



DECEMBER
2 0 0 4 /
JANUARY
2 0 0 5

IN THIS ISSUE

- Comments / 2
- Planning in the News/ 1, 6
- Legal Affairs/ 4
- Employment / 6
- Calendar / 7
- Consultant Directory / 8

Save the date!
Reserve early for the APA National Planning Conference in San Francisco, March 19-23, 2005. Register online, www.planning.org

Published by the
 Massachusetts and
 Rhode Island Chapters
 of the American
 Planning Association

New England PLANNING

Massachusetts Chapter & Rhode Island Chapter

Ballot Box Victories for Transit and Conservation ... and a Big Loss

*by Paul Farmer, AICP
 APA/AICP Executive Director*

On November 2, voters across the nation sent a message. I'm not talking about red states and blue states, terrorism, or moral values. The message sent by voters is that citizens are willing to invest in projects and programs that improve local quality of life. Community livability continues to be a winner at the ballot box. Voters approved a record number of ballot initiatives to fund transit and, once again, voters overwhelmingly supported new funds for land conservation.

The Center for Transportation Excellence found that more than \$40 billion worth of transit investments were approved on Election Day. Transit initiatives achieved an astonishing success rate of 80 percent. Not only did transit win at the ballot box, it won big. CFTE notes that the average transit ballot initiative garnered 62 percent of the vote. Some might call that a real mandate.

Land conservation initiatives fared equally well. The Trust for Public Land's Land Vote project reviewed election results nationwide and discovered that voters in 111 communities passed ballot measures creating more than \$2.5 billion in new public funding to protect land for parks and open space. Nationally, land conservation measures had a passage rate of 76 percent. For the fifth consecutive year, voters have approved at least 100 different land conservation measures. 2004 was second only to 2000 in total initiatives adopted in a single year.

A close look at ballot measures approved this year reveals two other important findings. One, planning issues aren't partisan. Two, support for smart growth issues like transit and open space isn't limited to major metropolitan areas.

Of the 11 different states where transit initiatives passed on November 2, seven went for President Bush and four for Senator Kerry. The regional distribution was even broader among successful land conservation measures with fully half of all states home to at least one adopted ballot measure.

The broad, bipartisan nature of popular support for these measures is echoed in a new survey cosponsored by the National Association of Realtors and Smart Growth America. The survey examined consumer preferences for housing and community characteristics. The findings reinforce the election results. Among people planning to buy a home in the next three years, 87 percent place a high importance on a shorter commute as their top priority. Asked to choose between two communities, 60 percent of prospective homebuyers chose a neighborhood that offered a shorter commute, sidewalks, and amenities like shops, restaurants, libraries, schools, and public transportation within walking distance over a sprawling community with larger lots, limited options for walking, and a longer commute.

A common caricature of the smart growth and livability movement is that its adherents are all elites living in major urban centers near a coast. That view is hard to sustain when we see transit initiatives being adopted by voters in Parkersburg, West Virginia; El Paso County, Colorado; Kalamazoo, Michigan; and Branson, Missouri.

Of course, no discussion among planners of the recent elections would be complete without mentioning the results of Measure 37 in Oregon. Measure 37 — a statutory measure, not a constitutional amendment — requires local government to compensate private landowners when a land-use regulation is enacted after the owner or a family member became the owner of the property if the regulation restricts the use of the property and

Continued on page 3

Massachusetts Chapter

by Peter Lowitt, AICP, Chapter President



Happy Holidays!

Rhode Island Chapter

Congratulations to Krista Moravec and Zac Gordon for passing the AICP exam in May or November 2004.

2005 AICP Exam Information

The American Planning Association is pleased to introduce a new one-step, single-payment application process for taking the AICP exam, starting with applications for the May 2005 exam. Upon submission and approval of a completed application, an applicant will receive an Authorization to Test and proceed with picking a testing center, date, and time. Applications for the May 2005 exam will be accepted through mid-March. Apply now!

