Smart Growth Communities: how well will they sell?

Sally Lerner

Biosphere Sustainability Project, working paper 5, discussion draft subject to revision

Introduction

The main objectives of the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH), Greenbelt, Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM), 'Smart Growth' and 'Places to Grow' initiatives in Ontario are to manage urban growth so as to protect agricultural land from urban sprawl and move toward more 'sustainable' communities and regions. A central tenet of these plans is the need to create 'complete communities': compact, mixed-use places to live and work that achieve higher density through Intensification, re-development, and better design of newly-constructed neighbourhoods. Mixed-use – inclusion of places for employment, shopping, recreation and public events – is seen as key. Advocates claim that this approach to urban form will contribute to sustainability by preserving greenfields, reducing infrastructure costs, encouraging healthy walking and biking as well as transit use, reducing automobile use, and promoting better social relations (e.g. CMHC 2005).

But will this new approach to growth management work? Over a decade ago, UK geographer Michael Breheny, ["Urban compaction: feasible and acceptable?" (1997)], usefully suggested that the case for this 'new' type of community be subjected to three tests: veracity, feasibility and acceptability. He maintained that its acceptability to the public had been the least explored of the three, despite the fact that it might be the most crucial in the long term. In other words, even if more compact, 'complete' communities do provide most of the sustainability benefits claimed for them (veracity), and it is feasible for private and public developers to build them, questions of acceptability remain: Will people agree or choose to live in them? If so, who are these potential residents? And how can advocates of such smart growth initiatives increase acceptance of this community form?

This working paper examines literature that relates to these three tests. It deals briefly with veracity and feasibility before focusing on acceptability, about which more needs to be understood (Storper & Manville 2006). Acceptability poses complicated rather than complex problems; certainly they do not appear to be intractable.

Veracity and Feasibility

There has been an interesting arc of controversy around questions of the extent to which various 'compact community' proposals, contrasted with 'urban sprawl', will actually enhance 'sustainability' in practice, on the ground[1]. We are all familiar with criticisms of urban sprawl. More recently, questions have been raised about the extent to which compact smart growth communities can fulfill the claims made for their contributions to enhanced sustainability, such as a decline in auto use (e.g. Clark 2005; Neuman 2005). A few contrarians have even leapt to the defense of urban sprawl (e.g. Bruegmann 2007), or at least to consideration of possible negative impacts of curbing it, including social-equity issues related to congestion, pollution, noise, health, affordability and ghetto creation (Kahn 2006; Burton 2001).

A recent study in the UK by Bramley et al (2009:1) suggests that mixed results from assessments of the effects on sustainability of compact communities should perhaps be expected:

> "Outcomes [from a study of five British cities] relating to residential satisfaction, stability, neighbourhood environment, and safety are all shown to be lower in higher density/central places, but it is also shown that a good deal of this apparent effect is due to social and demographic factors. Interaction with neighbours and participation in groups is better at medium densities, controlling for other factors, while use of local services is, as expected, greater in denser, more central locations. These findings indicate that compact cities are not 'win – win' on all dimensions of sustainability but, rather, that reductions in transport emissions will have to be weighed against social criteria. In addition, urban form has different aspects, which have differing social effects, and this knowledge could inform the future design of 'smarter' urban environments."

While positive sustainability impacts of smart growth communities have been documented (e.g. Geurs & van Wee 2006; Nelson et al 2007), the research jury is still out on the extent to which the claims for sustainability benefits are adequately documented. While it is intuitively

---

[1] *Authors of the material reviewed usually define these terms and do so with predictable similarities and variations, so we will not deal with the semantic issues here. For a discussion of the relevant definitions, see Neuman's "The Compact City Fallacy" (2005) which includes astute comment on this debate and its history, suggesting "a new type of planning and city building that is not obsessed with urban form" (23).]*

obvious (to most of us) that Canada needs to move ahead in a generally smart-growth direction, both supporters and opponents of Ontario's Smart Growth plan maintain that hard evidence of potential benefits is currently thin (e.g. Neptis Foundation 2008).

