# UC Berkeley
## Berkeley Planning Journal

**Title**
The New Urbanism: Expanding the Vision for the Design Professions

**Permalink**
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7jw8834p

**Journal**

**Authors**
Anthony, Carl
Deakin, Elizabeth
Hood, Walter
et al.

**Publication Date**
1994

**DOI**
10.5070/BP39113074

**Copyright Information**

Peer reviewed

## THE NEW URBANISM :
### Expanding the Vision for the Design Professions

## A Roundtable Discussion

### Participants[1]

**Carl Anthony,** *President, Earth Island Institute; Chair, East Bay Base Conversion and Reinvestment Commission*

**Elizabeth Deakin**, *Associate Professor of City and Regional Planning, U.C. Berkeley*

**Walter Hood,** *Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture, U.C. Berkeley*

**Clarisse Lula,** *Managing Director of RDC, Inc., an environmental, economic and technical consulting firm*

**Peter Owens**, *doctoral candidate, Environmental Planning/Urban Design. U.C. Berkeley*

**Carolyn Radisch**, *urban designer, ROMA Design, San Francisco; graduate student, Transportation Planning, U.C. Berkeley*

**Greg Tung,** *urban designer and partner, Freedman Tung & Bottomley, San Francisco*

**Rick Williams**, *founding partner and urban designer, Van Meter, Williams, and Pollack, San Francisco*

### Introduction

On September 14, the editors of the *Berkeley Planning Journal* met with eight professionals and scholars to discuss a body of work we called "the new urbanism." This design movement has captured the attention of public officials, planners and citizens alike in recent years. We asked the participants to read at least two of four influential books and a recently published critique, to serve as a touchstone for the discussion; the result was a far-ranging discourse on the promise, pitfalls, and politics of urban planning and design in the 1990s. The participants brought very distinct concerns and first-hand experiences to the table. While agreeing that the new urbanism offered a much-needed step in the right direction, they divided on whether its ideas, as now articulated, speak to the systems and attitudes that shape and divide suburban and urban communities today. Overall, we believe the participants pushed the discussion of this new movement onto important ground.

We have edited the transcribed text to bring out key themes. Although we rearranged the discussion in the editing process, and se-

lected key portions for reproduction here, this reconstruction remains true to the major points made by each participant. An annotated set of references follows the text.

## Definitions And Genesis

*BPJ: In a few words, what definition would you give of "the new urbanism?"*

**Rick Williams:** It's a large set of principles about issues, including economics and design, that affect the physical environment, but it really gets down to a series of ideas about community-building.

**Greg Tung:** Coming from these particular books, it's a necessary propagandistic spin on a lot that's been going on in planning and urban design for the last 30 or 40 years. Much of the neotraditional new-town work is garnering the lion's share of attention. On the up side, that gets a lot of people interested in the issues. But the downside is that it may seem like that's the only thing going on.

**Walter Hood:** For me, I would say that the new urbanism is non-existent.

**Carolyn Radisch:** I think it's a hopeful first step on some problems we've been grappling with for some time—managing new growth, preserving agriculture and open space, integrating land uses, and solving transportation problems. I don't think it's the whole answer, but it's a hopeful first step.

**Elizabeth Deakin:** I'd say it's an extended set of hypotheses masquerading as a theory, and an oversimplification that nevertheless addresses some very serious problems.

**Carl Anthony:** I would say that this new urbanism is a positive direction, but in some ways it doesn't go far enough. Its foundation in urban design doesn't question the forces that make cities; and there are a number of other questions it doesn't really address, like questions of social justice and racism.

**Peter Owens:** Two words: historic marker. It's part of a long tradition of design manifestos reacting to a perceived crisis in the urban environment. In this case, it's a reaction to the faceless sprawl of suburbia; 100 years ago it was the overcrowded industrial city.[2]

**Clarisse Lula:** A quick phrase: Impossible.

* * * * *

**Williams:** I'm not happy with the idea that this is just a propagandistic spin. I think the people working in this field would say that the issues are multidimensional—there are many forces creating our communi-

ties. The new urbanism is really not about one book having all the answers, or any one small group of people, but how certain principles that share a common foundation work toward some common goals.

***BPJ:*** *So what are the issues that have prompted this body of work?*

**Anthony:** There are a lot of issues, on many levels. There are issues of economics---developers are finding that their markets are vulnerable. They're also under a lot of criticism from environmentalists who rightly point out that we're in a global crisis—the patterns we've inherited over the last generation are damaging the basis of life on the planet. There is a nod in the direction of social justice in the recognition, for example, that land-use patterns based on zoning for single classes of people in isolation from one another, is not only not healthy, but also boring. Many dimensions are moving us in the direction of the new urbanism. But, there's also the aspect of this that being an architect you have to get clients; you have to get jobs and·try to put them to good use.

**Tung:** Hence the necessary propagandistic spin. We're talking about many things that are going on, but there's a certain direction that gets a lot of attention, that gets published in *Time*. We need to push for a more broadly based public exposure to the bigger issues. The problem is, as always with the media, packaging the ideas in an exciting way that gets people interested and thinking about them.

**Deakin:** One of the issues is the question of who it is being sold to. These ideas have had difficulty in finding acceptance among the development community. They haven't been easy sales by any means; they're not even easy sales among public officials. There have been some success stories, but there have been many, many cases where elements of the overall model seem to fall apart. Did everyone get the paper [by Audirac and Shermeyn]? I'd like to talk a little bit about the elements of the model [see Figure 1]. Some elements are more important than others. For example, "mixed use" is being used both as a metric for being able to provide better integration from a transportation perspective, and also indirectly to provide affordable housing, although that isn't articulated in some of the designs coming out. Higher densities do the same; the justification for higher density, it seems to me, is to create a more accessible on-foot kind of development. In part, it's also to make land costs a smaller percentage of the overall cost of the development; the environmental impact may be less as a result. The gridded street network is a little more difficult to talk about. We have arguments that grids sometimes create better accessibility, but in many places grids have created a lot of problems,

