

A Review Studies on Community Planning

Patel Dhruvang¹, Sejal Bhagat²

¹Student of ME Town Planning at Sarvajanic College of Engineering & Technology

²Assistant Professor at Sarvajanic College of Engineering & Technology

Abstract- Conversely, the community planning literature emphasizes participation and empowerment, but overlooks emotional connections to place. Yet these attachments can motivate cooperative efforts to improve one's community. This article reveals that such isolation has ushered in a rigid and simple paradigm of community participation in tourism. This is assumed to be of one form and has universal validity without considering the existence of the different circumstances at various tourist destinations. It is suggested that the concept of community participation should be re-considered in terms of an adaptive categorical paradigm, which incorporates a range of various forms of community participation. These forms of participation are outlined for a variety of abstract situations with the aim of illustrating the legitimacy of different forms of community participation in tourism.

Key Words: Community participation, collaboration, community forestry, conflict resolution

1. INTRODUCTION

Community planning involves the formulation of long range visions, goals, policies and strategies for achieving social, economic and environmental sustainability within a community in order to guide future community development. Typically referred to as "long range planning", community planning differs from day to day development planning which typically focuses on the review of current development proposals to determine how they fit within community plans such as the Official Community Plan, neighbourhood or sector plans and other plans and strategies.

1.1 community development

Community development is often linked with community work or community planning, and may involve stakeholders, foundations, governments, or contracted entities including non-government organisations (NGOs), universities or government agencies to progress the social well-being of local, regional and, sometimes, national communities. More grassroots efforts, called community building seek to empower individuals and groups of people by providing them with the skills they need to effect change in their own communities. These skills often assist in building political power through the formation of large social groups working for a common agenda. Community development practitioners must understand both how to work with individuals and how to affect communities' positions within the context of larger social institutions. Public administrators, in contrast, need to understand community development in the context of rural

and urban development, housing and economic development, and community, organizational and business development.

Formal accredited programs conducted by universities, as part of degree granting institutions, are often used to build a knowledge base to drive curricula in public administration, sociology and community studies. At the intersection between community development and community building are a number of programs and organizations with community development tools. One example of this is the program of the Asset Based Community Development Institute of Northwestern University. The institute makes available downloadable tool to assess community assets and make connections between non-profit groups and other organizations that can help in community building. The Institute focuses on helping communities develop by "mobilizing neighborhood assets" – building from the inside out rather than the outside in. In the disability field, community building was prevalent in the 1980s and 1990s with roots in John McKnight's approaches.

1.2 The 5 C's of community planning

The source of most conflicts and confusion I see occurring when cities update their Community Plans is due to the confusion over the scale and size difference of a 'Community' versus a 'Neighborhood' unit. A community is defined as, "a group of people living in the same place or having a particular characteristic in common." Many places have different communities inhabiting them, such as an elderly, or arts, or ethnic community living and/or working in close proximity to one another. Even the internet can be considered a place inhabited by many diverse communities. So the scale, parameters, and character of a community-scaled planning effort is difficult to define. Usually, community planning areas are defined by political boundaries, or historic development plans and, in some deplorable cases, old insurance red-lining practices that gave a city its initial zoning districts. This being the case, I contend that the neighborhood unit is a better tool to define, plan, and express policies and regulations necessary to preserve, enhance and, yes, build great places.

1. Complete: Great neighborhoods host a mix of uses in order to provide for our daily need to live, work, play, worship, dine, shop, and talk to each other. Each neighborhood has a center, a general middle area, and an edge. The reason suburban sprawl sprawls is because it has no defined centers and therefore no defined edge. Civic spaces generally (though not always) define a neighborhood's center while commerce tends to happen on the edges, on more highly traffic-ed streets and intersections easily accessible by two or more neighborhoods.

The more connected a neighborhood is, the more variety of commercial goods and services can be offered, as not every neighborhood needs a tuxedo shop or a class 'A' office building.

2. Compact: The 5-minute walk from center to edge, a basic rule-of-thumb for walkability, equates to approximately 80 to 160 acres, or 9 to 18 city blocks. This general area includes public streets, parks, and natural lands, as well as private blocks, spaces and private buildings. This scale may constrict in the dead of winter and/or heat of summer, and expand during more temperate months. Compactness comes in a range of intensities that are dependent upon local context. Therefore, more urban neighborhoods, such as those found in Brooklyn, are significantly more compact than a new neighborhood located, for example, outside Taos, New Mexico. Remember, the ped-shed is a general guide for identifying the center and edge of a neighborhood. Each neighborhood must be defined by its local context, meaning shapes can, and absolutely do, vary. Edges may be delineated by high speed thoroughfares (such as within Chicago's vast grid), steep slopes and natural corridors (as found in Los Angeles), or other physical barriers.

3. Connected: Great neighborhoods are walkable, drivable, and bike-able with or without transit access. But, these are just modes of transportation. To be socially connected, neighborhoods should also be linger-able, sit-able, and hang out-able.

4. Complex: Great neighborhoods have a variety of civic spaces, such as plazas, greens, recreational parks, and natural parks. They have civic buildings, such as libraries, post offices, churches, community centers and assembly halls. They should also have a variety of thoroughfare types, such as cross-town boulevards, Main Streets, residential avenues, streets, alleys, bike lanes and paths. Due to their inherent need for a variety of land uses, they provide many different types of private buildings such as residences, offices, commercial buildings and mixed-use buildings. This complexity of having both public and private buildings and places provides the elements that define a neighborhood's character.