Todd Litman, of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute in BC, ambitiously attempts to explicate and refute most of the challenges aimed at Smart Growth initiatives by critics ["Evaluating Criticisms of Smart Growth" 2007]. Litman's major point is that such initiatives are meant to be *comprehensive, coordinated* programs encompassing innovative community design, re-structured tax regimes and zoning regulations, and a variety of public policy changes. For Smart Growth to succeed on a significant regional scale such as the GGH, or even on the smaller ORM scale, requires a *suite* of coordinated policies and strategies as the *context* for higher density, mixed-use residential and commercial development. Litman concludes, for example, that:

> "Smart Growth is a set of planning principles intended to increase land use and transportation system efficiency. An effective Smart Growth program includes various integrated strategies, many of which reflect market principles and offer positive rewards for choosing more efficient land use and transportation patterns. Such programs can help address many problems and provide many benefits.
>
> Critics argue that Smart Growth is unfair, ineffective and unjustified, but they only recognize a few Smart Growth benefits, misrepresent issues and use selected examples and information. They claim to have evidence that Smart Growth increases traffic congestion, air pollution, accidents, public service costs, housing inaffordability, crime and poverty. In each case the critics select data and measurement units that support their arguments, while ignoring alternative perspectives and information. In many cases their data is wrong or out of context.
>
> Critics assume that current markets are fair and efficient, ignoring existing distortions that encourage sprawl, and ways that many Smart Growth strategies correct these distortions, increasing consumer options, economic efficiency and equity. They argue that consumers want large single-family homes in automobile-dependent communities, although there is abundant evidence that many people will choose other housing and transport options if given suitable options and incentives." (Litman 2007:68)

Calling some criticisms of Smart Growth legitimate, Litman suggests how these might be addressed, as in the following examples:

> "Legitimate Criticism / Appropriate Response
> There is uncertainty about the full costs of sprawl/ Continue research, and implement strategies that reflect market principles or help achieve strategic community goals.
>
> Smart Growth can have unintended consequences/ Support research to better understand impacts, and develop responsive Smart Growth policies and plans.
>
> By itself, increased development density can increase traffic congestion and local air pollution emissions/ Smart Growth programs should include additional strategies besides increased development density to improve accessibility, encourage modal shifts and reduce urban automobile travel.
>
> Many consumers value lower-density suburban homes and automobile-dependent lifestyles/ Allow consumers to choose by providing better land use and transport options and reducing subsidies that favor sprawl.
>
> Strategies that reduce land supply available for development can increase housing costs/ Implement Smart Growth strategies that increase housing and transportation affordability.
>
> The economic costs of farmland preservation are not a justification for restricting urban expansion/ Farmland and other greenspace preservation may be important for a variety of economic, social and environmental reasons" (Litman 2007:67).

Though Litman is primarily interested in transportation issues, his work suggests a useful way of addressing broad Smart Growth cost/benefit issues.

The Ontario government's 2006 *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* "seeks to reduce automobile dependence, promote more efficient provision and use of infrastructure, and decrease the rate of conversion of rural land to urban uses" (Neptis Foundation 2008:3). The Neptis Foundation (Toronto) is a major source of information bearing on the feasibility of realizing Ontario's Smart Growth objectives. The Neptis analyses of Ontario's Plan aim to identify and address potential problems relating to both feasibility and outcomes so that some improved version of the plan might actually succeed. A 2006 Neptis research report expressed support for the government's goals and policy initiatives, but also raised doubts that its objectives could be met by the proposed version (Neptis Foundation 2006; see also Winfield 2006 for a Pembina Institute assessment).

The 2008 Neptis analysis examined the extent to which the then current version of the Plan might encounter problems in meeting Plan objectives, particularly with respect to density:

> "For future development on greenfield land, the plan's policies promote the creation of 'complete communities' – urban form and activities that are more mixed, dense, and conducive to travel by means other than automobile relative to currently prevailing forms. To support these policies, the provincial government has set a minimum density target of 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare for designated zones of future development in each single- and upper-tier municipality" (Neptis Foundation 2008:3).

