann claims that local citizens should not merely use the city to advance their personal interests but as citizens of a political community (which is the city in its political aspect) also contribute to establishing those minimal conditions - political, economic, social, physical and ecological - which are necessary for human flourishing. He writes that “exactly human flourishing serves us as a template for judging the performance of cities.”

Gavin expresses the same opinion in even more creative way by saying that “like it or not, we are all condemned to be artists. The very fact that we are organisms going through a process of self-realization forces us to be creative creatures.” Also Mugerauer bears a similar viewpoint when debating about ways how could cities facilitate further growth and simultaneously shape space for a good life. He says that the environment should provide “physical stimulation, intellectual challenge, emotional range and cultural diversity.” This concern is especially valid when considering the changes brought about by a shift from the industrial to a technological city and society. Addressing the impacts of displacement for the inhabitants, the built environment should combine old and new elements, thus providing both stability and coherence and a positive outlook to the future. Moreover, Mugerauer talks about the practical issues of creating a safe place that contains natural and spiritual aspects in a dense built environment thus establishing harmony between the man-made and natural surroundings.

Gavin describes harmony as “the greatest amount of diversity with the fewest assumptions for unity,” as “the maximum feasible participation” and as “the creative tension of opposites.” And in the city context this understanding can be interpreted that it is “a continuously changing pattern, a cultural matrix in and through which man undergoes the process of self-realization.” Not being too prescriptive or limiting for certain spatial forms, their alignment or interaction that would be a traditional discourse of the good city form, Kevin Lynch identified a set of specific dimensions of performance that are important for evaluating quality of urban spaces (particularly cities):

- Vitality – the support of biological
requirements;

- Sense – mental perception and differentiation of a settlement;
- Fit – the match between pattern and behavior;
- Access – being able to reach resources;
- Control of the use of the settlement;
- “Meta-criteria” of efficiency (cost) and justice (equity).

These dimensions of performance help us to understand that buildings, street layout, public places or greenery in an urban environment is just a tool and physical expression of the policies that should strengthen such qualities of the good city as social inclusion, respect to diversity both in social and physical terms, sense of community and belonging. Friedmann tries to be more precise and defines four pillars that support the material foundations for the good city:

- Adequate housing together with complementary public services and community facilities;
- Affordable healthcare;
- Adequately remunerated work for all who seek it;
- Adequate social provision in housing, medical care, human services and income must be made for the weakest citizens, if their own efforts are insufficient to provide for what is regarded as the social minimum.

Basing of Friedman’s four pillars Amin reveals four registers of urban solidarity that engage with multiplicity through the collective basics of everyday urban life. These are repair, relatedness, rights and re-enchantment - which could be labeled as the four Rs of contemporary urban solidarity. Amin claims that “no discussion of the good city in terms of the politics of repair can ignore the need to ensure universal and affordable access to the basics of shelter, sanitation, sustenance, water, communication, mobility and so on.” Friedmann makes it clear that there always will be certain material inequalities but it is more important not to tolerate a contemptuous disregard for the qualities of social and political life, which is the sphere of freedom. A good city is a city that cares for its freedom, even as it makes adequate social provision for its weakest members.” As for the relatedness Amin stresses that “in the good city it has to be about working on the prosaic as the space of strange (be)longings, the site of cultural transgression.” The rights, to a very large extent, are based in understanding of the universal recognition of citizenship that lays the foundation for inclusion in society and decision-making, which is an essential part of city development as a continuous process. Amin even claims that “the ultimate test of the good city is whether the urban public culture can withstand pluralism and dissent.” But this claim does not mean anarchy. Instead, it is considered as an important procedural and spatial challenge for the civic leaders and the society in general “to make city available for all.” Also Kublāčovs writes that planning should not be limited to the interests of some groups but rather targeted at creating a good city for the sake of all its inhabitants.

However, it is crucial to understand that in reality a total win-win situation for each individual is almost impossible; planners should think about adequate impact mitigation and compensation measures that can be derived through various methods like the Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment for policy documents, the ordinary Environmental Impact Assessment for certain spatial development projects or the Social Impact Assessment that focuses specifically on social aspects of policies. Instead of striving for the single perfect policy, planners should focus on achievable goals that bring most benefit with the least harm and respects the interests of all concerned parties.

**Physical form of the good city**

Referring to Talen and Ellis there are philosophies suggesting that facts are separate from values, beauty is subjective, there is no human nature, virtues cannot be identified or ranked and that there may not be need to decide...
between different substantive conceptions of the good at all. “Such a position is supported also by the notion that ‘social, economic, and cultural variables are far more important in determining the good city than any choice of spatial arrangements.” Example of this debate you could read in the previous chapter. This notion is getting even stronger because planners do not have a unitary viewpoint and practice in creating a good city form. But should there be such a unique standard? Most probably the answer would be negative both from the planners and the society in general, for not to lose diversity, creativity and for not creating “a sterile sameness of design” as Talen and Ellis write. However, it is possible to find strong arguments also on the opposite side that tries to prove necessity of normative theory in planning. Talen and Ellis mention various arguments about higher efficiency in the planners’ work, distinctiveness of planners’ profession and quality benchmarking. But, referring to the real life planning practices and personal experience, the strongest argument among all seems to be one where they criticize that by “not having a strong normative theory of city form simply cedes the field to other actors who have no qualms about fighting for their preferences, even if they are narrow, short-sighted, and in conflict with the public interest.” Discussion about the good city form refers to the quest for excellence, quality, and beauty in our built environments. As Talen and Ellis point out “particularly important in this discussion is the notion of beauty, which acts as a powerful unifying concept.” Talen and Ellis quote on Frederick Turner who has written that “beauty is a quality of certain complex, organized, and unified patterns that emerge out of the creative advance of a world that is conceived as nonlinear, chaotic, dissipative, and self-organizing. Patterns are beautiful that exist at the margin between order and disorder that exhibit a hierarchical organization which is troubled and opened up by contradictory elements.”

