

---

**C&RP 746 Managing the Urban Spatial Environment: Regulatory Techniques**      phone: 292-1457  
(3 credits 04494-6)      e-mail: nasar.1@osu.edu  
Meets: 12:30 – 2:18 p.m. Tues. 247 Brown Hall      Office hours: TBA

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

This course seeks to give students a sound bases for those environmental design decisions relating to visual quality. It provides an understanding of the environmental and human factors that influence perceived environmental quality (PEQ) and meanings. It exposes students to theories explaining the nature of evaluative response, to empirical findings on environmental meaning, to design for appearance goals and to policy mechanisms for guiding visual form. It also gives students an understanding of the techniques available to planners to manage the visual form of the city. The course will include both explanations of the techniques and case studies and evaluations of their effectiveness.

## **OBJECTIVES**

Upon completion of the course, the student should be able to define terms, identify and describe important principles, discriminate between different theories, to identify guidelines for aesthetic quality, to demonstrate the application of principles learned in class by evaluating designs according to evaluative meaning criteria and to create a design which responds to such principles. The student should also be able to create or select appropriate regulatory, incentive and financial strategies for managing the visual for of specific urban design contexts

## **CLASS PROCEDURE**

Classes will take a lecture/discussion form. I expect students to read articles each week and to actively participate in class discussion.

## **REQUIRED TEXTS**

Nasar, J. (ed.) (1988) *Environmental aesthetics: Theory, research and application*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Nasar, J. (1998). *The Evaluative Image of the City*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

## **EVALUATION**

Grades are based on the student's performance in meeting the course objectives. Performance is assessed as follows:

1. **CLASS PARTICIPATION:** Each week students are to be prepared to discuss required readings and to report on one optional reading. You will also submit an abstract of that reading (20 percent).
2. **MIDTERM EXAM (Feb. 10):** The exam will cover readings and class discussions. Using information from class, students will review the visual quality of various projects, and make recommendations for improvement (40 percent).
3. **FINAL PROJECT (Due: March 17, 1:30 p.m.):** Students will develop a visual quality plan for an area, building, place or skyline. Using interviews and possibly overlay mapping techniques, students will uncover visual quality meanings. You will summarize the desirable features to preserve or add and the undesirable features to remove or buffer. You will also suggest policy mechanisms to implement the desired changes (40 percent).
4. The professor reserves the right to raise a student's grade by up to 10 percent for extraordinary efforts and quality work.

- A Excellent performance; above and beyond the assignment requirements.
- B Good performance, you're striving for excellence.
- B- Fair performance; you did only the minimum work required.
- C Poor performance, you did less than the minimum work required.
- C- REJECT; inadmissible evidence.

All work is expected to be handed in at the start of the class period when it is due. Late work will lose 1/2 gradepoint (i.e. A goes to B+) for each day (24 hours late)

## **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

All students are held responsible for knowing and abiding by the Department's policies on plagiarism and the University's policies on academic misconduct. If you have not received your copy of these rules, please get them from the Departmental secretary.

## COURSE OUTLINE

This represents a working outline for the course. Depending on time and student interest, we may spend more or less time exploring the weekly topics that follow:

### **WEEK 1** INTRODUCTION

Tue Jan. 6 Introduction to course purposes, procedures, requirements, etc. A schematic overview of theoretical and conceptual approaches to environmental meaning. A discussion of the importance of environmental meaning & appearance.

### **WEEK 2** THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY

Tue Jan. 13 Definitions, models and theories on the process underlying appraisals of environmental meaning and aesthetics. Art vs. craft, pleasant vs. sublime, beauty in the eye of the beholder vs. beauty in the object, innate vs. learned, phenomenology vs. scientific approaches, the lens model and the definition of appearance features.

ASSIGNMENT: Read

*The Evaluative Image*

Ch. 1 The Evaluative Image of the Environment (pp. 1-16)

*Environmental Aesthetics*

Ch. 1 Behavioral and perceptual aspects of the aesthetics of urban environments

Ch. 3. Prospects and refuges revisited

Ch. 4. Perception and landscape: conceptions and misconceptions

Ch. 5 Where cognition and affect meet

Ch. 8 Aesthetic perception in environmental design

Additional optional readings may be distributed in class

### **WEEK 3** DIMENSIONS OF RESPONSE TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Tue Jan. 20 What are the salient dimensions of emotional response to the environment? What features of the environment stand out in the perception of the public, of designers?

