

Water Demand Management in Planned Residential Developments



V. Kelly Turner

School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning
Arizona State University

Privatizing Residential Landscapes

Private residential communities have emerged as a dominant feature in urban landscapes, and while some communities require water intensive management practices, others do not. These communities are privately designed and managed by a network of stakeholders in the development industry. These stakeholders influence both landscape structure and maintenance practices by virtue of Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions (CCRs) enforced by Homeowners Associations (HOAs). This research presents a typology of networks associated with private residential development--top-down, centralized, and collaborative--and identifies the ways in which different network structures potentially influence outcomes of management decisions. Furthermore, networks are situated in a broader social-ecological context, therefore, discourses related to this broader context were identified through stakeholder interviews.



Approximately 60% of single family homes have CCRs.

Privately developed and managed communities increasingly dominate the landscape.



CCRs influence water demand by regulating vegetation and pest management, species composition, and water management.

Stakeholder Interviews

Interview	Snowball, semi-structured (n=6)	
Representation	Project developer (1), landscape architect (1), land planner (1), lawyer (2), and retired (1)	
Question Themes	(1) Project Involvement (2) Collaboration (3) Drivers of Landscaping Design Change	

In semi-structured interviews, respondents identified collaborators on specific projects as well as broader socio-ecological themes relevant to landscaping in Phoenix. Responses were used to construct networks and identify discourses.

Structure of Networks

Planned community development networks may exhibit top-down, centralized, or collaborative structures. Differences in how relationships between actors are structured influence decision-making outcomes.

Top-down



Centralized

Collaborative



Four types of network centrality were ranked low, medium, and high relative to the other models.

Model	Density	Centrality	Betweenness/ Modularity	Broker
Top Down	Medium	Medium	High Modularity, Low Betweenness	Land Planner
Centralized	Low	Highest	Low Modularity, Low Betweeness	Developer
Collaborative	High	Lowest	Low Modularity, Medium Betweenness	Developer, Land Planner

Adaptive Management Capacity

Elements of adaptive management are facilitate or constrained by different network structures. The table below, derived from Bodin, Crona, and Ernstson (2005), connects measures of centrality to elements of adaptive management.

	Top Down	Centralized	Collaborative
Social Memory	High modularity inhibits retention.	Low density limits retention.	High density increase retention.
Heterogeneity	High modularity increases diversity of thought.	Low density increases diversity of experiences. Low modularity promotes group-thinking.	High density reduces diversity of experiences. Low modularity promotes group-thinking.
Redundancy	High modularity increases potential for fragmentation.	Low density increases potential for fragmentation. Low modularity decreases the potential for fragmentation.	High density decreases potential fo fragmentation. Low modularity decreases potential for fragmentation.
Learning	High modularity promotes transfer of knowledge.	Low modularity inhibits transfer of knowledge.	Low modularity inhibits transfer of knowledge. Low centrality increases opportunities for experimental learning
Adaptive Capacity	Medium modularity and density.	High level of centrality increases coordination. Low density reduces social constraints.	Low centrality decreases coordination. High density increases social constraints.
Trust	Low density inhibits collective identity	Low density inhibits collective identity. Low modularity	High density increase collective identity. Low modularity

Network Type: Collaborative

Measure of Centrality: Density

Rank: High

Adaptive Management Feature: Social Memory

Adaptive Management Implication: High density increases the retention of social memory.

Implication: Less likely to utilize older knowledge or learn from the past.

Networks are Situated in Place

Place dependent discourses are collected by and negotiated between actors in a network as discourses. Several discourses about the broader social-ecological contexts emerged during interviews.

Trends & Legacles





The Public



Policies & Governance

Municipal Environmental Codes ADWR species

CCR's are like the constitution: very hard to change.



Sustainability & Environment



Yeah all the water that we use is measured drip and we monitor it.
Water's expensive and you do it because you want to use your pennies wisely but it's also the right thing to do for the environment.

Markets & Economy



During a recession, cost efficiency is key. This can lead to reductions in



Conclusions

- •There exists a distinct typology of network structure in Phoenix planned residential community development.
- •A set of recurrent discourses emerge within that community.

To what extent do network structures and the broader social-ecological context play a role in shaping residential landscape form and management?