Contact Pam Sherrill, RI Chapter Professional Development Officer (PDO), at Pare Engineering, 401 334-4100, or psherrill@parecorp.com for study guides and training information. Limited scholarship funding is available through the RI Chapter. Please send a letter of request, outlining your qualifications and extenuating circumstances for consideration, to the PDO.

Krista Moravec, Senior Planner for the Maguire Group in Providence, received her Masters of Community Planning from the University of Rhode Island. She has 6 years professional experience including nearly 3 years with Maguire. Krista serves as the Secretary of the RI Chapter of APA.

Zac Gordon, Senior Planner in the East Providence Planning Department, received his Masters of City and Regional Planning from Cornell University. He has 16 years professional experience including 8 with the City of East Providence.

Rural Character of Shirley

By Jackie Eselionis

I've heard a lot of talk around town and in board and committee meetings about "preserving the rural character" of Shirley. Everywhere I go it seems that everyone is in agreement that this is essential ... we must preserve our rural character. But it has occurred to me that I have heard this phrase from all factions, from strict preservationists to developers ... the whole spectrum. Some of us want to preserve land just as it is ... don't walk on it, don't use it, just look at it. Some want to remove trees and soil, and place homes or businesses close together. Most of these people come to the table with the thought that their ideas are good for the town.

It is such a phenomenon to me that some time ago I began asking people what "rural character" meant to them. Some people really didn't have a good answer. Their answer was, "You know." Well, I do know. . . at least I know what it means to me. But I was curious what it meant to others. It seemed to me that if we could actually define "rural character" it might help us to work together toward the common goal of maintaining it. If we can all agree on what it is, we will have a better chance of maintaining it.

Some people I talked to felt that maintaining Shirley in its current state was the ideal but it seems the current state depends on when you moved here. In this version, nothing changes except for the minor things like painting a building, tending to a fallen tree, or maintenance of roadways, etc. There would be no new businesses added, no new homes, no clearing of land for development purposes or even for recreational purposes. In this realm, many active uses of the land shouldn't be encouraged ... just passive uses.

Others I talked to felt that if a town doesn't have growth, it would die ... that it is impossible to maintain the status quo. It's either forward or backward for some. Rural character to them was focused more around the people in the town. They felt that the definition of rural character was the fact that you can go into the local hardware store or your church, or the post office and run into people that you know and can talk with. . . as around "the wood stove." They like the fact that you can "go to the top" in Town Hall and other places and be heard and be helped.

Then there are those who would make changes to the town in order to make, in their opinion, a better town. Some feel that the look of some parts of the town could be much improved and they are committed to making that so: to develop a theme for the Village area, for example, and ensure that any changes would encompass that theme rather than the mixed way the Village has developed. This group seemed to feel that we needed to create a look because the mixture of varieties of looks was not attractive.

Then there are those who feel the rural character of the town is that you can be so separated from one another with large house lots and lots of buffer that you never have to interact with neighbors at all unless you choose to. They

continued on page 3

Rural Character, continued from page 2

come home from work and sort of hibernate until they are ready to emerge ... their home is their castle and their retreat and no one comes in unless they let down the bridge over the moat. They are happy with their privacy and relish it. They can become lost in the rural character and, for them, it is a good way to live.

The point is that most of us agree that we want to maintain the rural character of Shirley in whatever way we perceive it but there is no definition of "rural character" and we all have different views in this regard. In our Master Plan, preserving the rural character of Shirley is one of the goals. The discussion comes up in board meetings on a regular basis whenever something new is proposed. But the real question is: What is rural character? Is there a way we can meet the ideals of all of the various factions and their idea of what this is? We might be able to save a lot of discussion and time at board meetings if we actually knew how we define rural character. We might all be able to get on the same page if we knew how to define rural character and were able to come to consensus on just what this is. It would send a clear message to all those who might offer changes to our town if there was some clear direction of the Town's plan to "maintain the rural character." It is such a mainstay of what we say we are and want to be in the future. We have all kinds of groups promoting this or that or looking into this or that. It's important that someone take charge of identifying just what rural character is to most people who live in the town. It's important that all factions have areas of their concern addressed somewhere in the town. It's important that someone take charge and make sure that all of the viewpoints are validated and that all points of view are considered and have a place in our town.

