Smart Growth

Rewriting the City: Repairing America's Urban Fabric with Smart Growth

Nathan Elliott Shantz

Author manuscript for *The Sage Encyclopedia of Environmental Justice*, edited by Dorceta E. Taylor. SAGE Publications, 2026.

The post-World War II era marked a significant divergence in urban development patterns between the United States and much of the rest of the world. While Europe, East Asia, and many Latin American regions maintained their tradition of compact, mixed-use, transit-accessible urban centers, America pursued a dramatically different path. This distinctive American approach to city planning and suburban expansion would eventually prompt a critical reassessment, leading to the emergence of policies to counteract such trends, collectively known as Smart Growth.

Beginning in the 1950s, new federal programs such as the GI Bill and FHA-backed mortgages encouraged white, middle-class families to move to newly built suburbs, often through racially restrictive covenants. Simultaneously, inner-city neighborhoods—many of them home to Black and immigrant communities—were systematically disinvested, redlined, and later fragmented by urban renewal and highway projects. This was not a natural evolution of human settlement but a deliberate reshaping of the urban landscape—one that prioritized cars over people, private lots over public space, and exclusion over integration. This divergence in development patterns not only embedded racial segregation into the physical structure of cities, but also drove massive environmental degradation, auto dependency, and unequal access to services and opportunity.

While many nations retained compact urban forms and invested in public transit, the American model entrenched spatial inequality. Even the closest parallel to America's development —Northern neighbor Canada— while experiencing postwar suburban expansion, its cities such as Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal, preserved stronger urban cores than their American counterparts. This was due in part to more sustained investment in public transit, a greater emphasis on urban density, and less aggressive use of exclusionary zoning. Meanwhile, in the United States, environmental burdens—such as air pollution, contaminated sites, and noise—were disproportionately placed near low-income and minority neighborhoods, while the benefits of development accrued elsewhere. These patterns have persisted into the 21st century, with consequences that span public health, climate change, and environmental justice.

Smart Growth emerged as a response to these uniquely American challenges. It seeks to reverse the damage wrought by decades of sprawl by promoting denser, walkable, transit-connected, and equitable communities. Importantly, Smart Growth is not just about better design—it is about redressing the legacy of segregation and environmental injustice baked into the postwar American city.

From Sprawl to Smart Growth: A Historical Reckoning

The post–World War II expansion of American suburbs was not simply a free-market response to growing housing demand as the parents of the Baby Boomer generation sought to establish family life. Rather, it was propelled by a web of federal legislation, infrastructure investment, and housing policies that actively encouraged, financed, and prioritized suburban development. This coordinated policy agenda—ranging from federally backed mortgages to massive highway construction—played a central role in the degradation of inner cities, increased environmental pollution from car-dependent commuting, and the deepening of socioeconomic and racial segregation across metropolitan areas.

From the late 1940s to the 1960s, the suburban ideal—detached homes on large lots with separate commercial zones, expansive parking lots, and wide roads—became enshrined in zoning regulations across the country. Most notably, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 funded the nationwide interstate highway system, further enhancing access to suburban areas. This suburban ideal also encouraged Americans to rely heavily on their cars while limiting housing supplies and increasing living costs.

Exclusionary zoning practices—including minimum lot sizes, restrictions on multi-family housing, and excessive parking requirements—burden low-income communities by limiting affordable housing options and restricting access to social services. These zoning laws have ultimately contributed to enduring patterns of residential segregation and an unequal distribution of access to quality education, healthcare, and environmental amenities (Walker, 2012).

Reimagining Urban Spaces: The Core of Smart Growth

The Smart Growth movement gained significant momentum in the 1990s, as a response to the environmental, social, and spatial consequences of postwar suburban sprawl. Urban planner Peter Calthorpe, a pioneer of transit-oriented development, helped shape the movement's early vision through his advocacy for human-scaled, environmentally sustainable urban design. Around the same time, architects like Andrés Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk contributed to the rise of New Urbanism, emphasizing traditional neighborhood design and compact, mixed-use development. These ideas found institutional backing through federal efforts such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's launch of the Smart Growth Network in 1996, and the emergence of non-profit coalitions like Smart Growth America, which began organizing broad support for comprehensive urban reform. Academic voices and environmental justice advocates—such as Robert Bullard—also played a critical role by highlighting how marginalized communities bore the brunt of toxic land-use decisions and car-centric planning under the current model.

The essence of the Smart Growth movement lies in reimagining neighborhoods as safe, sanitary, toxin-free, and compact. It provides a framework for designing cities as interconnected networks of walkable communities, where daily needs—housing, work, education, and recreation—can be met

without reliance on extensive car travel, thereby reducing environmental harm and promoting equitable access to urban opportunity.

