should occur outside of existing and incipient metropolitan territories, and that federal resources should be committed to meeting any gap between this goal and private development efforts. By the year 1980, the national policy should cover a spectrum of programs which would reduce the growth rates of the existing urban concentrations and encourage the growth of entirely new cities of metropolitan size.

THE POLICY AND PROGRAM INSTRUMENTS

A National Urban Communities Commission

To formulate and administer the national settlement policy, the task force recommends that Congress create a National Urban Communities Commission. The Cabinet, Secretaries of HUD, DOT, HEW, USDA, Commerce and Interior would be automatically active members. The President should appoint perhaps five additional members from among State Governors, Senators and Congressmen, and local government chief executives. A strong executive director of the commission staff, appointed by the President, would also be executive secretary to the commission. The commission staff organization would be placed in the Executive Office of the President.

The first year of commission activity should culminate in a draft interim report containing policy and program alternatives for public discussion. The second year of activity should include revision of the interim report and its presentation to the President for transmittal to the Congress, along with the enabling legislation necessary for program administration.

Beginning in 1970, assuming favorable action on the legislative and appropriations package discussed below, the NUCC would administer the national urban settlement policy and coordinate the federal programs and resources committed to it. The commission would consider requests for franchises for new community development, and would grant franchises to qualified corporations and agencies.

Before the National Urban Communities Commission would grant a franchise, the public in the state in question would be informed of the intentions of the corporation and given the opportunity to discuss all aspects of the proposed new community with the potential developers at a public hearing. The opinions of the citizens of the local communities that would be affected by the creation of a new community in their area should be considered by the commission before it awarded the franchise. This procedure would insure the participation of the public in the decision-making process in a national policy that will have a broad effect on the American way of life.

The grants of franchises for new communities would be based on pre-defined standards including consistency with expressed public policies for the nation and the region as established by the federal, state and local governments; viability of the new community; and capability of the organization applying for a franchise. Just as the initial franchise could be granted by the commission, so could it be revoked in instances of failure to perform in conformance with commitments and stated goals.

The franchises for new community development could be granted for satellite urban communities in or near existing metropolitan areas of all sizes; for the expansion of existing small towns and cities; and for independent new communities in non-urban areas. The boundaries of the new community would be established to help insure its market, and economic and development viability. Franchises could be granted to a variety of sponsor organizations including public-private development corporations, quasi-public agencies and institutions, existing municipalities or other local agencies, state-created development corporations and an entity possibly created by the federal government.

The programs and budget allocations of federal agencies administering programs related to various aspects of new communities would be closely coordinated with national policies for settlement as established by the National Urban Communities Commission. Of special importance would be the determination of the overall level of financial commitment by the federal government to the development of new communities throughout the nation.

In granting many such franchises, the commission would make available for such new communities the benefits of all federal aid programs for new communities. However, in order to provide for all potential new community growth, and because federal financial aid is always limited, the commission would grant the majority of franchises without an automatic claim to all federal aids. Only those in the most strategic national interest would receive "comprehensive aid contracts" as part of the franchise.

Goals might be established in the legislation in terms of the franchises available for 1) the fraction

of total annual population growth which should be accommodated in new communities; 2) the portion of national population which should be resident in new communities established under this program at a specified point in time; 3) the proportion of national income allocated annually to the creation of new community investment; 4) and finally the annual expenditures allocated by the federal government.

As one guideline in this effort, the AIP suggests a "barebones" federal commitment during the decade 1970-1980 to make available not less than 300 franchises for new communities. Franchises would be awarded for communities with a minimum population size of 25,000.

Financial Sources—Old and New

In the beginning any new communities policy must ride upon work horses of financial aid with which planners are already familiar. A national resource commitment of $25 million per year initially in grants-in-aid expenditures, beyond what is already programmed for eligible new community aid, is a rockbottom requirement. The earmarking of an additional five per cent of all federal credit activities for new community development would also be necessary—and more rapidly effective than the lengthy grants application and approval process.