Many people I have talked with or listened to say they "love this town." Why? What do you love about it? I challenge those who have a viewpoint to make it known and to understand others may have a different viewpoint. It's important that we respect and find room for all points of view. What does your perfect Shirley look like? How do you want to see the town go forward into the future? What is important to you about our town? At a minimum, take the time to write a letter to the editor, to the Selectmen, to the Planning Board or any other board or committee that can take some action on your behalf. Make your wishes known in a very explicit way to give the "powers that be" guidance. Without your input, no one has any way of knowing. Without your viewpoint, we may continue in this quagmire of what is our rural character. At best, volunteer to serve with a group that might better serve your vision. And make it happen.

Ballot Box Victories, continued from page 1

reduces its fair market value. If a land-use regulation restricts the use of the owner's property and reduces its value, the government responsible for the regulation will have a choice: pay the owner of the property an amount equal to the reduction in value or modify, change, or decline to apply the regulation to the owner's property. Heavily financed by the timber industry, Measure 37 takes a liberal view of ownership and owners may file for compensation even though they may have acquired their title long after a regulation was put into place. That's one area of contention that undoubtedly will be adjudicated.

Cleverly worded to mask its real effect, Measure 37 is a direct, frontal assault on the nation's most honored and progressive planning system. Yet, 60 percent of Oregonians cast ballots in support of Measure 37. In focus groups and surveys, citizens rejected the notion that decades of good land use and planning measures could be swept away. They simply didn't believe that government would let it happen. With deceptive language and even more deceptive campaign ads, those who crafted Measure 37 successfully boiled the issue down to what sounded fair. If government reduces your property value, shouldn't you be paid? Planners were left as the standard bearers for government regulation.

Many pro-planning leaders throughout Oregon are now focusing on how to blunt the potential impact of Measure 37. It is not likely to be successfully challenged in court, as was its predecessor Measure 7, a constitutional amendment approved in 2000. Measure 7 was ruled unconstitutional by the Oregon Supreme Court, but Measure 37 proponents used Measure 7's passage in their campaign.

I think it's fair to assume that we'll see litigation related to individual property claims under the current measure. Methods may well be devised that soften the blow of Measure 37, but we should make no mistake that planning was dealt a serious blow by Measure 37. Our Oregon chapter has been effective in educating Oregon legislators about the planning movement during the past few years. They will continue to do so as the legislature and local governments grapple with the implementation of Measure 37.

It is all too likely that the success of Measure 37 in Oregon will embolden critics of planning, environmental regulation, and local decision making and lead to similar initiatives elsewhere. We must learn from the loss on Measure 37. What's the lesson? While I plan to discuss the lessons in greater detail in this space over the next few months, let me outline two keys about which much more remains to be said.

First, we lost the war of words. We have not yet found a voice and vocabulary that speaks to what the public values in good planning. APA will be working hard on this issue in the months ahead. We have embarked on a new communications plan during the last 18 months. Its implementation will be critical to our future success.

The opposition to good planning is well-financed and media-savvy. They don't play fair. They don't adhere to a

Continued on page 5

Recent Legal Cases

By Robert D. Smith, Town Attorney
Barnstable, Massachusetts

One of the recurring problems facing land use regulators is the claim by a property owner that their structure or use has acquired legally-protected non-conforming status, essentially the same status as a “pre-existing non-conformity,” because it has acquired the “statute of limitations” protection contained in section 7 of chapter 40A. That is,

1. The structure or
2. The use

is authorized by a building permit more than six years old; or

3. The structure has been in existence for more than ten years. (To complete the universe, there is no statute of limitations on actions to stop use violations which are not authorized by a building permit).

Clearly, this statute of limitations prevents us from going to court and getting an order to compel the cessation of an offending use if it is covered by a six-year-old building permit, or mandating the tearing down of a structure which has been in existence for more than ten years without a permit or six years authorized by a six-year old building permit.

But can the beneficiary of such statute of limitations protection base the privilege of being able to change or expand a legal non-conformity on it?