ASSIGNMENT: Read

*The Evaluative Image*

Ch. 2 Measuring Community Appearance (pp. 17-33)

*Environmental Aesthetics*

Ch. 10 Affective appraisals of environments

Ch. 14 A Study of meaning and architecture

Ch. 16 Dimensions in the perception of architecture: identification and interpretation of dimensions of similarity

Ch. 19 Perception and evaluation of residential street-scenes (read only through p 285)

Ch. 22 Dimensions of meaning in the perception of natural settings and their relationship to aesthetic response

Additional optional readings may be distributed in class

**WEEK 4**      FORMAL AESTHETICS

Tue Jan 27      Empirical findings on the roles of formal features of the environment in aesthetic response

ASSIGNMENT: Read:

*Environmental Aesthetics*

Ch. 13 Lighting design decisions as interventions in human visual space

Ch. 17 Contextual compatibility in architecture

Ch. 18 Visual preferences in urban street scenes: a cross-cultural comparison between Japan and the U.S.

Ch. 19 Perception and evaluation.. (pp. 285-end)

Ch. 21 The effect of sign complexity and coherence

Ch. 24 The emotional quality of scenes and observation points: a look at prospect and refuge

Additional optional readings may be distributed in class

**WEEK 5**      SYMBOLIC AESTHETICS

Tue Feb. 3      Empirical findings on the role of content or symbolic features of our surroundings on emotional appraisals.

ASSIGNMENT: Read

*The Evaluative Image*

Ch. 3 Two Cities (pp. 35-58)

Ch. 4 Elements of Urban Likability (pp. 59-80)

*Environmental Aesthetics*

Ch. 2 Symbolic aesthetics in architecture: toward a research agenda.

Ch. 23 A cognitive analysis of preference for field-and-forest environments

Ch. 25 Aesthetic preference for rural landscapes: some resident and visitor differences

Ch. 26 Familiarity and preference: a cross-cultural analysis

Additional optional readings may be distributed in class

**WEEK 6**      MIDTERM EXAM

Tue Feb. 10      In class (open notes, 2 pages)

Students will review various projects based on the information in class.

**WEEK 7**      PROGRAMMING AND EVALUATION METHODS

Tue Feb. 17      A review of the various methods available for programming and evaluating the emotional quality of various environmental setting and other arts. Midterm returned. Discussion and planning for final project.

ASSIGNMENT:

*The Evaluative Image*

Ch. 5 Evaluating the Method (pp 81-98)

Ch. 6 Other Dimensions of the Evaluative Image (99-127)

Ch. 7: Shaping the Evaluative Image (pp. 129-138)

Appendix: Visual Quality Programming (pp.139-156)

**WEEK 8**      INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL APPEARANCE

Tue Feb. 24      Demonstration of color image processing. How to digitize, alter, merge images, add elements, create animations, save, output results to disk, videotape or slides. Web as a tool for guiding appearance.

ASSIGNMENT: Evaluative meaning interviews completed

**WEEK 9**      DESIGN POLICY

Tue March 2      Discussion of the public policy mechanisms for planning, design and management of meaningful surroundings for the public.

ASSIGNMENT: Preliminary Guidelines

**WEEK 10**      DESIGN POLICY CONTINUED

Tue March 9

DUE: Draft Final Project and discussion of findings.

**FINAL EXAM WEEK**

Tue. March 17, 1:30 p.m. Final project due

## ADDITIONAL READINGS

New readings will be added each week of the quarter.

