

But this would be a battle in parts of New Jersey and it would be a battle in parts of Long Island. It would be a battle in most metropolitan areas. This is a battle which in most places the developer would lose.

Mr. BARRETT. May I just interpose for a minute? You certainly indicate that you are very knowledgeable in this field. I was wondering if you would be desirous of submitting the balance of your statement in the record so that the other members could actually read it and know the answers.

Mr. ROUSE. I have handed in a written statement which I assume is for the record and I didn't want to bore the committee by reading it.

Mr. BARRETT. That may be submitted in the record without objection. It is so ordered.

(The complete statement of Mr. Rouse follows:)

STATEMENT OF JAMES W. ROUSE, PRESIDENT, COMMUNITY RESEARCH
& DEVELOPMENT, INC.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, by name is James W. Rouse. I appear before you to testify in support of title II of H.R. 12946 because I believe it is important to the sound future growth of our country. My support of the bill grows out of extensive experience in the business of financing and developing the bits and pieces of the American city: An outline of my background and experience is attached.

May I begin by saying that I am aware of the fact that this legislation is opposed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, by the National Association of Home Builders and by the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, and, that while I have great respect for their organizations, I believe that they misunderstand the need and the purpose of this legislation and misjudge what the results will be, if it is passed. It is very much in the best interests of the cities of America, the homebuilding industry and our country as a whole for this legislation to be enacted.

The simple fact is that, with the powers and processes that now exist in local government and in the homebuilding industry, it is impossible to provide, in an orderly and intelligent way, for the metropolitan growth which we know lies just ahead.

Our cities grow by accident—by whim of the private developer and public agencies. A farm is sold and begins raising houses instead of potatoes—then another farm; forests are cut; valleys are filled; streams are buried in storm sewers; kids overflow the schools—here a new school is built—there a church. Then more schools and more churches. Traffic grows; roads are widened; service stations, Tasty Freeze, hamburger stands pockmark the highway. Traffic strangles. An expressway is cut through the landscape—brings clover leaves—which bring shopping centers, office buildings, high rise apartments. Relentlessly, the bits and pieces of a city are splattered across the landscape.

By this irrational process, noncommunities are born—formless places, without order, beauty or reason; with no visible respect for people or the land. Thousands of small, separate decisions—made with little or no relationship to one another, nor to their composite impact—produce a major decision about the future of our cities and our civilization—a decision we have come to label “suburban sprawl.”

Sprawl is dreadfully inefficient. It stretches out the distances people must travel to work, to shop, to worship, to play. It fails to relate these activities in ways that strengthen each and, thus, it suppresses values that orderly relationships and concentration of uses would stimulate.

Sprawl is ugly, oppressive, massively dull. It squanders the resources of of nature—forests, streams, hillsides—and produces vast, monotonous armies of housing and graceless, tasteless clutter. But worst of all, sprawl is inhuman. It is antihuman. The vast, formless spread of housing, pierced by the unrelated spotting of schools, churches, stores, creates areas so huge and irrational that they are out of scale with people—beyond their grasp and comprehension—too big for people to feel a part of, responsible for, important in.