

**The Use Of Digital Visual  
Simulations in Three Participatory  
Planning Case Studies**

Michael Kwartler, FAIA

**Lincoln Institute of Land Policy  
Working Paper**

The findings and conclusions of this paper are not subject to detailed review and do not necessarily reflect the official views and policies of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Please do not photocopy without permission of the authors.  
Contact the authors directly with all questions or requests for permission.

**Lincoln Institute Product Code: WP04MK1**



## Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy is a nonprofit and tax-exempt school organized in 1974, with a specialized mission to study and teach land policy, including land economics and land taxation. The Institute is supported primarily by the Lincoln Foundation, which was established in 1947 by Cleveland industrialist John C. Lincoln. He drew inspiration from the ideas of Henry George, the nineteenth-century American political economist, social philosopher and author of the book *Progress and Poverty*.

The Lincoln Institute aims to integrate theory and practice to better shape land policy and to share understanding about the multidisciplinary forces that influence public policy. The Institute organizes its work in three departments: valuation and taxation; planning and development; and international studies.

The Lincoln Institute assembles experts with different points of view to study, reflect, exchange insights, and work toward consensus in creating a more complete and systematic understanding of land policy. The Lincoln Institute does not take a particular point of view, but rather serves as a catalyst to facilitate analysis and discussion of these issues—to make a difference today and to help policy makers plan for tomorrow.

The Lincoln Institute offers challenging opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching, research and publishing. The education program incorporates research findings into courses, conferences and workshops for both scholars and practitioners. The publications program produces books, policy focus reports, *Land Lines* quarterly newsletter, and this series of working papers.

The Lincoln Institute admits students of any race, color, national or ethnic origin, or gender to all rights, privileges, programs and activities generally accorded or made available to students at the school. It does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national or ethnic origin, or gender in administration of its educational policies, admission policies, scholarship and fellowship programs, or other school-administered programs. The Lincoln Institute is an equal opportunity employer.

For more information, please contact:

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy  
Information Services  
113 Brattle Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138-3400

Phone	617.661.3016 800.LAND.USE (526.3873)
Fax	617.661.7235 800.LAND.944 (526.3944)
Email	<a href="mailto:help@lincolninst.edu">help@lincolninst.edu</a>
Web	<a href="http://www.lincolninst.edu">www.lincolninst.edu</a>

## **Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Working Papers**

Lincoln Institute working papers make available the results of new and continuing research. Although papers may be in early draft stages and subject to revision, they should strive for final publication in reputable scholarly or professional journals.

To be accepted as a Lincoln Institute working paper, a manuscript must explicitly address one or more items on the Lincoln Institute's current agenda, which is organized in three departments: valuation and taxation, planning and development, and international studies.

In addition, working papers must:

- build on rather than repeat earlier work—through new data and analysis, an original interpretation of previously available data, or an innovative theory;
- demonstrate awareness of the most relevant previously published sources and, for empirical papers, summarize the data and methods used;
- be coherently argued, logically organized and clearly written.

Submissions to the working paper series are subjected to informal review to ensure that each paper meets these basic standards without requiring that it be a completely finished product.

We give the highest priority to manuscripts that explain in a straightforward manner the significance of their conclusions for public policy. However, the Lincoln Institute is a nonpartisan organization and strives to present a variety of viewpoints on the issues it addresses. The opinions expressed in working papers are therefore those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Lincoln Institute.

For more information about the Institute's programs, please contact one of the following department chairmen:

H. James Brown, Cochairman	Department of International Studies (China)
Armando Carbonell, Cochairman	Department of Planning and Development
Rosalind Greenstein, Cochairman	Department of Planning and Development
Martim Smolka, Cochairman	Department of International Studies (Latin America)
Joan Youngman, Chairman	Department of Valuation and Taxation

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy  
113 Brattle Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138-3400

Phone	617.661.3016
Fax	617.661.7235
Email	<a href="mailto:help@lincolninst.edu">help@lincolninst.edu</a>
Web	<a href="http://www.lincolninst.edu">www.lincolninst.edu</a>

## **Abstract**

This paper is presented as case studies of three projects on which the Environmental Simulation Center, Ltd. (ESC) and its collaborators employed digital simulation and 3D visualization to support community-based decision-making and consensus-building on three scales: the neighborhood, the extension of the city, and the region. These case studies explain how simulation and 3D visualization were integrated into the visioning process in these projects: Vision 2030: Shaping our Region's Future Together in Baltimore, Maryland, Southwest Santa Fe City/County Master Planning Initiative in Santa Fe, New Mexico and the Near Northside Economic Revitalization Planning Process in Houston, Texas. In each case the simulation and 3D visualization played a critical role. They made concepts and public policies accessible to the lay public by translating words, numbers, and maps into real-time 3D models of the places that would result if they were implemented and experienced at eye level. Their use throughout the visioning process provoked spirited discussions that ultimately led to consensus among the participants. Finally, the case studies argue for the careful integration of digital simulation and 3D visualization in the design of the process itself.

## **About the Authors**

**Michael Kwartler, FAIA** is an architect, planner, urban designer and educator, and principal of Michael Kwartler and Associates. He is the founding director of the Environmental Simulation Center, a non-profit research laboratory created to develop innovative applications of digital technology to inform complex public land-use issues and debates.

You can contact Mr. Kwartler at:

261 West 35<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1408

New York, NY 10001

Phone: 212-279-1851

Fax: 212-279-5350

[kwartler@simcenter.org](mailto:kwartler@simcenter.org)

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overview	1
Baltimore Region	3
Vision 2030: Shaping our Region’s Future Together	3
The Regional Workshop (“Where to Grow”)	3
The Regional Public Meetings (“How to Grow”)	5
Southwest Santa Fe	10
Southwest Santa Fe City/County Master Planning Initiative	10
Methodology/Process	10
Near Northside, Houston	17
Near Northside Economic Revitalization Planning Process	17
Organizational Structure	18
Methodology	18
Focus on Simulation/Visualization	19
Conclusion	25
Notes	27





# The Use of Digital Visual Simulations in Three Participatory Planning Case Studies

## Introduction

This paper details the use of visual simulations by the Environmental Simulation Center, Ltd. (ESC) and its collaborators to involve citizens in the neighborhood/city/regional planning process. It does so by examining three planning projects undertaken in the last three years. Demonstrated is how to obtain citizen input regarding the place in which they would like to live, how to model their suggestions via 3D/Geographic Information System-based simulation and visualization software and how to use the citizens' critiques of the models to improve the planning process and ultimately the livability of the neighborhood/city/region.