Voluminous research indicates that smart growth is an effective remedy for reducing automobile dependence and environmental degradation. Smart growth initiatives aimed at enhancing public transportation and reducing car usage have lowered greenhouse gas emissions and improved air quality in various cities (Gren et al., 2018).

Smart Growth strategies and tools offer the potential to address issues of social equity and environmental justice:

Mixed-Use Development combines residential, commercial, and recreational spaces to create vibrant community centers. By integrating housing with retail, office spaces, and public amenities, mixed-use development reduces travel requirements and encourages urban communities to stay active throughout the day. Amsterdam serves as a salient example of mixed-use development. Amsterdam's innovative urban planning approach to the circular economy has led to dense, mixed-use neighborhoods featuring extensive canal-based public transport and biking infrastructure. Additionally, Amsterdam has launched a series of initiatives aimed at minimizing waste and reusing materials in construction and operations (Lee, 2019).

Environmental Sustainability and Green Infrastructure preserve farmland, wetlands, and green spaces to protect ecosystems. Harnessing green infrastructure tools—such as urban forests, bioswales, and permeable surfaces—into smart growth plans offers significant benefits for environmental justice. Green infrastructure effectively manages stormwater, alleviates urban heat islands, increases biodiversity, enhances air quality, reduces flooding risks, and improves natural access for marginalized communities that have historically lacked these amenities. Chattanooga demonstrates how industrial cities can reinvent their environmental systems through Smart Growth principles. Once known as the "dirtiest city in America" due to severe air pollution from heavy industry, Chattanooga implemented a comprehensive revitalization strategy that included restoration of the Tennessee Riverfront with public parks and walking paths, redevelopment of brownfields into mixed-use districts, creation of an electric shuttle system in the downtown core, and green building initiatives including LEED-certified public facilities (Bullard, 2005).

Energy-efficient buildings and climate-resilient designs also significantly lessen environmental impacts and nurture resilience within communities amid the climate crisis (Bullard, 2005). Portland, Oregon's implementation of an urban growth boundary in 1979 has made it a laboratory for Smart Growth policies in the United States. By limiting outward expansion, Portland’s boundary has preserved surrounding farmland and natural areas, encouraged infill development and higher densities within the urban area, supported the viability of public transportation systems, and reduced per capita carbon emissions compared to similarly sized metropolitan areas (Lee, 2019).

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) expands public transit, bike lanes, and pedestrian networks to offer equitable mobility options. TOD clusters housing, jobs, and services around transit hubs,

maximizing accessibility and minimizing car dependence. Americans living in neighborhoods influenced by TOD drive one-third fewer miles than those in car-centric suburbs. Transit-oriented development serves as a vital solution to the climate crisis by significantly reducing driving and shrinking the country’s carbon footprint.

Affordable housing and inclusive zoning institutionalize non-discriminatory zoning ordinances while prioritizing affordable housing options in mixed-income neighborhoods. Washington, D.C.'s Inclusionary Zoning Program exemplifies this tenet by mandating that new residential developments include affordable units. Since its implementation in 2009, this residential program has created thousands of affordable housing units in neighborhoods that are inaccessible to low-income residents (Cisneros & Bowdler, 2016). Smart growth counters historical socioeconomic and racial segregation patterns by providing diverse, dignified, and affordable housing options across a community.

Smart Growth in Action: Global Case Studies

Medellín, Colombia's transformation from a center of violence to a model of effective urban planning illustrates how Smart Growth can advance environmental justice. The city's Metrocable system connected informal hillside settlements to the metro system, transforming mobility for marginalized communities that had previously faced arduous commutes down steep, winding roads. Before this Smart Growth intervention, residents had to walk through neighborhoods marked by high crime or depend on costly transportation options to access the city center. The cable car network significantly reduced travel times and transportation costs for residents, while catalyzing additional public investments in these previously underserved areas.

Medellín's urban planners didn't stop with transportation. They created high-quality public spaces and parks in neighborhoods that had never had them before, built "library parks" that combined educational resources with recreational facilities, developed green corridors that enhanced air quality and pedestrian connectivity, and implemented participatory budgeting processes that empowered residents to guide local investments (Walker, 2012).

European cities have pioneered innovative approaches to Smart Growth with strong equity components. Barcelona's "Superblocks" (Superilles) initiative restricts vehicle access to groups of city blocks, reclaiming streets for pedestrians, cyclists, and green spaces. Superblocks has significantly reduced air and noise pollution while increasing public space in densely populated neighborhoods.