Based on a detailed analysis of 16 existing ~400-ha urban districts in the GTA and the effects on density of "24 hypothetical development scenarios", the Neptis diagnostic study (Neptis Foundation 2008:15-19) concluded, for example, that:

> Density should be supplemented by other measures: e.g. establish a minimum density target for individual subdivisions.
>
> The Plan should take into account trends and forecasts that suggest a decline in construction of single-detached dwellings (thus an increase in net residential densities) but also a decline in average household size trending toward lower densities.
>
> "Greater mix of use may actually reduce densities measured at the district scale." (17)
>
> "Smaller and smarter allocations for public facilities would increase densities…by expanding the amount of land available for private residential and commercial development." (17)
>
> "While meeting the Growth Plan's minimum density target is feasible, the promise of 'complete communities' will likely be less easily fulfilled": no guarantee that residents would work (or shop) locally, even if jobs were available, though perhaps less auto use over time in 'walkable' neighbourhoods (18)
>
> "Existing postwar suburban areas will be hard to retrofit." (18
>
> "Change will take time", not least because "there are tens of thousands of dwellings 'in the pipeline' – planned and approved under previous rules – that will be built" before the Plan has a significant impact on the ground. (19)

The Neptis Foundation has a continuing program of studies that track the evolution of the Ontario growth management initiatives (e.g. Neptis Foundation 2009); their reports will continue to provide a framework for examining the feasibility and, later, monitoring the outcomes of these initiatives.

Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) researchers have addressed two different feasibility questions that bear crucially on whether smart-growth communities get built at all: 1) whether municipalities will, and how they can, encourage developers to invest in such projects; and 2) whether existing low-density neighbourhoods will accept diversity and intensification. The CMHC has produced a detailed report (CMHC 2004a) on 23 case studies of "successfully achieving residential intensification in a variety of circumstances." The report outlines ways to overcome the barriers of high development costs, neighbourhood opposition and regulatory issues. Good design and proximity to urban amenities played central roles in these consumer successes, and municipal support was key. (For a pragmatic discussion of ways in which municipalities can provide support to facilitate smart growth development, see CMHC 2004b).

While the CMHC research is upbeat in its conclusions and recommendations, it does not address the important questions of whether adequate employment opportunities can and will be located within sufficient proximity to residences to reduce auto-dependence; and whether people will necessarily work (and shop) in their home neighbourhoods. Neptis Foundation reports (2008; 2009), among others, have raised doubts on both these scores; more research is needed.

Debate will continue on the veracity and feasibility of the Smart Growth path to sustainable land use, transport and urban development management, in Ontario and elsewhere. The issues highlighted in the literature point to the need for continuing constructive scrutiny of this strategy to make sure it works to increase sustainability and that the most effective versions are built within a reasonable time frame. Want to learn more? Google can connect you with ~34,200,000 Smart Growth sites.

Acceptability: the dynamics of people's decision making about where to live

To what extent will housing consumers accept more compact, mixed-use communities? A number of studies have suggested ways to address the acceptability question. While some deal with countries other than Canada, their conceptual frameworks, methods and findings offer useful guidance on how to study, predict, perhaps influence, consumer acceptance of Ontario's Places to Grow/Smart Growth approach (Myers & Gearin 2001; Bailey & Humphrey 2001; Michigan Environmental Council 2003; Filion & McSpurren 2007; Dempsey 2008; Howley 2009). Not surprisingly, the most useful information has been obtained by interviewing and

surveying people about why they make the choices they do, how satisfied they are, and what their future residential aspirations are.

Research on consumer housing preferences in North America over the past two decades has generally found that single-family detached residences in suburban neighbourhoods are desired by a majority of those studied. Typical of 1980-1990s research findings are those from a study of the highly dispersed Kitchener Census Metropolitan Area that led the authors to foresee "a further entrenchment of the dispersed urban structure ["The Entrenchment of Urban Dispersion: Residential Preferences and Location Patterns in the Dispersed City" (Filion et al 1999:1317)]. This dispersed structure ('urban sprawl') is characterized by low population density and high automobile dependence with the attendant societal and environmental negatives of air pollution, loss of rural land and amenities, segregated income enclaves, etc. Yet it was the preferred residential choice of the overwhelming majority of those surveyed for this mid-90s study, particularly upper income families and those with children, which constituted major consumers of new homes at this time and place. As the authors note, this did not bode well for the success of efforts to promote the creation of more compact urban forms (see also CMHC 1995). More recent research has produced similar findings (Skaburskis 2006; Couch & Karecha 2006; Gordon & Lee 2003; Howley et al 2009).