Theory of good city form must directly engage both aesthetic ideas about the organization of space and ethical ideals concerning the city as a supportive setting for quality of life. Both Gavin and Mugerauer agree that the built environment needs to be inspiring and that a place should not be defined only by its function but that its character matters as well. In Gavin’s view an inspiring environment is achieved by aesthetical qualities, which provide identity to the place and cause people to feel involved in the urban environment. Instead, Mugerauer stresses the importance of green space and social interaction into providing identity to a built structure. Further, both authors stress that it is the responsibility of a city’s inhabitants to actively shape instead of passively “consume” the city environment. A theory of good city form can have as one of its principles that different “identifiable neighborhoods,” to use Christopher Alexander terminology, be allowed to flourish, creating a mosaic of subcultures lodged within a coherent overarching pattern at the urban and regional scales. It would seem that some kind of unity-within-diversity would be the proper goal, incorporating baseline principles for neighborhood structure while still leaving room for the expression of diverse local cultures and historical vernaculars. By these arguments we can see that there is not a contradiction between the social and physical aspects of the good city since both of them talk about human flourishing, diversity and harmony at the same time. Debating about a good city form Leon Krier relies on the principles of organicism: the view that urbanization should occur by multiplication of integrated, multiple-use, finite urban entities (or “quarters”), not through random, low-density diffusion at the periphery. Krier emphasizes the pattern of buildings and spaces inherent in organic urban forms and the way organic principles produce cities of much greater urban quality. Being more precise about these understandings in physical terms Talen and Ellis (2002) mention that during the last few decades there is increasing confidence (based on results of relevant studies) that “walkable, diverse, mixed-use landscapes produce the highest quality of urban life.”

Recalling on Kublačovs (20123) aesthetic things are important and neither Mugerauer (1994), the Prince of Wales (2001), Gavin (1971) nor Ginsberg (1994) would deny it, but the same or even bigger attention should be paid to the planning and design process, through which it is
possible to raise public awareness and stimulate social interaction. To increase society’s satisfaction in planning process the local resident (Heidegger might prefer using another term - city dweller) should be at the centre. It means that planning should be a process that improves liveability of city and planning starts with people – both as individuals, parts of certain interest groups and communities, and the whole society as well.

**Ideology of smart growth concept and New Urbanism movement**

**Smart growth**

The term smart growth has been a part of the USA planning lexicon for about a decade, and an ever-widening range of organizations have come forward to endorse smart growth principles. One of the most comprehensive and shortest definitions of this concept is given on the website of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: “Smart growth covers a range of development and conservation strategies that help protect our natural environment and make our communities more attractive, economically stronger, and more socially diverse.” However, in different information sources smart growth is predominantly associated with urban planning and transportation theories that try to avoid urban sprawl, improve resource efficiency and livability of the existing downtown areas. According to Ye and Meyer the umbrella organization for the smart growth ideology is the Smart Growth Network (SGN). SGN counts the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and many other agencies and organizations wedded to limiting urban sprawl. Membership includes thirty-three partners, spanning university research centers, a state government, traditional environmental organizations, developers’ associations, and federal agencies. Ye and Meyer have done a significant study on the different definitions and meanings of the smart growth. Their conclusion is that smart growth contains six major components (planning, transportation, economic development, housing, community development and natural resource preservation), each of them having several dimensions. Based on the experience of communities around the U.S. that have used smart growth approaches to create and maintain great neighborhoods, the Smart Growth Network developed a set of ten basic principles:

1. Mix land uses;
2. Take advantage of compact building design;
3. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices;
4. Create walkable neighborhoods;
5. Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place;
6. Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive planning</td>
<td>Pedestrianization</td>
<td>Neighborhood business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed land uses</td>
<td>Facilities for bicycling</td>
<td>Downtown revitalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased density</td>
<td>Public transit promotion</td>
<td>Infill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street connectivity</td>
<td>Systems integration and nodal networks</td>
<td>Using existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/innovative water infrastructure and systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public facilities planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Natural Resource Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily housing</td>
<td>Popular participation</td>
<td>Farmland preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller lots</td>
<td>Recognizing/promoting the unique features of each community</td>
<td>Subdivision conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Easement conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for special needs and diverse households</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transferable development right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase of development rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historical preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological land preservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Main elements of smart growth policies. SOURCE: YE AND MEYER 2005
7. Strengthen and direct development towards existing communities;

8. Provide a variety of transportation choices;

9. Make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective;

10. Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions.

A great and brief explanation of the smart growth is also given by the U.S. Green Building Council. It says that smart growth is not against cars and roads but wants to provide more transportation choices and less traffic; it is not anti-suburban but, instead, wants to create vibrant cities, suburbs and towns; it is not against growth in housing but just wants to offer wider variety in housing choices; it does not force people to live according to certain standards but rather inform how well-planned growth can improve the quality of life.

New Urbanism

New Urbanism is an international movement to reform the design of the built environment, and is about raising our quality of life and standard of living by creating better places to live. New Urbanism involves fixing and infilling cities, as well as the creation of compact new towns and villages. (http://www.newurbanism.org/)

The principles of the New Urbanism are defined by a Charter, which was developed between 1993 and 1996 by a broad range of architects, planners, interested citizens, scholars, elected officials, and developers. It was ratified at the fourth annual Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU). CNU was founded in 1993 by a group of enthusiastic architects looking to codify the thought behind their previous work in creating long-lasting and better-performing neighborhoods. Founders Peter Calthorpe, Andrés Duany, Elizabeth Moule, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Stefanos Polyzoides and Dan Solomon came together to form the organization. New Urbanism derives its legitimacy from (1) a large body of historical literature on city design; (2) the close study and emulation of universally admired great urban places; (3) existing research in the field of environment and behavior; (4) experience with the actual planning and construction of New Urbanist projects; and (5) a growing body of scholarly research on the performance of New Urbanist plans. The essence of the Charter of the New Urbanism is structured in three sections – (1) the region: metropolis, city and town; (2) the neighborhood, the district, and the corridor; and (3) the block, the street, and the building. Each of these sections comprise 9 principles (altogether 27) providing qualitative descriptions about good planning practice and outcomes in the spatial structures of different levels. But for getting a more comprehensive insight into the essence of the New Urbanism it is more valuable to take a glance not exactly to the 27 principles of the Charter of the New Urbanism, but to the main concepts identified by the CNU that are hidden behind the New Urbanism movement:

• Creating Enduring Neighborhoods - New Urbanism recognizes walkable, human-scaled neighborhoods as the building blocks of sustainable communities and regions. The Charter of the New Urbanism articulates the movement’s principles and defines the essential qualities of urban places from the scale of the region to the individual building.