## Overview

The use of digital simulation and visualization is explored through the experience of three planning projects:

- Vision 2030: Shaping our Region's Future Together for the five-county Baltimore (Maryland) Regional Transportation Board (January 2003)
- Southwest Santa Fe City/County Master Planning Initiative for the City and County of Santa Fe, New Mexico (April 2002)
- Near Northside Economic Revitalization Planning Process for the City of Houston, Texas (September 2001)

The impetus for these plans derives from and is a negative reaction to current development practice, generally automobile-based planning manifesting itself in traffic jams, chaotic development patterns (e.g., the loss of open space in the Baltimore region; sprawling, commercial strip, gated communities development and the loss of desert and the "sense of place" unique to Santa Fe; and a hostile pedestrian experience in Houston's Near Northside). The plans themselves are to guide future growth and development. Each project assumed growth, with pressure on the development of "greenfields" (typically undeveloped or agricultural land) in the cases of the Baltimore region and Santa Fe.

Each project is different in terms of scale, landscape, degree of anticipated change, governmental and regulatory structures, and the nature of public participation. As a result, each presents different challenges for simulation and visualization. The integration of simulation and visualization into the public participation process to facilitate informed discussion and decision-making was guided by the numbers of people involved, propinquity, and localism. Regardless of the form the application of the technology took, it was consistently used to develop the plan in a variety of settings, from hands-on workshops to large "town hall" meetings, not merely to represent or visualize outcomes. Technology has typically been used at the backend of a planning process; used to sell the project or place but not to help the public develop the plan. Our objective has always

been that the simulations and visualizations were a means to the end of informing communities making decisions about their future.

While each of the planning projects is unique, each also has commonalities that are useful for comparing why, how, and under what circumstances simulation and visualization are used to enhance public participation and most importantly, decision-making. Conceptually, they all share a common base: all are visioning processes plans. Visioning is a citizen-driven process where all of the results are derived from public input. It is neither top-down nor bottom-up. It is inclusive of both the private-sector stakeholders (from business leaders to NGOs) and the public sector. Its purpose is to reach consensus on issues regarding values and group identity. It is less concerned with differences (e.g., what sets citizens apart) than with what a community, town, city or region share in common. It is about finding common ground in our pluralistic society.

“Place” plays a critical role in locating common ground. As Appleyard has observed,

*(T)echnical planning and environmental decisions are not only value-based...but identity-based...(P)hysical planning decisions can, and frequently do, threaten the identity and status of certain groups while enlarging the power of others...The environment is divided into “ours” and “theirs;” the trees may be ours, the billboards theirs, the authentic is ours, the phony theirs, downtown may be ours or theirs, as may be the wilderness, the oil, or other natural resources. The city and the natural environment are areas of symbolic social conflicts and as such raise their own issues of social justice.*

From the perspective of the lay public, place -- their neighborhood, district, town, city or region -- is experienced as a whole in all of its glorious messiness, and not as a series of abstract planning categories. The “quality of place”, the combination of its experiential and functional attributes and group values and identity are recognized as being synchronous in visioning. Visioning uses physical design as a form of inquiry, exploring the match and mismatch between words and images. Words and numbers are abstractions that have very specific real world implications. It is not unusual to hear, as has often been the case at the ESC, “...that’s not what I meant at all” when the words and numbers in a standard master plan or zoning resolutions are simulated and visualized dynamically in three dimensions. The simulations and visualizations used in these three visioning processes and plans play a similar role: grounding metaphor in reality.

Regarding the digital technology, the projects were all done within a three year period, and make use of similar simulation and visualization tools and techniques (although the applications are obviously adapted to each project’s needs and scale).

## **Baltimore Region**

### **Vision 2030: Shaping our Region's Future Together**

Over a 15-month period Vision 2030 explored six thematic areas that dealt with a broad range of issues that are, for the first time, brought together to form a comprehensive regional perspective. The areas are: Economic Development, Education, Environment, Government and Public Policy, Livable Communities, and Transportation.

The visioning process involved six interrelated and sequential steps:

- Step One: Understanding the Region – Perception and Reality
- Step Two: Involving Stakeholders
- Step Three: Prototypical Development Patterns and Scenarios
- Step Four: Gathering Ideas and Testing Results with the Public
- Step Five: Developing Vision Statements and Strategies
- Step Six: Testing the Vision Statements and Strategies with the Public

Within the overall context of the Vision 2030 process, simulation and visualization played a central role in helping the public and the project's Oversight Committee reach consensus on the "hot button" issue of where and how to accommodate growth in the region identified by the focus groups in Step One.

### **The Regional Workshop ("Where to Grow")**

In response to the "hot button" growth issue, the Regional Workshop focused on "where to grow". Organized as a game, the purpose of the workshop was threefold:


1. To understand the complexity of thinking regionally,
2. To gain "intuitive" public input on future growth and land consumption considerations, and
3. To prepare for future subcommittee work (e.g., developing the vision statements, strategies, and principles that form the core of Vision 2030).

The participants amounted to 65 stakeholders, including elected officials, planners, educators, citizen activists, staff from NGOs, and business leaders. Participants were divided into eight groups, each with a facilitator.

As a first step, participants agreed on a percentage (average of all eight groups) of the region's total land they would like to protect over the next 30 years, in addition to land already protected. The next step was to agree on a common set of criteria, weighted differently by each of the eight groups, to help guide the choice of areas to protect for the future (e.g., the creation of contiguous natural environments, protecting forest and trail areas, etc.).

