# Designing Spatial Planning Codes for Sustainable Outcomes in Park City, Utah

A Case Study of Park City's Land Management Code

Makena Hawley

Sustainable Cities (M.Sc.)

December 2022

**AALBORG UNIVERSITY**
STUDENT REPORT

**Study:** MSc Sustainable Cities, 4th semester
**Title:** Designing Spatial Planning Codes for Sustainable Outcomes in Park City, Utah
**Semester theme:** Master Thesis
**Project period:** 30 September 2022 – 21 December 2022
**ECTS:** 30
**Supervisor:** Jacob Norvig Larsen

**Abstract:**

American planning practices have become synonymous with sprawl and specifically American zoning practices have been known to create more sprawl than their European counterparts. Compact development creates opportunities for more efficient infrastructure, creates less land waste, reduces resource use, and reduces the need to maintain a car for accessibility.

To present a case study, there is a small resort town in Utah, USA called Park City. The town is idyllic, surrounded by mountains and forest, and was a host of the 2002 Winter Olympics, but like other struggling cities, it is dealing with issues like affordable housing and congestion along with classic sprawling spatial planning in much of the developed city.

This thesis will investigate a high level of American verse European planning practices and be followed by an analysis of Park City, Utah's, social structures surrounding the Land Management Code, presenting it through the lens of the Actor Network Theory to initiate a foundational framework to utilize for future studies comparing development codes of similar international cities.

Makena Hawley

Number printed: 0 Pieces (in Digital Exam)
Pages: 42
Appendix: 27

# Table of Contents

## Acknowledgments

## List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| Actor Network Theory | ANT |
| Bebauungsplan | B-Plan |
| Floor Area Ration | FAR |
| Land Management Code | LMC |
| Local Development Frameworks | LDF |
| Not In My Backyard | NIMBY |
| Park City | PC |
| Plan d'Occupation des Soles | POS |
| Single Family Dwelling | SFD |
| United States | US |

## Preface

The work presented in this report is the result of a thesis project for the master program Sustainable Cities carried out at Aalborg University (AAU), Department of Planning, under the supervision of Jacob Norvig Larsen. The research was conducted in the period of September to December 2022. The source of reference used in the report is APA.

The principles of this work are initiated from influential city planners like Jaen Jacobs and Jan Gehl, also specifically being swayed by David Sim and his work in Soft City. Bred as an American City Planner, getting the experience to move to Denmark and gaining a true sense of a human scaled city changed my life and my work. Experiencing the lifestyle created by a cities-for-people movement required a swift departure from Modernist city planning practices. I hope this paper and future work will support, if only by a tiny margin, more compact development, sustainability and enhancement of quality in life for cities all over the world.

## 1. Introduction

As cities are built, their form, pattern, and function can be secured in place for decades, which notes the importance of initial good planning practices and how those perceived good planning practices affect the outcome of the built environment and the community. The book City Rules explores the ideology of how rules, essentially city development codes, encourage development practices in the US and identifies "Codes engage a reality that can lead to resounding defeat of anti-urbanistic practice." (Talen, 2012, p. xi). Talen describes in her book how land use regulations in the United States (US) have regressed from sincere applications toward healthier communities to burdensome legal barriers that need to be overcome by the community (2012). Furthermore, the book describes how American planning has been distinguished by a general lack of urbanism quality as well as sprawl, segregation, and dis-investment towards the downtown of the city. Turner (2013) points to sustainable urbanism practices to combat the negative characteristics of urban sprawl.

Compared to sprawl, more compact development has been known to be more energy conscious (Næss, 2001), provide more efficient use of infrastructure, and create less land waste, preserving more natural land and wildlife (Basiago, 1996). Compact development also reduces the need for community members to maintain a car for accessibility (which supports less $CO_2$ emissions, less land waste for car storage, and increases the mobile abilities of a larger population of the community - being people with different abilities that may prohibit them from driving, senior citizens that can't drive any longer or children under the age of 16).

'City Rules' goes over the necessity of 'good urbanism,' which Talen (2012) described as:

> *"as compact urban form that encourages pedestrian activity and minimizes environmental degradation; encourages social, economic, and land use diversity as opposed to homogeneity; connects uses and functions; has a quality public realm that provides opportunities for interaction and exchange; offers equitable access to goods, services, and facilities; and protects environmental and human health. Bad urbanism is the opposite: disconnected, automobile-dependent, land consumptive, environmentally degrading, single-*

*use, homogeneous, inequitable, and inaccessible, and with a low-quality, poorly designed public realm (p.2, see Talen, 2011)."*

Over the last decade, studies have been completed (Stone 2004, Glaeser and Gyourko 2002, Talen and Knapp, 2003.) attempting to review the connection between the rules and regulations applied to development areas and the outcomes that take place because of them. There are many factors that are affecting the outcomes of form and function in our cities; however, the development rules and regulations governing a city can have an especially significant influence in terms of the building pattern, resource use, connectivity, and livability of the community, as they dictate in code what can be built, and where.

This is not different across the world, nor does it differentiate if you are in large cities or small, and many cities are facing similar challenges. However, American zoning practices, in particular, is noted as creating more sprawl than its international counterparts. Sonia Hirt, whose work broadly covers US zoning topics and comparative studies of the US to European planning practices, highlighted, "Traditional American zoning separates land uses, yet many urbanists and contemporary planners argue that bringing mixed-use back to the American city is the key to restoring its vibrancy." (Hirt, 2007, p.436).

Hirt has published several articles and books that create analysis on American verse European city planning, which has provided an overview of cultural, spatial planning differences and illuminated an exciting perspective. As American cities are often considered to have larger spatial planning practices, it could be interesting to review the development codes of an American city compared to international cities. Reviewing development codes and their subsequential built environment or outcomes could reveal opportunities for code reform in the US.

To present a case study, there is a small resort town in Utah, USA, called Park City. The town is idyllic, surrounded by mountains and forest, and was a host of the 2002 Winter Olympics. However, like other struggling cities, it is dealing with issues like affordable housing and congestion along with classic sprawling spatial planning in much of the developed city. By taking similar tourist-based cities in Europe, those that maintain a conceptually better compact development pattern, and analyzing their

development codes, perhaps the analysis could link the written code and the built environment that it exists in. This could provide an international perspective and shed light on American planning practices and the different routes that other countries have developed. What would the development code of Park City reveal of the built environment as it exists currently and further as a cue as to what is possible to be built in the future? Looking at similar but international resort town development codes for comparison could help clarify opportunities for more 'European-like' compact development in an American city.

Measuring compact development policies against the existing Park City development code could clarify changes allowing support of more sustainable development, compact and walkable neighborhoods. The code is where planners need to start to affect the formation of cities and allow for positive urbanism outcomes and more informed planning practices. If, at the minimum, planners need to ensure the code is not explicitly blocking compact development.

## 2. Problem Formulation

### 2.1 Foundation of Problem Formulation

Research tells us that European cities create rules to promote a principal urban function compared to American cities that practice a type of "exclusive" zoning. In the US, the default planning practice is culturally acceptable to separate more uses from each other, compared to a more 'inclusive' European style of mixing them. Usually, the tradeoff of regulations can be found in more strict design requirements that are in keeping with the city's character.

The development, or planning code, of cities could be seen as a socially constructed entity, swaying back and forth, being pushed and pulled by different actors or social forces residing in that network or community. To better comprehend a comparative study, it is best to begin by understanding the cultural planning system of Park City (PC) through a structured analysis, and after completing a similar analysis in the identical structured framework, the town of PC and a comparison town could offer more significant report of their differences.

While it is necessary and valuable to consider all solutions to counter sprawl development, one particular solution may be available in reviewing the city's own regulatory code, known locally, as the Land Management Code (LMC). In the past decade, studies have been completed on American cities attempting to craft policy change that suggests reversing auto-oriented development by adopting different types of codes such as Form Based and New Urbanism (Cysek-Pawlak, M.M. & Pabich, M. 2021). These are also excellent tools, however, rather than adopting new codes, what if it was possible to review the existing code to reduce regulations or change them within the existing context to incentivize the development of more affordable type units and pedestrian or transit-oriented development.

At times, it is essential to realize the significance of an outsider's perspective to understand one's own situation. For example, single family zones in the US, that strictly limit the designated area to only detached, single family homes are noted by Sofia Hirt (2007 and 2012) as exceedingly different from other planning cultures that also have SFD zones but are expected and entitled to include duplexes or multi-unit dwellings as well as low intensity commerce, provided to enhance daily life. This concept seems foreign in small town America.

Since other cultures maintain different planning and development practices, there is much to gain from other processes and policies. It could be very informative to create a structured comparison with similar types of cities (area, population, economic situation) and review where codes may be supporting or limiting sustainability initiatives, by analyzing the existing code and the city's-built environment. In order to end up with a comparison, however, the city should understand itself in a structured method in order to have an even playing field to measure against other countries and be able to delineate differences. In this case the social structure will be reviewed to initiate foundational understandings.

### 2.2 Problem Analysis

US Cities need to evolve in a more sustainable manner. This could include walkable and compact development, which could influence utility length and resources, less resource intensive mobility increases, less land waste, healthier daily habits and increase in community awareness. Advancing our societies through more efficient resource management and planning could lead to more sustainable outcomes for the city as well as increase livability standards. In a recent article in Forbes, it was noted that through UNESCO a study will complete a study examining how the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals can be contributed to through urban design and architecture (Nikel, 2022).

### 2.3 Narrowing the Project Scope

Gathering research on international planning policy revealed that with time allotment, the research scope required a reduction of scale. In order to properly compare development codes in the future, first, similar cities would be required to be identified. Second, those cities would require a similar framework or lens to be compared through. This would make for a more methodological comparison and allow for the data to yield more informed knowledge as the entities would be compared at the same scale.

The end goal of this project would be to create a network of similar type cities that could each have a review under the ANT analysis and finally be compared to reveal differences in networks, actors, artifacts, and the relationships between them. To begin, this paper will focus solely on an analysis of Park City, Utah's network and what additional concepts can be revealed from this.