• Making Urbanism Legal Again - Although compact, mixed-use urban form was the standard before 1950, separate-use zoning codes and high-volume road standards subsequently helped to make sprawl today’s default development option. New Urbanists are providing leaders with tools (and more tools) to reverse course and strengthen the character, livability, and diversity of their communities.

• Making Connections a Priority - Through grids of streets, transportation choices, and the sitting of buildings along the sidewalks of compact blocks, New Urbanism brings destinations within reach and allows for frequent encounters between citizens, in sharp contrast to sprawl. A key measure of connectivity is how accessible communities are to people with a range of physical abilities and financial resources.
• Celebrating Shared Spaces - New Urbanism makes shared space the organizing element of a community. Architecture physically defines streets as places of shared use. Care for the public realm adds character, builds value, promotes security, and helps residents feel proud of their community. Plazas, squares, sidewalks, cafes, and porches provide rich settings for interaction and public life.

• Achieving Sustainability -- from Building to Region - By focusing development, New Urbanism promotes efficient use of infrastructure and preservation of habitats and farmland. With green building leaders, CNU is establishing new standards for green design at the neighborhood scale. Transportation plays a pivotal role in sustainability and truly efficient transportation – walking, bicycling, and transit use – is only possible where there is compact, urban form.

• Reclaiming Urban Places Once Thought Lost - New Urbanism is repairing the damage done to our cities through environmental degradation, misguided infrastructure projects and designs that isolated the poor.

• Renewing a Ravaged Region - Since the historic October 2005 Mississippi Renewal Forum, CNU members have led planning efforts along the hurricane-battered Gulf Coast, including in New Orleans. Master plans, form-based codes, and transportation designs are helping citizens and their leaders forge collaborative visions.

Brain has found that at the core of the social agenda of the New Urbanism, it is possible to identify two quite different and, at times, contradictory ideals. On one hand, there is the ideal of community, with its rhetoric of solidarity based on common feeling and personal connection. On the other hand, there is a loosely connected set of ideals that is commonly summed up under the heading of urbanism, with its rhetoric of vital diversity, the normative order of the public realm and civic idealism. Some would argue that the New Urbanism is purely about the urban design, but the concept is much wider since planning, design and spatial arrangement of place is considered just as means of improving quality of life for local communities on the different levels of block, neighborhood, city and region. Also Brain writes that “the social agenda of the New Urbanism, although often superficially focused on a limited ideal of community, embodies a deeper practical struggle with the problem of achieving a richer, more diverse, and more productive understanding of community in terms of an urban and civic ideal”. Moreover, New Urbanism claims to reduce various procedures for place development and design, decrease the role of the governmental institutions for small-scale improvements and increase engagement of local communities for development of their neighborhoods.

Ideology of compact city concept and Urban Villages movement

Compact city

It would not be incorrect to say that compact urban development is the most supported spatial planning concept almost for any size urban settlement in Europe in the last few decades. Even when talking about policentricity on metropolitan or regional level, usually planners link it to a certain level of compactness within a particular node (e.g. decentralized concentration like for Berlin-Brandenburg or Stockholm). As Healy writes about the actual spatial planning policies in Europe she says that “debates focus on ways of containing urban expansion into compact cities and on strategies to use cities as nodal points in regional development or to promote cities as co-existing in a competitive landscape of urban centers”. But she also argues that sometimes the compact city policy seems to be just a little more than a marketing by-line and does not reflect multidimensional conceptions of city. Contemporary compact city policies started towards the end of the 1970s and they were motivated by the desire to preserve open countryside and also to make the cities self-contained. As Pirart writes “many studies have tried to provide a response to how compact this city should be exactly and which indicators
should be used to measure it. However, in general, a compact city is “taken to mean a relatively high-density, mixed-use city, based on an efficient public transport system and dimensions that encourage walking and cycling.” In fact, many cities of many different forms have pronounced themselves or have been designated as being compact. Moreover, as for the definition of sprawl, the compact city can also be defined as a process rather than a form. In this perspective, a compact city means “that we make the fullest use of land that is already urbanized, before taking green fields.” This two-fold compactness is well expressed also in the principles of the New Urbanism. The 4th principle of the Charter of the New Urbanism expresses the compactness on regional level: “Development patterns should not blur or eradicate the edges of the metropolis. Infill development within existing urban areas conserves environmental resources, economic investment, and social fabric, while reclaiming marginal and abandoned areas. Metropolitan regions should develop strategies to encourage such infill development over peripheral expansion.” While the 11th principle of the Charter of the New Urbanism expresses the compactness on local level: “Neighborhoods should be compact, pedestrian friendly, and mixed-use. Districts generally emphasize a special single use, and should follow the principles of neighborhood design when possible.”