### WEEK 2: THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY

- Dickie, G. An historical introduction to aesthetics (pp. 1-42) *Aesthetics an introduction*. Indianapolis: Pegasus, 1971.
- Dickie, G. The aesthetic attitude (pp. 48-60) *Aesthetics an introduction*. Indianapolis: Pegasus, 1971.
- Langer, S.K. Principles of art and creative devices (pp. 108-123) *Problems of art*. N.Y.: Charles Scribner's, 1957.
- Lewontin, R.C., Rose, S. & L. Kamin, *Sociobiology: the total synthesis*, (pp. 233-264) Not in our genes, N.Y.: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Jackson, J.B. The vernacular landscape. In . Penning-Rowse, E.C. and Lowenthal, D. (eds.) *Landscape meanings and values*. London, Allen and Unwin, 1986.
- Jessup, B. What is great art (pp. 21-30) in L.J. Jacobus (ed.) *Aesthetics and the arts*. N.Y.: McGraw Hill, 1968.
- Orians, G.H. An ecological and evolutionary approach to landscape aesthetics. in C.C. Penning-Rowse & D. Lowenthal, *Landscape meanings and values*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1986.
- Read, H. A definition of art. in L.J. Jacobus (ed.) *Aesthetics and the arts*. N.Y.: McGraw Hill, 1968.
- Schulz, N. Aesthetics (pp. 67-81) *Intentions in architecture*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965.
- Wilson, E.O. The right place, (pp. 103-118) *Biophilia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.

### WEEK 3: DIMENSIONS OF RESPONSE

- Calvin J.S., Dearinger, J.A. & Curtin, M.E. An attempt at assessing preference for natural landscapes. *Environment & Behavior*, 4, 447-470.
- Canter, D.E. (1969) An intergroup comparison of connotative dimensions in architecture. *Environment & Behavior*, 1959, 1, 37-48.
- Carp et al. (1976) Dimensions of urban quality. *Environment & Behavior*, 8, 239-365.
- Geller, et al. (1982) Perceptions of urban scenes by small town and urban residents: A MDS. In Bart, P. et al. (eds) *Knowledge for design*, Proceedings of 13th EDRA, (128-141), College Park: EDRA.
- Groat, L. and D. Canter (1979) Does post-modernism communicate. *Progressive Architecture*, 12, 84-87.
- Harrison, J & Howard, W. (1972) The role of meaning in urban images. *Environment & Behavior*, Dec., 389-409.
- Hinshaw & Allot (1972) Environmental preferences of future housing consumers. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners (JAIP)*, 38, 102-107
- Horayangkura, V. (1978) Semantic dimensional structures: A methodological approach. *Environment & Behavior*, 10, 555-584.
- Kuller, R. (1972) Beyond semantic measurement.
- Lowenthal, D. & M. Riel (1972) The nature of perceived and imagined environments. *Environment & Behavior*, 4, 189-207.
- May, H. & Bassalla, T. Comparison of factor analysis and MDS to analyze semantic differential and construct eliciting date, EDRA.
- Maslow, A.H. & Mintz (1956) Effects of aesthetic surroundings: I. Initial short-term effects of three esthetic conditions upon perceiving "energy" and "well-being" in faces. *Journal of Psychology*, 41, 247-254.
- Mintz, N.L. (1956) Effects of aesthetic surroundings: II. Prolonged and repeated experience in a "beautiful" and an "ugly" room. *Journal of Psychology*, 41, 459-466.
- Pablant, P. & Baxter, J.C. (1975) Environmental correlates of school vandalism, Amer. Instit. of Planners Journal, July. 270-277.
- Sanoff, H. Youth's perception & categorization of residential cues. *EDRA IV, Vol. 1*, pp 84-97.