## 2.4 Problem Statement

If a planner is attempting to create change for a more sustainable future, they will need to codify changes that will affect the future built environment which will require them to interact directly with, and understand deeply, the Land Management Code and its network. Therefore, the overarching question that this paper attempts to answer is:

***What social characteristics exist within the Network of the Park City Land Management Code?***

In order to reach the answer to this Problem Formulation, additional questions will support the details to reach the overall goal:

1. Who are the actors in the assemblage?
2. What are the artifacts?
3. What relationships appear to be the most influential in the Park City planning realm?

This thesis will investigate a high level of American verse European planning practices and be followed by an analysis of Park City, Utah's, social structures surrounding the Land Management Code, presenting it through the lens of the Actor Network Theory to initiate a foundational framework to utilize for future studies comparing development codes of international cities.

## 3. Theory – Actor-Network Theory (ANT)

This section reviews the Actor Network Theory (ANT) which lends its qualitative analysis lens as a framework that could reveal strengths or weaknesses between entities that create change. Using the theory section to establish a foundation, the scope of the project is introduced, followed by additional methods utilized to gather and analyze data. The methods involve a literature review of foreign planning paradigms and a qualitative content analysis of interviews gathered of different significant stakeholders in Park City.

Rydin and Tate conducted research in the planning field using ANT and find that the theoretical lens could play a role in creating and supporting progressive agendas and could lead to new forms of planning practice (2016). ANT has grown from previous theories and approaches from people like French Philosopher Bruno Latour (1999). It developed further with a slight change in direction from people like French philosopher Deleuze and psychoanalyst Guattari (1988) that sought to include a foundation of scientific philosophy that took into consideration the inconsistency of relationships between society and nature that were far too complex.

As researchers began developing these ideals, interest regarding societal relationships grew in the Social Theory field (Rydin & Tate, 2016). The new theories proposed that society is an accumulation of actors or components and that the intricacies of the relationships between these, is the primary focus, verse the components themselves (Rydin & Tate, 2016). ANT focuses the perspective on the relationships between actors and artifacts. In an oversimplified explanation, the lens through which we view ANT focuses on the relationships of the actors, a biological entity, and an artifact, or a material object, developing in a limited network where the actors are attempting to overcome something or reach stabilization.

A social change requiring shifts of all those involved, humans or objects, is usually change on a large scale. To offer a different approach for future initiatives or policies, ANT could suggest different approaches be applied when planners are proposing new sustainability policies or developments. Below describes the aspects of ANT and the different ways the theory can apply practically to policy proposals. If strategic review of relationships of power can be better understood, then it is possible that those relationships can be critically reviewed as well to gain support.

### 3.1 Exploration of Theory

Everything affecting the social situation is in the same field which means nothing past the network, anything external is affecting this specific situation or its participants. All entities in the network are equally important and included. The network provides a map of all human and non-human entities, assuming that relations are both between people, things, and concepts. The theory differentiates itself additionally as it places human, non-human entities, and material objects as equal. The emphasis of the theory also focuses, not on "explaining" the social activity, but rather on "describing" it to review the situation. The actors can belong to many networks, not only the one. However, all the elements in a specific network gain causality or power from connections between them in that specific network. Rydin and Tate (2016) explain that power within ANT is attributed to the associations of the actors rather than the actor itself being considered powerful (due to an accumulation of resources, for example).

From 1986, a framework created by sociology professor Callon (1986) persists, as valuable for utilize four stages to structure the research (Rydin & Tate, 2016). The structure begins with problematization that identifies a problem, the provocation for the ANT analysis. Usually, an item to be overcome. Next is Interessment. This describes how actors are brought into the network and how those relationships between outside and existing actors are strengthened. Third, identifies enrollment as new actors are brought in and finally, mobilizing, which, as it suggests, constitutes of actors organizing towards a common goal.

### 3.1.1 Actors and Artifacts

When reviewing ANT, the researcher will begin with actors and artifacts. Actors are considered human and non-human, biological entities (like community members, or city planners), while artifacts are non-human objects (such as a document, a development code, or a concept). The actors and artifacts are considered the source of an action or relationship to something else.

An excellent example to deepen the understanding would be from the work of Rydin and Tate (2016) describing these entities in a practical situation:

> "*In Guy et al.'s analysis of the implementation of a seawater district heating and cooling system in The Hague, we see a social housing agency enroll its residents in support of the process through a gift of free cookware compatible*

*with the new ovens required under the new system. Gestures such as these, while small, can be integral to the professional toolkit for planners seeking change linked to cultural shifts from those inclined to resist or protest. ANT and assemblage theory also provide a particularly unique vantage point in appreciating the importance of material objects (e.g., cookware)." (p. 16).*

### 3.1.2 Network Assemblage

*"An ANT account is based on understanding the dynamic ways in which relationships between actants are forged, negotiated and maintained. Indeed, Latour rather regretted the use of the network metaphor because it tends to suggest stability rather than* flux (Law and Mol, 2001: 612–613). *He favoured a commitment to fluidity in relations and to 'uncertainties, ambivalences, transgressions and resistances' (Murdoch, 1998: 364*)" (Rydin, 2013).

The concepts involved must be understood to enlighten the theory and provide additional emphasis and perspectives. The overarching concept of Network Assemblage is the best place to begin. The network creates a web map analysis of the actors and artifacts involved in the network and the coinciding relationships and connections between the entities (Callon, 1986 & Sovacool, 2017). While conducting the study for this report, network assemblage is helpful to confirm and connect the actors and artifacts involved in the Park City Land Management Code.

It's common for city planners to address many relationships, such as elected officials and community members (actors), as it's also common to hold open houses or workshops (artifacts) to gain community buy-in. However, research does not show that this theoretical form has been utilized commonly in regard to city planning locally. ANT allows an exciting perspective on the actors and artifacts as the relationships of these entities has a unique view of power dynamics. The theory proposes a view of power "as something to be channeled, rather than held" (Rydin & Tate, 2016). This supports the illumination of the power dynamics taking place between actors and through artifacts. This can be an advantageous understanding when considering stakeholders of the project and how to keep the strength within that relationship. Rydin and Tate (2016) further discuss the benefits of ANT as it creates a framework to review the repetitive and dynamic nature of power being transferred through relationships of actors and artifacts. Additionally, if changes are introduced to the network, due to conglomerations of effective relationships, it can result in a new artifact, such as a

policy or a law (Rydin & Tate, 2016). The shift in power dynamics could cause destabilization in the network which creates an opportunity for those aware of it.

### 3.1.3 Translation

The next concept, that takes place within the Actor Theory Network is known as 'Translation'. This essentially assigns a 'value' of the artifacts or the actors. The process involves reviewing what type or amount of interest lies within the actor or artifact, and why.

It would essentially identify the 'how and why' an actor would be interested in the network, artifact, or actor. What are the mutual understandings and the mutual benefits of working together (Callon, 1986). These actors can be a human entity (a resident or a city councilor) or non-human (like a tree or a wetland). Translation can refer to if the actor is effectively communicating how joining the network can benefit the new actor. Translation can also reveal how failure to recruit a new actor to the network can illuminate lack of common interest (Rydin & Tate, 2016). For example, it could be seen as a 're-definition' of a construct that persuades other actors to support the requirements of the network.

### 3.1.4 Enrollment

Following Translation there is the concept of 'Enrollment'. If translation refers to the communication and substance of the relationship, enrollment is confirmation of power being transferred as one actor is enrolled into a network or concept of power dynamics. This portion pertains explicitly to actors that are currently not part of the network, enrolment is the act of an existing actor gaining a new actor to join their network.

Enrollment also requires a high-level execution of translations. Basically, communicating the cause and interest correctly between actors or through artifacts. This includes the amount and type of actions that can be utilized by the actors to bring additional actors into the network (Sovacool, 2017). Using ANT within the planning context, Rydin and Tate (2016) suggested it as tool for progressive planners, or equally, people with 'Not In My Backyard' (or "NIMBY") sentiments. When certain actors can appropriately 'translate' the goal to a new actor this can appropriately add power to the network in favor of the actor who successfully created the enrollment. Basically, collecting relationships of power.

### 3.1.5 Interessment

Finally, through the interlinked concepts, actors can strengthen bonds of those in the network (or already enrolled) actors through 'Interessment'. This represents a set of actions between existing network actors that strengthen the relationships and connections that the actors maintain to overcome the common goal (Latour, 1987 & Callon, 1984). This analysis presents the opportunity to identify a catalyst that brings different actors together. This can be human, non-human, objects, or concepts, and the intermediaries can strengthen or de-stabilize relationships as they intermingle through the network. In a planning conceptualization, this could be items such as models, site visits and pictures (Beauregard, 2012; Rydin, 2012) or stakeholder outreach and communication, workshops, visioning or consulting services (Rydin & Natarajan, 2015).

### 3.1.6 ANT in the Urban Planning Context

*"… there seems to be a new movement within planning theory and practice. A number of papers have considered Actor–Network Theory (ANT) to be of relevance (Boelens, 2010; Doak and Karadimitriou, 2007; Rydin, 2010; Webb, 2011). " (Rydin, 2013)*

Utilizing ANT as a lens allows an opportunity to perceive power not as accumulating but a constantly moving entity. and the fact that it is repetitive can help a researcher identify the conglomeration of power and what actors and artifacts are the most influential. Along with identifying the most powerful relationships in the network, the repetitive nature of ANT provides an opportunity to recognize holes within the power dynamics, where possibly new ideas or concepts, can be introduced.

Not only can ANT help reveal available opportunities for concept integration, but it can also help a planner understand where certain concepts lost progress or audience (Tate, 2013). This can support a planner's evaluation of failed progressive policies because it's possible to review where the power relationships were lost and possibly how they were lost before reaching the goal.

Another way to elaborate on relationships through ANT in planning practices would be to review the habits of specific institutions, such as the city council or the planning department, and artifacts can allow illumination of how a relationship of power flows through it.

So, this could include standard operating procedures or a management system that has choke points built into standardized processes. It can show where the power lies within code interpretations.

The habits or routines can reveal a large amount of information on the power dynamics existing in a planning department for example. This would include standardized processes, such as planners making conscious choices every day to abide by and continue practicing these habits or consistent interpretations of the code that enforce decision making. This reveals an additional power dynamic. Again, not that it can't change, however, something like a routine would require a type of interruption and subsequent change in power relationship thus shifting the direction of the habit.

