Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences ISSN: 2231– 6345 (Online)
An Open Access, Online International Journal Available at www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2015/02/jls.htm
2015 Vol. 5 (S2), pp. 1804-1814/Homafar et al.
Research Article

NEO-LIBERALISM AND URBANSMARTGROWTH, FROM THEORY TO ACTION

***Homafar M.[1] and Saeedirezvani N.[1] and Mehrabi M.[2]**
[1]Department of Architecture and Urbanism, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran
[2]Department of Architecture and Urbanism, East Tehran, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran
**Author for Correspondence*

ABSTRACT
Present study reviews the theoretical evolution of urban smart growth in the light of content and implementation. Literature suggests that urban smart growth theory suffers from theoretical and structural conflicts and due to noncompliance with the fundamental principles of economic liberalism as a substructure for urban planning; it cannot be fulfilled in communities with such economic structure. To achieve a coherent theoretical-conceptual framework, smart growth needs to clarify its attitude towards the fundamental principles of economic liberalism as well as resolving the existing content conflicts in order to be effective in strategy making and implementing; otherwise, it will restrict the process of urban planning to a set of action plans instead of strategies. Furthermore, this approach does not take account of the entire major social, economic and political elements while looking for the source of complex problems, therefore, it only concentrates on physical forms, which can call its ultimate goals into question.

Keywords: *Urban Smart Growth, Economic Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism, Sustainable Development*

INTRODUCTION
Rapid population growth and rapid expansions of urban settlements after World War II had led to formation of settlements full of economic, social and physical problems. Faced with this complex and multifaceted problems, urban planners and managers developed several ways to curb the unbridled urban development and reduce its consequences. As more complicated urban problems emerged, and also under the direct influence of theoretical planning paradigm changes, these methods, in addition to become more comprehensive, were evolved by optimizing the previous approaches.
Therefore, new approaches confronting the urban growth are due to a series of successive urban planning and management with the goal of organizing urban growth in a more evolved and coherent form, considering several aspects of urban issues. Urban smart growth as one of the main approaches proposed over the past three decades, has been able to acquire license of learning in many institutions in charge of planning all over the world (especially in countries with Neoliberalism economy).
To achieve the goals of urban planning, efficient action plans will be required which involve deep perception of the core concepts that govern the plan and identification of its theoretical movements.
According to the mentioned evolutionary process, some of the recent theories of urban development might be pursuing conflicting goals under the same title due to summarizing various experiences with different theoretical and philosophical foundations. The first step is to content review and analyze the conclusions of main theoretical approaches, experiences and definitions given in urban smart growth. The next step is to measure the level of compliance of concepts and principles of urban smart growth with economic neoliberalism theory as the main structure of planning in the west.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Research Method
The method used in this research is meta-analysis. In this method the main sources are considered books, professional journals and taking advantage of the global network of information. And also, given the nature of the research data, the method will be qualitative and based on the trends of analysis. Although related research records show that in the field of urban studies there are various references about the

thought process of experts and presented points of view in this framework, these factors are considered mainly general and the issue has not been entirely evaluated by detail. Also, due to extensive urban growth and development topics and the wide variety of affecting and impressible factors, many diverse and often conflicting theories regarding the concept of urban smart growth have been provided. So it seems necessary to create a classification framework based on the proposed key concepts for these theoretical approaches in order to have an accurate and useful literature review. On the other hand, review of relevant urban smart growth literature indicates that although this approach has been developed with the goal of solving the urban issues of generally neoliberal communities (especially in the United States of America), there has never been a comparative study between economic principles and practices of planning in neoliberal communities (as a substructure) with the approach to urban smart growth (as a urban planning theory).

Historical Overview of the Formation of Urban Growth Concept

The first efforts to limit and direct urban development's can be sought in plan and development of London's green belt. Environmental and infrastructural arguments raised the first serious and ingoing efforts at that time to constrain and guide the urban development's (Anderson, 2006). Years before the discussion of urban smart growth in recreation projects in 50s was brought up, there had been a proposal offered to keep the middle-class families in city center and prevented the immigration to suburb. In 1962, the report entitled of "comprehensive plan for development of metropolis" emphasized on the necessity of planning coincide with land use and transportation. The plan C3 which was introduced during the years of 1963 to 1967, considered the topics of land use, transportation, social values and preserving open spaces simultaneously (Miller, 2002). Transportation and community planners in early 1970 began to develop the idea of compact cities and communities.