A three-foot by four-foot Geographic Information Systems (GIS) generated map of the region, that included layers delineating urbanized areas, areas already protected, agricultural areas, and unprotected land (e.g., forests, wetlands, etc.) was overlaid by a one square mile (640 acre) grid (see Figure 1). Then each group was given green “chips”, each representing one square mile of land, and asked to place them onto areas on the map that the group believed should be protected. During a brief break, the results of each group’s approach to future land protection were hand-tabulated and a workshop average of protected land was calculated. The patterns of each group’s placement of chips were compared and discussed by the workshop participants, revealing an underlying consistency in the choices made by each group.

**Figure 1: Map of Baltimore Area Overlayered with One Square Mile Grid**



**Visioning Process: Where do we grow?**

Lincoln Institute for Land Policy

**New Development**

The next step was to determine where growth might be located. The groups were given brown “chips” that represented the amount of land that would be needed to accommodate the region’s projected growth for the next 25 years. In a similar way to the land protection exercise the participants discussed and agreed on criteria that they could use to guide their decision-making regarding where growth should occur (e.g., along transit lines in already developed areas, in undeveloped areas, near employment centers, etc.) Again, the results were tabulated, averaged, and discussed, and revealed a consensus for redevelopment rather than “greenfields” development.

The responses to the Regional Workshop “game” reflected an emerging consensus. Most groups chose to locate growth in the region’s developed areas and protect land in the outer areas.

### **The Regional Public Meetings (“How to Grow”)**

Over a two-month period 17 facilitated Regional Public Meetings were held. Presentations were made of prototypical development patterns, region-wide development scenarios and the absolute and relative performance of the development scenarios. Questionnaires were administered and small group idea sessions were conducted.

The Oversight Committee and its Thematic Subcommittee identified and tested three development patterns, four future regional development scenarios, and performance indicators. The development patterns became the building blocks for these future regional development scenarios. Each scenario showed how the region would develop depending upon the allocation of the development patterns/building blocks.

The three development patterns reflected trends that were occurring in the Baltimore region as well as those emerging nationwide. Each had different implications for land consumption, housing types mix, and proximity to jobs, shopping, and entertainment. They are:

*Type A: Conventional development pattern in undeveloped land.* This reflects a continuation of how the region has been growing with single-family detached houses, shopping, entertainment and employment in auto-centered malls.



*Type B: Mixed-use walkable community on undeveloped land.* This assumes the creation of more compact neighborhoods with a mix of housing types and nearby shopping, entertainment and employment.



*Type C: Mixed-use walkable communities on redeveloped land.* This also assumes the creation of more walkable compact communities but on redeveloped land.



Each building block or development pattern had the same goal: to accommodate 1,000 households with supporting commercial, schools, and open space. This allowed for “apples to apples” comparisons.

Unlike the Santa Fe and Houston vision plans, Vision 2030 was not focused on a particular place or places in the Baltimore region but rather on public policy and therefore on characteristic areas within the region. In fact, given the region’s emphasis on home rule (where each jurisdiction has land-use powers), it was critical that Vision 2030 not appear to be usurping local authority. Working collaboratively with the client, the ESC composited two characteristic places using the five-county GIS orthophotographs and database: one with large tracts of undeveloped land and existing suburban and rural development patterns with the possibility of “greenfields” development and another in an urbanized center with the possibility of infill/redevelopment (see Figures 3a and 3b).

Prototypical building types were created and introduced into the model development patterns that were included in the regional scenarios. Each development pattern was designed in the composite (layout of blocks, lots, streets, uses, open spaces, distribution of building types, etc.) and modeled in three dimensions to reflect the architectural character of historic and contemporary buildings in the region. The real-time 3D/GIS environment allowed the client to view the development patterns dynamically, to comment on the design of the development pattern, and to select views and real-time walk-through paths to be presented to the public at the 17 Regional Public Meetings. Because the development patterns were composed of a kit-of-parts that ranged from the building to the block (with each block having different combination of lot sizes), the ESC was able to quickly and efficiently respond in “real time” to subcommittee comments and suggestions regarding the building iterative process.

**Figure 3a: Redeveloped Land**



**Figure 3b: Redeveloped Land: Walkable Community**



With the 3D simulations and visualizations of the three development patterns validated by the Thematic Subcommittees, the three development patterns were then used to assemble the four regional development scenarios identified by Vision 2030. The scenarios accommodated the forecasted population and employment growth for the region by using the development patterns in different combinations. The four scenarios were:

- Scenario 1: Current trends and plans*
- Scenario 2: Emphasis on road capacity*
- Scenario 3: Emphasis on mass transit*
- Scenario 4: Emphasis on redevelopment*

The compositing of development pattern types or building blocks into scenarios is illustrated by comparing the mix of development types between Scenarios 2 and 3:

**Scenario 2**

Type A: Conventional development pattern on undeveloped land	75%
Type B: Mixed-use walkable communities on undeveloped land	20%
Type C: Mixed-use walkable communities on redeveloped land	5%

**Scenario 3**

Type A: Conventional development pattern on undeveloped land	25%
Type B: Mixed-use walkable communities on undeveloped land	37.5%
Type C: Mixed-use walkable communities on redeveloped land	37.5%



The comparison of the four scenarios was measured through a complex computer model that used indicators to quantify the performance of each scenario. The 3D/GIS simulations and visualizations of the development patterns were queried to provide the data used in the model.

The three development patterns (Types A, B, and C), the four regional development scenarios and the scenarios' performance measured by the indicators were presented at each of the 17 Regional Public Meetings in conjunction with a questionnaire (entitled "Choices for the Future") that focused on the regional scenarios.

The four scenarios and the performance indicators represented "what ifs"; hypothetical situations that were intentionally designed to offer a wide range of choices. Their abstraction, particularly when expanded to the five-county region was made palpable by the simulations and visualizations that employed 3D models and eye-level walk-throughs. They communicated to the public the question: "If you think or prefer this, then this is probably the kind of place that will result; is this acceptable?" The simulations and visualizations were compelling and in conjunction with the performance indicators provided the comfort level the respondents needed to complete the questionnaire. The results demonstrated overwhelming support for the *Emphasis on Redevelopment* and *Emphasis on Mass Transit* scenarios, both of which consumed less than half the amount of land in accommodating future growth as opposed to the other two scenarios.