Can policy trump preferences (Gordon & Lee 2003)? As part of a comprehensive effort in 1999 to kick-start urban revitalization in the UK, a government Urban Task Force examined attitudes toward urban living so as to be better equipped to "sell the city" to potential residents. The primary aim was to determine how people's attitudes towards housing "are formed and shaped, whether they are amenable to being changed and if so how this might be achieved" (UK Urban Task Force 1999: 2). The UTF report, "But would you live there? Shaping attitudes to urban living", notes that:

> "However well justified it might be, a policy that is out of tune with public opinion will never be effective. We therefore need to have a much clearer understanding of the factors which influence public attitudes to urban areas so that we are better placed to use these factors to encourage people to consider urban living…" (Urban Task Force 1999:1)

A large body of research over the past decade suggests that it may be difficult, though certainly not impossible, over the longer term, to change existing North Americans', and others',

preferences for single detached homes in suburban and exurban locations (Filion et al 1999; Bailey & Humphrey 2001; Gordon & Lee 2003; Clapham 2005; Couch & Karecha 2006; Skaburskis 2006; Howley 2008). There are indications of a trend toward more acceptance of alternative community design of the New Urban/Smart Growth type, with sociable inclusiveness – "knowing the neighbours" – as well as proximity to work and amenities as major appeals (Karsten 2007; Jefferson 2007).

Acceptance of more compact smart-growth communities will necessarily be contingent on cultural and historical context, North American and Canadian in our case. The owner-occupied single detached dwelling with garden-ready, child-friendly green space has been the traditional North American symbol of attainment of successful adult status, particularly in the context of marriage and family responsibilities. This type of dwelling has typically been marketed to young families as the more attractive, desirable alternative to 'denser', less private apartment block and row housing.

Along with price, "lifestyle preferences" are seen as particularly key to residential choice (e.g. Reed & Mills 2006). Such choices are linked *inter alia* to financial resources (Reed & Mills 2006), self-image congruence with dwelling symbolism (Sirgy et al 2005; Cantrill et al 2007; Karsten 2007), diversity of previous housing experiences (Volk & Zimmerman 2000), stages of the life-cycle (Filion et al 1999; Myers & Gearin 2001) and core values (Michigan Environmental Council 2003). How new and re-sale residential products are marketed is substantially geared to 'intangibles' such as the symbolic meanings of 'home' and 'community' (Arbury 2005; Clapham 2005; Coolen 2006; Karsten 2007).

People routinely take tradeoffs into account in their housing choices and aspirations (e.g. Storper & Manville 2006): lower price for smaller size dwelling, auto dependence and/or longer commute to work; higher price for access to more convenient transit, leisure amenities, better schools, etc. Tradeoffs pertain even within price ranges – a gardener will give up urban amenities for a large back lot; a certain amount of noise and pollution may be endured to live near work or interesting activities; proximity to good schools or valued social networks may trump other considerations (e.g. Myers and Gearin 2001). How different people juggle these tradeoffs is, of course, linked to financial resources, life cycle stage, household composition (children, extended and dual-earner families, for example) and myriad other variables, including how the elements are 'bundled' in any specific residential choice situation (Myers & Gearin 2001).

In addition, studies from several countries suggest that generalization about residential consumer preferences is difficult because acceptance of various urban forms is likely to be site-specific and scale-specific: that is, dependent on the region, community, neighbourhood, or street under consideration by a prospective resident (Wassenberg & Goetgeluk 2005; Skaburskis 2006; Yang 2008; Howley 2008). This should alert planners to the necessity of understanding what version of the 'compact community' concept – which is translated variously as new urbanism, higher-density, 'walkable', 'mixed-use', less auto-dependent, more sociable, etc. – fits the culture of a particular place. It also points toward the importance of careful, informed urban design versus simply urban form in nurturing the Smart Growth initiative (Bailey & Humphrey 2001; Nelson 2006; Neuman 2005).