#### WEEK 4: FORMAL AESTHETICS

- Anderson, L.M. et al. (1983) Effects of sound on preferences for outdoor settings, *Envir. & Behav.* 15, 539-566.
- Banerjee, Tridib & Gollub, J. The public view of the coast: Toward aesthetic indicators for coastal planning & management. EDRA.
- Berlyne, D.E. and Boudewijns. (1971) Hedonic effects of uniformity in variety. *Can. J. of Psych.*, 25, 195-206.
- Canter, D. The purposive evaluation of places: A facet approach. *Environment & Behavior*, 15, 659-698.
- Ertel, S. (1973) Exploratory choice and verbal judgment (pp. 115-132). in D.E. Berlyne & K.B. Madsen (eds) *Pleasure, reward, preference*. N.Y. Academic.
- Herzog, T. Kaplan, R. & Kaplan, S. (1976) The prediction of preference for familiar urban places. *Environment & Behavior*, 8, 627-645.
- Hesselgren, S. (1975) Preferences of townscapes (178-199). In *Man's Perception of man-made environment*, Stroudsburg, Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross.
- Im, S-B (1984). Visual preferences in enclosed urban spaces: An exploration of a scientific approach to environmental design. *E & B.*, 16, 235-262.
- Oostendorp, A. Experiment II: Descriptive and affective rating scale judgments, (pp. 54-79). in *The identification & interpretation of dimensions underlying aesthetic behavior in the daily urban environment*. Dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Oostendorp, A. & Berlyne, D. (1978) Dimensions in the perception of architecture: A MDS preference scaling. *Scand. Journal of Psychology*, 19, 145-150.
- Simonton, D.K. (1980) Thematic fame and melododic originality in classical music: A multivariate computer-content analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 48, 206-219.
- Southworth, M. (1969) The sonic environment of cities. *Environment & Behavior*, 1, 49-70.
- Wiggins, L. (1973) Use of statistical methods to measure people's subjective responses to urban spaces. *Design Methods Group-Design Research Society Journal*, 7, 1-9.

#### WEEK 5: SYMBOLIC AESTHETICS

- Cooper, C. C. The house as symbol of self (p. 130-146). In Lang, J. et al. (eds.) *Designing for human behavior*. Stroudsburg, Dowden Hutchinson & Ross, Inc.
- Cherulnik, P.D. (1991). Reading restaurant facades: Environmental inference in finding the right place to eat. *Environment and Behavior*, 22, 150-170.
- Cherulnik, P. D., & Wilderman, S. K. (1986). Symbols of status in urban neighborhoods: contemporary perceptions of nineteenth-century Boston. *Environment and Behavior*, 18, 604-622.
- Devlin, K. & Nasar, J. (1989) Architect and non-architect judgments of "High" and "Vernacular" residential architecture. *J. Envir. Psych.* 9, 333- 344.
- Duncan, J. Jr. (1973) Landscape taste as a symbol of group identity: A Westchester County Village. *The Geographical Review*, 63, 344-355.
- Fusch R. & Ford, L. (1986). Architecture and the geography of the American city. *The Geographical Review*, 79, 324-340.
- Ittis, H. Can one love a plastic tree? *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 54, 5-7.
- Kaplan, S., Kaplan, R. and J.S. Wendt (1972) Rated preference and complexity for natural and urban visual material, *Perception and psychophysics*, 12, 354-356.
- Krieger, H. (1973) What's wrong with plastic trees? *Science*, 179, 446-455.
- Lee, L. (1982) The image of city hall, in Bart et al. (eds) EDRA 13, 310 - 374.
- Lounsbury, J.W. (1974) Patterns and correlates of environmental design preferences. EDRA 5.

- Lowenthal, D. (1972) Environmental assessment: A case study of Columbus, OH. American Geographic Society.
- Lyons, R. (1983) Demographic correlates of landscape preference, *Environment & Behavior*, 15, 487-511.
- Lynes, R. (1954) Highbrow, lowbrow, middlebrow (pp. 310-333). In *The Tastemakers*, Harpers & Bros.
- Nasar, J. (1989) The evaluative image of the city. *Journal of the American Planning Assoc.*
- Sadalla, E. K., Verschure, B., & Burroughs, J. (1987). Identity symbolism in housing. *Environment and Behavior*, 19, 569-587.