By writing a book entitled of "changing the principles of design to promote social intelligence and eliminate the desire to travel back and forth with personal Automobiles", Andres Dancy offers strategies aimed at reducing the desire to drive. During the years of 1970 to 1990 two major theories were presented, first the theory of sustainable development in response to the post world war unbridled urban development and its worldwide problems was introduced.

This theory offered a type of development that could meet today's needs without adversely affecting the future ones. The logic of sustainable design is to improve the standards of living for all, especially those who have the least advantages in society. Land use control, improved quality of life, public health and optimal use of resources are the main issues in sustainable development discussion (Ziari and Janbaznejad, 1388). The second theory which is owned by LluisSert and Beninger's Team Ten offers principles to encounter the Athens Charter and modern urban planning (Kashanijoo and Mofidi, 1388). In 1989 Peter Calthrope proposed the theory of small communities based on publictransit and walkability with an emphasis of diversity in housing patterns and increasing the population density and residents' choices (Calthrope, 1989) and also in the early '90s he developed the concept of Transit Related Development (TRD) (Kashanijo and Mofidi, 1388). The theory of sustainable city was presented by the United Nations Center for Housing in August 1990 to execute the goals of sustainable development. This theory concentrates on urban problems including excessive growth of urban population, natural resources pollution, development without efficient infrastructures and environmental degradation. Public transportation, access to needed services in a timely and reasonable price, keeping the relationship between man and nature, preserving the identity and providing affordable housing for all is its main themes (Pagh, 1383). By concluding all the experiences and presented theories, especially the theory of sustainable design, the concept of smart growth was introduced officially in the late '90s by Stephen Plowden and Andres Duany in England. And occurring almost simultaneously in 1996, a collaboration group was formed by the various planning institutions in the United States called smart growth network .while defining the concept of smart growth,by observing the successful communities, they intelligently compiled principles in order to achieve smart development (International society of town and village and smart growth network, 1390). Finally, the evolution of theories related to urban smart growth is listed in table 1.

Table 1: Evolution of theories related to urban smart growth

Duration	Name of the theory	Theorist	Main Idea
1935-1945	*The greater London plan*	*Abercrombie*	*To prevent increasing the level of density in London, establishing a regional green belt, decentralization.*
1950-1960	*Urban recreation*		*To keep the middle class families in central areas and to prevent them from immigrating to suburbs.*
1960-1970	*Plan C3*		*Simultaneous attention to land use, transportation and social values, preserving open spaces*
1970-1980	*Changing the principles of design*	*Andres Dancy*	*To reduce citizens' desire to drive by designing pedestrian-oriented environments*
1980-1990	*Theory of sustainable design*		*To improve the standards of living for all, especially for those who have the least advantages in society, to control land use, public health, optimal use of natural resources.*
1980-1990	*Team Ten*	*Luis Sert*	*Interconnected transportation systems and the balance between the appropriate modes of transport, compact pedestrian-oriented urban villages around dense transport nodes, small urban nodes with medium densities, public facilities and pedestrian access*
1980-1990	*Pedestrian pocket*	*Peter Calthrope*	*Compact communities based on public transportation and walkability with the emphasize on diversity of dwelling patterns, increasing the density and residents' choices. (Calthrope, 1989).*
1980-1990	*The next American metropolis*	*Peter Calthrope*	*Transit Related Development(TRD) is to invest and create residential commercial (not mixed-use) areas designed by government and transit agencies around public transportation stops.*
1990-1995	*Sustainable city*	*United Nations center for housing*	*Efficienttran sport and access to needed services at the right time and at affordable price, keeping the relationship between man and nature, preserving the identity and providing adequate housing for all.*
1995-2000	*Urban smart growth*	*Urban smart growth network*	*Adopt an informed approach to smart growth, defining the concept of urban smart growth and providing 25 principles to achieve urban smart growth.*