The case of *Bruno v. Board of Appeals of Wrentham* has just about clarified that such a beneficiary may not. Decided by the Appeals Court on November 29, 2004, the Court wrote:

*In respect to nonconforming structures, we recently stated that the “limitations period of G.L. c. 40A, § 7, does not render [a] prior structure lawful [for the purpose of § 6], just immune from enforcement action.” Cumberland Farms, Inc. v. Zoning Bd. of Appeals of Walpole, 61 Mass.App.Ct. 124, 127 n. 9 (2004). We can think of no valid reason why a different principle should apply to prior unlawful uses. Consequently, we decline to construe the expiration of the six-year limitation period set out in § 7 as converting an initially unlawful use to a lawful use, as if by a belated or constructive grant of right. See *ibid.* Cf. *Mendes v. Board of Appeals of Barnstable, 28 Mass.App.Ct. at 528-531 (use maintained under variance has no claim to status as prior lawful nonconforming use, which comes from preexisting right and not “through the after-the-fact dispensation of a variance”)*.*

Our conclusion is supported by other considerations. First, there is the plain language of § 6, which omits any explicit reference to uses protected under § 7. See *General Elec. Co. v. Department of Env'tl. Protection, 429 Mass. 798, 803*

(1999). There is also the fact that the Legislature expressly provided for the relief to be accorded for unlawful uses commenced pursuant to an original building permit, viz., a limitation on the time during which others might initiate judicial proceedings to enforce zoning regulations. Were we to construe § 6 as applying to uses protected from enforcement by § 7, we would impermissibly augment the extent of that relief. See *Keene v. Brigham & Women's Hosp., Inc., 439 Mass. 223, 238 (2003)* (“We are bound to give [a statute] the scope intended by the Legislature”). Section 7 expressly limits its application to the use originally allowed by a building permit. See § 7, second par. (six-year statute of limitations applies if “property has been improved and used *in accordance with the terms of [an] original building permit*”) (emphasis supplied).

We have also considered the fact that our reading of § 6 is consistent with the policy expressed in case law and the legislative history of § 6, that is, the elimination of nonconforming uses. See *Blasco v. Board of Appeals of Winchendon, 31 Mass.App.Ct. 32, 39 (1991)*; *Davis v. Zoning Bd. of Chatham, 52 Mass.App.Ct. at 357-358*; Report of the Department of Community Affairs Relative to Proposed Changes and Additions to the Zoning Enabling Act, at 39 (1972) (House of Rep. Bill No. 5009).

In this case, the history of the actual parcel which was the subject of the case involved a period of apparently mutual confusion over the town's site plan approval process and the grant of a special permit, with both landowners and regulators apparently mistaking the latter for the former. Nevertheless, henceforth there should be no reason for confusion: the scope of protection under section 7 is extremely limited.

Sustainable Development Committee

is Established by MAPA

The Massachusetts Chapter Board of Directors has voted to establish a Sustainable Development Committee. The formation of the Committee will begin after the holidays. If you would be interested in participating in this committee's work, including the initial discussions of the role of the Committee both within the Chapter and in statewide sustainable development efforts, please contact: Bob Mitchell AICP, Committee Chair, Special Assistant for Sustainable Development, Office for Commonwealth Development, 100 Cambridge Street, Boston, MA 02114. Robert.Mitchell@state.ma.us; 617-573-1383

Ballot Box Victories, continued from page 3

code of ethics. Misrepresentation is their stock in trade. We must never stoop to their level but we must be engaged in the public discussion, even though it may often be limited to sound bites.

Second, if we don't lead, we lose. Planners cannot be passive in the face of this challenge. Planners need to frame the discussion. I wrote last month about the vital importance of planners aggressively taking on leadership roles in their communities and in the policy arena. If we don't heed that call, we will see further defeats ahead.

As we ponder the implications of the passage of Measure 37 and how we must retool our messages and strategies, the case of Denver offers an example of how good planning policy can win at the ballot box. Fifty-seven percent of voters in Denver (virtually the inverse of the Oregon outcome) supported a \$4.7 billion transit improvement package. The measure expands light rail, funds new bus rapid transit service, and increases park and ride capacity through a local sales tax increase.