#### WEEK 9: PHYSICAL PLANNING/DESIGN PROCESS AND PRODUCTS

- Alterman, R. and M. Hill (1978) Implementation of urban land use plans. *JAIP*, July, 274-285.
- Berk, E. (1976) *Downtown Improvement Manual*. APA, Chicago, Ill
- Ch 10 Building improvements.
  - Ch 11. Landscaping.
  - Ch. 12 Surface Materials.
  - Ch 13. Lighting and Street Furniture.
  - Ch. 16 Traffic studies and improvement.
  - Ch. 18 Bicycles.
  - Ch 20 Pedestrians.
  - Ch 21 Pedestrian Malls.
- Burton, J. et al. (1980) Design guidelines for West Colorado Avenue. University of Colorado, Denver.
- Byrum, O and R. Hoffman (1977) Development framework guides regional land use, public facilities. *Practicing Planner*, March, 20-22.
- Dannenbrink, R.F, Developing community identity. *Practicing planner*, Dec, 27- 30.
- Ewald, R. & D.R. Mandelker (1971) *Street Graphics a concept and a system*.
- Ch 1. The purpose of street graphics (1-8),
  - Ch 3. The physiology and psychology of seeing, 15-25.
  - Ch. 4 The Baltimore County Study (25-35).
- Groat, L. (1984) Public opinions of contextual fit. *Architecture*, Nov. 72-75.
- Groat, L. (1983) Measuring the fit of new to old. *Architecture*, Nov. 58-61.
- Hall, L. et al. (1983) No lost causes: Three strategies for salvaging neighborhood shopping districts, *Planning*, March.
- L. Hall New Haven, Private money first.
  - R.H. Lurcott and K. LaFrance, Pittsburgh: Market studies.
  - M.A. Dobbins, Birmingham: Design is the key, 12-17.
- Hedman, R. (1981) A skyline paved with good intentions. *Planning*, Aug. 12-18.
- Knack, R.E. (1982) Pedestrian malls: Twenty years later. *Planning*. Dec. 15- 20.
- Lu, W. and R.L. Heath (1984) *Urban Design in the Twin Cities*, *Planning*, March, 13-21.
- Lu, W. Minneapolis. Heath, R.L. St. Paul.
- Morphew, C. (1984) The ins and outs of skyways. *Planning*, March, 23-26.
- Nasar, J.L. and S.I. Gordon (1985) *High Street Project: Strategies for Commercial Revitalization, Phase I*
- Examinations of Problems in the Area. pp 1- 11. Phase II Studies of Signage and Parking. Signage pp 12- 17. Parking, pp 18- 21.
- Newman, O. *Defensible Space*. Ch. 4 pp. 78-101, Ch. 5, pp 102-117.
- Rafter, D. (1980) Neighborhood planning: Arnstein's ladder applied, *Planning*, Jan. 23-25.
- Sedway, P.H and T. Cooke (1983) *Downtown planning: basic steps*. *Planning* Dec. 22-25.
- Shirvani, H. (1985) *The Urban Design Process*. N.Y., Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.
- Chs. 6 (pp. 121-140) Design Criteria
  - Ch. 7 (pp. 141-156) Products
  - Chs.8 (157-166) Implementation: Administrative Mechanisms

Ch. 9 (167-184) Implementation: Legal Mechanisms

Ch. 10 (185-202) Implementaion: Financial Mechanisms

Simonds, J.O. Urbanization - form and content, In Earthscape, pp 212-229.

Tourbier, J. (1979) Caring for Doylestown: Capitalizing on cultural resources. Practicing Planner, June 36-38.

Urban Design Notebook (1984) Tricks of the Trade. Planning, Oct. R. Hedman. Tricks of the Trade, 17-18.

H. Shirvani. Setting standards for smaller cities. G. Hack. Research Opportunities.

Weisbrod, G. and H.O. Pollakowski (1984) JAPA, Spring, 148-161.

Werth, J.T. and D. Bryant A guide to neighborhood planning. Planning Advisory Service # 342.

Whyte (1981) The social life of small urban places. Ch 3. Sitting Space, 24- 39. Wash., D.C.: Conservation Foundation.

### WEEKS 9 AND 10: REGULATIONS

#### Process

Ballot box zoning (1985), Longhini, G. Around the nation. 11-13. Kahn, V. California 80-year romance, 13.

Easley, G. The Sun Belt's version Planning, May, 11-13

Hawbaker, J.S. (1982) Appeals boards need to clean up their act. Planning, Nov. 22-24.

Sanders, W. (1982) Zero lot lines can trim housing costs. Planning, April, 15-17.

Sedway, P and B. Loyd (1977) Building block zoning provides new flexibility. Practicing Planner, Sept. 26-30.