This is a great way to review the public input process often used by American planners. The expectations and consistently re-enforced practice of the process holds a great amount of power and is simultaneously utilized to certain actors' advantages, utilizing the procedure or habit as it currently exists. An important element regarding the habits should also review the differences these seemingly similar procedures exist in similar contexts however the way the habits are applied or supported may be different (this would be an interesting concept to review with other countries.)

## 4. Scope of the Project

The scope of this project includes a case study of primary data using interviews through the theoretical lens of ANT and a literature review using secondary data. Due to the nature of ever shifting social structures, the interviews were all done in the same period of time of a week to gain a perspective of the immediate moment but from several different points of view from actors involved in different capacities with the LMC. To consider how international cities social structure would add up is outside the scope of this paper.

### 4.1 Delimitations

Reviewing the land management code itself in comparison to the built environment is outside the scope of this paper. This would be a necessary review to create a comparison against other cities, however it would be beneficial to find a theoretical lens that would be more supportive of extracting the data necessary to set a foundation for comparison. Using the data of a document analysis alongside the social structure of the city could create a well-rounded framework to use in future studies.

Utilizing Actor Network Theory to provide a lens has many benefits to view a network, however there is a point where the network must be capped and other entities would not be influencial enough to consider in the analysis. The network surrounding the PC LMC is capped in this project to the extent that the entity was not mentioned by one interviewee, sufficing it irrelevant to this moment in the social structure.

The interviewees were chosen specifically because it was understood that they had an awareness of the LMC, for example, they include municipal employees, development advocates or council members. However, many residents in the community do not fall into this category. Community members that were not aware of what the LMC were not included although, the different perspective of these members could be very valuable.

### 4.2 Methodology

In the following sections, the two different methods utilized for the research project are reviewed. It begins with interviews, introducing the structure and design of the interviews and the interviewees, followed by how the data was analyzed

### 4.2.1 Foreign Planning Paradigms

The literature review was completed over several months, gathering studies that reviewed American and European planning practices. It was identified that five Planning Families exist in the realm of European planning literature and each was given a specific review.

### 4.2.2 Interviews

To analyze the existing framework and examine opportunities for sustainability increases in Park City, this study employed an exploratory case study research using qualitative interviews. As ANT foundationally preaches that actors shall not be considered higher level than the artifacts, this concept frankly favors the actors. It would most likely be useful to include a documentation analysis to compare the collected data in the future.

Latour (2005) even suggests that completing interviews to gather data for an ANT inspired research 'filters' the data and creates the opportunity for the interviewer to implement their own bias 'meaning' of the network – and how this, most likely will represent the interviewers viewpoint on the interview more than the actual reality of the network (although, as discussed in Section 3, the theory is not entirely in favor of a social reality either). However, more recently researchers have found ANT as a useful concept to apply to interviews, as noted by Demant and Ravn (2020). Specially to utilize the theory for its honest ability of revealing the connections of relationships between not only humans but objects as well (Jóhannesson, 2005; Konrad, 2006; Tatnall, 2002, Blok, Jensen and Kaltoft 2008; Hart, 2015; Törrönen and Tigerstedt, 2018; or the authors of this chapter, Ravn, 2012; Demant, 2009).

Described by Demant and Ravn in their paper from 2020 there are some important items to consider when completing interviews through the lens of ANT. These sentiments are foundational to the beginning of the interview structure and require the interviewer to keep a very open mind. The theory puts importance on how the interviewer receives the information and prompts the interviewer to keep their own natural bias from implementing meaning into the interviewee's answers and to accept sentiments of the answers at face value (Demant & Ravn, 2020). – this in turn reveals more data on the importance of elements within the network of the actor.

This mindset was utilized to begin interviews and it was briefly discussed at the beginning of the interview to note the passiveness of the interviewer and that this interview was a space to expand at will because there would be no wrong answers and it was judgement free.

The interviews are conducted one on one, online on google hangouts and zoom as part of the interview was visual to support the interviewee mapping their understanding of the network. ANT was not known or to be understood by the interviewees as the focus was intentionally asking trying to gain a face-value of what the interviewee found to be influential in the small-town planning realm. Words such as "stakeholders", "relationships", "all actors – humans, material objects, concepts", were used to give an understanding of the goal for the interview. The visual support presented what would be the map of the network the interviewee would be revealing, which initially shows one bubble with the statement "Land Management Code" in it.

Questions were posed (Appendix A) and while the interviewee answered, the interviewer placed additional thought bubbles on the map and drew arrows from different actors as indicated directly, or indirectly because of context, throughout the interview. The interviews reviewed interests and understandings surrounding the LMC network from different perspectives, attempting to gain as much information at face value from the interviewee as possible. The interviews attempt to reveal the actor-network surrounding park city development expectations and how experts evaluate changes in actor-network structure and less auto-oriented development future.

The following table provides the community members, representing different positions and perspectives within the community:

| Person | Community representation |
| --- | --- |
| Makena Hawley | Interviewer |
| Spencer Cawley | Park City Planning Department |
| Browne Seabright | Park City Housing Department |
| Angela Moschetta | Development Community Activist |
| Becca Gerber | City Councilor |

The interview holds a loose structure, however, attempts to honor ANT by allowing time for the Interviewer to simply 'listen' to the interviewee with an open mind. This leads to the interviews having a bit of variation. Each Interviewee was chosen as they have a large involvement in the Park City community. They often all attend Planning Commission and City Council meetings regularly. They were also chosen specifically as each representative has an adequate to professional understanding of the LMC and would also present their own unique perspective of the playing field they are operating in.

Interviews ranged from about 20 to 40 minutes. Some interviews ran longer to allow the interviewee to elaborate as much as they felt necessary.

### 4.2.3 Case Study of Park City, Utah, USA

Park City, Utah, has been chosen as the case study, this could be used to set up a cooperative of other resort towns around the world that are comparable in terms of population, size, tourist economy, or with seasonal considerations. Speaking to professionals in the respective cities can illuminate perspectives on their own challenges and can shed light on solutions that Park City may have opportunity to review further.

Park City, Utah, is a small town in Northern Utah, in the United States - roughly a total area of 51.77km of land (U.S. Gazetteer Files, 2019) with an approximate population of 8,396 primary residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). Park City was a host to the Salt Lake City Olympics in 2002 and tourism is the largest economic engine for the area as it is home to three ski resorts and the Sundance Film Festival. The town attracts an average amount of 600,000 visitors annually.

Park City manages land use and development through the [Park City Land Management Code](). The largely exerts control utilizing zones, in which there are 24. Each zone has specific uses and conditional uses as outlined in each chapter and any use that is not listed is considered prohibited. Further, most zones maintain lot and site requirements usually including:

- Density maximums
- Lot size minimums
- Setbacks (Front, Rear and Side yard)
- Height

- Architectural compliance
- Vegetation protection

Additionally, there are more strict guidelines and requirements for Historic Zones and no matter the zone, every use is accompanied with Parking Requirements seen in a different chapter.

The Land Management Code dictates the form, function and pattern in Park City, as it permits development today and how it will permit development in the future.

### 4.2.4 ANT to be Utilized by Professionals

In serval studies accumulated under the research of Rydin & Tate (2016) noted in specific research completed by Bent Flyvbjerg (2001) suggested that ANT also recognizes how an ANT analysis may provide a more robust and relevant understanding for an expert in the industry compared to the realizations made by a novice. Rydin and Tate (2016) follow Flubjerg's statement by agreeing that "The key, of course, lies with the values and the skills of the planner", describing the use of the theory as 'deep learning'.

It was further noted that ANT can support innovative planning practice, but this involves absorbing the sensibilities of the approach more than devising toolkits or recipes.

The idea of absorbing sensibilities can be applied generally, is an interesting thought because it assumes that the sensibilities of the theory are firmly established. But also interesting in that they are saying it's a complex theory and can't be used to identify the complexities of relationships in a manner that is too simplified (possibly because of intricate nuances of social relationships?)

# 5. Analysis

## 5.1 Literature Review – Foreign Planning Paradigms

### 5.1.1 Brief Introduction to Regulator Codes

Rules and regulations began influencing European cities as early as the seventeenth century (Hall, 2009), and began to be more mainstream in the United States right before the 20th century. Building ordinances came about to primarily protect the wealthy (Davies, 1958), but expanded to include public health initiatives (Talen, 2012) and fire control (Wermiel, 2000). Around 1692, American nuisance law began prohibiting specific industries from certain areas or city centers, such as slaughterhouses and noxious trades (New York Colony, 1894). In 1916, zoning was officially adopted in New York City, the first in the United States, modeled after the German practice that had been in practice for nearly 30 years by this time (Hirt, 2007).

There is no doubt that regulatory codes are a significant tool to direct the needs of the city. It is important to work within contextual rules of the collective urbanism. Talen (2012) describes how codes can ensure a minimum level of competence - even if that means putting constraints on design or architectural possibilities. However, the outcomes of the constraints put in place should be reviewed to ensure the final product of those codes are conducive to the health and viability of the community.

### 5.1.2 The Five Planning Families

The US code has an intricate history as all countries do. To set the stage, a brief description of cultural planning practices is reviewed, focusing on the research done on planning and zoning approaches in the US with limited contrasts from a global approach. Sofia Hirt is a specialist in the realm of city development codes with an international perspective. In Hirt's (2012) work she explores the American form of planning that includes zoning for the detached single-family dwelling (SFD) and its uniqueness from the five European planning families (according to Newman, P., and A. Thornley, 1996.) British, Napoleonic, Germanic, Scandinavian, and East European. It is noted that a large difference between American cities and European cities is that Europe planning generally allows more mixed-use environments.

In fact, Hirt identified in her book, Zoned in the USA (2014) "I could find no evidence in other countries that this particular form — the detached single-family home — is routinely, as in the United States, considered to be so incompatible with all other types

of urbanization as to warrant a legally defined district all its own, a district where all other major land uses and building types are outlawed." This statement is corroborated in research by several others, notably, Talen (2012), Whitmore (2021), Hall (2007), and Cullingworth (1993). Another key difference, based on research completed by Cullingworth and Hall, was that American planning practices tend to be more focused on regulating the private sector activity compared to a public sector-oriented planning and production of the built environment in European countries.