What the research on community acceptability and preference shows is not surprising: combinations of variables, often quite unique to the people and place involved, provide the push-pull dynamics of neighbourhood and housing selection. Some demographic developments such as an aging population and the increase in dual-earner families do provide clues to broad trends in future housing consumption: over the past two decade, studies have found increased interest in and acceptance of alternative housing forms among older (45+) consumers and a rising minority of younger 'niche-market' buyers/renters (Myers & Gearin 2001; Bailey & Humphrey 2001) However*, assumptions* based on life-cycle demographics must be carefully examined in light of other evolving social trends. Not all young singles prefer high-rise condos and not all 'seniors' want to trade a detached suburban home for a cozy apartment (Wulff 2004, but see Sainz 2009). And some parents of young children will not head for the suburbs, provided there are child-friendly alternatives closer to urban centres. Indeed, advocates of offering a variety of housing types in the same 'compact community' point to the desire of many people to raise their children or to 'age in place' surrounded by a diversity of neighbours (see van Vliet 2009 for an informed discussion of designing a community for a range of age groups).

The path forward: can design create acceptance of 'smart growth' communities*?*

What types of design are seen as key to consumer acceptance of, even preference for, the more sustainable communities envisioned by Smart Growth and Places to Grow advocates?

> *"Many, if not most, regions are groping toward an urban containment policy to hold back urban sprawl and create denser cities through reweaving of the tear in the urban fabric…But no matter what the investment or the strategy, what is important for the individual human being is how the city works at the personal*

> *level…..One doesn't start with density. Certainly one doesn't start the political process with density. One ends with density because a place is diverse and intriguing and people want to be there." (Sucher 2003:10-11).*

In his stimulating, copiously-illustrated book, *City Comforts: how to build an urban village*, David Sucher discusses some basic design concepts that "preserve and create walkable commercial areas": build to the sidewalk; make the building front "permeable" with windows and doors; prohibit parking lots in front of the building but allow on-street stop-and-go parking (Sucher 2003:45-65). Sucher photographed the larger and smaller urban design elements in a number of North American cities, including Vancouver, that contribute to vibrant street life as well as comfortable relaxation – such as plenty of places to meet and sit. Sucher's attention to small human-scale amenities (signage, clocks, lighting) as well as larger topics such as child-friendliness, street design, traffic calming, and appropriate architecture make this an engaging introduction. You'd like to live in the places pictured. This is one among many "how to" books on designing attractive sustainable communities (e.g. see Friedman 2007, for a recent, more comprehensive guide to sustainable residential development). If municipalities and developers bypass this type of project, perhaps the only excuse left is the traditional one: "people won't buy it".

> *"Cities can retain families if they provide three significant community elements that are required to establish or sustain urban residential neighbourhoods – safe and secure streets, sufficient green space, and good schools." (Volk & Zimmerman 2000:10)*

A key group to consider in trying to gauge the acceptability of smart-growth communities is the family with young children or planning to have them. Recent research suggests that there is a growing niche market among young urban dual-earner couples for child-friendly neighbourhoods that allow them to remain close to their jobs, family or friends and valued urban amenities (Morrow-Jones 2004; Karsten & van Vliet 2006; Jefferson 2007). The literature on child-friendly dwellings and community design emphasizes planning *with* children and families and reiterates the importance of informed design as well as safety, green areas, and good schools that serve as community hubs. For example, parks, sidewalks, and narrower streets in a grid pattern contribute to walkability and bikeability, important to parents tired of having to make 'playdates' so their kids can meet up with a friend (Bridgman 2004; Aurbach 2006; Karsten & van Vliet 2006; Kingston et al 2007; Furlong & Cunningham 2007; McAllister 2008).

Imaginative, well-conceived marketing will be a key factor in promoting acceptance of the smart growth community concept (e.g. Benson 2007; Cantrill et al 2007). Rather obvious suggestions abound: don't *ever* mention 'density'; talk about the pleasures of life where you can walk to the shops, get to know your neighbours, bike to the library, take the kids to the park, etc. etc.; emphasize that you can rent to begin with, then move up to ownership and on to retirement, all in the same friendly community. And, of course, say it all with full-colour illustrations! Since successful developers and real estate agencies are fully aware of all this, sustainability advocates would do well to become equally savvy – and vocal. Another important factor in the success of smart growth communities is the quality of design and construction in the initial development phases that are seen as examples of the genre. Particularly off-putting to potential residents is the presence in a locale of poorly designed and constructed dense neighbourhoods that give compact living a bad name (Volk & Zimmerman 2000; Arbury 2005).