The Denver initiative was the product of a broad coalition including planners, transit advocates, environmentalists, business leaders, local elected officials, and developers. Supporters took great pains to bring supporters together into an effective alliance. The coalition raised money and launched an aggressive communications campaign. However, the coalition did not fall into the trap of believing that advertising was enough. Rather, coalition partners teamed up for a broad public education campaign that included everything from presentations at neighborhood meetings to old-fashioned precinct canvassing. Despite staunch opposition that included Colorado's Governor, transit advocates were successful.

That citizens would repeatedly, often overwhelmingly, raise their taxes in an era when tax hikes are anathema to elected officials is instructive. In fact, the support for transit initiatives can be read as a rebuke to state and federal officials who haven't had the political will to meet the popular demand for transportation choice and efficiency. As Congress struggles to pass a transportation bill, the members may want to look back home and listen to the voters.

In recent election cycles, affordable housing has been among the more hotly debated ballot measures. This year featured fewer such measures but an important trend can be seen. Namely, that in an era when local governments are loath to increase taxes, even for widely popular measures, officials and activists are turning to the initiative process as a way of deflecting the political pain thought to be associated with a tax hike. This process has been widely used in transportation but appears to be a growing trend in affordable housing.

The most widely discussed example is from San Francisco, where voters were asked to approve two bond measures that would have raised property taxes to finance affordable housing development, homelessness programs, and historic preservation. One measure called for a \$200 million bond issue for affordable housing, including \$90 million for supportive housing aimed at homeless residents.

The second measure would have provided \$60 million for a variety of historic preservation initiatives.

Both measures had the strong support of Mayor Gavin Newsom, who acknowledged that such ballot measures were now part of the municipal finance landscape and essential to providing full city services. Majorities approved both measures, but California law requires a two-thirds supermajority. (In an interesting contrast, Measure 37 in Oregon also would have failed had there been a supermajority requirement, while both housing measures in San Francisco would have passed had only a simple majority been required.)

Such approaches are sure to become more common but raise difficult issues about how we make policy. In spite of the defeats, many housing advocates believe the ballot initiative process is ripe for progressive causes and may help move policy more quickly than the traditional political process.

Citizens can be mobilized to make sound, albeit tough, choices when advocates speak clearly and effectively about sustaining and expanding local quality of life. Mobilizing those citizens means that planning needs a vigorous grassroots network and a solid set of messages. When we advocate policies that implement the vision and values of citizens for the communities they truly desire, we can accomplish great things.

The reality of election 2004 is that citizens strongly registered both their desire for a new approach to building communities and a willingness to foot the bill with their own tax dollars. Voters want a voice in shaping the future of their neighborhood and region. It doesn't matter if they live in blue states or red states. The planning movement has a real opportunity to seize the desire of citizens for positive change. In order to seize this moment, we have to change the way we do business, take on new leadership roles, and get serious about affecting policy change.



Employment

Special Projects Planner (Planner II), Manchester, NH

Challenging opportunity in busy Planning & Community Development Department in the City of Manchester. The City is rapidly transforming into a regional center with a number of public and private projects. The position would work on various special projects with an initial charge of working on the City's Community Master Plan. Master's Degree in Planning or related field or appropriate combination of a degree in planning and planning experience required. Starting salary \$40,709.46 plus extensive benefits package. Contact the Human Resources Department, One City Hall Plaza, Manchester, New Hampshire 03101. Telephone: 603-624-6543. Or apply online at: www.ManchesterNH.gov.

Wetland/Soils Specialist, Spencer, MA

Office of Development & Inspectional Services, part-time. Proven professional with solid written/oral skills and thorough working knowledge of MA Wetlands/River Protection Act(s) to administer these and local Wetlands By-laws. Provides environmental/open space planning support and periodic Title V assistance by inspecting percolation tests and installations. Associates degree in Environmental Science or related field and three years experience (or equivalent). MA "Fundamentals" and DEP Soils Evaluator certifications required within 12 months. Application letter and resume to Town Administrator, 157 Main Street, Spencer, MA 01562. Open until filled. Review begins December 28th. EEO Employer.