---

## Figure 1

### New Urbanism and Traditional Neighborhood Design Guidelines

| Planning & Design Principles/Code Elements | Growth Management Claims |
|---|---|
| **Mixed land uses** | |
| • General land uses: public, civic, residential, shopfront, workplace (no industrial or manufacturing, unless of artistic or craft nature) | • Class and age integration by pedestrian propinquity to work, commercial and civic activities, and residences; by varying residential types, densities, and values (incomes) |
| | • Less pollution and traffic congestion from reduced auto use due to pedestrian propinquity |
| | • Balance of jobs and residences |
| | • "Bonds of an authentic community are formed" |
| **Higher residential densities than standard** | |
| • Single family-detached and zero lot line housing; garage and accessory apartments; apts. over shopfronts | • Same as above |
| | • Increased face-to-face interaction |
| • Building, lot, and town size limitations establish densities within a flexible framework (widely ranging gross densities, 10-40 units/acre) | • Increased potential for public transit, which further reduces auto usage and provides greater mobility to nondriving residents (children and elderly) |
| **Gridded street network** | |
| • Dense network of connected streets | • Increased accessibility from multiple routes due to many interconnections within neighborhoods and with external roads |
| • Reduced or nonexistent street hierarchy | |
| • Cross-section = two travel lanes with onstreet parking (max. 40' width) | |
| • Reduced lateral clearance | • Encouragement of pedestrianism and social integration by de-emphasizing auto use with reduction in road performance standard (capacity and speed); buffering of pedestrians from moving cars by onstreet parking |
| • Reduced curb radii (10 ft. or less) | |
| • Short traffic signal cycles | |
| • Alleys to reduce curb cuts and provide service and utility easements | • Less traffic congestion on internal and external streets due to gridded interconnections; "commuters are granted increased personal time" |

---

## Figure 1 (continued)

### New Urbanism and Traditional Neighborhood Design Guidelines

| Planning & Design Principles/Code Elements | Growth Management Claims |
|---|---|
| **Public spaces and town center** | |
| • Mandatory civic buildings and centralized public squares or parks | • Increased sense of place and community through social interaction |
| • Integration of mixed uses (retail, service, and residential town center) | • Socioeconomic integration and increased security through well-defined, accessible public spaces |
| | • Encouragement of democratic initiatives and public life, "The organic evolution of society is secured" |
| **Streetscapes and street vistas** | |
| • Requirements that define and landscape street edges, lots and building must front streets; required street walls and fences, reduced curb cuts (and gated cuts); trees planted in right-of-ways | • Increased social integration and sense of community by encouraging people to enter public spaces of which streets are a large component |
| • Civic building or other public structure terminates view down street axis | • A street becomes a "public room", to house social interactions |
| **Vernacular or traditional architecture** | |
| • Not required in the TND code; built examples have architectural codes, commonly including requirements for vernacular/traditional materials and detail | • Increased sense of community and neighborliness through shared perceptions of a neighborhood on a pedestrian scale, both intimate and familiar; e.g. front porch to bridge private and public spaces |
| **Limits on geographic scale** | |
| • Small blocks "average perimeter...not to exceed 2000 sq. ft." | • Engenders a sense of community and neighborliness by clearly delimiting neighborhood and town boundaries and by maintaining pedestrian-scaled communities. |
| • Geographic size constrained, neighborhoods delimited by 5-10 minute walking distance and town range from 40 to 200 acres | • Controls urban sprawl |
| • Greenbelt | |

**Source:** Adapted from Ivonne Audirac and Anne Shermeyn, "Postmodern Placebo or Remedy for Urban Malaise?" (*Journal of Planning Education and Research* 13 (1994)), Table 1, page 163. Quotations are cited in the original.

with traffic speeding through neighborhoods. So it's more than just gridded street networks—it's also a different design of street; the detailed design characteristics become critical. When some of these pieces start falling out though, you have something that isn't that different from what's already being built. When the density slides, from 15 units to the acre to 8 units an acre (or even 5 or 3 units an acre), then you won't have sufficient population to support local retail [or] mass transit. So, some of these elements are more vital than others, some are being used as very indirect measures of others, including possibly the social justice issues that Carl [Anthony] raised, and some of them are extremely vulnerable to minor changes that are actually critical to the design. If it isn't all there it just seems to flop.

**Anthony:** This discussion is not exactly where I would start, because the new urbanism is a response to something unstated: What are we doing here together? What is a community? How do we relate to each other? Then having some clarity about that, we can ask, "How do we arrange ourselves and our infrastructure to make ourselves more at peace with each other, more productive, happy, healthy, and successful?" As an American people, however, there's a huge vested interest in not asking those questions. There's a huge range of responses which cannot be talked about, because you can't sell them. There's the *Bladerunner* image at one end—of an urban nightmare. That's nowhere in the books, but it's a reality that everybody here knows about. One reason people move to the suburbs is because they're frightened. At the other end, there's a bucolic hope that if we can get out in the landscape with a bunch of cows, things will work out. Some people want us to go back to the wilderness, and other people have fantasies about high-tech, being able to live with helicopters or taking off to some other planet. But the reality is we're all forced to be here. We can't afford these fantasies anymore. We have to look at the real experiences that people are having. Nobody can afford a house in an urban area, because the land values are too high and the ones that they can afford are in bad neighborhoods. They're forced to move, because the only place you can find a $200,000 house is 50 miles away from San Francisco. Average people are trying to figure out whether they're slipping into a lower class than they thought they were going to be in. To me, there's too much that's not encapsulated in the debate the way it's currently framed, but none of this can be talked about, because you can't put it in a brochure when you're trying to sell somebody a $450,000 house. And one of the reasons it's hard to talk about these other issues is that you can't make a living [as an architect] this way.

**BPJ:** *Let's go back a little, because you are touching a core issue. You're looking at a design movement, and then asking how well it reflects the issues and experiences of people in communities and their needs—which is a huge arena and a small base. In this sense how does it differ from any other past design movement—Olmsted, for example, or the flip side, the modernist movement? Can we situate this historically a little bit before we move on?*

**Hood:** It seems to me that a lot of the neotraditional approach acts as if modernism never existed. If you take the whole Krier[3] notion of what community is, it throws modernism out the window, turns back to this bucolic image.

**Lula:** If you put it in a historical context, I would say that it's contending with underlying factors; it's a hopeful reach for developing community, but it's a shallow reach. The reason I said the new urbanism is impossible is that it's largely been a normative discussion so far. Our decision-making paradigms—and this is what bothers me the most about policy analysis and the lack of depth in it—have been based on a privatized individual maximizing his return. But we're facing an unraveling, or a paradigm shift, in what constitutes community. In neighborhoods, in families, our whole scale is exploding, in terms of the divisions of households into single mother households, and so on. Now economists and policy analysts are beginning to formulate concepts in terms of the economics of the family, the economics of the community. The reason I said the new urbanism is impossible is that the groups that have to come into interaction have such different value sets that I'm not terribly hopeful about reaching the agreements [we need] in order to succeed.

**Deakin:** To some extent the fact that it's called "the new urbanism" is a bit problematic to me. We shouldn't forget about the existing models. The oldest suburbs have the same characteristics the new urbanism calls for. I'd rather call it neotraditional, because although that has a nostalgic twang to it, we can point to many examples of successful urban neighborhoods, where people have survived and the housing is even worth some money.