What can we conclude about whether compact smart growth neighbourhoods and communities will find acceptance among present and future residential consumers? To what extent and under what conditions will different kinds of people be willing, or not, to live in or move to (more) compact dwellings in (more) compact communities that arguably contribute to more sustainable ways of living?

Research has shown that the determinants of people's responses to smart growth communities will include:

- •demographics: life-cycle stage, work-life balance issues, child issues
- •perceptions of well-being: safety, health, social life, desired amenities
- •available choices: price, existing examples of these community types
- •juggling tradeoffs, e.g. time/ease of commute, space, schools, greenery
- •core values: environmental stewardship; diverse neighbours; healthful living
- •life-style aspirations: self-image, status, 'life in the fast lane', 'simple life', etc.
- • excellent marketing, consumer education, and word-on-the-street

This overview of literature bearing on acceptability of smart growth communities suggests that well-designed and marketed versions of such communities will, over time, find acceptance. But the key phrase is "over time": housing stock evolves on a generational time line, so it would be premature to attempt to draw firm conclusions about the acceptability of the community design

element of the Smart Growth agenda until such communities have been on offer and in place for a at least a decade, perhaps longer (e.g. Nelson et al 2007).

This review does, however, offer ideas that can be utilized immediately, in that areas such as the Oak Ridges Moraine are attempting to make Smart Growth a reality within the GGH Greenbelt area. Looking toward the 2015 Greenbelt review, it is clear that a monitoring framework which will broaden the scope of the review must include attention to: whether development of smart growth communities is being encouraged by municipalities and other policy-makers (see CMHC 2004b for the types of municipal initiatives that could be monitored); how vigorously and effectively such places to live are being marketed by the public and private sectors; and the extent to which people, especially young families, are choosing to live in them. Monitoring these matters will require resources, ingenuity in crafting indicators (see CMHC 2004a for markers of successful projects) and cooperation with diverse stakeholders. It is fortunate that the Neptis Foundation and CMHC proactively initiated ongoing lines of research, the results of which should facilitate design of the needed monitoring programs (Neptis Foundation, all references; CMHC, all references). If 2015 is the reason, now is the time.

References and Selected Bibliography

Arbury, J. (2005) From urban sprawl to compact city: an analysis of urban growth management in Auckland. Auckland,NZ: MA Thesis Hon.Geog., University of Auckland

Aurbach, L. (2006) The market for mixed use and walkability. Ped Shed: Forecasts, new neighborhoods [4] comments Dec. 16 2006

Basu, A. (2005) Smart growth towards economic performance. April 19, 2005: www.umich.edu/~econdev/smartgrowth/index.htm

Bailey, J. & E. Humphrey (2001) Comment on Dowell Myers & Elizabeth Gearin's "Current Preferences and Future Demand for Denser Residential Environments". *Housing Policy Debate*, 12,4: 665-674

Benson, J. (2007) Branding and Marketing Smart Growth Communities. Produced and written for EPA from existing case studies and industry experience. http://www.epa.gov

Bramley, G., N. Dempsey, S. Power, C. Brown, D. Watkins (2009) Social sustainability and urban form: evidence from five British cities - *Environment and Planning A*, 41, 9:2125-2142

Breheny, M. (1997) Urban compaction: feasible and acceptable? *Cities*, 14, 4:209-217

Bridgman, R. (2004). “Child-Friendly Cities: Canadian Perspectives.” *Children, Youth and Environments* 14(2): 178-200. Accessed Nov. 5/09] from http://www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/.