Director/Town Planner, Spencer, MA

Office of Development & Inspectional Services seeks full-time planner/director. Analytical/creative person with solid written/oral skills and thorough working knowledge of zoning, subdivision, state statutes, land use, planning, and development together with sufficient knowledge of construction, wetland and health regulatory environment(s) and experience to supervise the six person office (fte's). Bachelor's degree in related field and five years of experience in professional planning, preferably in local government required. Master's degree, AICP and/or other professional certifications preferred. Application letter and resume to Town Administrator, 157 Main Street, Spencer, MA 01562. Open until filled. Review begins December 28th. EEO Employer

Town Planner, Town of Grafton

The Town of Grafton (pop.15,000+) is accepting applications for the position of Town Planner. Excellent opportunity to work on a variety of planning projects in a proactive and dynamic community, including mill village re-development, affordable housing, and various smart growth initiatives. Provides technical assistance to the Planning Board in administering the Subdivision Control Law, Subdivision Regulations, Zoning Bylaws, and other relevant regulations and policies, including coordinating the review of land use/development applications. Responsible for conducting studies and developing, implementing and monitoring current and long-range plans and programs for guiding development for the Town. Oversees the operation of the Planning Department, which includes a Planning Assistant and one secretary (both full-time). Familiarity with Massachusetts Subdivision Control Law and Zoning Act (MGL c.40A) desirable. Must possess strong oral and written communication skills; computer experience (MS Office); grant writing and management experience; and, ability to establish and maintain effective working relationships with various staff and elected officials. Minimum qualifications: Bachelor's Degree in Planning or related field with Master's preferred, and five years experience in municipal government. A Master's Degree may be substituted for two years of experience. Salary range: \$52,898 – \$62,452, with benefits. Submit cover letter and resume by January 3, 2005 to: Russell J. Connor, Jr., Town Administrator, Town of Grafton, 30 Providence Road, Grafton, MA 01519. Copies of complete job description are available at the above address. The Town of Grafton is an AA/EOE.

Land Use Reform Act Filed Again this Legislative Session

After an interesting and informative legislative experience last session, the Zoning Reform Working Group has re-filed the Massachusetts Land Use Reform Act (MLURA) through its principal sponsors, Senator Pamela Resor and Representatives Douglas Petersen and Stephen Kulik. Identical versions were filed in the House (Docket #3904) and Senate. Twenty-five co-sponsors have already signed onto the bill, with more expected.

Massachusetts was recently listed by the American Planning Association as one of the 28 states with the weakest and most outdated state land-use laws. The MLURA is the first major updating of the Commonwealth's planning, zoning and subdivision control statutes in almost 30 years. The Act encourages communities to adopt or update their local comprehensive plans and enables them to develop effective land use regulations that are consistent with those plans. At the same time many of the existing statutory impediments to the achievement of "smart growth" in Massachusetts, such as "approval not required" plans and excessive grandfathering protections, are addressed so that communities may better manage their growth and shape their futures.

In the last legislative session, the bill was filed on time, but was continuously tinkered with throughout the two-year session. This resulted in somewhat of a moving target, which was confusing to many trying to get a handle on this omnibus bill. The committee that would ultimately take responsibility for the MLURA did not even exist on the filing date, nor did it for a good part of the session. By the time the Joint Committee on Local Affairs and Regional Government finally did hold a hearing on the MLURA in the spring of 2004, the session was drawing to a close and there was precious little time left for its members to adequately consider a bill of this magnitude.

These problems should not plague the bill this time around. The MLURA is a finished bill, and will not be altered during the session (unless by the Committee). A hearing is anticipated in the spring of 2005, which will leave ample time for the Legislature to consider and debate the bill.