The ways in which the simulations and visualizations were used in Vision 2030 were a function of the scale of the community participation in the process in a five-county region. When working with the Oversight Committee's Thematic Subcommittee the participants had an opportunity to work in the real-time environment provided by 3D/GIS. Similarly, the Regional Workshop with its groups consisting of eight participants allowed for direct participation in the workshop. The results of the "where to grow" and "how to grow" workshop and meetings needed to be presented to the region's constituency where they lived. By definition, the Regional Public Meetings could not be "hands on" in terms of determining or even changing the content, but rather were designed to take the pulse of the community, to register their response to a series of scenarios from which they were asked to choose. Given the possibility of checking "none of the above" it was clear that the public outreach and communications effort, the simulations, visualizations, and indicators of the development patterns and scenarios and the iterative nature of the process (that at key points attempted to validate positions taken at that time in the visioning process) were effective at keeping people both informed and involved. The 1,200 random telephone interviews done at the end of the visioning process validated the positions taken by Vision 2030.

## **Southwest Santa Fe**

### **Southwest Santa Fe City/County Master Planning Initiative**

The objective of this 25-week study was to develop a public participation process the outcome of which would be a policy framework for future development (a “vision plan”). The study was seen as the first step in the formulation of a master plan with corresponding development regulations that would implement the policy framework established by the vision plan.

Unlike Baltimore’s Vision 2030, the issue of “where to grow” was explicit in that Southwest Santa Fe was, realistically, the only area left to accommodate growth within the City of Santa Fe. In fact, that area was already growing rapidly, if not chaotically, and all indications were that development pressure would continue. Southwest Santa Fe was at a crossroads. It could continue to develop as an entirely auto-dependent “suburb” of anonymous strip malls and “adobesque” gated communities or it could grow in a way that was sympathetic to Santa Fe’s historic development pattern, considered the values of the existing population, and conserved the high desert landscape. Hence, the public participation processes focus was on “how to grow”.

### **Methodology/Process**

While the vision plan was to be a policy document, its focus was on a clearly delineated and hotly contested area in which existing residents had a clear, if not personal interest that resonated Appleyard’s comment: “Planning is not only technical but value and identity based”. Because the study area was in their backyard, passions ran high. If consensus was to be achieved to guide the area’s future, the process needed to be inclusive, open, and informative. Most importantly, the vision plan needed to incorporate the values of all the participants and establish an area identity that all could support, relate to, and implement; that is, to find common ground.

The process that was designed to identify a vision for the Southwest Santa Fe area consisted of three sequential steps, each of which involved public participation, review, comment, and decision-making. The steps were:

1. Identify three prototypical areas where principles and possible development scenarios could be developed and applied to similar parts of the study area.
2. Develop land-use and urban design alternatives, including:
  - a) Identifying local patterns and conventions of development,
  - b) Translating those patterns and conventions into the development of 3D building blocks,
  - c) Extracting development principles from the building blocks, and
  - d) Applying the building blocks to each of the three prototypical areas.
3. Test the land-use and urban design alternatives and present them to the residents, the general public and the stakeholders in addition to the monthly meetings with the plan’s Steering Group.

The following paragraphs explore the role of simulation and visualization throughout the visioning process with a focus on creating the “building blocks”, principles, and the planning area GIS for the three planning areas, and explains how they were used in the public review and decision-making process

The principle advocate for the stakeholders, the existing residents, and the NGOs was the Steering Group. This 28 member committee was continuously involved in all aspects of the process, meeting monthly with the consultants. They participated in the process of developing land-use and design alternatives for each prototypical area. The process included identifying recurring patterns of development, translating those patterns into development building blocks, and applying the building blocks to the prototypical areas of “New Development”, “Corridor Development”, and “Rural Protection”.

Places to a great degree derive their character from conventions or patterns that are implicitly agreed upon by the community. Examples of patterns or urban design conventions are the more or less uniform setback of houses in New England, or the diversity of fences and walls that enclose the front yards of Santa Fe’s houses. The patterns used by the ESC to design the building blocks derived from historic Santa Fe and from the planning area itself. Over fifteen large and small recurring patterns or urban design conventions in historic Santa Fe were identified.

The next step in the process was to translate local patterns into digital 3D building blocks (blocks and lots consisting of houses, sidewalks, street widths, and on-street parking). The building blocks became the basic components used in developing the vision for each of the prototypical areas. For example, for the New Development prototypical area, building blocks included a variety of blocks and lots representative of Santa Fe, a hierarchy of streets, sidewalks, and traffic calming devices, linear parks (based on the land subdivision of narrow long lots, see Figure 4) and squares, mixed-use commercial buildings, and residential buildings. A draft of the 3D building blocks was presented to the Steering Group for its review and comment. Each block was reviewed individually and as aggregated patterns in the real-time 3D model.

The hierarchy of new streets and block sizes was reviewed in its entirety and as individual components; each street’s width, design speed, sidewalks and on-street parking patterns were determined. Because safety of pedestrians (and particularly children) was one of the overarching themes that emerged from the stakeholder meetings and focus groups, the Steering Group carefully scrutinized the components prepared by the consultant team. Each street type, from alley to collector street, was modeled in 3D using the building blocks based on historic street widths in Santa Fe. The Santa Fe Department of Transportation standard issue street widths were also modeled for comparison.

The street patterns and widths were thoroughly discussed and voted on and the streets were assigned grades based on comfort level. With this input the Steering Group reduced the number of street types. Not all street patterns of the other building blocks survived the scrutiny of the Steering Group; in some cases they were modified to better match local

conditions (as in the case of the commercial building whose height was reduced from three to two stories). In other cases, components were rejected as inappropriate for Santa Fe.

**Figure 4: Linear Parks**



As the planning process proceeded, the individual building blocks were aggregated into development scenarios and reviewed by the Steering Group. The building blocks were applied to the prototypical areas using a GIS-based existing-conditions 3D model of the three prototypical areas to show how they might go together to create a neighborhood, a mixed-use commercial area, or a development pattern in low-density rural protection areas.

