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Old Suburbs Meet New Urbanism

Nicole Stelle Garnett*

In recent years, America’s older suburbs—sometimes called ‘inner ring’ or ‘first’ suburbs—have become the focus of a tremendous amount of popular and scholarly attention.¹ A sense of doom pervades much of the commentary on these communities, which are home to approximately one-fifth of the nation’s population.² Since the publication of Myron Orfield’s *Metropolitics* in 1997, a steady stream of reports have emerged warning that many of our inner ring communities are on a path of decline that will lead inevitably to the social and economic crises facing inner city communities.³ Inner ring suburbs are, according to these accounts, our next ghettos. The 2014 riots in Ferguson, Missouri—a poor, predominantly African American suburban community—heightened these anxieties about the future of the inner ring, leading some to warn that the unrest in the St. Louis suburb was reflective of a pervasive and deep suburban dysfunction resulting from failed public policies at all levels of government.⁴

Among many scholars of metropolitan America, inner ring suburbs have assumed a symbolic role previously reserved for struggling urban communities: They have become the poster children for all of the land-use and local government reforms *du jour*, including regional growth controls, redistributive tax
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* John P. Murphy Foundation Professor of Law, University of Notre Dame. This essay was solicited for the MIT Center for Advanced Urbanism’s project, “The Future of Suburbia.” The essay will be included in an *Infinite Suburbia* (Alan Berger and Joel Kotkin, eds.) (Princeton Architectural Press).
policies and—most recently—the various tools in the New Urbanists’ regulatory tool kit. A complete discussion of all of these regulatory options would consume (and has, indeed, consumed) volumes. But the most interesting and perhaps the most significant of these options is, the argument that New Urbanist regulatory tools, specifically transect zoning and form-based codes, are uniquely suited to the task of renewing older suburbs.

The Inner Ring Today

Generalizations about the current state of inner ring suburbs are risky, given the stark regional and intra-metropolitan variation among inner ring communities. The inner suburban communities of the Sunbelt are quite distinct from those in the 'old and cold' metro regions of the Northeast and the Midwest. Moreover, while some older suburbs, like Ferguson, Missouri, are poor, majority-minority communities, others are extremely affluent. Indeed, many of the wealthiest communities in the United States are tony older suburbs. That said, despite the gloom pervading much of the commentary, inner ring suburbs, compared to the national median, continue to be relatively wealthier, and have a better-educated workforce, lower rates of unemployment, and higher housing values.

Still, inner ring suburbs unquestionably have undergone dramatic demographic transformations in recent decades. To begin, as demographer William Frey recently observed in the New Republic, these suburbs are “not just for white people anymore.” Many inner ring communities that were once
exclusively or almost-exclusively white are today racially diverse. A majority of racial minorities in the nation’s largest metropolitan areas now live in suburbs. In the past decade and a half, the lion’s share of suburban population gains was attributable to minority migration to suburbs, primarily inner ring suburbs. These demographic shifts include unprecedented ‘black flight’ from cities, dramatic increases in Hispanic suburban population share, and the emergence of new suburban immigrant gateways and ‘ethnoburbs.’ In 2014, sixty-one percent of immigrants lived in suburbs (up from just over fifty percent in 2000), with increasing numbers of new Americans shunning traditional “gateway” cities and settling directly in suburbs, especially in inner ring communities.

Many inner ring suburbs also are facing new economic strains, with relative poverty more prevalent than it was a generation ago. A comprehensive study of the economic and demographic profiles of sixty-four inner ring suburban counties undertaken by Robert Puentes and David Warren in 2006 found that, while the median income in inner ring suburbs remains about twenty-five percent higher than the nation’s median, income levels in inner ring suburbs were stagnating and poverty rates were increasing, even as national income levels rose and poverty levels declined. The number of high-poverty inner suburban neighborhoods is mirroring the promising decline in concentrated urban poverty. Elizabeth Kneebone and Alan Berube found, for example, that during first decade of the twentieth-first century, the number of poor individuals living in the suburbs rose by more than half, which was more than twice the 23 percent rate of increase.
in cities. Kneebone and Berube also found that the number of poor individuals living in suburban neighborhoods where poverty rates exceed 40 percent rose by 63 percent between 2001 and 2010, mostly heavily concentrated in inner suburban communities.\textsuperscript{12}