**Anthony:** To the extent that we're only grounded in design, and not grounded in economics or the national psychic state, we can't call this the new urbanism. When we talk in terms of Corbusier[4] or Howard's design ideas, we're really missing out; the focus is too narrow. One issue is the real lack of a sense of history. Our sense of who we are as a people is not accurate. We have representatives of 265 native American tribes living in San Francisco, and people treat them like

they just got off the boat, and they have to work their way up. Their ancestors have been [here] for 12,000 years, and they don't enter our discourse anywhere. It's like they don't exist. Olmsted wrote three books about black people in the south, but they never get discussed in any landscape context [today]. He talked about immigrants, and how to deal with immigrants in Central Park.[5] In 1910, 90 percent of the people living in the urban areas of the United States were either immigrants or first-generation Americans. So to some extent, there's a problem here of national purpose, of coming together as a community and finally coming to terms with this complex history. When you look at the number of immigrants coming into our cities today from Southeast Asia or Mexico—I don't see anything in these books that show they're even aware of the fact. They don't seem to be aware that Washington, D.C. is 70% black, that Los Angeles, Detroit—all the big cities are mostly people of color. To move the debate forward, we have to talk about things that professionally, and in the market sense, are still very difficult to talk about.

**Williams:** I think we have to understand that this *is* a design movement, and an attempt to translate a whole set of very diverse issues into a set of physical solutions, although not in a physical-deterministic way. These designers are not raising the issue of black or white, because they know that isn't an issue that can be resolved by design. Anyone can live in these communities. There is an economic issue about who lives in which neighborhoods, but that is the case regardless of whether the communities are designed in any different way. But many of these principles will translate from one community to another. For example, the higher-density or ancillary units are trying to address the many definitions of the family. That's just one example. The idea of having public space, which you think of as being a long-standing thing, is almost foreign in many suburban communities today. The idea that a park should be public, versus a private park, represents a whole lot of things, including the intermingling of many varieties of people, many different income levels—possibly—that are only possible as a public park. If you take on all these different issues you can see where they're trying to come up with a solution or a series of solutions or a philosophy behind design. I say, pick out an issue and see if it is addressed.

## Urban or Suburban? Redefining Community Building

*Participants quickly identified several contradictions in the new urbanism: does it encourage flight to the suburbs at the expense of urban residents, and agricultural land? Can design be a medium for social change without relying on a naïve physical determinism?*

*Participants agreed, at least to an extent, that any new urbanism worth the name must acknowledge complex concerns about personal safety and the well-being of children, as well as racism and class divisions.*

**Hood:** I agree with what Carl is saying. When I hear the term "the new urbanism," it's for a particular group of people: people who have fled the cities; people in the suburbs, people who have escaped a lot of the really hard issues that people are facing in urban communities. If you look at where freeways run in the East Bay, and you look at the economic infrastructure that's in place, you see traditional neighborhoods—sure, people are living there—but they're gutted. These communities have problems bringing a Safeway in, or a bank in. I live in West Oakland, and there's no bank, no cleaners, although those are basic community services. Communities on the fringe are in the same position; they can't get these services either, but there are differences too. It's easy to go out on a grassland and envision what a community can be. The harder question is: why are people leaving the cities? We need to construct some paradigm to deal with those issues.

**Tung:** I don't think it's quite so simple as that. We're finding, for instance, that in older residential areas, the neighborhood groups we work with are really receptive to these ideas for resuscitating their old neighborhoods.

**Anthony:** So it's not just propaganda then.

**Deakin:** I think that's right—

*BPJ:* —*and it's not just suburban.*

**Hood:** Seems like these books are really about urban patterns, but if you look, we've adopted suburban standards for the development of our cities. I'm totally blown away every time I see a new drugstore go in. Now they have this new design approach, where instead of building to the sidewalk you put up I-beam trellis things and set the buildings back. It's interesting to see that these suburban standards have infiltrated the city, and now all of a sudden we're taking urban ideas back out to the suburbs.

**Williams:** I think there are two ways of looking at this movement. One is, where the projects are, the other is the principles. Many of the design principles apply to West Oakland[6] as much as they would apply to Brentwood or Concord or Walnut Creek.[7] Many of the people planning new communities in Sacramento are also looking at models of Rockridge [in Oakland][8] and other urban areas to gain their principles. Mission Bay [in San Francisco][9] is consistent in its thinking with many of the more suburban projects, and they all work on many of

the same design principles. Many of the fundamental ones are listed in the Audirac article. The translation of what a "mix of land uses" is may be modified in the suburb versus an inner city because of other dimensions, including ownership patterns, and the existing structure of the area. The real question to me is, should we be looking at creating communities in Brentwood or other suburban areas and taking San Francisco development prototypes to do that?

**Deakin:** That's part of the problem. We've gotten caught up in thinking of this as a suburban design issue, because so many of the projects that are featured are large-scale, 10,000-acre, 5,000-acre, 2,000-acre suburban projects. The infill projects receive less attention, if for no other reason than that they tend to be a bit less controversial and the scale isn't so massive. The new urbanists don't raise the questions that I think ought to be raised more often about the Brentwoods and the Laguna Wests[10] that do get so much attention, which is: why are we building in these places? They're out in the middle of nowhere, on rice paddies and apricot orchards. Why are we doing that? And why in the world are we as professionals celebrating such a thing?

**Anthony:** Especially when we have the Eastmont Malls of the world [an inner city shopping center in Oakland] that are abandoned, that can't find tenants, and no way can they possibly work financially. Every time [a suburban mall] is built, you create a fiscal strain, you create social division, segregation, energy loss, you lose ecological resources. If we're going to talk theory, then we need to deal with the real issues, and build up from a common understanding of what they are, and then get to the question of what the form should be. And there are a lot of issues that have not yet been addressed, frankly because a lot of the people putting the theory together don't have the experience, and they don't even know what these issues are.

**Deakin:** Maybe we should turn to that. Part of the question seems to be whether the designs themselves will generate a milieu in which social re-creation and greater democracy is possible. Carl, you're raising questions of how in the world will that happen, if the designers and the residents are lily-white—

**Anthony:** —Among other things.

**Deakin:** Among other things. But I think Rick [Williams] and Greg [Tung] have made a convincing argument—to me a right argument— that new suburbs are not the only places that are being designed this way. But [Eastmont] and other places like it are failing not just because of white flight but because of the whole change in urban economics and urban organization. I think we need to be careful that

we're not just being nostalgic about this. We should put the economic issues on the table along with the social issues.

**Williams:** I think we need to ask why people are moving to the suburbs. Can we provide them with reasons for staying by creating places that aren't in the suburbs but are back in our cities?

**Anthony:** This is one of the reasons there really is value to the concept of a new urbanism, even though I still have a lot of questions about it. There's a paradigm underlying the whole suburban development process—its driven by a lot of factors, including the availability of mortgage money, the federal highway tax, the fact of cheap land and less development controls. In addition, you had working-class people who felt they could move to safer neighborhoods and they also didn't have to be around black people; they wanted to be sure their kids had schools they could control. There are all these factors making the current paradigm work.