Specific attention is called to the critical need to make the low performance Title X (new community land development mortgage insurance) program viable. In 18 months of service, and despite significant amendments, the program had not become the incentive for large scale new community development it was touted to be. Accordingly, an amendment is recommended to provide:

- that maximum project size be increased from $25 million to $50 million, and that total insurance coverage be increased from $250 million to $500 million; and
- that the general maximum loan term of seven years be extended to a flexible 10 to 15 year term, determined by the Secretary of HUD; extension for even longer periods in the case of non-metropolitan new communities should also be considered.

In addition to the harnessing of existing grants for water supply and sewage disposal facilities, for example, and credit support and the amendment of Title X, several new sources of funding must be developed if any substantial start is to be made on a national new communities program. Specifically, three new instruments of federal fiscal aid, in addition to the recently enacted Title IV legislation, designed for coordinated impact on the financing problems of new communities, are proposed:

a) creation of a supplementary grant program for new communities, which can tie together in a single package several existing grants and provide a maximum federal input of at least 80 per cent of the package;

b) establishment of an Urban Development Bank chartered by the federal government, with initial capital of $1 billion, which would make long term low interest loans to local and state public agencies and corporations undertaking new community development. This proposal will meet the critical gap of venture capital requirements for public and quasi-public agencies sponsoring new communities; and

c) formation of a "soft loans" consortium of private banks through federal encouragement to finance $250 million worth of "soft loans" activities for special provisions in education, health, etc., otherwise not easily subscribed by private credit instruments. This would be similar to the World Bank's IDA model. A further extension of the use of participation certificates could be used by the federal government to guarantee the soft loans. The federal government could undertake placement of community-issued certificates in the consortium banks, with five year insured federal guarantees of interest payment.

A Federal New Community Development Agency

The task force recommends the creation of a federal entity, a New Community Development Agency, capable of building new communities in a defined set of circumstances and situations. This could be a federal agency of conventional organizational form such as NASA, a federal agency with a degree of independence such as TVA, or a public-private corporation such as COMSAT.

This mechanism for direct federal action should be eligible for participation in all other agency programs and funding in the manner of any private corporation or state or local agency; however, its initial capital should be provided by the federal government (and perhaps by the public at large). Its sphere of action should be limited to existing federal land holdings which might appropriately be used as new community sites. Public agency construction on non-governmental lands should be left to state and local new community development agencies.

The task force suggests the phased commitment of this agency to create no less than five new com-

munities in the next decade, the majority of which should be built outside of metropolitan areas.

Regional Development Policy

If the national settlement policy is to achieve its purposes, it must be complemented by more detailed policies to guide development at sub-national areas. There is a need for development policies for two kinds of regions:

- the relatively large resource-based regions such as river basins, coastal plains, and mountain areas; and
- the metropolitan agglomerations defined by groups of cities and their considerable hinterlands.

Important beginnings have been made in the creation of federal, state and local multi-jurisdictional instruments which could do this work; the task now is to broaden their charge to include strategic planning for new community locations. AIP strongly believes, however, that where a region is entirely contained within a single state, the state government should play a paramount role in the regional planning for selection of new community locations. The National Urban Communities Commission in the award of franchises for new communities should recognize detailed state efforts to specify desirable sites.

State and Local Development Corporations

A major part of the task of developing new communities should be performed by agencies established by state and local governments. As in the case of the federal New Community Development Agency, a state or local organization might take the form of a line agency, a partly independent authority or public corporation, or a public-private corporation. In the large majority of cases, the corporate form would be preferable because development of a new community is so different from the functions ordinarily entrusted to conventional governmental agencies.

AIP also believes that states should be the first to form these entities, though some of the larger and stronger local governments, especially in larger suburban counties, might be able to launch them successfully. Such agencies or corporations would be provided with an initial grant of capital from federal and state sources sufficient to finance the preliminary planning and land acquisition for the new community. The further capital needed for development of the new community should be secured by sale of state-backed bonds and from second round federal grants and loans.