Exploring the Provided Definitions and Principles of Urban Smart Growth

Many people consider theoretical roots of urban smart growth to be the same as sustainable development. In fact; they identify this theory as a new interpretation of sustainable development (Oslen and Lister, 2004). Some consider smart growth as a sort of development which reduces urban sprawl to provide a better combination of land use and transportation and its strategies that lead to develop pre-developed lands rather than wild lands and also replace none-motorized transportation modes (Handy, 2005). Environmental Protection Agency defines smart growth as a type of development which improves economy, society and environment (Knaap and Talen, 2005). State of Maryland considers smart growth

as an idea to develop metropolises that supports economy, communities and environment (Miller, 2002). Community of urban and land development also defines smart growth as a form of a development which is economically sustainable and preserves open spaces and resources. All private, public and non-profit organizations are involved in growth and development, while all infrastructures are maintained and cities neighborhood centers are common components of a healthy regional economy. The main approaches include: infill development and redevelopment of abandoned residences, compact suburban developments along with public transportation and providing economically affordable transport modes (Ye *et al.*, 2005).
According to U.S Department of Agriculture, smart growth principles include: locating more development in center cities and older suburbs rather in fringe areas, supporting mixed land used development, preserving farmland, open spaces and environmental resources. The American Planning Association identifies smart growth as that which supports choice and opportunity by promoting efficient and sustainable land development, incorporates redevelopment patterns that optimize prior urban infrastructure investments, and consumes less land that is otherwise available for agriculture, open spaces, natural systems, and rural lifestyles. It introduces criterions such as efficiency of land use, directions of growth, population and building density, urban form, the balance between residential and work places, open spaces, housing, transportation and environmental factors to measure the level of intelligence of development. Zoning and public infrastructure programs play an important role in achieving the goals of smart growth. The American planning Association considers economic development and protection of natural resources and open spaces, predictability and to be protected by sanctions, conservation and efficient use of infrastructure, pursuit of the housing infill development in vacant lands and abandoned buildings and compact suburban development as the common features in every smart growth agendas (APA, planning and urban design, standard, 2006).
And finally urban smart growth network consensus of several organizations and foundations provides a more comprehensive definition of smart growth: urban smart growth is defined as a form of development that serves the economy, community and environment. It establishes a basic framework to make informed decisions about the methods and fields of growth. Smart growth gives the communities the opportunity to grow in ways that support economic development and jobs, develop strong neighborhoods and a wide range of alternatives for residential, commercial use and transportation and also create healthy communities that can accommodate families in healthy environments.
10 core principles of smart growth according to Smart Growth Network include:
1-Mix land uses
2-Take advantage of compact building design
3-Create a range of housing opportunities and choices
4-Create walk able neighborhoods
5-Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place
6-Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas
7-Strengthen and direct development towards existing communities
8-Provide a variety of transportation choices
9-Make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective
10-Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions (International City/Country Management Association & Smart Growth Network, 2011)
Despite the efforts of Smart Growth Network in order to establish a clear intellectual framework, it seems that these principles prove non-congregative contradictions in implementation strategies and also in concept. For instance, the emphasis on creating communities with a strong sense of place, and on the other had being opposed to the economic and racial ghettos, disregarding the fact that each of these ghettos have a strong identity and a sense of place due to the similarities between the individuals and the distinctions between other areas. This arises from ignoring the urban sociology topics in the process of studying the urban issues. Major clear and fair decisions made for the society are in semantic opposition to the exact definition of justice. In fact if smart growth advocates believe in the traditional definition of justice defined by Rawls, what they choose to justify the benefit of the majority against the rights of

individuals is unacceptable. In addition, smart growth advocates essentially believe in an elite-driven program which argues social engineering and top-down decision making for social ecological models.
Smart growth goals despite the different definitions provided by different organizations are in a general agreement with the protection of natural resources, healthy environment, unpolluted air, wildlife habitats, green spaces and agriculture. All programs are trying to better coordinate smart growth with the data obtained from the community and provide varied choices of transport and housing, green spaces to build more attractive communities, promote mixed land uses in development, pursue the strategies of infill development, take advantage of compact building design and encourage the people and stakeholders to contribute in order to achieve the core goals above (Knaap and Talen, 2005). Various experiences in the field of urban smart growth provide a wide range of rules, investment and educational experiences which can be led to coordinate the programs. The differences in definitions provided by several organizations are related to their main emphasis (Preferences) upon smart growth; however there is an approximate agreement between all agencies on the necessity of preserving the environment, transport choices and building strong communities. But there is substantial disagreement over three other dimensions of the concept: Housing, planning and economic development. Focusing on each of these three elements can explain the differences in provided definitions (Ye *et al.,* 2005). The attempt to sum up all the successful experiences in various fields can be considered as the main cause of this discrepancy. While moving from large scaled preservation debates into the inner realm of cities, urban smart growth will face such functional conflicts and different prioritizations among its advocates. In addition the four primary areas of discussion are considered general and globally accepted, the main conflicts and differences between the urban planning approaches are mainly due to the issues such as economy, housing and jobs where the smart growth advocates' disagreements begin. In general, by exploring the definitions and urban smart growth agendas, six major components and related specific implementations can be classified according to table2.