Bruegmann, R. (2007) Sprawl: A Compact History. Presentation at Center of the American Experiment Forum, February 22

Bunker, R. et al (2005) Building the connection between housing needs and metropolitan planning in Sydney. *Australia. Housing Studies*, 20, 5:771-794

Burton, E. (2001) The Compact City and Social Justice. Paper presented at Housing Studies Assoc. Spring Conference – Housing, Environment and Sustainability, University of York, 18/19 April

CMHC (1995) Resettling Cities: Canadian Residential Intensification Initiatives. *Research and Development Highlights*, Socio-Economic Series, Issue 20

CMHC (2002) Sustainable Community Design Demonstration in Okotoks, Alberta: Testing Consumer Receptivity. *Research Highlight*, Socio-economic Series 111, December

CMHC (2004a) Residential Intensification Case Studies: Built Projects. *Research Highlight*, Socio-economic Series 04-014, February

CMHC (2004b) Residential Intensification Case Studies: Municipal Initiatives. *Research Highlight*, Socio-economic Series 04-002, January

CMHC (2005) Sustainability, Planning Practice, Housing Form and Environmental Protection in the Toronto Region’s Oak Ridges Moraine. *Research Highlight*, Socio-economic Series 05-022, June

Cantrill, J.G., J.L. Thompson, E. Garrett, G. Rochester (2007) Exploring a Sense of Self-in-Place to Explain the Impulse for Urban Sprawl. *Environmental Communication*, 1, 2:123-145

Clapham, D. (2005) *The Meaning of Housing: a pathways approach*. Bristol, UK: Polity Press

Clark, M. (2005) The Compact City: European Ideal, Global Fix or Myth. *Global Built Environment Review*, 4, 3:1-11 [see entire issue on compact communities]

Coolen, H. (2006) The meaning of dwelling: an ecological perspective. *Housing theory and society*, 23(4), 185-201.

Couch, C. & J. Karecha (2006) Controlling urban sprawl: Some experiences from Liverpool. *Cities*, 23, 5: 353-363

Dempsey, N. (2008) Quality of the Built Environment in Urban Neighbourhoods. *Planning, Practice & Research,* 23, 2: 249-264

Filion, P., T. Bunting, K. Warriner (1999) The Entrenchment of Urban Dispersion: Residential Preferences and Location Patterns in the Dispersed City. *Urban Studies*, 36, 8:1317-1347

Filion, P. & K. McSpurren (2007) Smart Growth and Development Reality: The Difficult Coordination of Land Use and Transport Objectives. *Urban Studies*, 44, 3: 501-523

Friedman, A. (2007) *Sustainable Residential Development: planning and design for green neighbourhoods.* New York: McGrawHill

Furlong, T. & B. Cunningham (2007) *Principles of Child Friendly Housing*. Portland,OR: City of Portland, Oregon Bureau of Planning, Portland Courtyard Housing Competition

Geurs, K.T. & B. van Wee (2006) *Ex-post* Evaluation of Thirty Years of Compact Urban Development in the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 43, 1: 139-160

Gordon, P. & B. Lee (2003) Settlement Patterns in the U.S. and Canada: Similarities and Differences – Policies or Preferences? Keynote address, 26th Australasian Transport Research Forum, Wellington, NZ, October 3

Howley, P. (2009) Attitudes toward compact city living: towards a greater understanding of residential behaviour. *Land Use Policy* 26: 792-798

Howley, P., M. Scott, D. Redmond (2009) An examination of residential preferences for less sustainable housing: exploring future mobility among Dublin central city residents. *Cities*, 26, 1:1-8

Jefferson, E. A. (2007) Americans are leaving gated communities: neighborly interaction tops list for desirable home. denverpost.com 03/16/2007

Kahn, M. E. (2006) The Quality of Life in Sprawled versus Compact Cities. http:://greeneconomics.blogspot.com/2006/03/benefits-of-sprawl.html

Karsten, L. (2007) Housing as a Way of Life: Towards an Understanding of Middle Class Families' Preference for an Urban Residential Location. *Housing Studies*,22,1: 83-98

Karsten, L. & W. van Vliet (2006). "Children in the City: Reclaiming the Street." *Children, Youth and Environments* 16(1): 151-167.

Kingston, B.,P. Wridt, L. Chawla, W. van Vliet, L. Brink (2007) Creating child friendly cities: the case of Denver USA. *Municipal Engineer* 160, Issue ME2: 97-102

Litman, T. (2007*) Evaluating Criticism of Smart Growth*. Victoria, BC: Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 24 September

Mallett, S. (2004) Understanding home: a critical review of the literature. *Sociological Review*, 52:62-89

McAllister, C. (2008) Child Friendly Cities and land use planning: implications for children's health. *Environments*, December 2008.