Additionally, recent arguments portrayed by researchers Manville, Mokkonene, and Lens (2000 and 2022) have voiced that single family zoning, a key contrasting zoning code practiced by cities in the US, is a direct cause of rising housing prices and car-oriented development that eventually leads to congestion.

### 5.1.3 England - British Planning Typology

Hirt (2012) describes the British (English/Welsh) Planning system was highly influenced from the circumstantial experience that this was the first country to industrialize. This changed the city experience significantly as these cities became more congested, polluted and created public health risks. These issues were initially addressed through nuisance laws. Eventually, the English began designating areas for different uses in what they called "Planning schemes" which were basically their first zoning tools (Cherry 1996).

Prior to the planning scheme implementation however, land use separation occurred through market processes. Hirt (2012) references the work of Fishman (1987) who found that the first 'suburbanizers' were the English bourgeoisie as far back as the 1700's. This was reinforced in the work of McKenzie (1994) using England as the first example of upper-class housing forming single use - private deed restrictions were utilized to ban the influx of poor people.

A unique planning initiative to the English was the introduction of the Town and Planning Act of 1947 which created governmental oversight over development, both use and construction regulations (Hirt, 2012). This was a significant change in English planning practices in that the Town and County Planning Act removed the social construct that if a person wanted to develop their private land and the proposal complied with the rules in a planning scheme - their right to build was guaranteed. This culture changed as the development rights were essentially nationalized. Meaning that

local planning authorities held significantly more discretion over development proposals on private land (Booth, 2003).

Hirt (2012) elaborates at a high level the policy of the English by stating "Planning authorities make decisions on a case by case basis following precedent" (p.378). The English planning framework has remained relatively stable since 1947 and requires local entities to develop plans called "Local Development Frameworks" (LDFs) setting out site regulations or requirements and options for various locations around town. This is the first document that a developer would consult to propose new plans. The LDF holds "Site Specific Allocations" which require compliance. These are not zoning maps, but they are a comprehensive plan of the city showing where new development could be placed or where change of use is to be expected, as well as existing infrastructure, or conservation, industrial and commercial areas.

So, England is not known to 'zone' in the usual sense and although guidelines and frameworks are provided, often a lot of development is not necessarily guaranteed before it goes through a process to gain approval from the local authorities.

### 5.1.4 France – Napoleonic Planning Typology

Next, reviewing the Napoleonic planning practice in France also appears to hold significant control over development codes, especially at the National level. Hirt (2014) discussed how France has a national guide towards regional and local planning called the code de l'Urbanisme. These also include outlines of procedures for obtaining permits (Legifrance, 2022). There are several major codes stemming from the code de l'Urbinisme such as the Plan d'Occupation des Soles (POS) which would refer to the land use plan at the local level (Kopf, 1996; Loew, 1998).

Loew (1998) summarized how the local Municipality is able to prepare their own local plans in regard to the physical and land use component (Newman & Thornley, 1996; Booth et al., 2007). The national plan dictates the pattern of the local plan, and provides overall guidelines, when the local plan does not provide a better proposal or there is conflict. This could be considered to be the closest relatable document to a local government's American LMC.

In French POS, there are typically 4 zones that are established across the country (Loew, 1998). Although municipalities are not obliged to use all the zones if they don't apply. The zones include:

1. **U – Urban:** Classifies areas that have already been built out. This area is further broken up:
   a. **General Urban (Urbaine Ge´ne´rale)**
      i. **Residential Protection sector.**
      ii. **Sector where mixing housing and employment is encouraged.**
      iii. **Sector for mansions and villas without a Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) requirement**
      iv. **Sector without a FAR requirement**
   b. **Large Public Services (Zone Urbaine de Grands Services)**
   c. **Urban Green Areas (Zone Urbaine Verte)**
   d. **Natural and Forest Areas (Naturalle et Forestière)**
2. **AU -** Urbanizing, suitable for future urbanization
3. **A -** Agriculture
4. **N -** Natural areas

The U (Urban) zone can be best compared to US type zoning in terms of land use categories except there is a stark difference, the French version allow a large variety of uses such as houses, apartments, restaurants, commerce, office space, etc (Hall, 2007).

The main difference being that verse a use comparison and separation, the French focus on the Coefficient d'Occupation du Sol, which is what Americans refer to as Floor to Area Ratio (FAR). So, all sectors within the U zone allow mixed uses but instead regulate based on a higher or lower FAR percentage to be occupied by non-residential uses. Of course, this is not the only regulation, the French code will state requirements for height, color, setbacks, parking, landscaping, etc (in some cases number of windows) (Hirt, 2012).

Main takeaways of French planning system include the regulation and responsibility that comes from a national level, such as high-level national documents of procedures and guidelines that require compliance. The French seem to be more focused on regulating the FAR of the lot compared to the use. It appears that the French incentive of city planning lies in keeping the character and the built environment of the city while allowing the highest level of flexibility in land use to

support economic growth and building renovations. This in turn supports goals for the French to maintain a steady tax flow, in turn, allowing a high level of city service to that area. Hirt (2014) notes that unlike American zoning, the French do not split land area into "mono-functional zones".

### 5.1.5 Germany - Germanic Planning Typology

The Germanic Planning Family includes Germany, Austria, and Switzerland and are typically characterized by a high degree of codification. A unique notion about the German planning family as well, would be that they were the first country to place restrictions (as we know them today) on the location of polluting industries with noxious fumes, in specific residential zones (Hirt, 2012).

In Germany, it is noted that overarching planning principles are guided by Federal planning legislation, State, Regional, and the Local areas – where Local areas, like the Scandinavian practice, have a greater say over the direct areas they manage.

Germanic planning laws often outline four land use classes and eleven other subclasses, the top four include:

1. Residential
2. Mixed Use
3. Commercial
4. Special

The Sub classes appear similar to other planning practices such as American Euclidean zoning, however many of the subclasses are not exclusive to the name of the class, rather the name indicates the majority of the use. The subclasses would look something like the below:

1. Small scale residential
   - Includes: single and two family homes, farms, small shops, restaurants, crafts and non-disturbing industry.
   - Mixed uses permitted by right
   - There are still form and density regulations that would disallow things like an Ikea while not preventing a small grocery store (Hirt, 2007).
2. Exclusively residential

- (This could be considered very misleading to a US planner. Both German and French refer to these as what a US planner would think is 'mixed use')
  - For example allowed uses include: hotels, gas stations, and non-disturbing industry.
  - Retail is considered a conditional use
3. General Residential
4. Special residential
5. Village-type
6. Mixed-use
7. Town center
8. Commercial
9. Recreational
10. Industrial
11. Special

Hirt (2012) explains that Germanic codes intend to regulate primarily bulk and density and generally permit commercial uses in all areas, only placing prohibitions on certain uses that release noxious fumes. Additionally Germanic planning practices are not known to make a distinction between the single-family detached home and other types of housing (Liebmann, 1996; Hirt, 2007).

In Germany, creating a local plan is mandatory. Two basic tools are used which are a General or 'Preparatory' plan (or Flächennutzungsplan) and a Detailed Development Plan (or Bebauungsplan or B-plan) (Wiegandt, 2000; Hirt, 2007; Cable, 2009). The Preparatory plan could be considered similar to a US Master plan, designating the overarching goals and direction for the area that would identify items such as areas for future growth or conservation. Following this, the 'B-Plan' would work from that document to give more contextual specific regulations on a specific smaller area. Again, these areas can range from a larger swath of land to as small as a city block and would include the subclassifications written above. So, it would not be unreasonable for a German city to have hundreds of B-plans.

The B-plan allows a higher amount of certainty compared to the English system for example. It sets the parameters of development and if a developer follows those rules, they will most likely receive approval. The codes include the normal regulatory items

and focuses mainly on bulk, density, land use, and design, amongst other items. The B-plan would differentiate some uses as granted by right while there also exists conditional uses. This lends back the power to the local authorities to maintain additional discretion over some items that may require additional scrutiny (Hirt, 2012). Finally, Hirt (2012) noted that amendments to B-Plans are common and expected when developers offer a different perspective on the area and the development that should/could occur.

### 5.1.6 Sweden - Scandinavian Planning Typology

Moving on to the Scandinavian family of planning practice, which per Newton and Thornley (1996) includes Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland. It has been observed that Scandinavian countries began introducing zoning type rules around a similar time as the Germans, early 1800s (Hirt, 2012). The national government typically also has a directing role in land use in regional and local areas, however, the local municipalities have more responsibility and autonomy over their own plans and legislation, then would be governed by a country like France. It can be viewed in a sense as hierarchical in that the national legislation protects significant entities like nature conservation and building safety which municipalities would be required to abide by. However, the local authorities have the flexibility past those items, to create plans and procedures that benefit the situational experience of each individual city. Ceginskas (2000) writes that Scandinavian countries utilize a concept referred to as a "planning monopoly" relating to the strong control that the local municipalities retain over their land use decisions. Additionally, municipalities often own a large percentage of urban land and housing, thus allowing the government jurisdiction over urban development.

Municipalities create non-binding "General Plans" called översiktsplaner along with a legally binding, development plans called "detaljplaner" that review specific regulations (Hirt, 2012). The development plans define rules for land use, density, and bulk and specify areas for infrastructure and public space, in addition to architectural design, materials or color. However, an interesting point about the detailed plans is that they can cover as small of an area as a city block, so there can be many different development plans within a city.

Scandinavian planning is similar to other systems like the French and American systems in terms of coding and designating urban functions such as residential and commercial. However, like the French and unlike the US, it is common to introduce new commercial entities without amendments to the detailed plan. For example, a single-family housing category could occur, however, a housing category with mixed use is much more likely as the cultural initiative is to make it easy for businesses to be created and commerce to take place (Hirt, 2012). Overall, Scandinavian, and French planning styles appear more similar than compared with US planning, specifically noting the Americans cultural obsession for areas strictly zoned for

detached single family homes. Scandinavia planning culture operates under the assumption that commerce and retail that serve the local residents daily needs without harming the community character is expected. Scandinavians also have a stereotypical planning preference to support healthy, intertwined lifestyles (Kornov, 2009).