Vienna's model of social housing demonstrates how Smart Growth can advance housing equity. Vienna invests in energy efficient public housing units characterized by easy access to public transit, ensuring that low-income populations are not displaced as environmental amenities improve. By maintaining approximately 220,000 city-owned apartments (approximately 25% of the housing stock), Vienna has developed integrated neighborhoods where residents of different income levels benefit from smart urban design and green infrastructure (Cisneros & Bowdler,

2016). While not a perfect system, having municipalities implement an urban planning system that incorporates Smart Growth principles can lead to better outcomes for its occupants.

The Atlanta BeltLine showcases the Smart Growth strategy by converting 22 miles of neglected railway corridors into a network of parks, trails, and transit options. This initiative has revitalized previously neglected areas by fostering economic development, improving walkability, and expanding green spaces in communities throughout Atlanta's metropolitan area. The BeltLine also offers sustainable commuting options that reduce highway congestion and enhance public health by encouraging active lifestyles.

The Environmental Health Imperative

The health implications of urban sprawl are profound and unequally distributed. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, African Americans and Latinos are almost three times more likely than whites to die from asthma. One in every four American children lives in an area that regularly exceeds EPA ozone standards. Smart Growth can save lives by reducing deadly air pollution, which claims 70,000 lives a year—nearly twice the number killed in traffic accidents (Bullard, 2005).

The Bronx River Greenway in New York City illustrates these health benefits. This community-led initiative transformed a neglected waterway that had become a dumping ground into a series of parks and trails connecting diverse neighborhoods. Bronz's greenway improved air quality by creating new green spaces, reduced flooding risks through ecological restoration, and provided recreational opportunities in an area that had long lacked adequate park access (Walker, 2012).

The economic dimension of equitable access is particularly important for low-income families. Spending on transportation is lowest in metropolitan regions with strong public transit systems. For working-poor homeowners, nearly 25 percent of household income is consumed by housing and commuting expenses, compared with just 15.3 percent for other households. In some rural counties in the predominantly Black and low-income Mississippi Delta, families spend over 13 percent of their take-home income on gasoline—rivaling what they spend on food and housing (Cisneros & Bowdler, 2016).

Stockholm's congestion pricing system discourages excessive car use while generating funds for public transportation expansion. Berlin also focuses on redeveloping abandoned buildings and brownfields rather than expanding into Greenfields, while investing in green roofs, urban forests, and energy-efficient housing policies.

Low Emission Zones (LEZs) in European cities like London, Paris, Berlin, and Milan represent another emerging trend, restricting high-pollution vehicles to improve air quality, particularly in low-income neighborhoods historically subjected to higher pollution levels. These policies directly address the environmental health inequities that have resulted from conventional urban development patterns (Walker, 2012).

Policy Reforms for Smart Growth

Mixed-use zoning and form-based codes prioritize walkability and access to public transit by regulating the physical form of buildings rather than strictly separating their uses. These methods encourage human-scale development, supporting diverse transportation options and vibrant public spaces.

The Smart Growth Network has developed ten fundamental principles for achieving Smart Growth: mix land uses; utilize compact building design; create a range of housing opportunities and choices; design walkable neighborhoods; foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place; preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas; strengthen and direct development towards existing communities; provide a variety of transportation choices; make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost-effective; and encourage collaboration among community members and stakeholders in development decisions (Lee, 2019).

Smart Growth Network’s principles align with findings from the IMD Smart City Index. This index evaluates cities based on both technological factors and residents' perceptions of how "smart" their cities are in improving their lives. The IMD Smart City Index reveals that the most successful smart cities emphasize not just technological solutions but also prioritize inclusive access to amenities, affordable housing, and public transit—key components of Smart Growth. According to the 2024 IMD annual report, cities that rank highest on the index, such as Canberra, Zurich, Oslo, Geneva, and Singapore have implemented comprehensive strategies that integrate technological innovation with equitable access to services across socioeconomic groups (IMD Smart City Index, 2024). While wealthier cities tend to rank highest on the index, we believe that middle-income and lower income cities also have this opportunity to utilize the principles to great effect.

Climate Resilience and Regional Equity

Climate resilience is increasingly integral to Smart Growth planning. As communities confront escalating climate-related risks—including extreme heat, flooding, and wildfire threats—equitable adaptation strategies have become essential components of sustainable urban development. The global climate crisis will elevate temperatures on hot summer days, potentially resulting in more unhealthy "red alert" air pollution days, with the most vulnerable populations experiencing the earliest and most damaging setbacks despite contributing least to the problem (Bullard, 2005).