**Deakin:** May I throw one more thing on the table? I think we've touched on it—it's children, the obsession with children: keeping children safe and having them protected in schools and otherwise sheltered that drives part of this. It ranges from not wanting to have to teach your kids to dive into the bathtub when there are shootings going on in the neighborhood, to worrying about what's going to happen to kids in school if they're rowdy.

**Anthony:** There is a value in this new paradigm, because it suggests that there's another way to do things. It says you can have a good life in the city. It is an attempt to create an orientation on the part of people who are in the market for buying a house, towards a new synthesis that acknowledges a lot of the problems with the way we've been going. To the extent that we can get developments that are higher density, that have in-law units that meet the shape of the new family, to the extent that you can have these located near mass transit so you don't have to rely on automobiles, to the extent that you can get people on bicycles and having a different relationship to nature, and also make it feasible, so developers can make money off of it—it suggests the hope that the current pattern is not inevitable.

**Tung:** To an extent, the new urbanism is a kind of Trojan Horse approach. We're making urbanity safe for the suburbs. That's what I find we have to do all the time, if you want to get people to sign up and be enthusiastic.

**Deakin:** My problem is that it harkens back to a Jane Jacobs [11] cut on things. While I think Jane Jacobs had some attractive ideas about how life might be in the city, about the time she was writing, Kitty

Genovese[12] was killed with all those eyes on the street, ignoring what they were seeing. I think the *Bladerunner* image is something we need to bring into this and to discuss. We need to think more realistically about what people think and how they behave. Carl raised a question about crime: crime is a really important part of this. And it's not something that suburbs are immune to. But we aren't dealing with that question at all; we're making assumptions that we can celebrate publicness, and that publicness will create a kind of social integration and social betterment that hearkens back to some of the writings of the turn of the century that are physical determinism, by definition. That's dangerous, because it allows us to escape the issues that aren't going to get solved if we don't talk about them—try to do some nice things and maybe they'll take care of themselves.

**Anthony:** For example, some people doing a creek restoration project in East Oakland wanted to involve 13-year-old kids out there. There was so much fear about drug dealing [among the neighbors] and whether this place was safe. The people who think about daylighting the creek don't have any sense of what it would be like living in the neighborhoods that are being terrorized. They don't realize, that for these neighborhoods, creek restoration may not be the coolest thing to be doing.

I want to make a pitch for an almost psychological deepening among designers to acknowledge that in our cities there are taboo places. There are places where you don't go, places you don't talk about, places that are set aside for adult entertainment, where prostitutes hang out—all these things that people know about but when it comes to doing urban design they don't make it into the books. Unfortunately, poor people—immigrants, African-Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, people who can't get the money that is necessary— quite frequently end up living in these places that have a lot of these problems that don't get addressed in this kind of discourse.

**Owens:** That is the heart of the dilemma. On the one hand, there are these historical polarization processes happening in America that have been well-documented. For example, Robert Reich's piece on the segregation of the successful in the *New York Times* recently—

**Anthony:** He called it the second secession, in reference to the Southern people trying to escape the Union.

**Owens:** I want to underscore something Betty [Deakin] said earlier. To the extent that there's a whole set of unexplored hypotheses that are put forward, If we do this, then this will happen," really strikes one as an incredibly innocent and naïve approach. Yet physical de-

sign does make a difference; it does contribute; it's part of the equation. What is promising about this new series of ideas is that they're beginning to introduce some physical designs that have the potential to contribute in a way that could support the larger questions. At the same time, the danger is that those things will only become images. We'll have master-planned communities with walls and gates around the front, but inside they look like a town and all the people can walk to their shops—

**Deakin:** So we're building new walled towns, and that's better?

**Owens:** That's the danger. It needs to be pushed further. As Clarisse [Lula] mentioned and we've all been talking about, building community is not about building something that looks like a 19th-century townscape. Building community has to do with people working together, building consensus, working out problems, having conflicts, and all those kinds of things. How do different people get a stake in the community? and where is the dialogue and the physical change that adapts to the different and changing needs of those people? If it just becomes another covenanted idea of freezing time, I don't think we're any better off than we are with the kind of typical master-planned subdivision.

**Lula:** I think that's a really good question. It goes back to Betty's point about the scare around children. Our community making processes—someone said this earlier—focus on the negative, instead of a positive response. The crisis in education is an old crisis. It started in the 60s in the ghettoes. There's a great article in the *Atlantic* about Headstart—a grassroots community response to save the children. It actually started to succeed, but when Johnson saw it was working, he infused it with a lot of money and destroyed it. The money created a power base. People who had been disenfranchised started gaining franchise in the community, and this threatened the old Democratic party. Your comment [Rick] was that [the new urbanism] is a design response, but you cut yourself off from the very roots of your vision when you just make a design response. [Community-building] works, in a big way, if it keeps itself rooted in its deepest ideals.

**Hood:** It's really hard to say, "If I design this way, it will be a community." I'm from the suburbs; I went to high school there. There were some dirty parts in my [former] community; there was a liquor house in that community. Some people looked at that [as a problem], and for other people that was viable. But people recognized they were all in this thing together. People helped one another. To me, those were viable communities. But what happened for my family, when we

moved to the suburbs—the suburbs had typically been where whites had moved—all the whites left. Now this isn't all that long ago, it was the '70s, but they left. When we got access to these places, reaching for that dream, we didn't care if it didn't have sidewalks. As long as it had a school, it had stores, a shopping center, that's all we really cared about. Now the area is predominantly African-American, and there's another ring of suburbs where the white people moved. This process goes on and on. The people in suburbs don't want small streets. They don't want mixed use. They want to be away from those things. They want to be able to get in their cars, come into the city, even go into the ethnic enclaves and go to the jazz clubs and things, on their own terms, then go back home and talk about the great fun that they've had.

I think what the new urbanism is getting at, is that there's a diversity of needs. I don't think there's just one traditional vision. There are these differences. Someone said that it's very naïve that as architects we think that to do it this new way is going to make things better. It may be easier to go out of the city and just reinvent it. But, I think we have to grapple with some of these other issues that Carl brought up. I think the issues that deal with "community" should be addressed a little more; we should be willing to deal with those harder issues. And I think that this will provide diversity and difference—not homogeneity.

## New Urbanism as a "Visioning" Tool

*The panelists, especially the designers, seemed to concur on the value of the new urbanism as a tool in the community planning process, because it uses images that people in different communities can understand and may prefer. However, people may have quite different experiences and judgments about the things designers value.*

**Tung:** In many cases of working in infill situations or revitalization, your real power—your only power—as a designer is to help people see things. When you can go out and take pictures of things that are there, and then compare them to other places, it gives people an opportunity to understand what kind of choices they have. That's when people can take a look at things; they can decide, "No, we're going to go this way and not that way." We worked on an old neighborhood in Mountain View that adjoins the downtown, a neighborhood of mostly old houses. Many of them had been bought up by young couples, but a lot of older folks still remained in the neighborhood, so it was a pretty mixed group. We went through all the slides of how to do the streets—whether they wanted to control traffic coming in certain di-

rections to the neighborhood versus another. A consensus came out of that, but previous to that educational process there was a lot of uncertainty and lack of direction. In every case, it was essential to give people a planning and design vocabulary to talk about the kinds of decisions they could make. Given that the city was trying to do a neighborhood plan, they could shape the direction of these policies. That's where their entry [to the process] was.