Table 2: Subject Areas related to urban smart growth

Area	Main emphasis
Planning	*Comprehensive planning, mixed land uses, increased density, street connectivity, alternative/innovative water infrastructure and systems, public facilities planning*
Transportation	*Pedestrianization, facilities for bicycling, public transit promotion, systems integration and nodal networks*
Economic Development	*Neighborhood business, downtown revitalization, infill development, using existing infrastructure*
Housing	*Multifamily housing, smaller lots, manufactured homes, housing for special needs and diverse households*
Community Development	*Popular participation, recognizing/promoting the unique features of each community*
Natural Resource Preservation	*Farmland preservation, subdivision conservation, easement conservation, transferable development rights, historical preservation, ecological land preservation.*

Source: Ye and Mandpe, 2005

The Logic of Neo-liberalism and Urban Smart Growth
To rely on functional logic of the free market, strengthening the private sector and mainly reducing the government role and involvement in business activities are considered as the basic principles of economic neoliberalism. In general, the neo-liberal market-driven approach causes every phenomenon such as space to be considered as a commodity and planned from the supply-demand and profit point of view. Neo-liberal policies in the field of urban planning will result in strengthening the local governments and also its consequences such as strengthening the individual rights against the profits of majorities, creation of

isolated towns as space commodity demanded by the market and so on. Also, the foundation of economic neoliberalism is based on property rights and capital accumulation which are reflected in the field of urban issues as the right to individual ownership of land (Sager, 2011). Urban planning policies as superstructures should be built based on theories of economic and social substructures, thus urban policies in neo-liberal communities affirm the following principles in various fields: preserving public places and commercial districts, creating flexible commerce-friendly areas, and zoning in order to adapt and support the business, free market housing, necessity of economic investment(capital accumulation), investment in housing sector, NGOs and supporting protected neighborhoods, striving and competition among cities to attract creative labor, emphasis on providing infrastructures by the private sector, preferring the private sector to governmental to build and operate commercial districts etc. Each of the policies mentioned above are adopted in order to achieve more conformity between urban plans and the economic rationale of the planned communities. Therefore, the study of adaptability of urban smart growth principles and goals with structural principles of urban planning in liberal communities and the critique of urban smart growth approach from the neo-liberal economic logic's point of view is necessary. Because if there are deep contradictions or conflicting principles in urban smart growth agendas, not only it won't have the social and economic supportive mechanisms of advocates of liberalism, but also will face many social and legal obstacles in the implementation phase.

Content Criticism of Urban Smart Growth Principles from the Perspective of Neo-liberalism

Free market: since the free market economy is the main focus of the major liberal communities, problem solving strategies is designed based on investment opportunities. So in the field of urban issues as smart growth advocates guarantee" the basis of the development based on investment opportunities, especially for private sectors, is the creation of communities based on the principles of smart growth". The level of tendency for investment is directly related to the amount of profit earned, in fact private sector as opposed to governmental and non- profit institutions prioritizes the investment opportunities based on the their amount of financial profit, while environmental and social benefits resulting from the projects will not be considered in calculating the profits. on the one hand, barriers to internal development and its complexities and on the other hand, short-term economic efficiency in the suburban development and inefficiency of other incentive mechanisms will cause the profitability to depend on the public sector direct involvements and governmental investments to support the required profit which is contrary to the principles of reducing involvements in the construction market (as an economic good) according to the economic liberalism approach. For instance, Portland's regional government due to lack of interest and profitability of compact development projects had to legislate tax exemption to encourage the urban developers (O'toole, 2001).The examination of smart growth in the four sates of United States of America shows the necessity of public sector investment and regional governmental involvements in order to fulfill the goals of smart growth (Ingram and Hong, 2009).