Fitting the building blocks and land-use patterns to existing conditions demonstrated how the areas could develop incrementally and inclusively. The simulations and 3D visualizations were not meant to be finished static designs rigidly applied, but rather used to illustrate how the building blocks might be organized to show a possible but by no means singular end result.

The results of the scenario review were then translated into ten development principles. Each principle represented a basic core value agreed upon during the process. Each principle lists the specific building blocks necessary to fulfill its intent. The principles generalized the results of the process, making the principles and the building blocks from which they were derived applicable throughout the entire planning area.

At the Public Forum each of the principles and building blocks were presented and discussed individually. To help the public better understand what kind of neighborhood would result if the principles were implemented in the aggregate the ESC created a representative portion of a prototypical mixed-use neighborhood using the building blocks (a “cluster”, see Figure 5). The cluster allowed the ESC to simulate at eye level, and in real-time in the context of the 3D model, what it would be like to leave your house in the morning, walk to the daycare center to drop off your child, pick-up a snack at the corner deli, and get on your bicycle and ride along the linear park to work at the commercial center.

**Figure 5: Building Blocks**



The real-time walk-through was very effective in conveying to the public the future identity of Southwest Santa Fe. The real-time 3D model also made it possible to respond to requests to walk down other streets or what it would look like from someone’s front yard. Being able to be “in the model” and to make choices was critical to engendering a spirited discussion of the pros and cons of the principles.

After considerable discussion, the public forum’s participants were asked to rank the principles on a scale ranging from 1 (indicating the lowest level of support) to 5 (indicating the highest level of support), and an average score for each principle was tabulated. For example, Principle 5 (“Neighborhoods in Southwest Santa Fe should have a variety of lot sizes and building styles to allow for economic diversity, affordability and an inclusive community”) received 4.13 out of 5 points. All ten principles received “strong” to “very strong” support at the public forum.

**Figure 6: Voting on a Scenario**

**Neighborhood Street Type B 28' ROW**

15

C 5

SC 8

NC 4

NR 4



September 21, 2000

South West Santa Fe City/County Master Plan Initiative

To increase public input, the designs and concept for Southwest Santa Fe were further reviewed and scrutinized through seven small scale workshops with neighborhood associations and professional groups and through a survey widely distributed to residents, business owners, students and others throughout the planning area.

The second of the Community Choices Workshops presented the emerging community consensus around the principles for the three areas. Up to this point density had not been mentioned. As in Baltimore it was critical to the methodology to separate “what we want” from “how we get there”. This is critical to the vision process so that the vision is not comprised and consensus built to support implementation. For example, Principle 5 (“Neighborhoods in Southwest Santa Fe should have a variety of lot sizes and building styles to allow for economic diversity, affordability and an inclusive community”) is extremely difficult to achieve in new developments and communities due to bank lending preferences (where economic stratification is preferred), zoning regulations (that set minimum lot and house sizes), and difficulty marketing the development to a public that has an expectation of uniformity. Nonetheless, simulations and visualizations were done that showed “apples to apples” comparisons of a neighborhood where each block had the identical lot and house size and another where the same number of lots and houses were randomly mixed on each block. The latter was closer to a typical Santa Fe neighborhood that has developed over time (not “cookie cutter”, regimented or stratified economically). This principle was one of the highest ranked, notwithstanding its difficulty of being achieved, only because implementation was not to be considered. The same was true with density.


So during the visioning process density was not discussed because density per se is not a principle but rather a means, and not an end in and of itself. Instead of the abstraction of density numbers (e.g., dwelling units per hectare), building blocks that encapsulated the public's value system were used to design the new neighborhood the public wanted. The translation of the building blocks into principles was the process of extracting policy from the design of the neighborhood place. Used this way the simulations and visualizations supported design "as inquiry" rather than "as a product".

With consensus on the principles achieved, the next step was to explain how density would help achieve the vision plan. The visualized and simulated neighborhoods could be developed at different densities all meeting the same amount of anticipated future growth. To help the community understand how much of undeveloped Southwest Santa Fe would be needed to accommodate future growth the consultants used GIS. To get a general "feel" for density, a figure/ground map was created of the historic core of Santa Fe and superimposed on Southwest Santa Fe adjacent to a trailer park that occupied the same amount of land. This little demonstration was an "eye-opener". One was a complete world and the other...just a mobile home park. In addition, utilizing the GIS building footprint areas and parcel maps, existing densities of representative neighborhoods well known to the participants were calculated, visualized, and used to inform the discussion of density.

The effects of density (or the lack thereof) on the consumption of land was demonstrated by the use of GIS-based dynamic maps and charts that graphically delineated the amount of land needed to meet the area's projected housing needs at 3 dwelling units per acre (existing zoning density, see Figure 7a), 5 dwelling units per acre (see Figure 7b), and 8 dwelling units per acre (the density of Santa Fe's historic core, see Figure 7c). This, in combination with the 3D model, represented the proposed prototypical development types that effectively conveyed both the quantitative and qualitative effects of development at "sprawl" and "urban" densities.

**Figure 7a**

**Critical Choices: How Do We Implement the Plan?**




October 18, 2000

South West Santa Fe City/County Master Plan Initiative

**Figure 7b**

**Critical Choices: How Do We Implement the Plan?**




October 18, 2000

South West Santa Fe City/County Master Plan Initiative

**Figure 7c**

**Critical Choices: How Do We Implement the Plan?**



October 18, 2000

South West Santa Fe City/County Master Plan Initiative

What became instantly clear was that at current zoned densities all available land, including land fronting the Santa Fe River, would be developed in contradiction to the agreed upon principles. The amount of land consumed at the levels of 5 and 8 dwelling units per acre was also visualized and consensus was reached on a density of over 5 dwelling units per acre (or almost twice the current zoned density). Without having first developed the vision for Southwest Santa Fe through simulation and visualization it is highly unlikely that the community would have supported doubling the density, if it even would have considered it.

Given the focus on land-use and urban design, GIS simulations and 3D visualizations were vital to the entire project. They were used at Steering Committee meetings and public workshops to validate perceptions, test ideas, understand alternatives, formulate



the principles that would become the backbone of the area plan, and to develop recommendations for implementation. The use of a real-time data rich interactive 3D environment to explore values and ideas as an integral part of the decision-making process resulted in high confidence that “what they meant is what they will get”. The real-time 3D models went beyond abstractions such as FAR (Floor Area Ratio – a poor indicator of density and/or intensity of use found in most zoning regulations) and provided the experiential basis to discuss in concrete terms the kind of place the residents and stakeholders wanted.