*BPJ: So using some of these principles, you give people a vision that allows them to say, "Yes, we have more agreement than we thought there was." That's really significant.*

**Tung:** Yes. As a designer you're always threading this course. You have your own prepackaged visions in your head of what the neighborhood could be, and you may push for that pretty hard. But by the same token, you hopefully counterbalance your own tendencies by giving out as much information as you can, so that if there really is a different vision than yours, it pushes back on you. That's happened many times.

**Williams:** Just a week ago, having sat at community meetings on the same project two nights a month for five years, a person I'd never seen before walked in with one of these books and said: "Why can't we do something like this for our community?" What was really embarrassing for her, was that a vision of her community was in the book she was holding. That's the power of vision—if it can be explained in a way that the general public can see it and say, "This is what I want in my community," at least it gives them a sense of direction. Then they have to ferret out for themselves how much [growth] they really want to have. I think that as in many things—in every project you do—the devil is in the details, because many of these principles fall apart if they aren't achieved to certain levels. Even in the cities, density is hard to achieve. It is hard to sell a "high-density" project in Oakland, or in Alameda. Even an affordable housing project is just as hard to sell in the city as it is in the suburbs. A really critical thing to mention about the Mountain View project, is that there was a group of public officials that supported what Greg [Tung]'s firm was talking about. The problem is that you can go to a lot of communities, and not have a group of citizens or planners in the public sector that can actually implement the concepts once they are accepted.

**Anthony:** Many neighborhoods are well organized these days, and in no mood to be run over. Unless there's an education process, many people in those neighborhoods will fight—in my view, for the wrong thing. They will be right to the degree that they should have some say

over what goes on in their communities. For example, I worked on a four-acre redevelopment plan in downtown Oakland, and a lot of affordable housing people were pushing me to put 50, 70 units per acre on the site. And the neighborhood people remembered what it used to be like, when it was all Victorian houses, and they said, "We have too much of that [affordable housing] in the neighborhood, we're not going for it." We did manage to get some owner-occupied dwelling units—with two apartments and a house, so it had some bulk and it looked like Victorian houses and so forth—but it took a lot of education and a lot of respect for what people know. To some extent this "nostalgia" image—the picket fence image—to people who have some authority and power, that's what they remember from when they were kids. That's not something to be dismissed. The only way a designer can succeed is to have some kind of positive image that people can feel they want to be connected with.

**Hood:** To pick up on Rick's point, I was working with HUD on a project. I walked into the San Francisco office, and they said: "Can we do this?"—and they pointed to Calthorpe's book. People in the community also responded to this imagery. Working in West Oakland on a 26-unit housing development with a small meeting house, a very New England kind of thing, I was out looking at the front yards, and one of the guys who lives in his truck across the street came up to me and said: "These are pretty damn cool. They look like the other houses here." All of a sudden, he made the connection that low-income housing doesn't have to look like the projects around the corner—that they can have some character and individuality about them, and you feel good about it to a certain degree. I do have a problem promoting this nostalgic image[, though]; you can't do any other kind of fence, except a picket fence. What I'm finding is that for a lot of [inner city] residents, it's not familiar to them. They know what a fence is, but that aesthetic, that choice, is foreign to them. Once I got a call about plants attracting bees in a housing project. People weren't used to flowers, and they called and complained, "There are bees in my neighborhood." You just see how far the gap really is. It brings everything to earth.

**Owens:** When I was in Burlington in 1984, Seaside[13] had just been publicized and Calthorpe came to Burlington to give a talk. We were doing a redesign of a suburban strip there. So I went out and did all this drawing about street corners and showed it to the steering committee, and I'll never forget this one old guy who goes, "That's a street corner! There'll be alcoholics and bums hanging out—what are you doing?" So I didn't photograph the dirty little corner of Hartford, a

town in Vermont that I loved; I photographed Middlebury, which had a really nice common and a white church and a bunch of active, clean-looking people shopping on the street, because I knew that was what was going to change these people's minds. In the end, we got the project through, although with a kind of different vision. So it's not just getting the disenfranchised people involved; it's also getting the privileged people back into the arena that says there is a potential world where I could foresee myself sharing some of my life with people who may be different. To take a step outward, to open up, building that connection—the idea of building on a street is very simple, or a residence over a store—but those start to be very powerful ideas when you think about how different they are from the practices of the past 60 years. People in the social sciences and community action tend to beat these [new urbanist] ideas over the head and say they're silly, but I see the new urbanism as an opening, a dialogue, to begin to talk about many of the deeper issues that Carl and Walter [Hood], and others have been very articulate in raising.

## Diversity versus Standardization: The Role of Clients

*BPJ:* What about this issue of diversity? What would design look like if it really suited different populations? Is it different design, or a different design process?

**Anthony:** I think it has to do with clients. If you have the same developers being the clients, [with] ways of looking at the world based on that role, it's a lot different than having a nonprofit corporation serving single women with children as a client. We need to move toward the acknowledgment, creation, and generation of good clients for good urban design and architecture. Not because that's the end, but because that's the means towards serving for a better fit. Even a lot of people who go to the suburbs now are only going there because that's the only choice they have. If we had a richer cross-section of clients, and mechanisms, partnerships, things like that, that would make a big difference.

**Hood:** The stake for a developer is purely economic. They don't care if there's a single parent-diversity issue; if I can turn a buck and sell them all, that's what I'm going to do. I was thinking the other day that I've never done housing except with nonprofits. They're the ones building these projects in the city, getting these ideas through. Why are they the ones? Those are their clients; they have a vested interest; they're in the communities. Have other people [here] worked with other clients who have been willing to have that interest?

**Williams:** There's a wide diversity, and yet I'm not going to say that every nonprofit is as socially responsible as they make out to be. I think they fall under many of the exact pressures that a for-profit developer falls under. If I only had one particular dimension that influenced the most things in design today, whether it's in the inner city or the suburbs, it's security. For example, you want to have multiple entries on the street, as a design principle, to add a greater amount of activity along a long length of street, but their management people state they have a security problem, and they need to have a single point of entry. If they have other porches that are at ground level, and it's a senior project, they have an additional security problem because elderly people have a tendency to forget to close and lock their doors. All these factors have a tendency of creating a closed projects. A senior project done in Oakley [a new suburb in the eastern Bay Area] has the exact same security issues, for some reason, as a senior project in the Mission District in San Francisco—both the exact same size, with the exact same funding, with two different nonprofit organizations—and it's because those groups have a particular formula and way of working with things.