*Supply and demand balance***:** restrictive suburban development legislation to attract private sector investors on smart growth projects in city centers is inconsistent with the principle of supply and demand balance according to which the quality and quantity of housing as a commodity is determined by demand (Sager, 2011). Thus suburban or gated communities (with doors or gates) should be created based on the market demand (consumer) and any interference in demand market is considered disrupting the normal flow of capital in the market. Regarding this principle, one should realize that changes in the forms and patterns of urban development should not be sought in the method of supplying but in the type of demanding. This will cause sprawling and suburban development to be taken from physical planning phase into social planning level which will change the consumption patterns in society.

*Capital accumulation***:** Asset value increase is often caused by investing on suburban or gated settlements. Because the property value in gated communities increases both in terms of time needed to reach to the point of profitability and the rate of growth several times more than in central areas of cities which is mutually related to resident's exceeding desire to live in the suburbs, restricting the suburban development rather than spatial balance will lead to an uncontrolled increase of land prices, more capital accumulation for wealthy suburban residents, reduce the affordability of working class to buy houses and

increase the economic gap leads. Demand is the mechanism which determines the price and the government has the least authority in controlling and limiting the prices. For instance, the institute of Land Policy found out in their comparative surveys that the states in which the smart growth agendas were implemented, failed to control the prices and rents for dwellings in comparison to other states (Ingram and Hong, 2009). And also restricting the suburban development will result in increasing the dwelling prices in central areas and due to the constant family income, living in central regions will practically not possible for low income working class and tenant population which causes the low-income families to leave the urban central areas, followed by not having the advantage of proximity to residential and work place for the most vulnerable groups of people in the society. So it takes steps to further the interests of the middle class.

Property rights: valuing the individual rights as one of the basic principles of liberal communities leads to defend suburban communities and suburbanites' resistance against the changes which smart growth advocates tend to make. Validation of local governances as the main operators of economic liberalism makes them more accessible to more legal tools, thus to more protection of their individual rights as a specific group(according to the law of protecting social and individual rights of minorities) against the proposed development. Thus increasing building density, integrating the social classes and removing gated communities, especially those wealthy suburbs that have high spatial quality will encounter the fierce resistance of suburbanites. Because the substitute smart growth patterns while ignoring the privacy of these individuals, are in conflict with capital accumulation principle. Building and human density increases because the land prices drop in these areas, so according to the principal arguments of justice, methods of equitable distribution of benefits caused by development and even estimating the benefits and losses incurred to several communities cannot be accurately predicted (Downs, 2005). On the other hand, suburbanites' economic solution to public sectors expenses to provide suburban infrastructure is to pay heavy taxes in order to take advantage of living in suburbs. To eliminate the spatial and social benefits of living in suburbs, not only tax abolishment is required but also compensation for the damages cause by prolonged heavy taxes payments in return for an investment in a highly priced land (as an economic commodity) is claimed by the suburbanites. An example of this resistance is dismissal of the mayor and two members of municipality due to acceptance of increasing the building density by the residents in one of the suburbs in Portland. This reaction eventually forced the planners to develop golf courses adjacent to city boundaries of which consequence was the loss of a large area of void lands around the city (O'toole, 2001).

Competitive cities and creative human resources: the ability of the cities to attract creative human resources, as one of the key factors of competitiveness of a city, is considered global. The absorption of these groups cannot be achieved only by highly payments (wages). These individuals and their families require specific spatial facilities to recreate, rest, work, study and live. Living in gated communities with specific semi- private recreational and educational facilities is one of the main demands of these residents (Sager, 2011). Therefore, given the need to attract these key economic groups to keep the urban economy active, either cities should continue their development into suburban areas, or provide the residents with high qualified central neighborhoods which can compete with the suburbs. The second option will require new expenses on creating gated communities not in the suburbs but in the heart of the city. Since the spatial qualities, comfort and convenience desired by these groups will strongly decrease due to more social interacts. In addition, providing educational and recreational facilities desired by these group calls for the investment of private sector. Considering the threshold required for the construction of some high-level facilities in the city, the threshold number of customers to make long distance services and facilities to suit the consumer will not be possible as long as they are scattered across the city. As a result, the private sector will not be able to support educational and recreational facilities due to economic deficiency. It is very important to protect the interests of these people as the most qualified groups in determining the position of cities in the global economic cycle. Smart growth claims that high security and less social problems of suburbs is irrelevant to their low population and building density because suggested strategies of smart growth provides the required security. Such a viewpoint seems to ignore the