## **Near Northside, Houston**

### **Near Northside Economic Revitalization Planning Process**

The Near Northside Economic Revitalization Plan was initiated by the City of Houston and was supported by grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Federal Highways Works Administration (FHWA) Main Street Revitalization Project, with contributions from Avenue CDC, a local community development corporation. Webb Architects and Associates (Webb Architects) was selected to prepare the plan that included the work of two parallel efforts: The Houston Neighborhood Market Drill Down conducted by Social Compact Inc. (which is a retail market study for Houston’s inner-city neighborhoods) and Community Preferences workshops (conducted by the ESC and funded by HUD’s Community Technology Initiative grant) that lead to the implementation of urban design guidelines for the Near Northside community. The case study will focus on work with the Near Northside community, Houston’s Department of Planning and Development, and their consultants.

*The following plan for the Near Northside, like many such plans, has many facts, figures, and maps. But behind these lies a vision for how a neighborhood might grow and develop. A vision not developed by city planners or outside consultants though such individuals played a vital role in development. Rather, it is a vision for a neighborhood developed by that very neighborhood. Through countless steering committee meetings and public sessions over a year’s time, community members developed this plan. It is their plan for their neighborhood.*

- Gabriel Vasquez, Council Member, District H

The Near Northside, located adjacent to Houston’s Downtown, is a predominantly Latino, yet diverse neighborhood, and is one of two neighborhoods in Houston selected for HUD’s Community Technology Initiative in 2001. One of the primary objectives of the Initiative was demonstrating the role simulation and visualization could play in helping communities collaboratively plan and reach consensus on their future. An essential part of making the Initiative sustainable was technology transfer. Here, the Houston’s Planning and Development Department staff was trained in the use of visualization software and most importantly, its application in future community-based visioning and planning workshops.

## **Organizational Structure**

A Steering Committee of community stakeholders was established to provide community input, act as a sounding board, share their intimate knowledge of the community with the consultants and review the work of the consultants. The Steering Committee met frequently over a nine month period; members included neighborhood civic associations, neighborhood service organizations, the school district, business associations, local development corporations, and property owners. A separate Advisory Committee provided input from governmental agencies. In addition, three community-wide workshops were held. All meetings and workshops took place in the Near Northside neighborhood.

## **Methodology**

The overall plan's methodology/ process was somewhat compromised by a series of factors that made coordination, and at critical moments collaboration between the three consultants, difficult. Because each consultant was funded by a different source whose objectives and timing were not always consistent with the general goals of the revitalization, coordination suffered. For example, the ESC's work focused primarily on the commercial corridors and in the best of worlds should have reflected the market potential of the neighborhood to attract and support a broader range of services and retail than currently existed. Unfortunately, the market work done by Social Compact, Inc. came too late in the process, focused only neighborhood buying capacity to the exclusion of neighborhood demand for goods and services, and was not designed to provide information such as how much additional space the neighborhood could support. As a result it was not particularly useful in formulating the development scenarios, simulations, and visualizations. To complicate matters, the consultants did not begin their work in unison, making coordination, the sharing of information, and the development of an integrated process difficult. Notwithstanding the hurdles, the collective efforts of the consultants, the Steering Committee, the Advisory Committee, Houston's Planning and Development Department staff, and the Near Northside community led to the adoption and implementation of the vision plan.

Interviews were held by Webb Architects with property owners and other stakeholders rather than groups. The difference between interviews and a group discussion is that with interviews there is no dialogue in which the participants are engaged. This had the unfortunate result of sustaining often contradictory expectations rather than achieving consensus both in terms of content and process.

Three community-wide workshops were held. Initially, there were to be two, but for reasons to be explained below an additional workshop was required. The first workshop was held about a month before the ESC's contract with the City of Houston took effect with no input from the ESC. Over 100 people participated in a facilitated process that identified issues, problems, and assets, and had a question-and-answer session.

The second workshop, held about two months later, was keyed to ensuring that the consultant team was on-target regarding community issues, transportation, strategies for change, and concepts for new development. The ensuing discussion clearly revealed deep flaws in the Webb Architects-led process. Expectations were high and frustrations deep because the workshop was virtually all presentation with little time for discussion. The ESC was asked to simulate and visualize the development implications of a commercial corridor with and without the proposed light rail system. The real-time simulations and visualizations were mislabeled and introduced by Webb Architects at the end of a three-hour meeting as the “virtual reality tour” of future corridor development. When confronted with possible development scenarios in real photorealistic 3D, the participants were outraged. They were frustrated because they felt that they were being asked to choose a development alternative, notwithstanding that simulations and visualizations raised substantial questions about the values, future, character, and identity of the Near Northside neighborhood.

What became clear in the ensuing confrontation was that the community assumed that perceived visual simulations were being used to sell rather than inform. Moreover, while the ESC envisioned the simulation and visualizations as the beginning of a process the community saw them as a product of a process in which they had no role. The Webb Architects process/methodology had misinformed the community about the way simulations and visualizations were to be used to help the Near Northside community develop its vision. Once the mismatch was identified, the steering committee and Near Northside community decided to start over and hold another workshop. It is this last workshop that is discussed in more detail. One lesson learned is that when simulations and visualizations are presented out-of-context and without a prior explanation of how they will be used in the planning process to a group with other expectations they can be very threatening because the implications are concrete to the degree images of the real world are concrete.

### **Focus on Simulation / Visualization**

The neighborhood’s second public workshop focused on presenting the policies and programs formulated in response to the first, but failed to address the issues of values and identity – the character, look and feel, and sense of place. The Webb Architects process was a traditional planning process of identifying what needed fixing, a litany of policies and programs and a grab-bag list of everything from a department store to repairing sidewalks. Many of the community-suggested policies and programs were often mutually exclusive or contradicted other community objectives. Moreover, and this is where the community’s outrage emerged, there was no attempt to reconcile the inconsistencies and contradictions nor to give form and reality to these policies by translating them into a 3D representation of the neighborhood using visual simulations.