**Deakin:** It sounds like the traffic engineers. I can only say that these are arbitrary standards.

**Tung:** When you're fortunate enough to get the city as a client, it's easier to get the design guidelines to change in response to some of these ideas.

**Anthony:** This also argues for the need to deal with a project before it actually becomes a project. Some people say, "Well, security! Those people just don't know what good design is, they just want security." But that's why people live [in one place or another]. They have to be safe. This pushes us more in the direction that we first started off talking about—having a context that makes sense, that there's some relationship to the demographics and the other social issues in the neighborhood. When you look at a couple of examples here in Dan's [Solomon] work, he's been able to do very interesting projects because he's had clients that are willing to do that—for example, the project in the Castro for a gay client. These projects lead to interesting architectural issues, but they also touch social issues because there's somebody there who can afford to take the time to work out what it means to be different. Our society is so hooked on the idea of a suburban family with 2.5 kids and a dog—it's [the equivalent] of traffic engineering. We're missing lots of opportunities to use the talent people have. The economics of being an architect are so weird that you end up seeing postmodern McDonald's because people are so com-

pulsive about doing "design" regardless of whether it's appropriate. To the extent that these books are pointing toward another vernacular, that's helpful and wholesome.

**Deakin:** That's a good point. Look at the fights [transportation planners] have to go through. Every single project, there's a battle over the width of the streets—whether to get up on top of Communications Hill [in San Jose] we needed an eight-lane arterial, whether in the Hayward BART station area we needed 50-foot-wide streets to get people into and out of low-income housing, in all of Peter Calthorpe's projects in Sacramento whether the streets have to be 50-feet wide or even wider. It's the idea we need to land small planes on them, I think. Most of these standards really don't have a basis; there isn't real evidence of one door being so much better for security reasons. Somebody wrote a rule once, and other people adopted the rule and it becomes a shorthand.

**Tung:** Or it becomes the mantra that the developers chant as they come in the door. We had the case in Mountain View of a big in-town infill project slated for a site just off the main street. The opposite side of the street was already lined with houses with little doors and apartment buildings with individual doors. The architects, not just the developers, came in insisting on building big inward facing doughnuts. We were working with the City on design review and establishing policies, and we insisted on having stoops on the outside. They jumped up and down and held their breath 'til their faces turned blue but finally gave in. Two years later we saw them saying it was their idea.

*BPJ: Have those measures actually increased the use of the space, a sense of community? We're talking about a relationship between design and community-building that is still not very well established.*

**Tung**: I can't say that I've done a post-occupancy evaluation. I know from walking around there, there's a much greater sense of continuity of the neighborhood than there otherwise would be, if it had been a residential fortress.

**Deakin:** Susan Handy[14] looked at communities with vernacular streets and cul-de-sac communities, and found people walked more in the former, making trips to nearby convenience stores, etc. She didn't show that [gridded] streets made any difference on the overall environmental impact, because people still used their cars for regional shopping and work. People are outside more and making more trips on foot, but this may not be a substitution of car trips. There's so

much more work [like this] we could be doing, as academics. We should start our students off on these problems.

## Economics & Politics: Changing the Terms of Development

*Over the course of the discussion, participants identified a number of obstacles and limitations to new urbanist development thus far: neglect of commercial areas, particularly the ubiquitous strip; the private financing mechanisms underlying development standards; and the lack of viable regional decision-making regarding the costs of suburban infrastructure. In turn, they proposed a number of policy options.*

**Deakin:** Seems to me there is another thing we have to put on the table. Are we being realistic, given the market? We are in a situation for the next 20 years, where we have 30 percent vacancy in retail. The kind of retail that's succeeding is very large scale discount warehouse type places or tiny boutiques at the high end, for the most part, plus some ethnic retailing. Is it realistic to talk about going back to a turn-of-the-century neighborhood center, with a small grocery store? Are we going to get a Safeway, or even a private operator, to locate in one of those places? Will it succeed? I think we need to be careful that we're not just being nostalgic. There's an economic set of issues that we should put on the table along with the social issues.

**Tung:** A lot more work needs to be done on the building of operational types that are barely addressed in the new urbanism—for example, all the "big boxes."[15] There's an implicit critique when you see the preference for neighborhood mom and pop groceries versus the big box, but so far there's also a lack of experimentation with new models. Right now there's an inability to grapple with commercial buildings; you don't know what to do with them. We just put them on the edge, and integrate them the best we can. There are the realities, of course, that the operation needs to be a certain size and needs a certain amount of parking and so forth. Some cities are making an effort, and saying, "We won't let you build out on the edge; you must come into our downtown and we've tried to assemble some parcels for you." Then [you can] figure out ways to make it work: "You aren't allowed to have a blank box; you must coat the outside with little shops," or something. A lot of work needs to be done in that way.

**Radisch:** There's another issue I want to bring up on infill projects. It's difficult to do any project, but these projects have additional constraints. The cards are stacked against developing anything; ultimately, you come down to financing. I'm kind of a cynic, and I think that those people hold the cards. There's still redlining going on; it's hard to get financing for anything that's different. That's another

benefit to having some new models of development that can be successful, it can start to make some inroads into what I think is the most difficult frontier.

**Anthony:** I don't want us to be overly naïve about who's determining these standards, and for what reasons. David Goldstein, who works with the Natural Resources Defense Council, has come up with some ideas about "green mortgages." If you could change the mortgage application to include transportation costs, you could create incentives for people who were exchanging a house that was near public transportation for one in the suburbs—because people spend $700 to $1,000 a month on cars. Just put the line on the mortgage for transportation and housing costs together, have a percentage that was OK for that, and let people figure out what they want to do about it—this would have a big effect. Then we had a discussion with the banking people, who told us you have to affect the secondary mortgage market. There are only six big companies that have an effect on that market, and one of them is the General Motors Acceptance Corporation—which in fact was responsible for making these problems in the first place.

**Owens:** I want to raise the financing issue [too]. The FHA housing standards from the 30s have so much to do with our template of the suburban life. Change in federal loan guarantees tied to a different set of performance or site-design standards [can] begin to change things. I just came across a recent federal transportation initiative that ties federal dollars to projects that meet certain kinds of livable community standards. But it's even more important to get inside the underwriting industry and the standards they use to guarantee loans, because that's where it all begins.

**Williams:** Oakland is voting to get rid of our lighting and landscaping district, which is supporting our street trees, lights, and parks. This is the exact same thing that the City of Brentwood did; they said we just aren't going to create [special districts] anymore, because those are taxes on our residences. The issues can be the same in both places in some regards, but we need to be looking at these larger issues—what impacts land-use policy is where we put our [tax] dollars.

**Radisch:** I agree. At the state level, there's been talk of restructuring the way sales tax money is allocated to cities. That would assist in focusing urban development; and urban limit lines, too, can help focus development in urban areas. But [they've] been talked about for years, and not gotten off the ground.