Semos, G. (1978) Creative zoning: Blacksburg, Virginia uses it as a preservation too., Practicing Planner, Sept. 33-34.

#### Codes

Access for all: An illustrated handbood of barrier free design for Ohio (1978) Legislation & Regulations, p 27-32, Appendix I: Excerpts from the Ohio Building Code, 173-176.

Access for all.. (1981) Addendum.

Babcock, R.F. (1982) Houston: unzoned, unfettered and most unrepentant. Planning, March, 21-23.

Dowall, D.E. (1981) Reducing the cost effects of local land-use controls. JAPA, April, 145-153.

Ellickson, R.C. (1985) Inclusionary zoning: Who pays? Planning. Aug. 18-20.

Ewald, W. and D. Mandelker (1971) Street Graphics. Ch 9. Model Street Graphics Control Ordinance, 85-105.

Floyd, C.F. (1979) Billboard control under the Highway beautification Act--A failure of land use controls, JAPA, April, 115-126.

Floyd, C.F. (1979) How the billboard industry beats the law. Planning, April, 14-16.

Gordon, S. I and J.L. Nasar (1985) High Street Project: Research for commercial revitalization. Phase II, pp 3 - 5.

Jones, J.P. (1973) Controlling strip commercial development: Five Michigan communities cooperate on lan-uses along major highways. Planners notebook, 3, Aug.

Hill, G. (1981) California's coastal zone commission: Ten years of triumphs. Planning. Jan. 10-14.

Knecht, R.W. (1978) Coastal zone managment comes of age: In four years since the first federal CZM grants, states have begun to shape their shorelines. Practicing Planner, Dec., 16-22.

McAllister, A. (1976) But hold the golden arches. Practicing planner, October 20-21.

Radding, A. (1979) Even billboarders admit something has to be done. Planning. April, 17-18.

Smith, R.C. (1976) Sign regulation. Practicing Planner, Sept. 29-32. Schwartz, A.R. (1982) Stumping for state land-use controls, or why I took on the good ol' boys. Planning. March, 24-26.

Spieregen, Present regulatory factors, in Urban Design., 176-181. State of Ohio Dept of Econ and Comm. Dev. Parts I Regulations and II Commentary.  
Toner, W. (1984) AG zoning gets serious. Planning. Dec., 19-25. Whyte, W. (1980) The social life of small urban spaces. Appendix B: Digest of open-space zoning provisions New York City. 112-119.  
Woolfe, D.A. (1976) Zoning is doing planning in. Practicing Planner, June, 10-13.

### Performance zoning

Frank, M.J. (1982) Performance zoning: How it's doing in the place where it began. Planning, 21-23.  
Lynch, K. & P.B. Herr (1973) Performance zoning: The small town of Gay Head, Mass. tries it. Planners notebook, 3,5.  
Pease, J.R. and M. Morgan (1980) Performance zoning comes to Oregon. Planning, Aug. 22-24.

### WEEKS 9 AND 10: INCENTIVES & GROWTH MANAGEMENT

#### Incentives

Adams, G.D. (1984) A last-ditch effort to save downtown San Francisco. Planning, Feb., 4-11.  
Brooks, M. Bonus provisions in central city areas, ASPO PAS report #257.  
Brooks, M., Transfer Development Rights, ASPO PAS, Report # 304.  
Costonis, J. Development rights transfer: Description and perspectives for a critique, 92-113. ULI's Management and control of growth, Vol. III.  
DeChiara/Koppleman Cluster development, PUD, 219-221 in Urban Design Criteria.  
Dugan, J.M. (1981) Memphis cottons to PUD. Planning. Jan., 19-22. Fulton, W. (1985) Bethesda stages a beauty contest for developers. Planning. Jan., 18-21.  
Humphreys, J.A. & G. Delhson (1985) Point systems: keeping score. Humphreys, J Feb., 12-15.  
Regional Planning Assoc. Introduction and summary 6-11, Urban design Manhattan  
State of Ohio Dept of Econ and Comm Dev, Art. 13, PUD 63-69, and commentary, pp 111-113 in Model Zoning Regulations.  
Woodbury, S.R. (1975) Transfer of development rights: A new tool for planners. JAIP. Jan., 5-14.  
Urban Design Council of The City of N.Y. Housing Quality: A program for zoning reform.  
Zavarella, M. Windsor, Conn.: Small town transfers residential density via zoning credits. Practicing Planner. Sept., 30-31.