Inner ring suburbs also are growing more slowly than their outer suburban cousins. Puentes and Warren found, for example, that while inner ring suburbs were growing faster than central cities, their rate of growth was only half that of newer suburbs. The slowing of growth is frequently coupled with an aging population and stagnating or declining housing values.\textsuperscript{13}

The Inner Ring as a Distributional Problem

Most academics consider the challenges facing inner ring suburbs that are a result of these demographic shifts—such as a declining tax base, strains on public education, aging infrastructure, increasing crime and a heavier social service burden—to be a distributional problem. According to this view, inner ring suburbs are victims of a local government system that enables suburban sprawl and exclusionary zoning, encourages better-resourced communities to lure wealthier residents, and deprives older suburbs of access to a fair share of the regional tax base. According to these critics, the fragmentation of American metropolitan regions enforces intra-metropolitan inequalities, leaving older struggling suburbs to play a constant and futile game of catch up. Unable to finance improvements in local services without raising taxes, imposing tax
increases in turn makes inner ring suburbs less attractive places to live. As Bernadette Hanlon has argued, “The 'push factors' of deteriorating schools and poor services combined with relatively high tax rates encourage further population loss, particularly of any remaining high income families.”14

Critics who view the problems of the inner ring suburbs in distributional terms tend to endorse redistributive policy solutions: Growth management is promoted as a means of redirecting populations that might otherwise locate in outer suburbs into older, built-up areas. These critics endorse tax base sharing mechanisms to ensure what they consider the fair distribution of fiscal resources across municipalities in a metropolitan region. Also proposed: new regional government structures to tame the excesses of inter-municipal competition for resources and residents, allocate the inputs required for new development (such as infrastructure funds), and foster intra-metropolitan collaboration.15

Commentators such as Richard Briffault and Myron Orfield specifically link the need for regional policy solutions to the plight of inner ring suburbs. As Briffault has argued, “For many poorer urban municipalities—especially the older, declining suburbs, which lack even the business districts, housing stock, and cultural amenities of older cities … [a] regionalist strategy that recognizes the relationships and connections among localities in a metropolitan area is essential.”16 These arguments are not without intuitive appeal, although, as I have written elsewhere, it is unclear whether the costs of policies designed to tame the
woes of metropolitan fragmentation will sacrifice too many of the benefits of the inter-municipal competition predicted by Charles Tiebout.\textsuperscript{17}

The Inner Ring as an Aesthetic Problem: Enter the New Urbanism

Briffault hints at a related, but distinct, concern about inner ring suburbs, one that is framed in aesthetic rather than distributional terms. Observers frequently refer to the built environment in many older suburbs as aging, unattractive, and unappealing, and contrast the housing and commercial stock (tract, ranch and split-level houses and strip malls) to the older, more architecturally appealing homes and commercial buildings found in central cities and select early suburbs. This critique is primarily directed not at the true first suburbs, as inner ring suburbs are sometimes called, but at what more accurately might be called the second suburbs. The first American suburbs were developed prior to the great depression, and tend to have the older housing stock and traditional street front commercial districts that are favored by elite opinion. The second wave of suburbia, which was developed on a massive scale in the post-war period, lacks such amenities. These homes and communities are considered by many to be aesthetically challenged timepieces with little to offer in the frenzied metropolitan competition for wealthier residents.\textsuperscript{18}

The distributional view of inner suburban problems suggests policy solutions that would minimize competition between municipalities. The aesthetic view suggests a slightly different approach that seeks to overcome impediments to
competition imposed by the presumably unappealing built environment of post-war suburbs. Critics raising aesthetic concerns assert that inner suburbs cannot be expected to compete because they lack the inputs needed to fuel successful regeneration, especially the types of residential and commercial structures attractive to would-be gentrifiers. In a recent book, for example, Ellen Dunham-Jones and June Williamson argue that suburbs need to be “retrofitted” to reflect contemporary architectural and urban design preferences and accommodate modern land use patterns. That is, “isolated privately owned malls and aging office parks” need to be demolished and replaced by “multiblock, mixed-use town centers,” “[e]dge center agglomerations of suburban office and retail…interlaced with residences and walkable streets,” “ambitious new public transit networks … proposed, constructed and integrating into rapidly developing suburban contexts,” and [a]rchaic zoning ordinances … thoroughly overhauled to permit higher-density, mixed-use development.19