This is exactly what the ESC did. Taking the policies, words, numbers, and wish-lists, the ESC gave them physical form illustrating their implications and asked – “this is what you said, is this what you mean?” For example, in the case of the light rail alternative for the Irvington Commercial Corridor, the recommendations included:

- an intermodal garage for commuters working downtown,
- densities needed to support light rail,
- mixed-use development that included the introduction of new building types into the neighborhood, and
- attracting a large chain store typically found in shopping malls.

The ESC's real-time visual simulations of three light rail development scenarios (from moderate to high – by Houston neighborhood standards) showed radical change. The development scenarios were based on discussions with Webb Architects regarding the results of the first workshop and the level of consensus reached on both program and community identity. Given the response to the simulations and visualizations of the three development scenarios, it was clear there was a considerable gap in perception and expectations between the community and Webb Architects. The jump from the programs and policies to physical design appeared to be a disconnect in the process. First, the simulations and visualizations, by necessity, involved making design decisions, many as we shall see fundamental, that assumed a value system and (possibly implicit) identity that had not been explicitly discussed with the Near Northside community. Second, poor management of time and lack of clarity of purpose by Webb Architects at the workshop resulted in a limited time to discuss the issues related to each development scenario and led to the high level of community frustration because they were not being implemented.

As a result, a Community Preferences Workshop was added. Its purpose was five-fold:

- Reach agreement on the community values and sense of its identity (where it is and where it wants to be),
- Help the community understand the rules of the game such as the City of Houston development regulations,
- Translate the policy and programs presented at the proposed second workshop into a series of principles that would profoundly affect the way the Near Northside neighborhood developed,
- Understand the community's perception of itself as it currently exists, and
- Comprehend the implications of light rail on future development.

In order to both reveal and test the community's perceptions of itself, its common values, and sense of identity, the ESC focused the Near Northside community's workshop on combining a cognitive mapping narrative exercise and 3D simulations and visualizations. The mapping narrative approach was employed rather than a formal questionnaire so as not to restrict or channel the residents' responses. Members of the Steering Committee were given a "brief" that was distributed to their constituency. The brief asked each participant to describe through words and images his or her daily experience. The approach was purposely open-ended, leaving the length, format, and organization to the individual. Themes that had emerged in prior workshops (e.g., walkability, pedestrian-friendly, shopping, housing, landscaping, etc.) were mentioned in the brief, but were not required to be referred to in the narrative.

The narratives were then interpreted for environmental images. Not surprisingly, the environmental images of the residential areas were generally positive while those of the daily shopping experience were uniformly negative. The narratives revealed that shopping was generally done on foot rather than by automobile, in part because of the Latino culture and economics (where most families had one car that was used to get to work in Houston's decentralized environment). As a result, in the Near Northside neighborhood walking to reach destinations within the community is a way of life. While the narratives identified many strong service and retail destinations, they are dispersed making them difficult to access on foot. Further, the existing character of development is suburban and based on the automobile. The narratives noted the unpleasantness of negotiating curb cuts, parking lots, and discontinuous sidewalks. They also discussed the lack of shade (e.g., from trees), security (e.g., from lighting), and a place to sit (e.g., from street furniture). Implicit in the narratives was a desire to concentrate and connect compatible activities. How these objectives would be achieved, given form, and agreed upon was the goal of the Near Northside Community Preferences Workshop.

In addition to interpreting the narratives, the ESC produced a set of graphics to explain the relationship between Houston's parking requirements for specified land-uses, and a photo-realistic real-time 3D digital model to simulate and visualize potential development in the commercial/ residential areas with and without the introduction of the light rail. The 3D model was disaggregated into its constituent components (buildings, parking, streetscape, etc.) creating a set of building blocks that could easily be assembled and re-assembled to represent alternatives. The photo-realistic 3D models of retail, office, restaurants, and housing used typical Houston building types for purposes of familiarity and local context to the participants. The buildings used represented an array of types, sizes, uses, and densities. Photographs of the buildings were texture mapped on the 3D massing model of the building. The use of familiar buildings avoided the issue of architectural design, since the workshop was focused on urban design and the siting and configuration of open/ public spaces and the location of parking. The workshop was concerned with principles leading to the formulation of urban design guidelines, rather than a particular design solution, which in any case is virtually impossible in Houston's regulatory and development culture. As a result, a representative section of blocks, including residential blocks, were selected for simulation and visualization.

The choice of a real-time environment allowed the ESC to simulate a pedestrian's experience of walking from a house to the commercial corridor. It also served the additional purpose of building confidence in the openness of the workshop process, since a participant could locate themselves anywhere in the 3D model rather than be limited to either static images or animations where the viewers' path and focus are predetermined. It was important that the participants saw the 3D digital model as support for decision-making rather than as a bludgeon to manipulate decision-making.

At the workshop, the ESC presented its interpretation of the narratives and how they informed the design of the workshop, and the issues to be discussed and acted upon. The validation of the ESC's interpretation of the narratives and their translation into a series of issues dealing with connectivity, continuity, and compatibility was critical to

proceeding. Without validation by the community, the workshop would have been redirected to better understand the meaning of the narratives. As a methodology for understanding environmental images, the narratives proved to be, according to the participants, a non-threatening and non-manipulative means of inquiry.

The visualization of Houston's parking requirements proved to be an eye-opener for the participants. By visualizing the area of a typical block in the Near Northside neighborhood consumed by a use and that use's required parking, it became instantly clear what the implications of the parking requirements meant in terms of a compact walkable commercial district. While the development rules were done in the abstract, a single use at a time, the rules were used in the simulations and visualizations to accurately reflect the reality of the regulations.

An additional "reality test" was the simulation and visualization of what are called "big box" uses such as mall-style department stores. While many residents articulated a desire to have one or two in the neighborhood, their sheer size, the amount of parking, and the service requirements raised issues regarding pedestrian access, traffic and conflicts with the bordering residential use. Moreover, there were one or more blocks within the neighborhood commercial areas that could have accommodated the big box. The simulations and visualizations added clarity and substance to the discussion.