### 5.1.7 Russia - East European Typology

Russia has an interesting history to planning approaches as the country's development was regulated by royal decrees for a long portion of its history. Public and private developments were all subject to royal supervision, which included the rise of St. Petersburg. All development was basically under the decrees of the Royals and went through urban codes operated and enforced by the royal decrees. Hirt describes through research completed by Trutnev and Bandorin (2010), that in 1918, during the Russian civil war, the power of the Empire was basically transferred to the Soviet State and all private ownership of land was eliminated. At this time Municipalities created urban plans for their areas. Hirt's (2012) research described the detail of plans for cities, as the city acted as the owner, developer, and planner. The specificity was so detailed that an area wouldn't just be zoned for commercial or retail but the finest detail of what exactly type of commercial, or retail would take place in a specific unit.

Naturally, Russia's planning practices have experienced a lot of ebb and flow throughout the past century, which makes it a very interesting country to review planning practices on and compare how well certain policies and procedures affected its cities development. Post-Communist Russia is where Newman and Thornley (1996) place it in the realm of East European planning family due to the common communist thread of policy over development in the Soviet Union. However, Hirt (2012) writes that after the end of Communism, urban land was re-situated or privatized, and the country had to adopt new rules to consider development parameters including the private sector. Now the planning procedures in Russia and Eastern European countries are not that different from Europe's general planning ideas, though it has been noted in research that the political landscape of regulation may still appear very different (Pagonis & Thornley, 2000; Golubchikov, 2004).

In Russia, the Urban Development Code (known as Rosyiskaya Federacia) was adopted in 1998 and most recently updated in 2011. This includes the process for permit issuance, planning hierarchies, and other relevant documents for planning.

More locally, General Plans (or generalnyi plan) are required and represent the overall goals and acts as a guide for Russian Cities (Golubchikov, 2004). Cities also require Land Use and Regulation Rules (or Pravila zemlepolzvaniya i zastroiki) which represent the actual legally binding rules and zoning regulations that developers would require compliance with.

Like in other countries development codes the Urban Development Code signifies several land uses including:

1. Residential
2. Public and business
3. Infrastructure
4. Industrial
5. Agricultural

Like other European cities, these definitions are broad, and a lot of leeway is given to the local municipality to make the best decisions for it. Furthermore, Hirt (2012) explains how, like other European cities, and unlike the US, 'zoning' does not attempt to limit the zone to only one use however describes what the main type of use would be for that area.

For example, the residential zones can also include the following Uses:

1. single-family and multifamily dwellings
2. social, cultural, and communal buildings
3. schools
4. hospitals
5. retail that is in keeping with residential character but serves daily needs of residents

Hirt (2012) notes that height, bulk and design is valued over restricting land use.

### 5.1.8 American Planning Distinction

In the US zoning is used as the main tool for land use control, an American type of public regulation over private property. Hirt (2012) explains how in the US cultural context, zoning provides a reliability to the private sector. For example, zoning sets the rules of the development location, and if the private party follows the rules, approval is guaranteed. A definition proposed in 2006 more clearly defines the practice

well as "zoning entails separating the land in a particular area into sections, or zones, with different rules governing the activities on that land" (Pendall, Puentes, & Martin 2006, p.1). Often, zoning in the US is simultaneous within the limitation of the use of land, even though on a broader international scale, land-use zoning is only a subtype of zoning.

Though the Germans were the creators of modern zoning, delineating portions of Frankfurt in 1891, throughout the 1800s and the 1900s. the focus on urban function division was both utilized by Europeans and Americans, the gap simply grew overtime (Le Goix & Callen, 2010). Additionally, an infamous landmark case from 1926 called Euclid v. Ambler, set a precedent that supported zoning as a legitimate government function over the private sector. This pushed the US further from traditional planning and directed zoning toward use separation, for example, residential from industrial. Utilizing regulations to separate uses during the Industrial Revolution could be seen favorably as to specifically isolate noxious exhaust from the residential areas. However, studies have also revealed that zoning regulations were utilized to separate not only uses, but people, by race and class, creating social divisions as well as seperated uses (Shertzer, Twinam, T., & Walsh, R. P., 2016).

### 5.1.9 Research Gap

Countries range in size, population, affluence, and culture, among many other differing entities, and researchers find this produces difficulties in creating comparisons amongst their planning styles (Alterman, 2001). Often, it is limited to comparing the US to one European country and even then, this research is rare (Hirt, 2012). Although comparative research can result in beneficial perspectives, this area of study appears to be especially difficult to measure.

The built environment of different countries has been developing per their city codes for decades, but their codes are closely linked to how the culture's legal structure has been established or the culture's social norms. Hirt (2010) notes that the question regarding comparisons between city regulations and the outcome of the built city environment should be examined more in depth.

### 5.1.10 Findings of Foreign Planning Paradigms

To summarize the takeaways, European planning principles tend to focus more on design and creating cities that are amenity rich. Taking from the Scandinavian portion to make a note, European cultures tend to mix needed uses that are required everyday by citizens. Additionally, European cities did not end up designing for the automobile as significantly as it's American counterparts. American cities are going to typically be more spread out, this is in part due to the automobile culture but also can be due to the exclusive separation of uses.

## 5.2 The Park City Planning Network

The interviews were focused on the community around local development policies and the Land Management Code to present how ANT theory can add to our knowledge of the system and possibly to the power dynamics in that system. As stated previously, ANT focuses not on the actor themselves but on the relationships between the human and non-human entities within the network to reveal how these interactions affect the network overall.

The Interviewees offered different perspectives as they utilized the LMC from different angles. For example, the planner would be in charge of interpreting it on a daily basis and enforcing it - or proposing changes to be reviewed by the Planning Commission or the City Council. The City Councilor sits at a station that allows the opportunity to suggest direction to the planners, as well as it is in her purview to interpret the code at certain instances to make final decisions.

For the housing advocate, the LMC will supply the parameters of the current reality in which this entity needs to work within to create or obtain more affordable units. Finally, the citizen advocate must understand the code to also understand the parameters that developers or owners are required to work within in order to provide checks and balances over the system or a community members perspective. Additionally, the advocate would require knowledge of the code to understand what areas require attention to support change in the direction they are seeking.

The interviews offered a conglomeration of information. Although the interviewer intentionally takes an open mind when interviewing, it should be assumed that the analysis is still going to be interpreted by the interviewer to an extent. The first questions focused on building the network map around the Land Management Code coming from the perspective of each interviewee and drawing similarities from them

to understand the relationships between these entities, attempting to answer the Problem Formulation supporting questions number 1, 2, and 3.

**Question 1, 2, and 3:**

**Who are the actors and the artifacts in the network assemblage and what relationships appear to be most influential?**

The top noted actors and artifacts were pulled for this analysis to represent the most likely average actors in the network surrounding the Park City LMC.

Developers, property owners, residents, and governmental bodies (Planning staff, Planning Director, City Council, etc) were often mentioned. Alongside these actors, the interviewees also mentioned entities such as business owners and advocacy groups (whether 'pro'-development or 'anti'-development), as well as workers and tourists. Although not mentioned directly in every interview, the concept of a 'wealthy' actor presented itself in all interviews.

### 5.2.1 Residents

What appeared to assert significance in almost all interviews (largely 3 out of 4 but still noted in the 4th) was the specific concept of past, present, and future residents. Possibly, this is due to the recent increase in residents that occurred during the Pandemic, but regardless, the presence of time passing and the humans living and influencing town at that time is considered to be a portion of the network that was highly regarded by all parties. For example, the idea of environmental justice was discussed by the Housing Advocate, specifying how Park City's mining history (essentially, the work of past residents) affects the residents today (and the future residents if toxic mining soils are not cleaned up properly) as any development being pursued must consider the remediation of any digging to accommodate the history of mining and contaminated soils.

The second interviewee to mention this concept was the Planner, who noted the LMC, as it exists today, was largely based on code written pre-Olympics (pre-2002). Considering a code that was written to properly host an international event on a massive scale, especially for a small town, must have heavily influenced the form of the code as it sits today. Additionally, it acknowledges how at the time in the past,

exclusive development rights were handed out which affects the land today and has created the built environment we live in today but also the density rights that have not been realized yet. This gives a nod to the present timing and poses the question if the city is at another inflection point to consider a re-write to address the issues of today? If the citizens of Park City in the past had the comprehension that an international event required a code to match, maybe today, with sustainability issues that require enormous attention, could create enough

An interesting note by the Housing Advocate, mentioned that he did not necessarily see much difference between the different "groups" of present-day resident or bureaucratic stakeholders because (in the spirit of a small town) for example a developer is developing one day and working for the city the next, and then consulting the next. Or an advocate, who works as a consultant and then decides to run and win a city council seat, and the same goes for most all other entities. Simply changing roles but within the same system, like a revolving workforce of actors taking on different roles at different times.

Additionally, the category of future residents was brought up. This group of people who don't live here yet, maybe aren't even born yet, but inevitably come here in the future. The Citizen Advocate elaborated on the resident mix in Park City is currently ever changing with the trends consistently favoring new residents of wealth and increasingly loosing residents that cannot afford the growing rents and prices in town. Thus, pushing not only cherished neighbors and community members to the outskirts but also creating a loss of a valuable workforce that keeps the resorts, restaurants, hotels and city services staffed and running. The Housing Advocate noted that Park City is the only community in Utah where the workforce of the town outnumbers the population of primary residents. He went on to assert that the previously assigned development rights could be a reason why there hasn't been a more proactive effort to accommodate more residents who can also act as workforce in town.

Furthermore, this change in resident has not only been replaced by the wealthy but by second homeowners, either using their home infrequently or renting at a nightly rate that reduces housing stock from full time residents and simultaneously raises values. As quoted by the Citizen Advocate "that really is just the cultural problem of us having gone into the realm of property now being a wealth accumulation strategy".

As noted by most of the interviewees, many living in Park City have specific needs that include access and enjoyment to the outdoors. However, observed by the Citizen Advocate, there appears to be a disconnect between the expectations of the existing community and those from the outside that are wanting to come in. An interesting relationship to review from this perspective may be what perception of Park City is being pushed to the outside world that we are in control of but possibly communicating/or translating incorrectly? Or what entity is actively translating that fits their specific goals and what are they?