Where the existing structure of local government is capable of providing the facilities and services required during the development stage, the corporations would cooperate with local agencies. If local government is not able to do this part of the job, the state should vest these traditional powers of local government temporarily in the development corporation, enabling it to plan and build public facilities for the new community and to operate these until the community is ready for self government.

Current Suburban Development Organized Into New Community Form

The continued rapid suburban growth in many metropolitan areas bordering hinterlands provides a great opportunity to create many new communities, if the ongoing processes of development can be harnessed to channel development into new community form instead of a typical pattern of incoherent development. Creation of new communities in this manner would have the advantages of building upon the very strong economic forces at work in the metropolitan areas, and of proceeding largely within the framework of existing political institutions.

But we have ample evidence that existing institutions of local government, engaging in the traditional forms of activity—provision of roads, utilities and other public facilities, and regulation of development through zoning, subdivision control and the building codes—may be unable to form new communities.

To provide the missing ingredient, local governments should establish development agencies, more limited in scope than the corporations proposed above, but having power to acquire land, prepare it for development, sell land for development in accordance with a detailed plan, and to hold or dispose of other land, with appropriate limitations, needed for permanent preservation as open space. These agencies should be empowered to acquire all land in and around the site of a proposed new community; however, if the agencies have the bargaining power implied by the power of land acquisition they may be able to achieve most of their objectives by negotiating agreements with land owners.

Also, within the areas that are prime targets for urban development, the general local government must establish a schedule of the order in which these districts are to be developed. All public facilities and services, provided by both local and state governments, should then be provided in accordance with this schedule. In this way, urban development can be guided into the neighborhoods, industrial parks and commercial centers which will eventually take

the form of a new community. Tax incentives could be offered to the owners of land in districts scheduled for later development, and in areas not indicated for development at all, in order to relieve the pressure for development in such areas.

Local governments which propose to secure the development of new communities in this manner should be entitled to secure development franchises from the National Urban Communities Commission in the same manner as state or local agencies or corporations proposing to proceed entirely by land acquisition and centralized development.

The New Communities Task Force

Robert Gladstone, AIP, Chairman
Washington, D. C.
Robert Gladstone Associates

Henry Bain
Washington, D. C.
Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies

John Bivens
Dover, Delaware
Bivens and Associates
(formerly with Delaware Technical & Community College)

Charles Carter
Washington, D. C.
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

Jeanne Davis
Washington, D. C.
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Michael L. Joroff
Cambridge, Mass.
Nash-Viger, Inc.

George McBride
Washington, D. C.
Resources for the Future, Inc.

Robert Piper
Chicago, Ill.
Perkins and Will Partnership

Michael D. Spear
Columbia, Maryland
The Rouse Company

David Wilcox
Los Angeles, California
Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
(formerly with the U.S. Bureau of the Budget)

Robert N. Young (with Jacob Kaminsky and W. Wilson Horst)
Baltimore, Maryland
Baltimore Regional Planning Council

Primary AIP National Staff Support:

David K. Hartley
Washington, D. C.
Director of Institute Development, AIP

Muriel I. Allen
Washington, D. C.
Editor

Acknowledgements

The New Communities Task Force gratefully acknowledges the valuable contributions of the many persons who offered their ideas, criticisms, and material during the preparation of this report.

The AIP Task Force especially thanks Brian Barber, AIP Director of Research, for his comments and assistance in the preparation of the report, and George N. Kurilko, Fellow, MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, for contributing a paper on design criteria. The cover photograph of Reston, Virginia was taken by William D. Wilson of Washington, D. C.

The task force particularly wishes to thank the Review Panel for the Task Force Report. General reviewers included: The AIP Board of Governors, the AIP Committee Council, the AIP National Office Staff; C. D. Loeks, Mid-Hudson Pattern for Progress; William Finley, Rouse Company; Simon Eisner; and Carl Feiss.