Pirart provides a brief but comprehensive insight into the compact city concept referring to different authors. For example, quoting on Williams he writes that advocates of the compact city, especially in Europe, play on its positive effects, while negative ones are often overlooked. Indeed, they claim not only environmental benefits can be gained from intensifying urban areas, but higher densities are also considered by some to be more socially sustainable because local facilities and services can be maintained, and is seen as a prerequisite for vitality, cultural activities and social interaction. Thomas and Cousins summarized some of the most cited benefits of a compact city form as: “…less car dependency, low emissions, reduced energy consumption, better public transport services, increased accessibility…, a high quality of life, the preservation of green space and a milieu for enhanced business and trading activities.” To some extent Pirart is reserved in regard to the compact city concept stating that the assumptions for it are “romantic and dangerous because usually founded on basic belief or on studies neglecting the complex reality.” But this critique mainly goes for the so called monocentric compact city strategy, as defined by Merijn Martens and many other authors. To keep this strategy alive and attractive several actions should be taken into account:

- Strengthen the inner city by concentrating employment inside the inner city;
- Redevelop run-down & brownfield locations;
- Concentrate residential development as much as possible inside the existing built up area;
- If residential development is still needed outside the built-up area, then realize it in high-density neighborhoods as close as possible to the existing built-up area and with a good access to existing public transports.
- Preserve a clear distinction between urban and rural areas by means of a growth borders and/or land use regulation.
- Give priority to public transport, walking and bicycling. This asks for a decrease of the space taken by motorized transport in the inner city, for the benefit of public transport, walking and bicycling.

A second view on the compact city strategy is the one of a city of mixed use, high-density neighborhoods with a distinct identity. On the contrary to the monocentric compact city strategy, employments and services should be more or less dispersed across the entire city, instead of being kept in the inner city alone. Such an understanding of compact city development goes very much in line with the previously discussed smart growth concept in the U.S.

Urban Villages

According to Franklin and Tait findings the first
use of the term urban village is generally credited to Herbert Gans, whose study of the West End of Boston resulted in the book The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans. Gans introduces both the terms urban village and urban jungle to distinguish between two types of urban environment. The urban village represents an adjusted place, where ethnic migrants have sought to adapt their essentially non-urban culture to the urban setting, while the urban jungle represents a maladjusted place. Nearly three decades after Gans first used the term the urban village, it resurfaced in the UK in another guise. The Prince of Wales, a keen critic of contemporary architecture, introduced the phrase urban village in A Vision for Britain, where he states: “I am hoping that we can encourage the development of urban villages in order to reintroduce human scale, intimacy and a vibrant street life.” Masoumi adds that the source of inspiration for creating Urban Village theory has mainly been the American New Urbanism that was undergoing a dynamic recognition and development phase in 1990ies. But the design principles for urban villages are European.

In 1992 the Urban Villages Group published the Urban Villages report, in which the philosophy and principles of the urban village concept were set out, arguing for well-designed, mixed use and sustainable urban areas, with a sense of place and community commitment. The following year the Urban Villages Forum was established to widen the level of involvement, with membership open to any individual or organization supporting the aims of the campaign in promoting urban villages and their realization on the ground. The phrase “urban village” is usually used for a settlement, which is between urban and rural spaces, and has the characteristics of both. As David Sucher writes: the word urban bears these meanings: hustle-bustle, liberty, lonely, hostel, far-away, strangers, possibilities, growth, artificial, complex, large, skyscrapers, liberal, and anonymous. While the emotions and sensations which the word village transfers to the hearer mind are: tranquility, structure, together, friendly, close by, kindred, limits, stasis, natural, simple, cottage, conservative, and familiar. Most of the people want to feel all of these feelings. So, as a settlement, Urban Village has the advantages of both urban and rural areas.

Franklin and Tait writes that the main physical features of an urban village are that it should be mixed-use; have a maximum area of 100 acres (40 hectares) so that every facility is within walking distance; have a population of 3000-5000 people; be pedestrian friendly with adequate public transport; offer mixed tenure housing; possess a varied townscape and a sense of place; foster community commitment; and be sustainable. However, this approach does not necessarily mean that an urban village may not exist in already established city – in this case the city may contain several inter-linked urban villages.

Attributing the good city notion to the principles of New Urbanism and Urban village movement

So far the discourse about the good city and the four concepts that to larger or lesser extent should support urban development in direction to the good city has been very theoretical with just a few precise examples from urban planning practice. This chapter will provide an insight how these principles are being implemented in Portland that is considered as one of the most progressive cities and metropolitan areas in the U.S. as far as it concerns urban planning. Portland’s urban growth boundary (UGB) was one of the most significant land use reforms enacted by Oregon in
its 1973 statewide planning legislation. Portland’s UGB was proposed in 1977 and approved by the state in 1980. The UGB is recognized as one of the smart growth policy tools which intend to limit suburban sprawl by containing future development within the boundary and protecting farmlands and open space from development. Under Oregon law, Metro, the managing body of Portland’s UGB, has the responsibility for maintaining a twenty-year supply of developable land to accommodate urban activity and growth for the Portland metropolitan area.

Planning in Portland is being executed both on regional, city and neighborhood level. As a practical example one can mention variety of approved plans, like neighborhood plans, area plans, community plans and natural resource plans. Such an approach is well embedded in the smart growth concept and its understanding of the good city. Portland is also known for its public transit system. Portland shifted from a freeway-dominated transportation policy to a policy that emphasizes a balance of highways and public transit in 1975. The Tri-County Metropolitan Transit District (Tri-Met), a special district of the State of Oregon, operates light rail and bus service in most of the urbanized portion of the Portland metropolitan area.

Empirical evidence gained through analysis on automobile dependence by Myung-Jin reveals mixed results for smart growth proponents in Portland. Higher accessibility to the MAX light rail and bus service and more mixed uses of land were significantly associated with higher probabilities of commuting by the alternative modes to private vehicles, while transit oriented development (TOD) and higher residential and employment densities were hardly related to a reduction in the choice to drive alone. In addition, higher accessibility to freeway interchanges and a higher share of single family residential land resulted in a greater likelihood of driving alone. Thus, more diversified land use in neighborhoods, more extensive provision of public transit service, and decreasing accessibility to freeway interchanges were associated with fewer choices of driving alone, while making settlements compact via the UGB and TODs has no clear relationship with reducing the choice to drive alone. Empirical analyses also suggest that the provision of public transit service and mixed land use implemented at residential zones (origins) were more effective in reducing automobile dependence than those implemented at places of work (destinations).