role of wealth in the characteristics of the social context. In many wealthy un-gated communities, hawkers and drug distributors and …are less visible. For many reasons, these people choose to come to troubled and busy regions because most of their clients commute in the same regions. According to smart growth advocates, it seems right that design plays a minor role in the security of neighborhoods. But they have forgotten the role of wealth and social classes as intermediate factors in the bias towards committing crimes. Smart growth disapproves of too much monitoring the suburbs that is followed by increasing the expenses. This standpoint certainly ignores the critical principle of market economy "pay more to get products with more quality" and insists on consuming low-quality but cheaper products. Relying on the same old position, it seeks to alter the need of having private gardens and back yards with public spaces, and also ignores the disinclination of households to use these public spaces due to the property rights of public spaces which can reduce the controllability on how to use these spaces and the tendency to be in private spaces especially in middle and high-income communities. Some studies on suburban areas have shown a tendency to live in downtowns but assuming the central areas will maintain the desirable qualities. There are two fundamental questions at the head: 1. How the necessary expenses of establishing such communities should be funded by private sectors where land prices do not raise dramatically in these areas. 2. If costs are funded by the government, increase in land prices will practically create a predominantly wealthy district in city center and this further will increase the benefits of high-income groups, so the lowest-income individuals will be excluded from the least previous advantages (proximity to work place and public transportation). On one hand, smart growth advocates consider downtown population growth in recent years as a sign of tendency to live in city centers, however, it seems that housing prices have a decisive role. As the studies show young couples and singles are more likely to live in city centers. This is due to the lower rentals in these areas compared to the suburbs. However, most of these groups spend their daytime in public spaces and unlike families with children, the house functions is limited to this class of society. Thus, the differences in the way of living and socioeconomic classes are considered the main factors in choosing the city centers as place of residence. Studies show that the states which are pursuing smart growth strategies need to spend money and time to review two or three times more than other states (Ingram and Hong, 2009).

Therefore, with reference to social conflict theory, by violating the rights of a particular group, smart growth causes the other groups to acquire their rights and grants the final decision to programs and initiatives that are approved in engineering offices or provincial meetings in order to eliminate the suburban life and with the slogan of protecting the rights of the poorest people, deprives the suburbanites of the benefits and interests on which they have paid thousands of dollars and taxes. On the other hand, Bertrand Esminger, member of State Board of Washington indicates that smart growth agendas actually allow the government to interfere in the determination of land use, so instead of a regulatory role, it will have an advocacy role in favor of the commercial core of the city(www.baltimoresun.com).

Therefore, the economic structure of neoliberal government, even where it is in charge, causes uncertainty over achieving non-discriminatory goals. Smart growth expects the private sector of which many investors are suburbanites, to invest on these projects with small profit. Despite the economic slogan of smart growth, it seems more like an up-to-date reading of Marxist methods in the field of urban planning which supports the theories of inefficient wealthy government that are not widely supported in neoliberal communities. The goals of smart growth are to pursue the social engineering of liberal communities in order to create a classless society (in terms of space) in a liberal economic community. What has created the special settlements, facilities and high-level services is the economic logic of liberal communities which is reflected on living and consumption patterns of particularly wealthy classes. It seems that some of the goals of smart growth are in deep conflict with the concepts of liberalism such as free markets, property rights and so on and it only emphasizes on physical forms and changes and has neglected to understand the main infrastructure and the main cause of this urban life pattern.

Criticisms over the Possibility of Achieving Urban Smart Growth Goals

As mentioned at the beginning of this article, urban smart growth rather than a detailed theoretical study is based on the conclusions of previous successful experiences and common viewpoints of the theories

such as sustainable development, new urbanism, and environmental protection programs. Thus the written critiques rely on two different sides: 1. Critiques that examine the conceptual shortcomings in the approach (theory). 2. Critiques that review the possibility (attainability) of frequent conflicting goals of smart growth. Here are some of the most common criticisms leveled at smart growth approach. Baum believes that smart growth is only limited to urban restructure programs. Emphasizing on physical planning and urban design, it ignores the social planning and analysis to solve the problems arising from suburbia. On the other hand smart growth standards are less attentive to public safety, job opportunities and other social problems (Baun, 2004).Although urban planners and designers still insist on the need for compact development and preventing the suburban development, the majority of people on the basis of statistics (at least in the United States), despite all the economic savings resulting from the compact development, still tend to live in the suburbs and use their personal automobiles. Thus the planning that does not provide the possibility of living in the suburbs (that is demanded by people) to what extent is consistent with the goals such as planning with people and respecting their rights and freedom?