Reviewers with special expertise who also advised the task force were: Harold Herman, Public Health Service; Bernard Frieden, MIT; James Thornton, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Richard Heidermann, FHA; Ned Eichler, Crown Properties; Dorn C. McGrath, George Washington University; Donald Slater, HEW; Grenville Garside, U.S. Department of Interior; Art Davis, HUD; Jonathan Lindley, U.S. Department of Commerce; Peter Stern, TVA; David Walker, Page Ingraham, and James Pickford, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; Fred McLaughlin, HUD; Paul Sitton, Department of Transportation.

Also, Harold F. Wise; Ralph Widner, Appalachian Regional Commission; Thad Beyle, University of North Carolina; Richard RuBino; Vincent Moore, John Joyner, Paul Benson and Robert Huefner, AIP State Planning Committee; Charles Byrley and James Martin, National Governors Conference; Patrick Healy, NLC; Bernard Hillenbrand, NACO; John Gunther, U.S. Conference of Mayors; Jerome Kaufman, ASPO; John King and Lee Syracuse, NAHB; Andrew Euston, AIA; John Lange, NAHRO; George Bogard, General Electric; Miss Barbara Currier, Office of the Vice President of the U.S.; Carl G. Lindbloom; John S. Hewins, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission; Mrs. Shirley Weiss, University of North Carolina; David Brodeur, HUD; Samuel Joroff, Staten Island Planning Office; Farnum Kerr; William Powers; and Fritz Gutheim.

37+38

Suggested Readings on New Communities

An exhaustive reading list on all issues related to new communities would encompass the entire literature on urbanism. Contained in the following list are *selected* readings that focus on new communities and various aspects of their development or that deal with significant policy choices that set the context for new communities development. Six types of citations are included: reports, books, articles, special issues of periodicals, proceedings of symposiums, conferences and hearings, and bibliographies.

Readings Focused on New Communities

Reports, Books and Articles

Ascher, Charles S. *Administration of New Towns in the Americas.* UNESCO: United Nations. New York: 1960. 38p.

Barker, Michael B. *California Retirement Communities.* University of California Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics. Berkeley: 1966.

Best, Robin H. *Land for New Towns, A Study of Land Use, Densities, and Agricultural Displacement.* Town and Country Planning Association. London: 1964. 59p.

Carter, Luther J. "New Towns: Geological Survey Has Key Role in Experiment," *Science,* Vol. 158, November 10, 1967. pp. 752-755.

Cartsonis, Emanuel M., "New Towns: A Challenge to Partnership of Private and Public Enterprise," *Planning 1967.* American Society of Planning Officials. Chicago: 1967. pp. 174-177.

Creese, Walter L. *Search for Environment: The Garden City, Before and After.* Yale University Press. New Haven, Connecticut: 1966. 360p.

Dahir, James. *Greendale Comes of Age: The Story of Wisconsin's Best Known Planned Community as it Enters its Twenty-First Year.* Milwaukee Community Development Corporation. Greendale, Wisconsin: 1958. 32p.

Duff, Alan Colguhoun. *Britain's New Towns, an Experiment in Living.* With a forword by Martin Maddan. Pall Mall Press. London: 1961. 108p.

Eichler, Edward P. and Marshall Kaplan. *The Community Builders.* University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles: 1967. 196p.

Gans, Herbert J. *The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community.* Pantheon Books. New York: 1967.

Gibbard, Frederick. *Town Design.* Frederick A. Praeger. New York: 1967. 372p.

Herman, Harold and Michael L. Joroff. "Planning Health Services for New Towns," *American Journal of Public Health,* Vol. 57, No. 4, April 1967. pp. 633-640.

Howard, Ebenezer. *Garden Cities of Tomorrow.* (First Edition, London, 1808). Edited with a Preface by F. J. Osborn; introductory essay by Lewis Mumford. M.I.T. Press. Cambridge, Mass.: 1965. 168p.

Hurd, Richard M. "The New Towns—One Solution to the Problems of Urbanization," *Real Property in the Urban Society, A Compilation of the Original Dicta, 1965-1966.* Virginia Law Weekly. Charlotttesville: 1966. pp. 45-49.