Not surprisingly, New Urbanists embrace the view that inner ring suburbs face many problems as the result of aesthetic challenges. From its inception, the New Urbanism has been, in important respects, an aesthetic critique that views American suburbia as an affront to good urban design—one which can only be remedied by implementing better, more urban, design principles. New Urbanists believe, in other words, that suburbs need to be urbanized.20

Some of the development tools promoted by New Urbanists could conceivably serve older suburban communities well. For example, 'dead' malls
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can be flipped, unused parking lots filled, and one-way streets rerouted and lined with sidewalks to achieve greater connectivity and walkability. The challenge for inner ring suburban leaders, however, is that many New Urbanist redevelopment efforts are pricy—well beyond the reach of many cash-strapped local governments.

In this context, the allure of using land use regulations to require alterations in the urban landscape is apparent. Land use regulations appear costless, since they theoretically only set the stage for the desired development and redevelopment, which will in turn be undertaken by private parties. The difficulty is—as decades of social science research demonstrate—that land use regulations are far from costless. And, unfortunately, their costs all too frequently are borne by those of modest means. Proponents of the distributional approach to inner-suburban challenges acknowledge the costs of land use regulations. Indeed their proposals flow in important respects from their critique of prevailing regulatory practices. They also acknowledge that their proposed alternatives are not costless, although, in my view, they may underestimate those costs. Proponents of the New Urbanist alternatives to current land use regulations tend to ignore or downplay the costs, frequently billing them as cost saving devices that will free communities from the constricting grip of traditional zoning tools, when in reality, compliance costs can be extraordinarily high.

New Urbanists argue that cities should reject use-based zoning regulations in favor of a system of form-based aesthetic controls. This regulatory alternative
to zoning flows from the assumption that urban development proceeds naturally from more dense areas to less dense ones. Andrés Duany called this progression the “urban transect,” and New Urbanists urge local governments to replace traditional use zoning with regulations on building form appropriate to the various “transect zones” along the progression. The extent of the New Urbanists’ influence is reflected in the fact that local governments are increasingly supplementing or supplanting traditional land use regulations with transect zoning laws and the form-based codes that inevitably accompany them.\textsuperscript{22} The extent of this trend is difficult to gauge, but the fact that it is a trend is verifiable. Local governments as large as Miami, Denver and Cincinnati and as small as 100-person villages have enacted these devices into law.\textsuperscript{23} Transect zoning and form-based codes may be particularly attractive to inner ring suburban leaders, since they are billed as a way to remedy the aesthetic challenges that prevent their communities from competing with their suburban neighbors, both older and newer. A good example of such a community is Arlington, Virginia, an inner ring suburb of Washington, DC, which adopted a form-based code to govern its Columbia Pike corridor in 2013.\textsuperscript{24}

**Countering Costlessness of New Urbanist Codes**

Despite their allure, however, the adoption of these codes may prove counter-productive, especially in inner-suburban communities, for four related reasons:
First: Transect zoning is billed as embracing a simple theory about how to regulate urban development, which is that buildings appropriate for the city center should go in the city center, regardless of their use, and suburban buildings should look suburban, again, regardless of their use. In its implementation, however, transect zoning is anything but simple. As a practical matter, New Urbanists favor replacing traditional zoning with very meticulous and exhaustive aesthetic regulations, found in the form-based codes that fill the ubiquitous gaps in transect zoning regimes. To varying degrees, these codes dictate the architectural details (that is, the form) of buildings appropriate for the various zones in the urban transect. These details can consume dozens, even hundreds, of pages of regulations. As an alternative, some codes, including the Columbia Pike form-based code, provide illustrative “examples” of “appropriate” building and design styles, and require architectural review of all but the smallest projects.[Figure 1] Both forms of regulation raise development costs, and the vagueness of the second approach raises its own serious concerns.25