Residents - past, present, and future, were a significant part of the LMC network as they are the entities that are collectively creating the mass of force that either supports or rejects the code, and thus the built environment they live in. Although they do not directly enforce the code, the collective action, or interessment of actors towards certain ideals, signifies support for or against the status quo.

### 5.2.2 Government Bodies

This portion included entities such as the elected City Council, the appointed Planning Commission, the Planning Director, and staff of the Planning Department that enforces the code. It was noted that elected officials and city staff will bring their own preferences and opinions into the job, which can be informed to varying degrees, which is a bias that should be expected on some level in all government institutions. But this leads to a tie into the Residents section above. One important question raised by the Citizen Advocate, was who exactly are the elected officials representing. As noted above, it was consistently brought up that there were two very different economic levels of residents in town. The Citizen Advocate spoke at length about the dichotomy between the visions of the future that elected representatives have when they run for office but once the office is attained, to keep order and a smooth hold of office, it can be an easier choice to not "rock the boat" per se, which inevitably will enforce the existing structures of power and maintain a business-as-usual scenario. She noted further, "so you look at anyone in government who's not willing to rock the boat, I would say is looking to preserve the power that is their job or their elected position". Although the counter argument, the previous statements related directly to what the City Councilor spoke about when describing the difficulties of maintaining balance between consistent opposing

viewpoints including "The local pressure versus state pressure. Developers verse responsible development groups. Maybe a pull between the council and the planning director and planning staff right now".

This would be an interesting area of relationships to review at length, as it is obvious that there is a disconnect in expectations for example, between what the Citizen Advocate expects from an elected official, to what the elected official seems to experience on a daily basis. Furthermore, distinct dissemination of the relationships supported by City Councilors could help clarify whose interests are the responsibility of the elected officials. Or what percentage of people are able to enjoy a greater quality of life in Park City. Of course, the City Councilors will have many different stakeholders to support, that have a wide variety of interests, so it would mainly be useful to see how often each o the groups needs are supported.

### 5.2.3 Developers

Developers as actors significant to the LMC were also discussed. Mostly in a negative light. For example, gaining quotes such as "And I think that developers – to speak candidly – are all terrible human beings." to being lumped into a traditional category that actively attempts to fend off change. Generally, especially compared to the average resident, developers appeared to be associated with selfish interests, where on the other hand, residents on the other side were seen as more socialist or trying to make life better for larger amounts of people.

These actors were seen as having a direct relationship with the LMC because the code is what dictates what can be built. However, what was also detailed was the impression that developers utilized relationships or resources to negotiate or influence the code. The impressions given where to maintain or maximize the wealth of the private entities.

It was suggested by the Citizen Advocate that there were examples of companies, that were known to be progressive and could help bring about change, but that they did not hold as much influence as traditional developers or also tended to change plans at the last minute. An example given, reviewed how known developers in town are often chosen to complete the Request for Proposals (RFP) offered by the city and even if those developers seem to want the right things for Park City, often come up against unknown roadblocks or excuses that down the line, make for a project that

doesn't include all the expectations put forth in the RFP. Possibly expanding the comfort zone of the municipality to offer more bold competitors the project could be considered in the future, even just as a trial and error example to compare against.

An interesting point made by the Citizen Advocate suggested that developers, though possibly with good intentions and progressive ideals can still get scared in the end and worry about the success of a project, if for example, it doesn't have vast amounts of parking. Despite the fact that there truly are many in town that are willing and ready to adapt to a different kind of lifestyle that involves walking, biking, or transit.

### 5.2.4 Tourists

Tourists were mentioned notoriously throughout the interviews. Mainly in the light of a massive economic driver for the town. This brought awareness from the interviewees regarding the lack of requirements for connectivity and mobility options outside the use of a car. For city that's main problems are traffic congestion and housing affordability and availability, the code in this way could be a significant instigator of more sustainable planning practices in order to support the existing challenges. The Housing Advocate spoke at length about how his impressions of the LMC today were very specifically written to actively enhance and expand the capabilities of a tourist-based economy. As noted in his interview regarding an LMC that was written prior to the 2002 Olympics, "I think we're 20 years past that now, so we could see that with a bit more clarity of how faulty that system is – how cumbersome it is to manage…but ultimately we have an LMC that is oriented towards a resort economy that is also oriented towards second homes".

This direct relationship from the LMC to the existing built environment could be reviewed further with direct code recitals which could backup these statements and lend strength to a power structure that could be identified. And if a power structure is identified that doesn't serve the present community any longer, perhaps it could be dismantled, if translated appropriately.

### 5.2.5 Community Resistance to Change

Overall, the concept of change resonated with the interviewees without prompts, all four basically stating that overarching sentiments in town related to resistance to change. Stated from the City Councilor "..we have this idea of Park City and what it is, and we don't want it to change. That's a big thing that I think we have here". She further

elaborated that the community just doesn't expect much change, even when people come in with really cool ideas and buildings, the community is quick to shoot it down. The Housing Advocate noted that a general perception existed that, development unchecked will be undesirable.

The Planner had experienced this sentiment with residents many times as well, stating that there was a concept that "density leads to more and over development" and "any change is seen as bad". People don't want to see things get any bigger than they are now. And the Housing Advocate went on to specify that his perception included the process of development that the community specifically didn't like stating "So, I think that people generally care less about the built form then they do with the overall process associated with it I mean I think they pretend to care about the built form, but I don't think they really care about the built form. They care about the built form, as long as they can make it smaller and therefore, less impactful during the construction process".

The City Councilor spoke specifically of a familiar struggle across planning cultures, that every time the Council tries to implement more environmentally restrictive code, they receive immense amounts of pushback, from many angles. Finally, an interesting perspective was that nightly rentals and the transient nature of tourism seemed abundant through the interviews. Nightly rentals or transiency would not seem to fall in the category of 'change', especially for a town built on a tourism economy for a minimum of the past 50 years. The Housing Advocate linked this fear towards the traffic congestion and late-night parties or odd hours of visitors. This sentiment seems to grow further than simply fear of change, it almost puts the residents of Park City in a light of frozen anxiety, where the group is too afraid to make any decisions, and thus stands stagnant.

The Citizen Advocate offered an opinion: "I think until we start to be a little more authentic, I don't think that we're going to move in either direction – I think what's going to keep happening here in Park City is what's been happening. Things get decided for us, like the previous 'Visioning' – it was "Keep Park City Park City" but nobody really looked at what that meant. They just thought that if we project our virtue and our values hard enough, then we'll just stay in this hippy town! But that did not work". The Citizen Advocate went on to note "And there is absolutely no way to solve our two greatest

problems which are traffic and a declining work force – if we don't radically change our conversations about development and transit."

These concepts are important to consider when mapping the actors, relationships and what type of ideals they subscribe to, as the information will become very relevant to understand what types of translations would be more useful than others when addressing certain groups of residents.

### 5.2.6 Wealth

The concept of wealth was also discussed during several interviews. The Housing Advocate elaborated on the limited space within a popular cul-de-sac that is Park City and the wealth that had been driven there purposefully over the years to gain even higher investments back for future expensive real estate. The Citizen advocate noted that the way our code is currently set up is prime for the wealthy to take advantage and take opportunities within the code that allow them to grow their own wealth and not leave many opportunities for the rest of the less affluent population in town.

The Citizen Advocate lamented: "that life is still so classist, and you know it every minute that you are living it. You know if you are living in a mansion up on a hill with more space than you'll ever need and beautiful views. And you know if you are the person who comes back to a dark apartment that you are sharing with other people that is surrounded by all this snow and these mountains, but you can't see them". This concern was related to the culture Americans have accepted of allowing a dwelling unit to be seen more as a commodity than an actual shelter for people. The difference was pointed out by the Citizen Advocate again, by suggesting that the person who buys a second home to set up their family's future was not the concern but the concern was the different realm Park City (and other locations) are experiencing now, where people are buying 10 or 12 homes and investment companies pick up units, leaving the actual residents of Park City paying significant amounts on rent and thus diminishing their quality of life. It was also discussed occasionally over the interviews of the difference of actually having the time to enjoy where you live, as opposed to someone who must go to work and simply come home to rest every day, a person who is just 'functioning' to keep our city as beautiful and running smooth as it is.

The conversations on wealth were interesting, as it appeared from the interview data that, on one hand, the wealth accumulation was in fact purposefully driven, and on the

other hand, appeared to be out of control, but this interpretation is probably left to the actor experiencing the wealth or poverty. This relationship still seems unclear as to what entities affect what and how. A much deeper dive could be done on the concepts of wealth in Park City, the additional actors and their relationships.

### 5.2.7 The Utah State Legislature

This portion was interesting as it could most likely create a differentiating factor to a specific network in Utah compared to other states or an international city. As was noted in the literature review, several countries hold more significant power at the local level, when in the case of Park City, as several interviews noted: "we don't have "Home Rule" ("home rule" in the US is allocated by the state constitution, meaning more autonomy to a local government - a non-home rule has less autonomy granted by the state government), we don't quite have complete state overcontrol, but we're somewhere in the middle".

Many decisions made to the LMC are scrutinized using the perspective of the priorities of the legislature in mind. The concerns from those like the City Councilor or the Housing advocate specified their caution when proposing and voting on solutions based on Park City's priorities that may include sustainability initiatives that at all hinder private property rights. The City Councilor noted that using "the LMC and its purpose to help us control development and growth in Park City and then there's the outside pressures, for example, that even if we wanted to change some of those guardrails, we would have to navigate really carefully through the state pressures and also local community pressures."

### 5.2.8 The Land

The finite space in Park City was noted in all interviews as a significant artifact that affected and was affected by the Land Management Code.

From different perspectives, the relationship between the LMC and the land itself was laid out. The Planner noted that the initial power of the LMC over the land, stating the LMC "actually regulates space – like the space you can actually use – whether that be setbacks or building pad or building footprint – you may own a piece of property, but you may not be able to use every square inch of it."

Another angle was seen by the Housing Advocate as using the LMC correctly to fill in the space that we have, prioritizing based on values, questioning "how do we use the

known limits to our capacity to meet the goals that the community holds". This is an argument to better understand the social characteristics within the network because the city should evaluate what the code actually does prioritize. It has already been noted that the LMC is linked to a resort economy, and that includes large second homes, but does it necessarily include the notion of exclusivity that is taking place?