**Conclusion**

Summing up the different qualities of the good city identified in this essay we me prepare a long list of names. Such a city should have identity, diversity, harmony, inclusion, interrelation, co-habitation, order, harmony, stability and coherence, positive outlook to the future, vitality, sense, fit, control, efficiency, justice, excellence, quality, beauty, be socially inclusive treating difference with recognition and respect, allow human flourishing, physical stimulation, intellectual challenge, emotional range, cultural
diversity and community engagement, provide walkable, integrated, diverse, multiple-use, finite urban entities and landscapes. As a concept the closest one to these qualities is the smart growth that provides very integrated view to development of urban places. Though New Urbanism ideology developed prior to the smart growth concept, in practice, we can see that the smart growth concept comprise everything what the New Urbanism movement supports. It is due to the fact that the New Urbanism may be considered mainly as an urban (merely physical) planning and design ideology while the smart growth overarches both the social, economic and physical qualities of the spatial planning. Basing on the findings of this essay the contemporary compact city concept is somewhat very similar to the smart growth that also celebrates compactness of urban spaces. But in Europe this compact development is understood in a wider context of compact city concept that may be attributed both to the regional and local planning. To a large extent it is possible to admit that smart growth in the U.S. is the same as compact city policies in Europe. The British Urban Villages movement honestly does not deny its direct linkage to the American New Urbanism movement, where it got much of the inspiration. Though, the differences are quite obvious as well. While the New Urbanism gives guidelines for spatial planning both on regional and local level, the Urban Villages movement mainly concentrates on the local level – particularly the urban quarter or neighborhood. Moreover, design principles of Urban Villages directly reflect the traditional British village & town patterns that are attributed also in creation of new urban settlements. Both pairs of the analyzed concepts – smart growth & the New Urbanism and compact city & Urban Villages – contain most of the qualities of the good city. However, they mainly concentrate on qualities that describe physical form and arrangements of spatial elements of the good city rather than social form and human inter-relations in the good city. But this finding should not be considered as a critical shortcoming of these concepts but just as a fact that should not be forgotten in practical urban planning, since they represent (to a very large extent) the normative theory of the spatial planning. While the social part of the good city is merely represented by the relativistic philosophies. It is doubtful whether the extremes of both these philosophical approaches could be beneficial for cities and their inhabitants. Better, if there is some combination of these two philosophical approaches that evaluate the local context, needs, wills and possibilities.

Andis Kublačovs is the Chairman of the Board for the Latvian Association of Spatial Planners. For an expanded article including references, contact Mr. Kublačovs at andis_kublacovs@yahoo.com
Ports: Partnering for Job Growth

By Scott Keillor, AICP, BergerABAM and Todd Chase, AICP, FCS GROUP

Over the course of the past few decades, Oregon’s ports have been challenged to transition from timber and fishing resource-based economies to a diversified economic profile of bulk commodity exports, high technology, tourism, and recreation.

Most Oregon ports were created 60 to 100 plus years ago under Oregon law, ORS Chapter 777, to serve as the lead local special district for managing and operating strategic improvements to ocean and river jetties, harbors, and piers. Projects were originally funded with federal dollars to spur commerce and economic diversification. As federal dollars for preserving these investments and maintaining channel depths have become increasingly scarce, ports must be ever more vigilant to leverage state and local dollars to preserve infrastructure and desired private investment for job growth.

To maintain a competitive edge and relevance in today’s economy, the state has made funds available for Oregon ports to complete Strategic Business Plans that capture their market opportunities through strategic planning. Under Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR 123, Division 25), local port plans must follow the direction set by the state in Ports 2010: A New Statewide Strategic Business Plan for Oregon’s Port System. In completing their facilities inventory, market analysis and project priorities, local ports are also compelled to review statewide planning goals impacted by their plans. This primarily involves Goal 5 Natural Resources, Goal 8 Recreation, Goal 9 Economy, Goal 10 Housing, Goal 12 Transportation, Goal 16 Estuarine Resources, and Goal 17 Coastal Shore Lands. Port missions involve job creation, so Goal 9 is a focal point for their strategic plans. However, forces such as competing local visions, obsolete or limited zoning and land use designations, changing markets, and new technologies require innovative partnerships and fresh policies to keep Oregon ports competitive.

What do Strategic Business Plans accomplish? In addition to setting vision, policy, management, capital facilities, finance, market, and environmental policies for ports, these plans are now required to obtain state funding from Business Oregon (Oregon Business Development Commission). For example, the first state-compliant strategic business plan was completed by the Port of Garibaldi in 2010. The plan served as the springboard to obtain grants for strategic projects, including a waterfront parks and trails master plan funded by Oregon State Parks, and a Connect Oregon grant to assist with the reconstruction of the Commercial Avenue Wharf – a critical improvement needed to support water-dependent commerce for this traditional fishing village.

Along the south coast, the Port of Umpqua’s plan included an economic analysis of the benefits of maintaining channel depths needed to retain jobs that are dependent upon the Umpqua River; the dredging application is now on line to receive approximately $1 million in federal funding. On the Columbia River at the Port of St. Helens, five industrial parks with more than a thousand acres require infrastructure, including new roads, dock upgrades and airport services to generate aviation-related jobs. And in eastern Oregon, the Port of Morrow is partnering with Morrow County and the City of Boardman in
the Columbia River Enterprise Zone II, which provides limited property tax abatement in return for guaranteed private capital investment and family-wage job creation. According to Carla McLane, Morrow County Planning Director and enterprise zone manager, “private development on Port and private properties has generated as many as eight applications over the past two years, and could easily generate in lieu payments of over $1 million annually. With this current round of applications and agreements, well over 280 jobs will be created.”

Still, there are many small ports in Oregon in need of additional funds — for facilities, docks, dredging, and marketing — all as part of a shared vision to ensure their economic viability. Through local and state partnerships, ports can achieve broad community-based economic development policies and implement specific projects to spur job growth. As Oregon recovers from the Great Recession, now is the time to prepare for the next wave of economic growth. Through the development of effective strategic business plans, Oregon planners can play an important role in working with ports, municipal, state and federal agencies to effectively make targeted investments that preserve community livability and enhance Oregon’s economy.