**Anthony:** The strategies that create the kind of financing mechanisms that Rick is so concerned about—the special districts—are not considered relevant to the new urbanism. In fact, those [measures] would make this space livable for a large number of people. But there are no mechanisms in place to make it happen.

**Tung:** There are a few. We're working on some strip corridors. So sometimes as part of a downtown revitalization, instead of asking, "Where's the next festival marketplace going to be?" we try to impress on our clients that they have this incredible resource there. Somehow you have to capture this as a space you can be in—something the community can actually take some ownership for.

**Radisch:** How can we address issues like urban sprawl and the flight to the suburbs? In California, we've decided that we can't afford to do regional planning anymore.

**Anthony:** Look at what Mike Heymann[16] tried to do with regional planning. For all of its flaws, the problem of trying to get a regional consensus for making decisions proved to be unreachable. The cities want to maintain their police powers and land-use controls. There've been wars in Berkeley about this particular topic; people in neighborhoods are very jealous about the empty lot across the street. People will come out in droves and say, "I don't want anything on that corner because I use that corner for my dog."

**Deakin:** What we have here are ideas for suburban town planning, which by itself has value, and some ideas for infill development which have lots of value; but all too often the metropolitan and regional part of this [discussion] gets lost. That may be the only place where we can discuss a strategy for infrastructure investment or larger social policy that goes beyond pitting neighborhoods against one another. And we don't have a good language for that. Bay Vision 2020 failed, in my view, because they were using a 1960s image of organization from the top down that never reached anybody but a few people sitting around the table. We don't know how to do these things yet.

**Williams:** Transportation policy, and where the federal government's money's gone, is a major problem that's going to inhibit any of the new urbanist ideas from coming to fruition. As long as we continue to dump taxpayers' dollars into reinforcing freeways or adding new lanes instead of reinforcing our public transit systems, whatever we do to the suburbs isn't going to matter. People are still going to get into their automobiles and drive. A year and a half or two years ago, Clinton was saying what we really need is 70-mile-per-gallon automobiles.

But what we should be striving for is three-mile-per gallon automobiles, and five-dollar-a gallon gas, so there really is a disincentive to drive and an incentive to put our money into something else. We still are not voting our tax dollars to go to those types of public improvements. It will make land out in the suburbs less easily developed if we aren't putting our dollars into supporting the highway system. The federal and statewide air quality [standards]—if we actually force localities to meet them—will have a greater impact than a lot of micromanaging [of design].

## The Profession and the Future: Expanding Our Responsibilities

*The panelists were asked what future steps needed to be taken to heal the gaps within and between communities. The challenge we may best be equipped to overcome, the panelists seemed to conclude, is to revitalize the environmental design professions.*

**Hood:** I once heard this Italian architect say, "You take something away, you gotta give something back." That attitude of designing in the world—that every time you make a mark there's some kind of return—[is] more important than what the building looks like.

**Deakin:** One thing we can do is be more discerning about which projects to celebrate, which projects to report on, and which projects to look at. To me that isn't the projects that are out in the middle of nowhere. We ought to be looking at the infill projects; we ought to be looking at the Hayward BART Station, and we ought to be looking at Communications Hill, and some of the projects in Mountain View, in San Francisco, we ought to look at Fruitvale BART,[17] and we ought to be looking at other projects in other places that do have more potential for diversity—projects that are saying, "We aren't just going to mix use; we're going to mix incomes." Whoa! And they're working at it and being explicit about it. One of the things I respect about Dan Solomon and Peter Calthorpe is that both of them have been willing to walk away from projects when they've gotten out of hand. They've been willing to say, "This is crazy, I'm not going to deal with this, good-bye." That's important; not everybody wants to do that. We ought to celebrate those in our profession who are willing to say: forget this, this isn't right, this isn't going anywhere and I don't want to do this.

**Radisch:** Everybody also needs to recognize that urban infill projects are more difficult than the projects on the fringe. We must do more than just celebrating and recognizing them; we must support them and get them built. And level the playing field—infill projects are surrounded by neighbors, so they'll always have political costs. There's a

similar problem with toxic cleanups on military bases. They're excellent opportunities, but they're so expensive compared to ranchland on the fringe, that's cheap and very accessible, with growth policies and economics that favor development there.

**Deakin:** That's a good point, and it gets us to the point about infrastructure, and why it is that urban people allow their dollars to be used for infrastructure for suburban development. That land is only cheap because of massive subsidy.

**Tung:** Also, there's the combination of spatial structure and movement infrastructure we've set up. If you look at the diagram of the Kentlands,[18] you see this new town laid out in the trees, crossing ravines, and it's hard-up against an existing commercial strip. What's that strip doing? What do we do to make that strip a somewhat humane place? Do we have models to think of how a strip should be, how it could be different, or better?

**Owens:** A positive step, that's happened around this table tonight, is to see the extent that the new urbanism is not simply a hollow thing. There are parallel and mutually supportive ideas here that can create a framework that helps move other issues farther down the line.

**Anthony:** I think this is a step that has some hope connected to it. If we don't have hope, I don't see the point. If we don't acknowledge that beauty is important, then there really isn't a point. But I also think there's a long way to go. It's not just a question of having token people involved in the decision-making; it's also having their experiences and their stories being central to our tradition. And it's not just about black people. It's about women, about old people, about young children. What things mean to them need to be much more central to the way we think we are as a people. Once we get to that point, I think we can take some of these new directions and begin to make sense of them.

**Deakin:** If we try to make the new urbanism everything, we run the risk of sinking the whole thing under so much weight. It might be useful to try to break out some doable pieces. We can start working on these obstacles. Green mortgages, that's one strategy. We can begin to look at infrastructure investment policies, taxation policies, whose dollars are going where and why. We have to address these issues of race, class, and income more directly; we can't keep ducking them and try to sneak them in a Trojan Horse. Until we do, we're going to have a good bit of difficulty going the next step, to start looking at strategic policy—metropolitan, regional, and national questions that have to be addressed to make a difference in the issues

Walter and Carl are raising. Finally, we've spent 20 years in California and at least 12 or 14 years nationally destroying a sense that positive good can come from publicness. To talk about community-building in that environment is a tough thing to do. We've celebrated the private; we've scorned the public; we've scorned government. I find it amazing and distressing how deeply rooted that is. Even in the College of Environmental Design [at U.C. Berkeley], we have classrooms full of students who are totally scornful of government as being able to do anything. They don't recognize that the government is *us*, and has to be us or else nothing's going to work, including the private side of it. There's a problem to confront in this school because I think we are a bridge between the public and the private here, and until we recognize that the bridge needs repair, we have a tough row to hoe.