Second: The concept of the “urban transect” is ill suited to many suburban communities. The foundational planning principle of New Urbanism is that urban development naturally proceeds from more to less dense—from urban, to suburban, to rural. After decades of zoning, however, the urban transect frequently reflects New Urbanists’ preferences and aspirations for urban development more than the actual facts on the ground in American communities. Rather than proceeding neatly along the transect, the densities of many
metropolitan areas are either flat, or proceed from less dense, to more dense, to less dense again. While New Urbanists would like to reverse this trend, they have not satisfactorily addressed how to confront communities with development patterns that fail to approximate the urban transect. In fact, transect zoning has been imposed in locales where development patterns are entirely divorced from predictions of how the urban transect would develop. Columbia Pike is, again, a case in point. Consider, for example, the regulating plan for Baileys Crossroads, a neighborhood along the Columbia Pike corridor. [Figure Two] Not surprisingly, in suburban places like this, the transect is defined to fit existing development patterns, rather than the ideal progression New Urbanists prefer.

Third: Transect zoning and form-based codes seek to impose, by law, a particular urban aesthetic. Real estate developments governed by transect zoning and form-based codes look and feel very different from the developments, both urban and suburban, that preceded them for decades. This is because form-based codes have as their goal the reversal of over a century of planning practices that reflect what the New Urbanists consider wrongheaded aesthetic preferences. I happen to share the New Urbanists’ aesthetic preferences in large part. This fact, however, does not alleviate my concerns about using the law to impose aesthetic preferences on the built landscape. On the contrary, if the New Urbanists’ critique of twentieth century planning practices teaches anything, it is that using public land use regulations to impose architectural fads on the urban landscape can lead to unfortunate, even socially damaging, results. This may be particularly true in
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inner ring communities, where recent demographic shifts have led to the adaptive reuse of commercial structures considered obsolete by many New Urbanists. For example, many inner ring suburbs, features many strip malls filled with stores serving newly arrived immigrant populations, including this one in suburban Indianapolis. [Figure 3] Although these uses do not match the aesthetic preferred in most form-based codes, they can serve the residents of the community surrounding them well. As a result, just as the modernists’ wrecking balls destroyed functional urban communities during the postwar urban renewal period, so might the New Urbanists’ codes target suburban communities that function well for the thousands of newcomers who are discovering them.  

Fourth: Finally, at least in the inner ring, the goal of form-based codes is to 'upscale' communities. Form-based codes are in many respects, the equivalent of a highly technical performance-zoning schemes. (Performance zoning regulates land use by establishing parameters designed to limit the negative impact of the use. Although performance zoning is more flexible than conventional zoning, it is often prohibitively difficult to administer.) Anecdotal evidence suggests that compliance costs have stalled many redevelopment efforts governed by form-based zoning. But, even the successful implementation of form-based codes carries a risk of driving up housing costs, as well as the costs of running businesses like the ones in the Figure 3 above. Critics of inner suburbia frequently lament that many residents move up and out to newer suburbs with more attractive housing styles (read: McMansions, not split-levels). That is
undoubtedly true, but it not necessarily lamentable. Not only is the economic mobility reflected in such moves, generally speaking, a good sign, but these moves also free up quality housing stock for families and individuals of more-modest means. The reality is that the housing filtering process has, for generations, been one of the most important sources of affordable housing in the United States. The goal of the New Urbanist retrofit of inner suburbs essentially is to stop the filtering process, with the result being gentrification that prices-out many potential new suburban residents. Pulling up the suburban ladder at a time when immigrant and minorities are finally reaching its rungs raises serious transitional fairness issues. It also threatens to deplete the reservoir of vitality and diversity that can enliven and enrich struggling inner-suburban communities.29

Rethinking the Older Suburbs

Local leaders in older suburbs rightly want to promote economic growth by infusing an aging physical infrastructure with new life. The New Urbanists promise that this goal can be not only accomplished, but can be micromanaged through public land use regulations. The promise is undoubtedly attractive to local leaders who feel trapped by the geographic footprint imposed by zoning, but are wary of land use deregulation. Nonetheless, inner ring suburban leaders would do well to resist the deceptive allure of controlled diversity. A different vision of regulatory reform—one which embraces the goal abandoning the regulatory straightjacket of single-use zoning but eschews the desire to control the
aesthetic details of the transition from single-use to multi-use communities (which I have previously called “mixed use zoning without the strings”)—would better enable these communities to promote growth, maintain a stable supply of affordable housing, and harness the entrepreneurial energies of the individuals, families, and business who now call older suburbs home.30
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