Scott Keillor, AICP is senior planner at BergerABAM with 23 years of Oregon land use planning and project management experience serving ports, cities, counties, and private developers. Todd Chase, AICP is a senior economist and manager of FCS GROUP’s Oregon office, with 28 years of performing land use, economic and financial strategies for infrastructure and development projects for ports, cities, counties and special districts in the U.S.
Placemaking with the Public Square: Diagnosing the Identity Crisis of Downtown Eugene, Oregon

By Brittany Porter

The downtown of Eugene, Oregon lacks a central public square that represents the identity of the city and its community. Broadway Plaza, located along the main street of downtown, was intended to serve this purpose. An exploration into why and how the space fails to attract people is done based on the literature of William Whyte and Jane Jacobs. Analyzing both the timeless case study of Piazza del Campo in Siena, Italy and nearby Portland, Oregon’s popular Pioneer Courthouse Square provides comparable examples of success. The Broadway Plaza is found to be too open and undefined, lacks connections to public transit, and is purposeless as a destination. The conclusion explains the City of Eugene’s plans for Downtown improvements regarding the Plaza.

There’s No “There” There

A great city or district typically has a geographic center with a civic or public open space that disseminates a sense of place throughout the rest of the city. The community’s relationships, personality, and identity are created, maintained, and celebrated in such spaces. Eugene, Oregon is the second-largest city in Oregon after Portland and is home to roughly 150,000 people with the University of Oregon at its heart. The downtown of Eugene, Oregon has a public square called Broadway Plaza that attempts to be a space of aforementioned qualities, but despite being a bustling college town, the Plaza succumbs to the common problem of underuse. In order to diagnose the space’s issue, this paper will delve into what it means to be a public space, will ask what qualities make a successful public space, and will evaluate two case studies that are in the top five of successful public squares in the World: Piazza del Campo in Siena, Italy and Pioneer Courthouse Square in Portland, Oregon.

The questions of what makes a successful space, what attracts people to use it, and what makes a space’s popularity are by no means new. It was first discussed in mass during the 1960s and 1980s when urban activists like Jane Jacobs and William Whyte offered groundbreaking ideas about designing cities that catered to people, not just to cars and shopping centers. In his book “The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces” Whyte observes the public spaces of New York City and gathers data stating the seven physical qualities that should be in every urban space for it to be successful: street access, seating, trees, sun, water, food, and what he calls triangulation. “Triangulation is the process by which some external stimulus provides a linkage between people and prompts strangers to talk to other strangers as if they knew each other”. (Whyte)

For example, if a bench, a wastebasket and a
telephone are placed with no connection to each other, each may receive a very limited use, but when they are arranged together along with other amenities such as a coffee cart, they will naturally bring people together.

Jane Jacobs is best known for her book “The Death and Life of Great American Cities” in which she discusses the qualities of a successful streetscapes and the overall quality of a neighborhood. She advocated citizen ownership of streets through the now-famous “eyes on the street” concept. Jacobs states that a street must have three main qualities: clear demarcation between public and private, buildings must face the streets rather than turn their backs or blank sides to it leaving it unwatched and therefore unsafe, and the sidewalk must remain populated during all hours of the day for similar reasons and because “nobody enjoys looking out a window at an empty street […] large numbers of people entertain themselves by watching street activity”. (Jacobs) The common consensus between the two is that people enjoy public spaces with things to do and reasons to pause in the space. “What attracts people most, it would appear, is other person.” (Whyte) This is due to safety issues, as previously stated, and because the number one activity in a public space is people watching.

Modern Urbanists at the Project for Public Spaces seeking to answer this question have built upon literature of the past and determined there are ten key principles a successful public square should meet. While all ten principles are vital, this paper will further discuss the principles of image and identity, attraction and destinations, access, and the inner and outer square.

**Placemaking: From the Heart of a Community**

These spaces will live or die based on the use of the public; therefore their survival is dependent upon community input. “Placemaking is both an overarching idea and a hands-on tool for improving a neighborhood, city or region. It has the potential to be one of the most transformative ideas of this century,” says the Metropolitan Planning Council of Chicago when summarizing the value of community driven design. (Project for Public Spaces) Placemaking capitalizes on a local community’s assets, inspiration, and potential, ultimately creating good public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and wellbeing. It is considered both a process and a philosophy that takes root when a community expresses needs and desires about places in their lives. More often than not there is not yet a clearly defined plan of action, there is merely a community outcry for improvement. Experience has shown that when professionals incorporate grassroots involvement from the public, via open meetings and design charrettes, the process is made easier because the public is able to directly express what they want. “Common problems like traffic-dominated streets, rarely used parks, and isolated, underperforming development projects can be avoided by embracing the Placemaking perspective that views a place in its entirety, rather than zeroing in on isolated fragments of the whole.” (Project for Public Spaces) The goal is to create a place that has both a strong sense of community and a comfortable image. This is achieved through a setting, activities and use that collectively add up to something more than the sum of simple parts.

**Community Symbolism: Piazza del Campo**

Siena, Italy is home to a public square that is considered one of the top five places for public gathering in the world. (Amoss) The city is known for its extremely well preserved urban center, as many of the buildings have not changed since medieval times. At the geographical and cultural center of Siena is located Piazza del Campo, which was and is the city’s central market place. The city hall with its iconic tower was constructed in the 12th century and is now the Civic Museum. The spoke-like paving of fishbone-patterned red brick is an iconic and symbolic community art piece that covers the entirety of the space. The red brick is broken with ten lines of travertine that radiate out from the mouth of the gavinone, or central water drain in front of the Piazza Pubblico. It was commissioned in 1349 by Siena’s then ruling body, the Council of Nine. Each of the nine wedges of brick represents a different member
of the Nine each of which came from a different family in Siena. The space follows the principle of the inner and outer square. The inner square is paved with this decorative brick pattern and is a large open space that allows for programmatic flexibility. The outer square operates more like a promenade that interacts with the cafes and unified building facades, providing a very strong active edge with very small breaks for narrow streets that spill into the Piazza and reach back out into the city. Since the Piazza’s completion, it has remained the site of most of the city’s public events, including bullfights, executions, festivals and the famous Palio, a breakneck, bareback, 90-second horse race that occurs twice a year. (Project for Public Spaces) This space is an example of how a place for community representation, involvement, and interaction that remains comfortable and flexible can survive the tests of time.