Each of the objectives was simulated and visualized using the same set of building blocks, allowing the residents to better understand that, all things being equal, the location of buildings and parking lots on a block greatly affect the pedestrian's experience. In addition, the introduction of light rail in the area also raised substantive issues, such as whether or not to "hold the corner" with a pedestrian-oriented building activity or allowing parking lots to be located at the corners. Typically, a business as usual scheme (i.e., automobile-oriented) was contrasted to one that was pedestrian oriented (i.e., parking lots behind or next to buildings versus in front of buildings, all other things being equal).

Each of the objectives was presented in side-by-side comparisons as well as in synthesized virtual reality walk-throughs on the computer (see Figures 8a and 8b, 9a and 9b). Interestingly, the side-by-side comparison allowed for a sophisticated discussion of urban design aesthetics based on the participants' analysis of their alternatives relative to whether and why they were auto-centric versus pedestrian-centric. What became clear as the workshop progressed was that, all other things being equal, the siting of buildings and parking lots either favored the driver or it favored the pedestrian. This became a fundamental choice that participants were asked to vote on. The question was posed as an "either-or" or "both-and" set of choices. The final vote unanimously favored a neighborhood whose identity is shaped by the pedestrian experience and the potential of light rail.

**Figure 8a: Plan View: Connect Activities/Parking in Rear**



**Figure 8b: Plan View: Connect Activities/Parking in Front**



**Figure 9a: Eye-level: Connect Activities/Parking in Rear**



**Figure 9b: Eye-level: Connect Activities/Parking in Front**





The next step for the consultant team and Houston’s Planning and Development Department was the translation of the workshop findings/points of consensus into design guidelines to implement the vision. Participants emphasized the power of three dimensional computer images of the place, both static and dynamic, to effectively guide the discussion and lead to future development that is consistent with the communities’ values and identity.

**Figure 10: Near Northside Public Workshop**



### **Conclusion**

In the three case studies the use of digital simulation and 3D visualization greatly enhanced the public decision-making process and the building consensus when they were an integral part of the planning and visioning process in two fundamental ways. First, the visual simulations were not used to “sell the plan/vision” but to inform its creation by the participants throughout the decision-making and consensus-building process. Second, they did it by translating the abstractness of scenarios, public policies, and the like into 3D models that palpably represented the place(s) that would result from their implementation. Unlike maps and physical models, participants could be in the 3D models and walk through them at eye level as well as query the underlying data. Moreover, the visual simulations were used iteratively, responding to participants’ suggestions. The 3D models were quickly modified and new scenarios created, visually simulating policies and scenarios before they are implemented to ensure that—to quote Dr. Seuss’s Horton—“I meant what I said and I said what I meant.”

The Baltimore Vision 2030 demonstrated that digital simulation and 3D visualization could be applied to help a regional citizenry, living in cities, town and in rural areas, to determine the future of the region by evaluating the implications of a range of agreed upon growth patterns and scenarios. The Master Planning Initiative in Santa Fe was also faced with a question of “how to grow” but in the much more limited geography of a new district in Santa Fe. Finally, the experience of the Near Northside Economic Revitalization Planning Process demonstrated visualization and simulation being used to help determine how a neighborhood would develop with regards to transportation (that is, considering the concerns of pedestrians in a city reliant on the car). It also showed how the process can go awry when the use of visual simulation has not been carefully integrated.

The costs of simulation and visualization have been noted. However, given the vast amounts of time, money, and political capital at stake in any planning project, it is well worth it. It is an investment that helps to assure that the local community will appreciate your planning project because in a way, it is their project too.

## **Notes**

The core technology employed by the ESC was ArcViewGIS, a spatial database whose output is typically expressed in maps, charts, and tables, none of which by themselves either resemble the world of everyday experience nor are easily accessible to lay people. It is axiomatic that people experience the world in three-dimensions, in time, and in motion. In response to this need the ESC has developed software and applications that seamlessly integrate words, numbers, maps, and images in a real-time 3D environment (e.g., CommunityViz™). Further, the tools have been designed to support both deductive reasoning (analysis) and inductive reasoning (design, what ifs).

### **Vision 2030: Shaping our Region's Future Together**

#### **Background**

Vision 2030: Shaping our Region's Future Together was an initiative of the Baltimore (Maryland) Regional Transportation Board of the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Baltimore region. Additional support was provided by the Baltimore Metropolitan Council, a private non-profit regional planning agency and the Baltimore Regional Partnership, an alliance of civic and environmental groups that share a common agenda of enhancing quality of life through community revitalization and environmental protection.

ACP –Visioning and Planning (ACP) with its expertise in conducting regional visions was the lead consultant. The ESC was a member of the ACP team of five subconsultants.

### **Southwest Santa Fe: City/County Master Plan Initiative**

#### **Background**

The study was initiated by the Santa Fe City Council. Subsequently, after discussions with the County and members of the public, the planning area was expanded to coincide with the area undergoing development pressure. The Southwest Santa Fe Planning Area falls within both City and County jurisdictions and, as a result, two entirely different sets of land development regulations. A Steering Group, representative of the Southwest Santa Fe community, provided project oversight and the Planning Department of Santa Fe provided logistical and technical support.

The prime consultants were ACP and the ESC. Local consultants contributed their knowledge of the Santa Fe region and assisted in the implementation of the public outreach and participation program.

## **Near Northside Economic Revitalization Planning Process**

### **Background**

The Near Northside Economic Revitalization Planning Process was an initiative of the City of Houston. It was supported by grants from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the Main Street Revitalization Project, with contributions from Avenue CDC, a local community development corporation. Webb Architects was selected to prepare the plan, which included the identification of key economic development nodes. The work also encompassed two other parallel efforts: 1) the “Houston Neighborhood Market Drill Down” by Social Compact Inc., a retail market study of the neighborhood's potential buying power, and 2) the Community Preferences Workshops, conducted by the ESC and funded by HUD’s Community Technology Initiative grant. The public workshops resulted in community consensus on a planning vision and the implementation of urban design guidelines for Houston's Near Northside.