Additionally, the legacy pollution was discussed in regard to the mine tailings creating contaminated soils. The Housing Advocate noted at one point "until there is a cohesive, consistent solution for what to do with contaminated soils, I think that will be a major impediment to the ultimate, fully fleshed built out that matches the community's priorities."

### 5.2.9 What was missing?

An interesting angle to analyze the networks is to not only specify who is in the network but also specify who is *not* included as actors or artifacts. Defining this item could present a possibility for the existing actors calling for change within the network, as the actors/artifacts that were not mentioned can create an opportunity for interessment of new actors into the network to the benefit of the existing actor's direction.

For the interviews, the people were specifically chosen because they would clearly have knowledge of actors and relationships within the network surrounding the LMC. Though this was effective, as noted previously, there is a large workforce that does not live within city limits but participates daily in the workings of the city. Of course this would be a beneficial perspective to gather, especially if translation and interessment towards sustainability could be utilized. But until we gain this data as well, one cannot assume what goals or priorities these people have, or what types of lives they want to lead.

Although there are most likely a few entities left out of this study and could possibly have been gathered with more interview data, but one entity noticeably left out of the interview discussions was the Park City Chamber of Commerce. Though this may be indirectly related to the LMC Network, the Chamber brings significant spotlight and focus to the small resort town that previously said they wanted all the attention. It would further be advantageous to gain more data into the actors and relationships that the

city has with the Chamber and how those directly or indirectly affect the LMC and consequential development practices.

### *What social characteristics exist within the Network of the Park City Land Management Code?*

During the interviews, the Housing Advocate quoted Wallace Stegner which incidentally added perspective to this resort town network in the American west:

*"One cannot be pessimistic about the West. This is the native home of hope. When it fully learns that cooperation, not rugged individualism, is the quality that most characterizes and preserves it, then it will have achieved itself and outlived its origins. Then it has a chance to create a society to match its scenery."*

Actor Network Theory encourages studies that are broadly defined in order to make it empirically possible to pose answers to research questions. This broad context was utilized to build a foundation of Park City's Land Management Code Network with the data from foreign planning paradigms and the interviews based on the Park City planning realm.

Park City is clearly defined well within the American planning context as stated in Section 6.1.8 of utilizing rigid separation of uses and maintaining the cultural concepts of private property. These overarching characteristics could have been assumed to be linked with American planning concepts but the interview data proved a significant connection. Additionally, the residents that hold these beliefs were noteworthy as significant actors within the network. Specifically, the past, present and future residents that lend their own opportunities and challenges to the existing network as it stands today.

The governing bodies included the City Council, the Planning Commission, and the Planning Department. The overall sentiments resonating through the interviews suggested that the systems in power do not want to shake the network up too much, possibly in order to preserve power. This allows a consideration as to two distinct ways of utilizing translation, one would be to prompt the rocking of the boat, and the other to manifest a way to inject change through translation to create interessment while the actors maintain their existing power structure.

The interviews indicated the strength of the relationship between the governing bodies, residents and the Utah State Legislature. Known to be a hindersome factor as the

property rights heavy handed babysitter of the LMC. It appeared most considerations about the LMC or future development proposals were always considered in tandem with how the legislature would react and how far certain concepts could be pushed.

The discussions surrounding developers summarized the structures in place that included relationships with the governing bodies offering outsider developers opportunities as well as a need to change the narrative of what residents want and need for quality of life and what a city requires for a sustainable future.

Tourists were granted a love/hate relationship through the interviews, connected to the LMC as the town's main economic driver, yet the cause of traffic and nuisance type of behavior. The concept of wealth presented a strong relationship as it related to the LMC as it not only affected developers end game, and the perpetuation of the resort economy, but also a key driver of classist system, pushing prices of dwellings higher and the working class further from town.

The Land itself, naturally held a large association with the code. It is a finite resource, and also contains the pollution of our past, the challenges of our present and the opportunity for the future., The code and the land create a direct relationship of how Park City can solve it's existing issues or intensify them.

Finally, the concept of the community's sentiments of resistance to change. This relationship highly involves many of the previously noted actors and artifacts as they all accumulate to a culture of fear within the community surrounding the LMC. This may be a priority, in terms of relationships to assess first. In order to address a more sustainable Land Management Code, it will be imperative to reduce misinformation and highlight the opportunities in progressive change and collective action.

## 6. Discussion

Using the two methods of research, taking a wide perspective reviewing the planning families in Europe and taking a close look at relationships within the small confines of the Park City limits, created a cohesive frame of reference to review the issues of a small town from different angles. It is unfortunate that this is only one portion of what could be an in depth and interesting study of comparison internationally. Are other towns dealing with codes written for different purposes that don't apply anymore?

Although, it is a significant piece to at least consider the data gained for Park City. It is just one study, however, the capacity of the people interviewed offed a high level of understanding of the relationships that are dealt with every day in Park City. Bringing these perceptions together can offer great insight into the existing struggles of translation or interessment that they are all dealing with in different capacities daily and can enlighten future initiatives using the knowledge of these relationships and power structures to one's advantage.

This was a takeaway from utilizing the ANT theory, in that network awareness and cultivation can help a planner actively use translation and enrollment, adding strength to relationships as they build productively towards the goal. This could be especially helpful when attempting to make long term, multi-year, or perceived 'scary' shifts in your community.

Additionally, using ANT to conduct interviews proved to be simply a good, practical, interviewing application, also simply good practice towards being a good listener in general. Some discussion would come about in interviews naturally, but the conduct held during the interview helped to remind the interviewer to meditate on listening and digesting information that the interviewee is revealing. When the interviewer is not bringing in their own thoughts quickly into the process or pairing relevance with certain items, they are overall just a better listener. Furthermore, this will give the study a better understanding of the network that exists around the subject being reviewed, allowing the data to represent itself with well received information. It appears this could be the basis for most interviews, but it's interesting that ANT calls it out specifically.

## 7. Conclusion and Future Work

Identifying the relationships surrounding the Land Management Code within the Park City network cannot only help set a framework for comparison to consider how the small town measures up to other towns. It can also help by clarifying the relationships of power that would require influence or translation to implement the more sustainable initiatives found in other codes from European cities. Realizing the structures of power within a network can only lend useful information whether you are trying to maintain the status quo or trying to implement transformative change.

During the study, it was not surprising to find that, understanding one's code on a network level and using comparison of code and network to other countries could not only be useful but possibly imperative to attempt during timely reviews, to enlighten the perspective on one's own code. Additionally, for a city planner to have more awareness of their codes network and strengths in their relationships within that network could lead to increasingly more productive methods and approaches in their work. Utilizing the information that ANT can illuminate, can allow resources towards forethought and strategy to add an important step to any process, but especially progressive planning initiatives.

Sustainability is becoming more imperative for cities all over the world but can especially be significant for resort towns that's economy is based heavily on snow fall. Additionally, US cities like Park City are lacking an urbanism quality that could utilize lessons from more compact developed European cities. The health, happiness, and wellbeing of the residents and resources are imperative to not only the future residents but the present residents that have the ability to create change now. Understanding the power structures of the city on a more familiar basis, and having a perspective beyond your immediate situation, can help planners and other change agents identify opportunities for progress and increase the forethought and strategy prior to strengthen their efforts in the future.

# References

Alterman, R. (Ed.). (2001). *National-level planning in democratic countries: an international comparison of city and regional policy-making* (Vol. 4). Liverpool University Press.

Basiago, A.D. (1996). The search for the sustainable city in 20th century urban planning. *The Environmentalist,* 16(2), 135–155. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01325104

Beauregard, R.A. (2012). In search of assemblages. *Crios*, 4: 9–16.

Ben-Joseph, E. (2005). *The Code of the City: Standards and the Hidden Language of Place Making.* Cambridge: MIT.

Boelens, L. (2010). Theorising practice and practising theory: Outlines for an actor-relational approach in planning. *Planning Theory,* 9(1), 28–62.

Boonstra, & Boelens, L. (2011). Self-organization in urban development: towards a new perspective on spatial planning. *Urban Research & Practice*, 4(2), 99–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2011.579767

Booth, P., Breuillard, M., Fraser, C., & Paris, D. (2007). *Spatial Planning Systems of Britain and France: A Comparative Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Booth, P. (2003). *Planning by Consent: The Origins and Nature of British Development Control.* London, England: Routledge.

Cable, F. (2009). 'Design First, Codify later: Germany Offers Lessons for US Planners.' *Planning*, July, 25–27.

Callon, M. (1986). The sociology of an actor-network: The case of the electric vehicle. In *Mapping the dynamics of science and technology* (pp. 19-34). Palgrave Macmillan, London. Ceginskas, K. 2000. Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems in the Baltic Region: Sweden. Accessed October 5, 2011. http://vasab.leontief.net/countries/sweden.htm

Cheshire, P., & Sheppard, S. (2002). The welfare economics of land use planning. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 52(2), 242–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-1190(02)00003-7.

Cullingworth, B. (1993). *The Political Culture of Planning: American Land-use Planning in*

*Comparative Perspective.* London, England: Routledge.

Cysek-Pawlak, M.M., & Pabich, M. (2021). Walkability - the New Urbanism principle for urban

regeneration. *Journal of Urbanism*, 14(4), 409–433.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17549175.2020.1834435

Demant, J. (2009). When alcohol acts: An actor-network approach to teenagers, alcohol and

parties. *Body & Society,* 15(1), 26–46.

Davies, P. J. (1958). *Real estate in American history*. Public Affairs Press.

Demant, J. & Ravn, S. (2020): 'Actor-network theory and qualitative interviews'. In Qualitative

analysis – eight approaches for the social sciences, eds. Järvinen, M. and Mik-Meyer, N.

London: SAGE.

Doak, J., & Karadimitriou, N. (2007). (Re)development, complexity and networks: A framework for

research. *Urban Studies,* 44(2), 209–229.

Fishman, R. (1987). Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Freemark, Y. (2020). Upzoning Chicago: Impacts of a Zoning Reform on Property Values and Housing

Construction. Urban Affairs Review (Thousand Oaks, Calif.), 56(3), 758-789.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087418824672.

Glaeser, E. L., & Gyourko, J. (2002). The impact of zoning on housing affordability.

