

**Urban and Metropolitan Development: Planning and Policy Agenda**  
Course Syllabus

This course considers municipal and metropolitan policy issues through the lens of interaction between regulation and markets in land use. The course begins with disciplinary perspectives from urban economics, political science, and law on issues of metropolitan development and the role of land use policy in its guidance. It then considers land use regulation from a theoretical perspective, and the role of zoning and related tools in fostering or preventing metropolitan sprawl. Finally, the course employs these analytical perspectives to explore the policy-critical areas of housing and transportation.

Policies toward development in metropolitan areas turn the fields of economics and urban planning inside out. Terms like “pro-market” or “pro-intervention” lose their meaning as observers otherwise oriented towards market-based approaches to policy questions tolerate or even endorse governmental intervention in the form of municipal land use regulation. Conversely, declaring that “[w]e must free the land of unnecessary restrictions” and berating people for “employing the police power to protect their own interest in land” is not the libertarian’s battle cry, but that of the advocacy planner.<sup>1</sup> The course explores the ways in which these debates implicitly underpin many development-policy issues facing US metropolitan areas today.

Course requirements are as follows:

1. **A take-home midterm.** This will be designed as a three-hour closed-book, closed-note exam. (35%)
2. **A term project.** This will take the form of a paper of up to sixteen double-spaced pages on one of two general topics, related to the course. The projects will develop evidence, at the grass-roots level, to flesh out the theories of land use and metropolitan development presented in the course. (35%)
  - a. *Land-Use Conflict.* Papers on this topic would analyze a case of local land-use conflict with specific reference to the theoretical arguments of the course. Land-use conflicts will be defined as publicly-aired disagreements over the manner in which a particular piece of territory is to be developed, regulated, or operated. These conflicts can take a number of forms. They can involve private or non-profit developers; transit or housing advocates; homeowners; municipal officials and more. You may be familiar with a particular case, or may even have been involved with one. If not, Lexis-Nexis, which includes the full text of newspaper articles, and other web-based resources, can help you locate land-use conflicts of interest. Questions to be considered in the term project may include: facts of conflict and identities of players involved; nature of claims on all sides; interpretation of any “coded” claims (euphemism, subtext); values (environmental, social, economic) at stake for the various parties; claims regarding the propriety of regulation, property rights or free markets in this context; impact of the planning/regulatory function on the final outcome; consistency or inconsistency with theoretical arguments of course.
  - b. *Evidence of Trading of Land-Use Rights:* Planning practice has evolved a number of tools in recent years that render land-use regulation more fluid and fungible than classical regulatory practice might suggest. These include transfer

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Davidoff, quoted in Aumente, Jerome (1971). “Domestic Land Reform.” *City* 5:56.

or purchase of development rights; exactions and impact fees; and informal concessions offered in order to overcome opposition to development. Where the planners might identify some of these approaches as innovative elements of their practice, many economists would view them as simple trade in development rights, predicted under the Coase model (see March 3 session). Analyze a specific successful or unsuccessful attempt at employing one of these approaches. These might include a referendum on purchase of open space rights; enactment of an impact-fee policy; or land-use conflict that was resolved through some manner of exchange. In addition to the questions above, questions specific to the issue of “trading” in land-use rights include; impacts on planning claims (did the exchange undermine claims for regulation); any surprising sources of support for or opposition to the policy; the magnitude of the exchange relative to the rights at stake; the motivations of the various parties to the “deal.”

3. **A presentation.** Findings of the term project will be presented in 10 minute lecture format during the last several sessions of the course. (15%)
4. **Advance preparation and active classtime participation** are essential to the course. (15%)

Following is a tentative schedule of course topics and readings. Most readings will be made available electronically; others will be place on reserve.