Community Produced: Pioneer Courthouse Square

Pioneer Courthouse Square could be the poster child for placemaking. It was originally the site of the Portland Hotel and later became a parking lot. The administration recognized the wasted potential of the space after a public outcry. There was a call for proposals from professionals to create a public space out of the lot. The winner was Oregon native, Doug Macy. In their submittal to the city, Macy and his team decided to submit a modest proposal of sketches, the quote “We shape our spaces, and then our spaces shape us,” and an expressed intention to represent the local sensibility. The design process was governed by Macy’s overarching ideas of an “unencumbered” open space at the center of the square, and the need for “definition at the edges” of the square. (Bennet) However, aside from those big ideas, the process was a series of open meetings with the public and community design charettes during which the participants talked with the designers about the needs of the space and how they envisioned them with them occurring. Before construction began the lot was cleared of cars and a life size diagram of the design was painted in bright colors, announcing with anticipation the awaited arrival of “Portland’s Living Room”.

The square’s modern design incorporates public art, flowers, trees, water feature, steps that provide ample seating, and a symbiotic relationship with a Starbucks coffee house, thereby meeting all of William Whyte’s criteria for a urban space with an active social life. However, it was Macy’s big idea to enclose the space with a grove of trees along one side and a sculptural colonnade along the other that makes this square truly successful. It allows there to be two levels to the space, an upper and a lower – similar to the inner and outer circle principle discussed earlier. The lower is Macy’s unencumbered open space; the upper is the prime stage for watching the people using the steps or the lower level. The inclusion of an information center for Tri-Met, Portland’s public transit, allows there to be multiple connections to bus and light rail routes right on the squares doorstep. This is vital for the accessibility of the space and is why it works so well as an identifiable meeting space. Pioneer Courthouse Square is ranked the fourth most loved public square in the world due to its role as the city’s center, downtown meeting place, its integration with transit and the precedent it set for other revitalization projects in Portland.

Comparing the Two: New Portland and Old Siena

As discussed, the most important element of a
Public space is people, and both of these squares succeed in attracting and captivating people. In Siena, the Piazza was and is a public market, the center for trading and commerce in the city. Portland's Square is similarly important because of its function as a Grand Central Station for Portland commuters. Both spaces contain anchors or focal points. The bell tower of city hall in Siena is a visual icon for Piazza del Campo, while the Pioneer Courthouse, one of the oldest existing federal buildings in the West, is clearly the distinguishable landmark of Pioneer Courthouse Square. The squares also benefit from their perceived centrality. (Amoss) The key to these spaces is that they are the identifiable “centers of town”. Piazza del Campo does live at the geographic center of Siena, while Pioneer Courthouse Square is nowhere near the actual geographic center of the city. This is unimportant due to its aforementioned perceived centrality; shopping surrounds the space and because of its importance as the Living Room of Portland it has its own gravity that marks it as the center. Both squares host high-profile city events that cement their center-of-gravity status. Simple design does much to enliven both spaces. They are located on slightly sloped sites that are utilized in different ways but both point towards their institutional anchor or landmark. Both squares use brick paving, a material that is of a human scale and signifies that this is a surface for people, not cars. From these examples, it is clear that the ingredients to a successful public space are simple and timeless. “People, institutional anchors, location, and person-sensitive design, when done right can come together to create a world-class space.” (Amoss)

Community Needed: Broadway Plaza

Bringing it back to Eugene, the downtown could have a few perceived central public spaces. This is the first main issue in its identity crisis diagnosis. However, the main drag of downtown appears to be Broadway. It includes small cafes, boutique shops, and utilizes traffic calming techniques that indicate a pedestrian friendly area. The public space that this paper is evaluating is Broadway Plaza, formerly known as Kesey Square. It is located at the corner of East Broadway and Willamette Street, which is considered a “historic crossroads”. (City Council of Eugene, Oregon) The space is similar to the case studies in that it is paved in brick, contains an open central space, is accessible from a pedestrian friendly street, and meets all seven of William Whyte’s physical criteria. The City of Eugene describes it as showcasing “public art, including special paving, the Four Seasons sculptures, and carefully crafted ceramic tiles.” There are also food carts activating the space. The one Whyte item missing is a water feature. However, this is not main the downfall of the space. The problem is Broadway Plaza is rarely used outside of the food carts at lunchtime on weekdays and during organized events. It has been proven that people are the number one way to make a space that people will use.

The space currently feels uncomfortable and undefined. It is too open and pours out into the streetscape, while also lacking an anchor or landmark. Even the paving extends out past the
edges of the surrounding buildings which act as boundaries of the space, thus creating a blurred space. There is also no immediate or nearby connection to Eugene’s established public transit. Another missing component was exhibited by the case studies: an inner and outer square. This adds layers and dimension to the square by creating a space within a space quality that provides comfort and definition to the visitor. Jane Jacobs explained another issue; the street is blind to the Plaza. The surrounding buildings produce blank facades on three sides of the space. Therefore, the space feels unsafe, disconnected from the urbanity around it, not easily accessible, and is too open, lacking a defined inner square with purpose.