Golubchikov, O. (2004). 'Urban Planning in Russia: Towards the Market*. European Planning Studies*

12:229–47.

Hall, Thomas. (2009). *Planning Europe's Capital Cities: Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Urban*

*Development*. London: E & FN Spon.

Hall, E. (2007). *Divide and Sprawl, Decline and Fall: A Comparative Critique of Euclidean Zoning.*

University of Pittsburgh Law Review 68:915–52.

Hart, A. (2015). Making a difference? Applying Vitellone's Social Science of the Syringe to

performance and image enhancing drug injecting. *International Journal of Drug Policy,*

(61), 69-73.

Hirt, S. (2013). Home, Sweet Home: American Residential Zoning in Comparative Perspective.

*Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 33(3), 292–309.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X13494242

Hirt, S. (2016). Rooting out mixed use: Revisiting the original rationales. *Land Use Policy,* 50, 134–

147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.09.009

Hirt, S. (2012). Mixed Use by Default: How the Europeans (Don't) Zone. *Journal of Planning Literature,* 27(4), 375–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412212451029

Hirt, S. (2010). To zone or not to zone? Comparing European and American Land-use Regulation.

Hirt, S. (2015). Zoned in the USA. In *Zoned in the USA*. Cornell University Press.

Hirt, S. (2007). The Devil Is in the Definitions: Contrasting American and German Approaches to Zoning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73(4), 436–450. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360708978524

Jóhannesson, G.T. (2005). Tourism translations: Actor–Network Theory and tourism research. *Tourist Studies,* 5(2), 133-150.

Konrad, K. (2006). The social dynamics of expectations: The interaction of collective and actor-specific expectations on electronic commerce and interactive television. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 18(3-4), 429-444.

Kontokosta, C. E. (2014). Mixed-Income Housing and Neighborhood Integration: Evidence from Inclusionary Zoning Programs. Journal of Urban Affairs, 36(4), 716–741. https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12068.

Kornov, L. (2009). Strategic Environmental Assessment as catalyst of healthier spatial planning: The Danish guidance and practice. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 29(1), 60–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2008.04.003

Kopf, K. (1996). An Alternative Approach to Zoning in France: Typology, Historical Character and Development Control. *European Planning Studies* 4, no. 6: 717–737.

Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oup Oxford.

Latour, B. (1993*). The pasteurization of France*. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge.

Law, J., & Hassard, J. (1999). *Actor Network Theory and After*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, Malden.

Lauridsen, J., Nannerup, N., & Skak, M. (2013). House prices and land regulation in the Copenhagen area*. Journal of Property Research,* 30(3), 205–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/09599916.2013.791340

Lee, H. S., Chung, J., & Kim, W. (2020). Economic Effect of Zoning Regulations on Korea's Small and Medium-Sized Retailers. *Asian Economic Journal,* 34(2), 185–211.

https://doi.org/10.1111/asej.12208

Lehavi, A. (2018). One Hundred Years of Zoning and the Future of Cities (1st ed. 2018.; A. Lehavi, Ed.).  https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66869-7

Legifrance. (2022, Novemeber 10). "Code de l'Urbanisme." Legifrance. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/texte_lc/LEGITEXT000006074075/2022-11-22/.

Levkovich, O., Rouwendal, J., & Brugman, L. (2018). Spatial planning and segmentation of the land market: The case of the Netherlands. *Land Economics*, 94(1), 137–154.  https://doi.org/10.3368/le.94.1.137

Liebmann, G. W. (2002). Modernization of zoning: A means to reform. *The Appraisal Journal*, *70*(2), 224.

Loew, S. (1998*). Modern Architecture in Historic Cities: Policy Planning and Building in Contemporary France*. London: Routledge.

Manville, M., Lens, M., & Monkkonen, P. (2022). Zoning and affordability: A reply to Rodríguez-Pose and Storper. *Urban Studies* (Edinburgh, Scotland), 59(1), 36–58.  https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020910330

Manville, M., Monkkonen, P., & Lens, M. (2020). It's Time to End Single-Family Zoning. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 86(1), 106–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2019.1651216

McKenzie, E. (1994). *Privatopia: Homeowners Association and the Rise of Residential Private Government.* Binghamton, NY: Yale University.

Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics. A word and some questions. *The sociological review*, *47*(1_suppl), 74-89.

Murdoch, J. (1998). The spaces of Actor-Network Theory. *Geoforum,* 29(4): 357–374.

Næss, Petter. (2001). Urban Planning and Sustainable Development. *European Planning Studies*, 9:4, 503-524, DOI: 10.1080/713666490

Newman, P., & Thornley, A. (1996). *Urban Planning in Europe: International Competition, National Systems and Planning Projects.* London, England: Routledge.

New York Colony. 1894. *The Colonial Laws of New York from the Year 1664 to the Revolution*. 5 vols. Albany, NY: James B. Lyon, State Printer.

Nikel, D. (2022, December 7). *Denmark set for 'year of architecture' in 2023.* Forbes. Retrieved December 20, 2022, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidnikel/2022/12/06/denmark-

set-for-year-of-architecture-in-2023/?sh=1bb36104c286

Nizam, F., & Petrişor, A. I. (2022). Do we regulate to create buildings or to create places? Conventional Regulations Vs.Form Based Codes. *Urbanism. Arhitectura. Constructii*, 9-14.

Pagonis, T., and A. Thornley. 2000. ''Urban Development Projects in Moscow: Market/State Relations in the New Russia.'' European Planning Studies 8:751–66.

Pendall, R., Puentes, R. & Martin, J. (2006). *From Traditional to Reformed: A Review of the Land use Regulations in the Nation's Largest Metropolitan Areas.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Ravn, S. (2012). Intoxicated Interactions - Clubbers Talking about Their Drug Use. PhD Thesis. Aarhus University.

Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Storper, M. (2020). Housing, urban growth and inequalities: The limits to deregulation and upzoning in reducing economic and spatial inequality. *Urban Studies* (Edinburgh, Scotland), 57(2), 223–248. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019859458.

Rydin, Y. (2010). Actor-network theory and planning theory: A response to Boelens. *Planning Theory,* 9(3), 1–4.

Rydin, Y. (2013). Using Actor–Network Theory to understand planning practice: Exploring relationships between actants in regulating low-carbon commercial development. *Planning Theory,* (London, England), 12(1), 23–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095212455494

Rydin, Y., & Natarajan, L. (2015). The materiality of public participation: The case of community consultation on spatial planning for north northamptonshire, England. *Local Environment*, *21*(10), 1243–1251. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2015.1095718

Rydin, Y., & Tate, L. (2016). *Actor networks of planning: exploring the influence of Actor Network Theory.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315714882

Schmidt R., & Buehler, R. (2007). "The Planning Process in the US and Germany: A Comparative Analysis." *International Planning Studies,* 12:55–75.

Shertzer, A., Twinam, T., & Walsh, R. P. (2016). Race, ethnicity, and discriminatory zoning. *American*

*Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8(3), 217–246. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20140430

Shertzer, A., Twinam, T., & Walsh, R. P. (2018). Zoning and the economic geography of cities. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 105, 20–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2018.01.006

Sovacool, B.K. (2017). *E*xperts, theories, and electric mobility transitions: Toward an integrated conceptual framework for the adoption of electric vehicles. *Energy Research & Social Science,* 27, pp. 78–95.

Sovacool, B.K., Kester, J., Noel, L., Zarazua de Rubens, G. (2020). Actors, business models, and innovation activity systems for vehicle-to-grid (V2G) technology: A comprehensive review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews,* 131.

Stone, B. Jr. (2004). Paving over Paradise: How Land Use Regulations Promote Residential Imperviousness. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 69 (1), 101–13.

Talen, E. (2011). Sustainability in Planning. Oxford Handbook of Urban Planning, edited by R. Weber and R. Crane. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Talen, E. (2012). City rules: how regulations affect urban form. Island Press.

Talen, E., & Knaap, G. (2003). Legalizing Smart Growth: An Empirical Study of Land Use Regulation in Illinois*. Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 22(3), 345–59.

Tate, L. (2013). New York's High Line: Definitely Not Lost in Translation. Unpublished paper presented at the Joint Association of European Schools of Planning- Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference in Dublin.

Tatnall, A.B., & Burgness, S. (2002). Using Actor-Network Theory to Research the Implementation of a B-B Portal for Regional SMEs in Melbourne, Australia. Paper presented at the 15th Bled Electronic Commerce Conference eReality: Constructing the eEconomy, Bled, Slovenia.

Trutnev, E., & Bandorin, L. (2010). Azbuka zemlepolzvaniya i zastroiki: Glavnoe o Pravila zemlepolzvaniya i zastroiki v populyarno izlojenii. Moscow: Institute for Urban Economics (in Russian).

Turner, V. (2013). *Sustainable Urbanism: An Integrative Analysis of Master Planned Developments as a Vehicle for Urban Environmental Sustainability*. Arizona State University.

Webb, D. (2011). The limits of associative democracy: A comment on an actor-relational approach in planning. *Planning Theory, 10*(1), 273–282.

"U.S. Census website". United States Census Bureau. Retrieved 20 December 2022.

Wermiel, Sara E. (2000). *The Fireproof Building: Technology and Public Safety in the Nineteenth-Century American City.* Baltimore: john Hopkins University Press.

Wiegandt, C. C. (Ed.). (2000). *Urban development and urban policy in Germany: An overview*. BBR.

Willson, R. (1995). Suburban Parking Requirements: A Tacit Policy for Automobile Use and Sprawl. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61(1), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944369508975617

Whittemore, Andrew H. (2021). Exclusionary Zoning. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 87:2, 167-180, DOI: 10.1080/01944363.2020.1828146

"2019 U.S. Gazetteer Files". United States Census Bureau. Retrieved 20 December 2022.

## Appendices

| **Appendix A** | Interview Questionnaire |
|---|---|
| **Appendix B** | Interview Transcripts – Spencer Cawley - Park City Municipal City Planner |
| **Appendix C** | Interview Transcripts – Browne Seabright – Park City Municipal Housing Program Manager |
| **Appendix D** | Interview Transcripts – Becca Gerber – Park City, City Councilor |
| **Appendix E** | Interview Transcripts – Angela Moshcetta – Park City Citizen Advocate |