#### Growth control

Beatley, T. (1984) Applying moral principles to growth management. JAPA. Autumn, 459-469.  
Becker, R.W. (1978) Growth management downtown: New Orleans' plan is beginning to show results. Practicing Planner. June, 26-29.  
Butler, K.S. and D. Myer. (1984) Boomtime in Austin, Texas: Negotiated Growth Management. JAPA, Autumn, 447-458.  
Carter, S. et al., Local government techniques for managing growth, 341-351 in ULI's Management and control of growth, Vol III.  
Dubink, D. (1984) I'll have my town medium-rural, please. J American land development regulation. JAIP, Jan., 21-31.  
Fagin, H. Regulating the timing of urban development, 296-301. In ULI's Management and control of Growth, Vol I.  
Freilich, R.H. Development timing, moratoria and controlling growth, 361-389. ULI's Management and control of Growth, vol III.  
Heeter, G. Interim zoning controls, 409-413 ULI's Management and control of growth, Vol. III.

Northcott, K. (1984) Austin: The perils of popularity. *Planning*, Nov., 5-9. Peiser, R.B. (1984) Does it pay to plan suburban growth? *JAPA*, Autumn, 419-433.  
Rosall, N.L. (1977) Boulder adds a layer to growth management plans. *Practicing Planner*, June, 6-8.

*WEEKS 9 and 10: FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE STRATEGIES*

Cahill, D. (1980) Bonds to build housing with. *Planning*, May, 19-20. Casterline, B. (1977) Tax abatement encourages development. *Practicing planner*, June, 19-26.  
Clary, T.A. and P.W. Rasmussen (1985) The buyout phenomenon. *Planning*, Oct., 18-22.  
Coughlin, R.E. and T. Plaut (1978) Less-than-fee acquisition for the preservation of open space: Does it work? *JAIP*, Oct., 451-462.  
Finkler, E.L. and F.J. Popper (1981) Finding out who owns the land. *Planning*, Aug. 19-21.  
Gilmore, J.H. (1979) Tax incentives for historic preservation. *Practicing Planner*, June, 33-35.  
Gordon, L.A. (1980) Getting \$75 million worth of parkland for next to nothing. *Planning*, July, 15-18.  
Nasar, J.L. & Gordon, S.I. (1985) High Street Project: Research for commercial revitalization. Phase II Studies of Parking and Signage, Analysis of Parking Findings - an example, 22-25.  
Hornick, S. (1982) N.Y. plays Robin Hood to loft industries. *Planning*, Nov., 18-21.  
Huddleston, J.R. (1981) Tax increment financing in Wisconsin. *Planning*, Nov., 14-16.  
Linner, J. (1977) Cleveland is banking tax delinquent land. *Practicing planner*, June, 9-13.  
Mier, R. (1982) Enterprise zones: a long shot. *Planning*, April, 10-14.  
Montreal's housing hat trick: Infill, rehab, and co-ops. (1985) *Planning*, March, 18-23.  
Myers, P. (1982) UDAG and the urban environment. *JAPA*, Winter, 99-109.  
Peters, J. (1982) After the fair: What expos have done for their cities. July/Aug. 13-19.  
Rehabilitating the city. (1976) *Practicing planner*, June, 14-21.  
Setchwell, C. A., & D. Marks. (1984) 4 Rms hwy vu. *Planning*, Sept., 21-24. Starr, R. (1979) Getting the most out of excess urban land. *Planning*, June, 14-17.  
Using tax credits to save historic buildings: An update. (1984) *Planning*, Jan., 24-27.  
Wieitz, S. (1984) Impact fees: There is no free lunch. *Planning*, July, 12-14.  
Werth, J. (1984) Tapping developers. *Planning*, Jan., 21-23. What it takes to compete (1981) *Planning*, May, 12-18. Highland park. Fort Worth. Charlseton. New Rochelle, Hagerstown. Grand Rapids. Anniston.