The IMD Smart City Index highlights this climate resilience dimension, noting significant disparities in how cities approach environmental sustainability and climate adaptation. The index shows that top-performing cities have integrated climate resilience into their broader Smart Growth strategies through investments in green infrastructure, transitions to renewable energy, and the development of sustainable transportation systems. Notably, cities with the highest scores on environmental metrics tend to prioritize equitable access to green spaces and climate adaptation measures across all neighborhoods, not just affluent ones. This approach addresses the "climate

justice gap" that often leaves low-income communities more vulnerable to climate impacts (IMD Smart City Index, 2025).

The EU Green Deal, aiming for climate neutrality by 2050, drives innovative approaches to climate-resilient Smart Growth. Stockholm's eco-district Hammarby Sjöstad demonstrates how renewable energy, smart water management, and green spaces can be integrated into urban planning to enhance resilience. Similarly, Germany's Energiewende (energy transition) includes retrofitting programs that reduce energy costs for low-income households, ensuring that climate adaptation benefits reach those most vulnerable to energy poverty (Lee, 2019).

Addressing equity in the nation's metropolitan regions, cities, suburbs, and rural areas yields positive economic, environmental, and health impacts. Regional equity initiatives strengthen institutions and enhance infrastructure through policies that promote equitable public and private investment (Cisneros & Bowdler, 2016).

The absence of a national urban policy has left hundreds of financially strapped cities and their aging first-ring suburbs in a "sink-or-swim" position. Generally, central cities and their older suburbs are becoming increasingly resource inefficient, while developing and sprawling suburbs are growing resource rich. The socio-spatial layout and negative relations between cities, older suburbs, and newer suburbs have resulted from decades of policies and practices that isolate poor people of color (Bullard, 2005).

Conclusion: Economic Imperatives for Urban Reform

The evidence from global urban development patterns indicates that Smart Growth presents a viable framework for addressing the inefficiencies created by 20th-century urban planning. The coming decades require a systematic reorientation of our built environment to correct market failures and internalize externalities that have long been excluded from development calculations.

Urban sprawl generates measurable economic costs: increased infrastructure expenditure, higher transportation costs, inefficient land use, and significant health expenditures related to sedentary lifestyles. Analysis of cities implementing Smart Growth principles demonstrates tangible returns on investment through reduced municipal service costs, lower healthcare expenditures, and more productive land utilization.

Data from the IMD Smart City Index reveals that cities achieving higher rankings have implemented cost-effective technological solutions that address specific market inefficiencies. These cities demonstrate that technological investment produces optimal outcomes when governance structures ensure equitable distribution of benefits across demographic groups.

The housing affordability challenges observed across diverse urban markets indicate that supply constraints must be addressed through targeted density increases and regulatory reform. Mixed-use development creates multiple revenue streams from the same land parcel, improving financial viability while providing proximity benefits that reduce transportation costs for residents.

The economic case for walkable communities, reduced automobile dependence, and integrated development is compelling: lower infrastructure maintenance costs, reduced energy consumption, and improved labor productivity through better health outcomes and reduced commuting time. These benefits generate positive returns for both public and private investment.

The promise of Smart Growth extends beyond balance sheets and efficiency metrics. As cities from Warsaw to Medellín demonstrate, even modest investments in walkable neighborhoods, public transportation, and integrated spaces yield powerful human returns: communities where children walk safely to school, where local businesses thrive, and where residents enjoy both productivity and leisure. While challenges remain, the economic foundations for this transformation are increasingly solid, offering a practical path to cities that are not only more efficient but fundamentally more livable for all residents, regardless of income or background. This urban evolution represents one of our most promising opportunities to create lasting prosperity that can be broadly shared across generations.

References

Alexander, D., & Tomalty, R. (2002). Smart Growth and Sustainable Development: Challenges, solutions and policy directions. Local Environment, 7(4), 397–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/1354983022000027578

Bowdler, J., Cisneros, H., Lubell, J., & Phillips, P. L. (2017). Building Equitable Cities: How to Drive Economic Mobility and Regional Growth. trid.trb.org. https://trid.trb.org/View/1512274

Bullard, R. D. (2006). The quest for environmental justice: Human rights and the politics of pollution. Choice (Chicago, Ill.), 44(03), 44-1599-44–1599. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.44-1599

Bullard, Robert D. (2007). Growing smarter: Achieving livable communities, environmental justice, and regional equity (Robert D. Bullard, Ed.). Mit Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=NAcmSchlTOYC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Growing+smarter+achieving+livable+communities,+environmental+justice,+and+regional+equity&ots=X4O2h8jtC4&sig=V4dEkfItnv6w85IHsU_DJOshRlY

IMD Smart City 2025 Report. (2025). https://imd.widen.net/s/psdrsvpbk7/imdsmart_city_2025_report

Walker, G. (2012). Environmental justice: Concepts, evidence and politics. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203610671