Klutznick, Philip M. "Viable New Communities Inside and Outside the Old City," Lecture of April 18, 1967. University of Chicago Center for Urban Studies. unpublished manuscript.

Klutznick, Philip M. "The Renascent City and Its Complementary New Towns," Lecture of May 1, 1967. University of Chicago Center for Urban Studies. unpublished manuscript.

"Land Use Round Table, A dialogue among 33 experts singles out 14 significant areas that can change our patterns of land planning development and use in an increasingly urban future," *House & Home,* Vol. 27, No. 3, March 1965. pp. 114-124.

Layton, Elizabeth. *Administration of New Towns in the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, and Canada.* United Nations. New York: 1960. 50p.

Mayer, Albert. "Ingredients of an Effective Program for New Towns," *Proceedings of the 1964 Conference of the American Institute of Planners.* American Institute of Planners. Washington: 1964. pp. 186-192.

McDade, Thomas. "Considerations of a Federal Program for Facilitating New Community Development," *Proceedings of the 1964 Conference of the American Institute of Planners.* American Institute of Planners. Washington: 1964. pp. 193-197.

"New Towns: Are They Just Oversized Subdivisions—with Oversized Problems?" *House & Home,* Vol. 29, No. 6, June 1966. pp. 92-103.

"New Towns for America," *House & Home,* Vol. 25, No. 2, February 1964. pp. 122-131.

Orlans, Harold. *Utopia Unlimited.* Yale University Press. New Haven: 1953.

Osborn, Frederick, and Arnold Whittick. *The New Towns—The Answer to Megalopolis.* Introduction by Lewis Mumford. McGraw-Hill. New York; Leonard Hill. London: 1963. 376p.

Perloff, Harvey S. "New Towns Intown," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners,* Vol. XXXII, No. 3, May 1966. pp. 155-161.

Peterson, David Lee. *The Planned Community and the New Investors: Economic and Political Factors*

in Corporate Real Estate Investment. University of California Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics. Berkeley: 1967.

Rapkin, Chester. "New Towns for America: From Picture to Process," *The Journal of Finance,* Vol. XXII, No. 2, May 1967. pp. 208-219.

Rodwin, Lloyd. *The British New Towns Policy: Problems and Implications.* Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Mass.: 1956. 252p.

Shelton, Mercel J. "An Engineer Plans a New City in Megalopolis," *Journal of the Planning and Development Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers,* Vol. 93, No. UP4, December 1967. pp. 189-197.

Slayton, William. "New Cities: Policies and Legislation," *Planning 1967.* American Society of Planning Officials. Chicago: 1967. pp. 171-177.

Stein, Clarence S. *Toward New Towns for America.* Introduction by Lewis Mumford. (First Ed. University Press of Liverpool, 1951). Reinhold Publishing Corporation. New York: 1957. 263p.

Sub-Committee of the Central Housing Advisory Committee, United Kingdom, Ministry of Housing and Local Government, Welsh Office. *The Needs of New Communities; a Report on Social Provision in New and Expanding Communities.* Her Majesty's Stationery Office. London: 1967. 123p.

"The Critical Path to Columbia," *Business Automation,* Vol. 14, No. 8, August 1967. pp. 40-44.

Urbanism Committee. *Urban Planning and Land Policies. Volume II of the Supplementary Report of the Urbanism Committee to the National Resources Committee.* U.S. Government Printing office. Washington: 1939.

Viorst, Milton. "Reston. Robert Simon's fiefdom on the Potomac could provide a blueprint for the good life in the twenty-first century—if it isn't already a museum piece," *Horizon,* Vol. IX, No. 4, Autumn 1967. pp. 34-41.

Von Eckardt, Wolf. "Are We Being En-Gulfed?," *The New Republic,* December 9, 1967. pp. 21-23.

Von Eckardt, Wolf. "The Case for Building 350 New Towns," *Harper's Magazine,* Vol. 231, No. 1387, December 1965. pp. 85-92.