Some experiments indicate that it is not possible to limit the use of automobiles by increasing the compact development policies and public transportation. Thus any changes in travel behavior will not be possible unless the subsidy policies for personal vehicles change, otherwise smart growth physical policies will not have the adequate political supports to be properly implemented (Ellis, 2002). In addition, recent studies indicate that there is a little coherence within population density, occupations and travel behavior in residential sectors while controlling for other variables (Cox, 2013). Some of the principles of urban smart growth require actions at regional or provincial level and this means handing over land use decisions to higher levels. In many metropolitan areas, this hierarchy of governments does not exist or the local governments do not entrust the authority of decision making to other levels that leads to reducing their power. In the meanwhile, even if the local governments had complete control over their jurisdiction, still developers would have the ability to separate and develop the areas outside the boundaries of metropolises and at this scale, only federal government would have the authority to provide a coherent regulatory umbrella (Downs, 2005).

Rising housing price as a result of implementing smart growth policies is one of the main criticisms against urban smart growth. This can lead to not increase the prices if only economizing in the use of land leads to increase the consumers' desire to build apartments. If households continue to build their town houses, this policy will strictly increase housing prices and control of the factors affecting the housing market will be so difficult at this time. Even smart growth advocates acknowledge the fact that appropriate housing only can be provided under uncommon legislations. The endurance of existing infrastructures is much less liable than the proposed density. Unlike the smart growth advocates' viewpoint, denser development not only does not reduce the costs of secure infrastructures but also costs many times more than new developments (Altshuler and Gomez-Ibanez, 1994).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Due to the complex multifaceted urban problems and intense competitive environments, product orientation in urban planning emerges as a desire for physical planning along with high expectations of immediate results which in fact is a copy of previous successful urban projects regardless of socio economic infrastructures of the community under study, so it is considered as a threat to urban planning. Urban smart growth with the goal of managing and guiding the future development and improving the existing structure is open to debate on six thematic areas. The comprehensiveness of these areas that results from concluding and implementing the previous successful experiences and different (sometimes conflicting) theories makes the efforts of this approach in order to integrate the conflicting concepts such as – convenient housing development and denser cities- sense of justice and limiting the possibility of development- emphasis on freedom of choice and plans dictating the form of future developments and justice –lead to a conceptual paradox which according to some theorists will not lead to design of an appropriate and executive plan, but the pursuit of it can worsen the problems. On the other hand, urban smart growth projects focus more on physical issues and do not consider the role of social planning and

also public policy decisions on the success of projects. Therefore, despite the wide range of subjects, smart growth projects cannot make deep fundamental changes. On the other hand, the success of smart growth projects mainly depends on public participation and enactment of the limiting laws. But implementation experiences indicate the resistance and dissatisfaction of people towards limiting laws and thereby the reduction in desire to participate in the process of design and implementing the projects. Most importantly, smart growth as an approach to urban planning is pursuing goals that are in conflict with economic neoliberalism. Although it is trying to offer solutions with a focus on investment opportunities, non-participatory decisions and public investments are required to achieve its goals. Comparative studies in this paper showed that urban smart growth theory as an approach is in fundamental conflict with the principles of liberalism economy and social structure of liberal communities. Thus, as a superstructure, it will not receive the necessary supports in the implementation phase due to non-compliance with the main structure.

To upgrade the status of urban smart growth from theoretical design guidelines to a pragmatic approach, two essential steps should be taken: in the first step (in theory), urban smart growth needs to adopt a specific position (as an urban plan) on the economic liberalism system, because this approach despite of introducing problem-solving strategies based on the principals of capital, profit, etc., is in stark contrast to some of the intellectual principals of liberalism, especially regarding the balance of social-individual rights, private ownership , freedom of choice, principals of demand and supply, space as a tradable commodity and so on. In fact, smart growth approach in some ways is similar to elite-centered urban plans which were developed in engineering offices and run by the political leverage during the time from 50s to 70s.