Michigan Environmental Council (2003) Residential Housing Preferences in Michigan: Summary analysis of four focus groups in Detroit and Grand Rapids. Conducted for Michigan Environmental Council by Belden Russonello & Stewart, Washington, D.C.

Morrow-Jones, H.A., E.G. Irwin, B. Roe (2004) Consumer preferences for neotraditional neighborhood characteristics. *Housing Policy Debate*,15,1: 171-202

Myers, D. & E. Gearin (2001) Current Preferences and Future Demand for Denser Residential Environments. *Housing Policy Debate*, 12,4: 633-659

Nelson, A.C. (2006) Leadership in a New Era. *J. of the American Planning Assoc*.,72,4: 393-409

Nelson, A.C., C.J. Dawkins, T.W. Sanchez (2007) *The Social Impacts of Urban Containment*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company

Neptis Foundation (2006) Commentary on the Ontario Government's Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe: Revised Edition. March 2006. Toronto:The Neptis Foundation

Neptis Foundation (2008) Shaping the Toronto Region, Past, Present and Future: An exploration of the potential effectiveness of changes to planning policies governing greenfield development in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Report Highlights. Zack Taylor with John van Nostrand. Toronto: The Neptis Foundation

Neptis Foundation (2009) Places to Shop and Places to Grow: Power Retail, Consumer Travel Behavior, and Urban Growth Management in the Greater Toronto Area. Ron Buliung and Tony Hernandez

Neuman, M. (2005) The Compact City Fallacy. *J. of Planning Education and Research*, 25:11-26

Reed, R. & A. Mills (2006) Identifying the drivers behind housing preferences of first-time owners. *Property Management*, 25,3: 225-241

Saintz, A. (2009) Trend toward smaller homes for thriftier seniors. KOB.com Posted at: 04/03/2009 ///Users/lerner/Desktop/Housing%20prefs/Smaller%20homesseniors2009.shtml

Sirgy, M.J., S. Grzeskowiak, S. Chenting (2005) Explaining housing preference and choice: The role of self-congruity and functional congruity*. J. of Housing and the Built Environment*, 20,4: 329-347

Skaburskis, A. (2006) New Urbanism and Sprawl: A Toronto Case Study. *J. of Planning Education and Research*, 25: 233-248

Storper, M. & M. Manville (2006) Behaviour, Preferences and Cities: Urban Theory and Urban Resurgence. *Urban Studies*, 43,8: 1247-1274

Sucher, D. (2003) *City Comforts: how to build an urban village (revised edition).* Seattle, Washington: City Comforts. Inc.

UK Urban Task Force (1999) But would you live there? Shaping attitudes to urban living. Produced for the Urban Task Force by MORI,URBED and the School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol

van den Berg, A., T. Hartig, H.Staats (2007) Preference for Nature in Urbanized Societies: Stress, Restoration, and the Pursuit of Sustainability. *J. of Social Issues*, 63,1:79-96

van Vliet, W. (2009) Creating Livable Cities for All Ages: Intergenerational Strategies and Initiatives. Working Paper CYE-WP1. Boulder, Colorado: Children, Youth and Environments Center, University of Colorado

Volk, L. & T. Zimmerman (2000) *Confronting the Question of Market Demand for Urban Residential Development.* Fannie May Foundation 2000 Annual Housing Conference: The Market Power of Emerging Communities

Wassenberg, F. & R. Goetgeluk (2005) Measuring the residential environment. Paper for the conference “Doing, thinking, feeling home: the mental geography of residential environments”, Delft NL,14-15 October

Winfield, M. (2006) Comments on *Places to Grow: Better Choices, Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, November 2005 EBR Registry Number XR05E0002*.
Toronto: The Pembina Institute, c/o Centre for the Environment, Innis College

Wulff, M., E. Healy, M. Reynolds (2004) Why don’t small households live in small dwellings? – disentangling a planning dilemma. *People and Place*, 12,1: 57-70

Yang, Y. (2008) A Tale of Two Cities: physical form and neighborhood satisfaction in metropolitan Portland and Charlotte. *J. of the American Planning Association*, 74,3: 307-323