Wendt, Paul F. "Large-Scale Community Development," *The Journal of Finance,* Vol. XXII, No. 2, May 1967. pp. 220-239.

Werthman, Carl, Jerry S. Mandel, and Ted Dienstfrey. *Planning and the Purchase Decision: Why People Buy in Planned Communities.* University of California Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Center for Planning and Development Research. Preprint No. 10, a Prepublication of The Community Development Project. Berkeley: July 1965. 229p.

Special Issues of Periodicals

Creating New Communities, A Special Issue of the *Journal of the American Institute of Planners,* Vol. XXXIII, No. 6, November 1967. 63p.

New Towns Come of Age. A Special Issue of *Town and Country Planning,* Vol. 36, No. 1-2, January-February 1968. 137p.

Proceedings of Symposiums, Conferences and Hearings

National Growth and Its Distribution (Symposium on Communities of Tomorrow, December 11-12, 1967). U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the U.S. Departments of Commerce; Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Labor; Transportation. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington: April 1968. 89p.

New Towns. Symposium. Washington University Law Quarterly, Vol. 1965, No. 1, February 1965. pp. 1-104.

Planned Communities. Five reports presented at the 44th Annual Meeting of the Highway Research Board, January 11-15, 1965. Highway Research Record No. 97, HRB Pub. 1313. Highway Research Board, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. Washington: 1961. 51p.

Planning and Development of New Towns. Report of the United Nations Symposium, Moscow, August 24-September 7, 1964. No. 66IV.3, ST/TAO/SER.C./79. 48 p. United Nations, New York: 1966. (Out of print; should be available at all libraries acting as depositories for UN Publications.)

Readings on Policy Context for New Communities

Books and Reports

Mayer, Albert. *The Urgent Future.* Developed from series "Architecture for Total Community", *Architectural Record,* 1964-1965. McGraw-Hill. New York: 1967. 184p.

Mumford, Lewis. *The City in History; Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects.* Harcourt, Brace & World. New York: 1961. 657p.

Mumford, Lewis. *The Urban Prospect.* Harcourt, Brace & World. New York: 1968. 255p.

National Governors' Conference. *The States and Urban Problems.* Staff study for the Committee on State-Urban Relations of the National Governors' Conference. Washington, D.C.: October 1967.

Special Issues of Periodicals

The Conscience of the City, *Daedalus.* Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Fall 1968. 342p.

The Future Metropolis, *Daedalus.* Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Winter 1961. 253p.

Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress, *Daedalus.* Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Summer 1967. 355p.

Proceedings of Conferences and Hearings

Environment for Man, The Next Fifty Years. Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Conference of the American Institute of Planners; Portland, Oregon, August 14-18. American Institute of Planners. Indiana University Press. Bloomington, Illinois, and London: 1967. 308p.

Environment and Change. Proceedings of the 1967 Conference of the American Institute of Planners; Washington, D. C., October 1-6. American Institute of Planners. Indiana University Press. Bloomington, Illinois, and London: 1968. 392p.

Environment and Policy. Proceedings of the 1967 Conference of the American Institute of Planners; Washington, D. C., October 1-6. American Institute of Planners. Indiana University. Bloomington, Illinois and London: 1968. 453p.

Federal Role in Urban Affairs. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate. 90th Congress, 1st Session. Part 16: April 19, 1967. Part 17: April 20-21, 1967. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D. C.: 1967.

Bibliographies on New Communities

Reynold, Betty. *Crawley new town: A bibliography.* Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography Number 26. Monticello, Ill.: 1963.

U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency (now U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development). Library. *New Communities; A Selected Annotated Reading List.* U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C. 1965. 24p.

Vance, Mary. *Greendale, Wisconsin.* Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography Number 4. Monticello, Illinois: 1958.

Viet, Jean. *New Towns: A Selected Annotated Bibliography.* UNESCO Reports and Papers in the Social Sciences, No. 12. United Nations. New York: 1960. 81p.