Date	Topic	Readings
4-Feb	What’s the connection between scientific inquiry and policy-making in the urban context?	<p>Phillips, E. Barbara. (1996). <i>City Lights: Urban-Suburban Life in the Global Society</i> (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Oxford University Press. [CH. 2, "Thinking About Cities, pp. 28-55]</p> <p>Van Doren, Peter. (2003). Letting Environmentalists’ Preferences Count. <i>Regulation</i> 26(3):32-35.</p>
11-Feb	Metropolitan Structure and Function: Economic Theories and Planning Practice	<p>Krugman, Paul. (1998). <i>Development, Geography, and Economic Theory</i>. Cambridge: MIT Press. [CH. 2, “Geography Lost and Found,” pp. 31-65]</p> <p>O’Sullivan, Arthur. (2000). <i>Urban Economics</i> (4th ed.). Boston: Irwin/McGraw-Hill. [CH. 5, pp. 105-132]</p> <p>Heilbron, James. (1974) <i>Urban Economics and Public Policy</i>. Chapter 6:105-136. New York: St Martin’s Press.</p>
18-Feb	What motivates and circumscribes the politics of planning of cities and suburbs?	<p>Peterson, Paul E. (1981). <i>City Limits</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Ch. 1, <i>City Limits and the Study of Urban Politics</i>, pp. 3-16].</p> <p>Logan, John R., and Molotch, Harvey L. (1987). <i>Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place</i>. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Ch. 3, “The City as a Growth Machine,” pp. 50-98].</p> <p>Danielson, Michael N. (1976). The Politics of Exclusionary Zoning in Suburbia. <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> 91(1):1-18.</p>

		Fischel, William L. (2001) <i>The Homevoter Hypothesis: How Home Values Influence Local Government Taxation, School Finance, and Land-Use Policies</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 1, "An Asset-Market Approach to Local Government," pp. 1-18, and Chapter 3, "Capitalization, Zoning, and the Tiebout Hypothesis," pp. 39-71.
25-Feb	Are the rights of municipalities inherent and self-evident?	Briffault, Richard. (1990). Our Localism: Part II—Localism and Legal Theory. <i>Columbia Law Review</i> 90(2):346-454.  Cashin, Sheryll D. (1999) Localism, Self-Interest and the Tyranny of the Favored Quarter: Addressing the Barriers to New Regionalism. Georgetown University Law Center, 1999 Working Paper Series in Law in Business and Economics. Working Paper No. 194751.  Haar, Charles M. (1997). Judges as Agents of Social Change: Can the Courts Break the Affordable Housing Deadlock in Metropolitan Areas? <i>Housing Policy Debate</i> 8(3):633-650.
3-Mar	Why do many economists like—or at least tolerate—zoning?	Tiebout, Charles M. (1956). A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures. <i>Journal of Political Economy</i> 64(5):416-424.  Hamilton, Bruce W. (1975). Zoning and Property Taxation in a System of Local Governments. <i>Urban Studies</i> 12:204-211.  Coase, Ronald. (1960). The Problem of Social Cost. <i>Journal of Law and Economics</i> 3:1-44.
10-Mar	What's wrong with zoning and how can it be improved?	Kahneman, Daniel, Jack L. Knetsch and Richard H. Thaler. (1990) Experimental Tests of the Endowment Effect and the Coase Theorem. <i>Journal of Political Economy</i> 98(6):1325-1348.  Fischel, William A. (1999) "Zoning and Land Use Regulation" in Boudewijn Bouckaert and Gerrit De Geest, General Editors. <i>Encyclopedia of Law and Economics</i> . Entry 2200. Available at <a href="http://allserv.rug.ac.be/~gdegeest/tablebib.htm">http://allserv.rug.ac.be/~gdegeest/tablebib.htm</a>  McDonald, John F. (1995). "Houston Remains Unzoned." <i>Journal of Urban Economics</i> 71(1):137-140.  Gibson K. and C. Abbott. (2002) "Portland, Oregon." <i>Cities</i> 19(6):425-436.
17-Mar		Spring Recess: No Class
24-Mar	Is "sprawl" a useful problem definition?	Ewing, Reid, Rolf Pendall and Don Chen. (2003) <i>Measuring Sprawl and its Impact</i> . Washington DC: Smart Growth America.  Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson. (2001) "The Sprawl Debate: Let Markets Plan." <i>Publius</i> 31(3).  Pendall, Rolf. (1999). Do Land-Use Controls Cause Sprawl? <i>Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design</i> . 26:555-571.