During the summer and fall of this year the drafting committee of the Zoning Reform Working Group dug back into the bill for the last time. The group worked to address suggestions made by affordable housing advocates, and objections from the disability community to reforms of Section 3 of the Zoning Act. A new section on rate of development measures was added in response to the recent *Zuckerman v. Town of Hadley* court decision striking down longer-term use of these techniques. The bill was also combed for any confusing or unclear language, with English replacing legalese at every opportunity.

Continued on page 7

January 13-14 : Workshop : Institutional Planning and Development : Fundamental for Campus and Community Planners

MIT's Department of Urban Studies and Planning is offering a two-day workshop for students and professionals who want to know how institutions really work.

The two-day program will cover how a college or university is structured and how institutions organize their planning, programming, operations and financing of operating and capital budgets.

The program will provide a look at how the institutions financial structure influences building decisions and how Institutions relate their activities to their host communities.

The workshop is about: what one needs to know about institutions so that you can plan for them, provide services to them or regulate them. The workshop will be conducted Thursday and Friday, January 13 and 14. For further details and information about the faculty and course materials send inquiries to simha@mit.edu

Land Use Reform, continued from page 6

The MLURA bill is large and comprehensive, but can be organized around a number of major reforms in the areas of plan/regulatory consistency, grandfathering, approval not required plans, the zoning vote, affordable housing, and impact fees. Six procedural reforms are also proposed, including consultant fees for plan review, date of submission and performance guarantees for subdivision plans, submission of ordinances to the Attorney General, uniformity within zoning districts, and a new model statute for site plan review. Finally, eight miscellaneous reforms are proposed concerning cluster development, exemptions from zoning, transfer of development rights, parks and playgrounds (in subdivisions), along with new sections on dispute avoidance, mediation, rate of development, and purposes of zoning.

For more information please visit: www.masszoningreform.org or contact Jeff Lacy at (413) 323-6921 x. 501 or jeff.lacy@state.ma.us. To learn more about the Coalition for Zoning Reform, please contact Coalition Coordinator Don Keeran at (877) 955-4142 (toll free).

Smart Growth Conference

Again this year, APA is co-sponsoring the *New Partners for Smart Growth Conference* to be held January 27-29, 2005, in Miami Beach, Florida. The pre-conference registration deadline is January 7.

Report: Smarter Development, Safe Growth Can Save Pedestrian Lives

A new study, rolled out on December 2 with the participation of APA, shows that good planning can help improve and enhance the safety of pedestrians while making development patterns more efficient and livable.

APA joined with other organizations at a press conference announcing the release of *Mean Streets 2004*, the Surface Transportation Policy Project's (STPP) study that ranks every major metropolitan area according to pedestrian safety. The study identifies a connection between pedestrian safety and the development pattern of a community. Without smarter development, safe growth and thoughtful planning, APA notes, our streets will continue to get meaner.

"All too often we are designing hazards into our streets, but good planning can address the problem," said APA Executive Director Paul Farmer, AICP. "We can plan streets and neighborhoods that serve all users — walkers, drivers and bikers alike. Inclusive, comprehensive planning is the key to achieving the safe growth citizens want."

Farmer noted that good planning is the most comprehensive and far-reaching solution to the pedestrian safety issue. APA members help make it possible for citizens, business interests and political leaders to translate their priorities into pedestrian-friendly streets, neighborhoods and communities.

Land Use Inc.

IBI Group

MACP



Downtowns
Waterfronts
Brownfields
Greyfields
New Urbanism
Participation

DH
Dufresne-Henry

Offices throughout
the northeast
and southeast

978.692.1913
www.dufresne-henry.com

Sabine Prather
Alison Noreau
123 Sackett Road
Westfield, MA 01085

Address Changes: See Info Box Below



New England Planning is printed on recycled paper.