5. Convivial: The livability and social aspect of a neighborhood is driven by the many and varied communities that not only inhabit, but meet, get together, and socialize within a neighborhood. Meaning "friendly, lively and enjoyable," convivial neighborhoods provide the gathering places — the coffee shops, pubs, ice cream shops, churches, clubhouses, parks, front yards, street fairs, block parties, living rooms, back yards, stoops, dog parks, restaurants and plazas — that connect people. How we're able to socially connect physically is what defines our ability to endure and thrive culturally. It's these connections that ultimately build a sense of place, a sense of safety, and opportunities for enjoyment... which is hard to maintain when trying to update a community plan without utilizing the Neighborhood Unit as the key planning tool.

6. Themes and Topics for Community Planning: We strive to balance long-range strategies with shorter-term actions to serve community needs within a citywide and regional context. Although each plan is unique, we understand that many of our planning projects will include a focus on some of the following themes and topics. Strategic planning in each topic area requires close coordination with partner agencies who often implement recommendations.

Built Environment: Community plans often include analysis and data collection to better understand a neighborhood's physical characteristics. The plans often result in a coordinated set of strategies to improve physical aspects such as:

- Urban design and neighborhood sense of place
- Transportation networks (pedestrian, bike, transit, freight, vehicle) and streetscapes
- Utilities and infrastructure (stormwater, green infrastructure, etc.)
- Parks and open spaces
- Preservation of historic and cultural resources
- Resilience Policies and Regulations: Community plans often result in adjustments to city policies and regulations so future actions better align with the community's aspirations, including:
- Zoning and land use regulations
- Comprehensive Plan policies
- Affordability and anti-displacement policies
- Health, sustainability or environmental policies

Implementation of Capital Investments: Increasingly, community plans result in identification of specific capital improvements that the City can pursue in the short term for targeted small projects, or longer term for more complex investments. Examples include:

- Open space investments by Seattle Parks and Recreation, institutions and other property owners
- Negotiating with private developers for projects that are consistent with community visions
- Green Stormwater Infrastructure investments by Seattle Public Utilities and King County
- Guiding or refining streetscape or bicycle facility improvements in collaboration with SDOT
- Informing affordable housing resources investments to support multiple community benefits in partnership with Office of Housing
- Negotiate facilities identified by communities of color to support their cultural heritage and reduce displacement pressure
- Transformative Projects and Focus Areas: Some community plans focus on catalytic opportunities to achieve a community's vision such as:
- Transit Oriented Development at light rail stations or transit hubs
- Large private properties that are ready for development and centrally-located in a neighborhood
- Areas where multiple private or public investments can be coordinated for better community outcomes

- *Thematic community priorities, such as a food and innovation, or community health. Community Capacity Building Community planning often supports the capacity of local groups to make change and address their needs on an ongoing basis, including:*

- *Investment in community organizations through the Equitable Development Initiative*

- *Business district capacity building in collaboration with Office of Economic Development*

- *Establishing new arts and culture districts and stewardship groups in collaboration with Seattle Arts & Culture*

- *In the Duwamish Valley, the Central Area, the U District, and other areas, a focus of our work included supporting and developing leadership and community organizations.*

- *We are scoping work with DON to support leadership development and organization capacity focused in under-represented communities.*

7. CONCLUSIONS: *The adaptation of a typology of community participation to tourism development seems to reduce the conceptual vagueness regarding community participation in the TDP by enabling us to label and identify various forms of community participation. In this sense, it may also lead to tourism scholars not using different phrases interchangeably for community participation in the TDP. This article demonstrates that place attachments, place identity, sense of community, and social capital are all critical parts of person-environment transactions that foster the development of community in all of its physical, social, political, and economic aspects.*

REFERENCES

1. Ahlbrandt, Roger S., Jr. 1984. *Neighborhoods, people and community*. New York: Plenum.
2. Altman, Irwin, and Setha Low. 1992. *Human behavior and environments: Advances in theory and research*. Volume 12: Place attachment. New York: Plenum Press.
3. Appleyard, Donald. 1979. *Inside vs. outside: The distortions of distance*.
4. Working Paper 307, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California.
5. 1981. *Livable streets*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
6. Audirac, Ivonne, and Anne Shermyen. 1994. *An evaluation of neotraditional design's social prescription: Postmodern placebo or remedy for suburban malaise?* *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 13:161-73.
7. Bachelard, Gaston. 1969. *The poetics of space*. New York: Orion.
8. Amstein, R. S. (1969). *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* Amstein, R. S. (1971). *Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation*, in Cahn, S. E. and Passett, A. 8. (eds.), *Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change*. New York Praeger Publishers, Barber, B. R. (1984). **Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age**. Berkeley: University of California Press.
9. Amstein, R. S. (1969). *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*
10. Amstein, R. S. (1971). *Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation*, in Cahn, S. E. and Passett, A. 8. (eds.), *Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change*. New York Praeger Publishers, Barber, B. R. (1984). **Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age**. Berkeley: University of California Press. 35: 216-224. pp. 69-91.
11. Benicourt, J. (1982). *Popular Participation in Development in Africa*. *Assignment Children*, 59/60:57-77.
12. Blank, U. (1989). *The Community Tourism industry Imperative: The Necessity, The Opportunities, Its Potential*. Venture Publishing: State College.
13. Brohman, J. (1996) *New Directions in Tourism for Third World Development*. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (1): 48-70.
14. Burke, M. E. (1968). *Citizen Participation Strategies*. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 34
15. Cahn, S. E. and Cahn, C. J. (1971). *Maximum Feasible Participation: A General Overview*. In Cahn, S. E. and Passett, A. 8. (eds.), *Citizen Participation: Effective Community Change*. New York Praeger Publishers, pp. 9-66.
16. Cheema, G. S. (1987). *Urban Shelter and Services: Public Policies and Management Approaches*. London: Praeger Publishers.