31-Mar	Do planning interventions expand or contract housing affordability and choice?	<p>Downs, Anthony. (2002). "Have Housing Prices Risen Faster in Portland Than Elsewhere?" <i>Housing Policy Debate</i> 13(1):7-31.</p> <p>Nelson, Arthur C. (2002). "Comment." <i>Housing Policy Debate</i> 13(1):33-42.</p> <p>Fischel, William. (2002). "Comment." <i>Housing Policy Debate</i> 13(1):43-50.</p> <p>Mitchell, James L. (2003). Will Empowering Developers to Challenge Exclusionary Zoning Increase Suburban Housing Choice? Forthcoming, <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>.</p> <p>Jacobs, Harvey M. (2003). The Politics of Property Rights at the National Level: Signals and Trends. <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i> 69(2):181-189.</p>
7-Apr	Housing and social policy and metropolitan structure	<p>Marcuse, Peter. (1997). The Enclave, the Citadel, and the Ghetto: What has Changed in the Post-Fordist U.S. City. <i>Urban Affairs Review</i>, 33(2), 228-264.</p> <p>Orfield, Myron. (2002). American Metropolitcs: The New Suburban Reality. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. Part 2, "Metropatterns," pp. 5-64.</p> <p>Dawkins CJ and A.C. Nelson. (2003) State growth management programs and central-city revitalization <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i> 69(4):381-396.</p>
14-Apr	What's transit's job in metropolitan development?	<p>Rubin, Thomas A., James E. Moore II and Shin Lee. (1999). Ten Myths about US Urban Rail Systems. <i>Transport Policy</i> 6:57-63.</p> <p>Stanger, R. (2000) Ten Myths about US Urban Rail Systems by Thomas Rubin, James Moore, and Shin Lee—A Rejoinder. <i>Transport Policy</i> 7:303-305.</p> <p>Ben-Akiva, Moshe and Takayuki Morikawa. (2002). Comparing Ridership Attraction of Rail and Bus. <i>Transport Policy</i> 9:107-116.</p> <p>Levine, Jonathan and Yaakov Garb. (2002). Congestion Pricing's Conditional Promise: Promotion of Accessibility or Mobility? <i>Transport Policy</i> 9:179-188.</p>
21-Apr	Do "smart growth" policies solve transportation problems? (Hint: It depends what you count as a problem)	<p>Cervero, Robert. (1996). Jobs-Housing Balance Revisited: Trends and Impacts in the San Francisco Bay Area. <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i> 62(4):492-511.</p> <p>Boarnet, Marlon G. and Randall Crane. (2001) <i>Travel by Design: The Influence of Urban Form on Travel</i>. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 1, "An Overview of <i>Travel by Design</i>," pp. 3-14.</p> <p>Levine, Jonathan, Aseem Inam and Gwo-Wei Torng. (2003). A Choice-Based Rationale for Land Use and Transportation Alternatives: Evidence from Boston and Atlanta. Forthcoming, <i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i>.</p>

28-Apr	Politics, the planning profession, and alternative metropolitan agendas	<p>Orfield, Myron. (2002). <i>American Metropolitcs: The New Suburban Reality</i>. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. Part 2, "Metropolicy," pp. 65-150 and Part 3, "Metropolitcs," pp. 151-188.</p> <p>Kirby, Andrew. (2002). Do Cities Have a Purpose? <i>Cities</i> 19(6)371-372.</p> <p>Brueckner, Jan K. (2000). "Urban Sprawl: Diagnosis and Remedies." <i>International Regional Science Review</i>. 23(2):160-171.</p> <p>Campbell, Scott D. (1996). Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities? Urban Planning and the Contradictions of Sustainable Development. <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i> 62(3):296-312.</p>
--------	---	--