**Eugene’s Plan**

The City of Eugene is not unaware of this issue. Administration has recognized that spaces go unused without official programs. This issue carried through to the Park Blocks that are unvisited whenever the Saturday Market is not in season. In a document titled “Plan for Downtown Eugene” they mention, “An enhanced connection between Broadway Plaza and the Park Blocks is needed to create a prominent pedestrian path between these two downtown destinations.” (City Council of Eugene, Oregon) Once they connect the two areas the space as a whole will even meet the final Whyte criteria of a water feature seeing as the Park Blocks are home to a sculptural fountain that is a centerpiece of Eugene. Integrating and possibly expanding the two spaces could provide one central place that represents the identity of Eugene and marks the center of its downtown.
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The City of Newberg’s Design Star Program for 6th Graders Receives National Planning Award

The Design Star program, a learning collaboration between the City of Newberg, Oregon, and local 6th graders, will receive the American Planning Association’s 2013 National Planning Excellence Award for Public Outreach.

The program was honored for its success in engaging almost every Newberg 6th grader in critical thinking about community planning, and encouraging and empowering them to be creative in finding ways to be involved with improving their community.

The Public Outreach Award recognizes an individual, project, or program that uses information and education about the value of planning and how planning improves a community’s quality of life.

The Design Star program was created in 2006 in response to an APA National Community Planning Month initiative asking local planners to engage young people. Over the past five years, the program has evolved into an annual collaboration between Newberg city staff and middle school teachers and has been integrated into the curriculum.

Led by Newberg’s Assistant Planner Jessica Nunley, AICP, and GIS Analyst Jan Wolf, the Design Star program helps teach kids how and why things are organized the way they are in their community, as well as prompts them to think critically about the potential positive and negative impacts of a development, the need for jobs in the community, the need for certain city services (“city needs”), things that make cities great places to live (“city wants”), and even environmental impacts of commuting for jobs or recreation.

“The Design Star project invites students to think creatively and use higher order thinking skills including analysis, evaluation, synthesis and critical thinking that will drive student success in the 21st century,” said Ann C. Bagley, FAICP, 2013 APA Awards Jury chair. “The project not only teaches planning principles but it also helps young people develop skills related to innovative thinking, mapping, writing, presenting, and working in groups.”
As part of the program, city staff presents information using GIS (geographic information system) mapping technology to show different parts of the community such as the bare earth, utilities, addresses, parcels, and Census data. They then lead a discussion on the difference between city “needs” versus “wants”, possible impacts of popular ideas for “wants” (i.e. amusement parks), their favorite parts about Newberg now, and what things Newberg might be missing to make it a great place to live. The students are then instructed to come up with a development proposal for one of two vacant sites in town. After several weeks of work, the students present their proposals to the class and the winning proposals are presented to city staff and elected officials.

“This program provides a unique opportunity for students to think critically about why a community would want to actively participate in decision making around land use, development, and the protection of our environment,” said Angela Lazarean, Education and Outreach Committee chair, APA Oregon Chapter.

Although the proposals are only hypothetical, Newberg city planners learned that the community is lacking places that are geared for teenagers to gather—something to consider when moving forward with city plans.

The Design Star Program will receive the Public Outreach Award in a special awards luncheon held during APA’s National Planning Conference in Chicago on Tuesday, April 16, 2013. The program also will be featured in Planning magazine, APA’s flagship publication.

To view all of the APA 2013 National Planning Excellence and Achievement Award recipients, visit www.planning.org/awards/2013. APA’s national awards program, the profession’s highest honor, is a proud tradition established more than 50 years ago to recognize outstanding community plans, planning programs and initiatives, public education efforts, and individuals for their leadership on planning issues.

The American Planning Association is an independent, not-for-profit educational organization that provides leadership in the development of vital communities. APA and its professional institute, the American Institute of Certified Planners, are dedicated to advancing the art, science and profession of good planning -- physical, economic and social -- so as to create communities that offer better choices for where and how people work and live. Members of APA help create communities of lasting value and encourage civic leaders, business interests and citizens to play a meaningful role in creating communities that enrich people’s lives. APA has offices in Washington, D.C., and Chicago, Ill. For more information, visit www.planning.org.
Oregon Planners Invited to International Planning Meeting

IMCL announces the European Cities of Vision Study Tour

Friday, September 27 – Saturday, October 5, 2013

The 2013 “European Cities of Vision” Study Tour offers elected officials, planners and urban designers the opportunity to visit and learn in depth about two of Europe’s most livable and sustainable cities – Freiburg and Strasbourg. These cities are recognized internationally for leadership in sustainable transportation planning, promotion of walking and biking, traffic calming mechanisms, human scale mixed-use development, solar energy and sustainability. Tours and talks are given by the planning leaders and staff responsible for these achievements. All sessions are conducted in English. Participation limited to 20.

The City of Freiburg is often called Germany’s “ecological capital” and has been acclaimed as one of the world’s most livable, sustainable and child-friendly cities. In 1993, IMCL awarded Freiburg the IMCL City of Vision Award. Since then, Freiburg received numerous awards for its leadership in sustainable transportation planning, promotion of walking and biking, traffic calming mechanisms, human scale mixed-use development, renewable energy, protection of nature, and sustainability.

In 1994, IMCL awarded Strasbourg the IMCL City of Vision Award for inaugurating their exemplary light rail system and for removing traffic from the city center’s innumerable squares and market places that support social life and civic engagement.

IMCL is proud to work with these Cities in organizing the European Cities of Vision Study Tour to further disseminate the innovations and improvements in livability and sustainability achieved in recent years.

The program is available at http://www.livablecities.org/2013-study-tour-program. Early registration rate available until May 1st.

For questions, please contact Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard,
Director, International Making Cities Livable LLC.

Women and Diversity in Planning

There is interest among several OAPA members in re-forming the OAPA Women in Planning Committee with a broader focus on diversity. Early talks have included discussion of the possible theme Cultivating Opportunities for Women and Culturally Diverse Planners in Oregon Planning Programs and Work Places. The committee will seek to promote professional development, diversity, and leadership for Oregon planners. There is potential for this committee to work directly with the University of Oregon and Portland State University planning programs and focus on opportunities for emerging planning leaders. If you are interested in being a part of this committee, please e-mail OAPA member Jennifer Shih at jenniferdshih@gmail.com.