Although public participation is one of the central themes of this approach, private property right and suburbanites' preference to keep the status quo rather than returning to urban centers, eventually ignore the efforts of local government to preserve local qualities as an excuse for defending the public interest and with the purpose of social engineering the cities, step in the same route of elite-centered plans of urban modernism with only a change of direction from suburbs to city, under the slogan " public interest". Therefore, continuing the usual procedure of urban smart growth projects, especially in suburban communities with powerful local governments, not only ends in failure but also leads to major political conflicts and more social gaps. In the second step, the theory must overcome the existing inconsistencies in the framework of the program. Some of the inconsistencies and contradictions in the ten principles of smart growth and the criticisms leveled against which were reviewed. Focusing more on non-physical aspects especially social and political strategic plans is considered as an important factor in order to change the phase of urban smart programs from an idealistic logic to a pragmatic one. Because the purposes set forth in urban smart growth manifesto require a coherent planning in physical, economic and social aspects and physical plans without changing the typical environmental patterns of liberal communities will lead to an inescapable impasse.

REFERENCES

Altshuler A and Gomez-Ibanez J (1994). Regulation for revenue: the political economy of land use exactions. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **13**(4) 792-796.

Anderson G (2006). Why smart growth: A primer [online], International city/county management association, America. Available: http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/whySmartGrowth_bk.pdf [Accessed 3 April 2012].

Baum H (2004). Smart growth and school reform: what if we talked about race and took community seriously. *Journal of American Planning Association* **70**(1) 14-26.

Calthrope P and Kelbaugh D (1989). *Pedestrian Pocket* (Princeton architectural press).

Cox W (2013). *The Transit-density Disconnect* [online], Available: http://www.newgeography.com/content/003781-the-transit-density-disconnect.html [Accessed 11 April 2012].

Downsa (2005). Smart growth: why we discuss it more than we do it. *Journal of the American Planning Association* **7**(4) 367-380.
Ellisc (2002). The new urbanism; critiques and rebuttals. *Journal of Urban Design* **7**(3) 261-291.
Fruits E (2011). Compact development and greenhouse gas emissions: a review of recent research. *Center of Real Estate Quarterly Journal* **5**(1) 1-7.
Handys (2005). Smart growth and the transportation-land use connection: what does the research tell us. *International Regional Science Review* **28**(2) 146-167.
Ingram G and Hong Y (2009). Evaluating smart growth: state and local policy outcomes. Lincoln Institute of land policy, Cambridge.
International City/Country Management Association & Smart Growth Network (2011). *Getting to Smart Growth*, translated by AzeriAbbas (Tehran: Shahr Publication).
Kashanijou K and Mo Fydi Shemirani M (2009). The Evolution of Theories Related to Urban Transportation. *Journal of Urban Identity* 3-14.
Knaapg Talene (2005). New urbanism and smart growth: a few words from the academy. *International Regional Science Review* **28**(2) 107-118.
Millerj Hoel L (2002). The smart growth debate: best practices for urban transportation planning. *Socio-economic Planning Sciences* **36** 1-24.
Osolen R and Lister N (2004). Community research connections discussion paper series.3 [online], Available: http://www.crcresearch.org/files-crcresearch_v2/File/Discussion_Paper-3_SoCap&SD_Mar19-09.pdf [Accessed 11 April 2012].
O'Toole R (2001). *The Folly of Smart Growth* [online]. Available: http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/regulation/2001/10/otoole.pdf [Accessed 11 April 2012].
Pagh C (2004). *Sustainable Cities in Developing Countries*, translated by Moharamnejad Naser and Haddad Tehrani Neshat, Tehran: Iran urban planning & Architecture Research Center, Department of housing & planning.
Resnik D (2010). Urban sprawl, Smart Growth, and Deliberative Democracy. *American Journal of Public Health* **100**(10) 1852-1856.
Starrett B (2005). *Getting to Smart Growth* (100 more policies for implementation) [Online] ICMA, Available: http://www.smartgrowth.org/pdf/gettosg2.pdf [Accessed 14 April 2012].
Sager T (2011). Neo-liberal urban planning policies: A literature survey 1990–2010. *Progress in Planning* [online] **76** 147-199, Available: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305900611000511 [Accessed 21 April 2012].
Ye L, Mandpe S and Meyer P (2005). What is smart growth? --- Really?. *Journal of Planning Literature* **19**(3) 301-315.
Ziari K, Janbaz N and Mohammad H (2009). Viewpoints and Theories of a Healthy City. *Journal of Municipalities* **95** 14-23.