NATIONAL & CHAPTER OFFICERS

Frank Popper <i>Region I Director</i>	(732) 932-4009 x689
Don Krueckeberg, FAICP <i>AICP Region I Commissioner</i>	(732) 932- 2994 x735
RHODE ISLAND CHAPTER	
Daniel Baudouin <i>Chapter President</i>	(401) 521-3248
Jared Rhodes <i>Vice President</i>	(401) 780-3139
Marilyn Cohen <i>Immediate Past President</i>	(401) 294-3331 ext. 310
Pamela Sherrill, AICP <i>Prof. Development Officer</i>	(401)331-4100Ext.4141
Krista D. Moravec <i>Secretary</i>	(401) 272-6000 Ext. 255
Derwent Riding <i>Treasurer</i>	(401) 222-3949
Howard Foster, AICP <i>Chapter Historian</i>	(401) 792-2248
Deirdra Hayes <i>Membership Chair</i>	(401) 272-1969
MASSACHUSETTS CHAPTER	
Peter Lowitt, AICP <i>President</i>	(978) 772-8831 x313
Thomas A. Broadrick, AICP <i>Immediate Past President</i>	(508) 862-4703
Linda Petrella <i>Vice President for Chapter Affairs</i>	(413) 787-6020
Lynn Goonin Duncan, AICP <i>Vice Pres. for Prof. Development</i>	(978) 745-9595 x311
Lyn Billman-Golemme, AICP <i>Vice Pres. for Legislation & Policy</i>	(508) 799-0500
Peg McDonough <i>Treasurer</i>	(413) 533-8939
Heidi Samokar <i>Secretary</i>	(617) 451-2770 x2050
Joseph Cosgrove <i>Boston Region Representative</i>	(617) 222-4400
Matthew Coggins <i>Northeast Region Representative</i>	(978) 970-4256
Thomas Bott, AICP <i>Southeast Region Representative</i>	(781) 585-0549
Kathryn A. Joubert <i>Central Region Representative</i>	(508)393-5019
Richard Werbiskis <i>Western Region Representative</i>	(413) 256-4040
Sabine Prather <i>Newsletter Co-Editor</i>	(413) 949-3914
Alison Noreau <i>Newsletter Co-Editor</i>	(978) 538-5780
Ezra Glenn, AICP <i>Chpt. Librarian/Planning Historian</i>	(617) 625-6600 x2500
Diane Gray, AICP <i>Transportation Committee Chair</i>	(617) 757-8500
Joshua Channell <i>Planning Student Representative</i>	(617) 413-1589
Steve Sadwick <i>MAPD Representative</i>	
Laura Harbottle <i>APA CPTC Representative</i>	(781) 545-8730

NEW ENGLAND PLANNING NEWSLETTER INFORMATION

Changes of Address: *New England Planning* does not maintain address lists. All lists are maintained at the national office and mailed to local chapters each month. If you have moved, write: Membership Department, APA National Headquarters, 122 S. Michigan Ave., Suite 1600, Chicago, IL 60603-6107.

Employment Ads: Employment and jobs wanted ads are \$25.00 per listing, which includes the newsletter and posting on the MAPA website. Send copy to the newsletter editor (email preferred) with a name and billing address.

Consultant Directory: Rates are \$35.00 per business card listing (one month) or \$350.00 for an annual listing (ten issues). Send business card or camera ready copy (2.33" x 1.4") to the editor.

Membership Information: APA National Headquarters, 122 S. Michigan Ave., Suite 1600, Chicago, IL 60603-6107; (312) 431-9100.

Questions: Please try to call the appropriate chapter officer (see panel on left for contact info).

Back Issues: For copies of back issues, contact Peter Lowitt, President, at 978-772-8831 x313

Internet: National, www.planning.org; MAPA, ww.massapa.org; RIAPA, www.riapa.org.

Submissions: We welcome articles, letters to the editor, photos, calendar items, project profiles, etc. Please do not hesitate to send anything you think of interest, or query editor to discuss an idea. We may need to edit due to space limitations. If possible, please send electronic version in .txt format via email or disk.

Calendar Listings: Please send listings in calendar format (see inside this issue).

Send Items to: Sabine Prather, APA Newsletter Co-Editor, 123 Sackett Road, Westfield, MA 01085, phone: 413-949-3914; Email: pioneervplanner1@yahoo.com.

**INFORMATION FOR THE FEBRUARY ISSUE
IS DUE NO LATER THAN
THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 2005**