**Anthony:** I believe that these fields—architecture, city planning, design—are in deep trouble, because as professionals, we've been ducking the tough issues. We don't stand up to recognize environmental issues at the global scale—that the kind of decisions we make at the local, the regional, or the client scale have global impact. The professions have nothing to say about this. The same is true about social justice. To some extent, if you look at models like Olmsted—he did have something to say about it. And if you look at Le Corbusier, you may not like what he had to say, but he did have something to say about it. If we're going to regenerate these professions, we need to have the courage to face the big questions and take our collectiveness and put forward things that individual clients don't have the time, energy, or resources to address, so that when people ask how to do something different there's actually a body of experience and intelligence and an orientation toward change. That's difficult to do since we are such a diverse group of people, but it comes back to acknowledging that this commitment to the commons is what connects us all.

## NOTES

[1] For more complete information on all the participants, please refer to "About the Authors," at the end of this volume.

[2] Editors' note: We have altered the participant's response at his request.

[3] Leon Krier, influential European urban designer, critic of urbanization under modern capitalism, and promoter of preindustrial urban forms as the means to reconstruct urban communities. See Krier 1992.

[4] Corbusier's original treatise outlining his modernist vision of the *Ville Radieuse*—a city of 3,000,000 people—can be found in LeCorbusier 1987.

[5] A good discussion of Frederick Law Olmsted, with a focus on his understanding of the social and aesthetic dimensions of public space and park design in the early 20th century, is in Zaitzevsky 1982.

[6] An older neighborhood interspersed with industry, with many low-income households and a predominantly African-American population.

[7] Bay Area "edge cities" that have grown rapidly over the last two decades.

[8] A popular gentrified neighborhood with a highly successful high-density shopping street.

[9] San Francisco's "newest neighborhood," 122 acres of industrial waterfront land southeast of the Financial District; the Board of Supervisors approved the project in the early 1990s. The project sponsor is the Catellus Corporation; Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill served as the principal designer, with Dan Solomon serving as the primary housing consultant. The Mission Bay Plan was over 10 years in the making and involved thousands of citizens and hundreds of planners and architects.

[10] One of Calthorpe's designs; a suburban development south of Sacramento, CA.

[11] Jacobs (1961) shifted the tide of planning and design from the modernist impulse dominating the large-scale urban renewal projects of the 1960s to a greater respect for small-scale neighborhood design and streetscapes. Jacobs identified key physical elements that facilitated the formation of urban community life: small scale blocks, mixtures of uses, and "eyes on the street"—windows and stoops overlooking the street that allowed residents to notice and therefore enforce rules of street behavior among children and others.

[12] In 1960, Genovese was stabbed to death over the course of several hours in full view of passers-by and residents of a New York City apartment house.

[13] Duany & Plater-Zyberk's design for a small resort community (see Duany and Plater-Zyberk 1987).

[14] See Handy 1992; for an abstract of this dissertation, see *Berkeley Planning Journal* 8 (1993).

[15] "Big boxes" is a term for the increasingly popular discount stores such as Home Depot, Pak-N-Save, etc., that are up to 100,000 square feet or more in space. Also refers to the size of the packages the customers take home.

[16] Former U.C. Chancellor Ira Michael Heymann was Chairman of the Bay Vision 2020 Commission, a blue-ribbon panel of civic leaders that met for a year to develop a proposal for a new regional growth management system for the San Francisco Bay Area.

[17] High-density, mixed-use development is being planned for the parking areas around these BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) stations. Hayward, CA is a growing city south of Oakland. Fruitvale is a predominately Latino and Asian neighborhood of Oakland. The Spanish Speaking Unity Council, a nonprofit community development corporation is developing the project on land donated by the BART Authority.

[18] A neotraditional development in Maryland designed by Andrés Duany and Elisabeth Plater-Zyberk.

## REFERENCES

### New Urbanist Works & Critique

Calthorpe, Peter. 1993. *The Next American Metropolis: Ecology, Community, and the American Dream.* New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press.

Calthorpe sets forth guiding principles for a regional vision of urbanism that integrates natural habitats and watersheds with concentrated nodes of transit- and pedestrian-oriented development. He emphasizes physical and environmental planning, with some discussion of the polarization between urban and suburban areas. Calthorpe is a visionary whose major designs are presented extensively in this work. Among the most important are the LUTRAQ (Land Use Transit Air Quality) strategy for regional growth around Portland, Oregon and designs for new development near Sacramento, CA and Tacoma, WA.

Duany, Andres, and Elisabeth Plater-Zyberk. 1991. *Towns and Town-making Principles,* ed. Alex Krieger. Cambridge, MA and New York: Harvard University Graduate School of Design and Rizzoli International Publications.

This volume outlines the neighborhood, site, and street design elements used by Duany and Plater-Zyberk, an innovative design team based in Miami, FL. It gave national exposure to their designs, particularly Seaside, a resort community in Florida that replicated the feel and look of older Southern towns; Kentlands, MD; Mashpee Commons, MA; and Belmont, WA. Essays by several architectural critics and scholars celebrate this work and place it in historical context with a critique of the modernist design movement to which it responds.

Katz, Peter. 1994. *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

This book describes the work of five "new urbanist" architects. Todd Bressi's extended essay traces the current critique of contemporary suburban designs, which rely on a separation of land uses and auto-dependency, and connects urban and suburban examples of the new urbanism; the urban and infill projects Katz profiles make this discussion even more convincing. The photographs in The New Urbanism lavishly illustrate 25 planned and built communities and designs.

Solomon, Daniel. 1992. *ReBuilding.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

In contrast to Duany, Plater-Zyberk and Calthorpe, Solomon, a Bay Area architect, aims to fill in and repair the existing urban fabric with building- and project-oriented designs. In this book, he describes specific design strategies, such as alleys and courtyards, to support the parking needed for increased housing den-

sities, while maintaining the context of surrounding neighbor-
hoods. The book also contains plans for several large scale proj-
ects, from 12 city blocks (Hayward BART station mixed use re-
development project) to 400 acres (Communications Hill in San
Jose, the last large undeveloped site within that growing city) to
8,000 units (San Francisco's Mission Bay). His writing uses col-
orful, almost journalistic, language to convey his battles with the
institutional forces shaping cities.

Audirac, Ivonne and Anne H. Shermeyn. 1994. "An Evaluation Of Neotradi-
tional Design's Social Prescriptions: Postmodern Placebo or Remedy for
Urban Malaise?" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 6, 2
(Summer).

Audirac and Shermeyn trace the intellectual roots of neotradi-
tional urbanism to its roots in European postmodern movements
in design and social theory. The article summarizes the empiri-
cal elements and claims made by proponents of traditional
neighborhood design (TND). Projects such as Seaside, offer du-
bious support for TND claims; TND guidelines, they argue, must
adapt to realities of modern lifestyles and metropolitan contexts.

## Other References

Handy, Susan L. 1992. *Regional Versus Local Accessibility: Variations In
Suburban Form And Its Effects On Travel.* Unpublished dissertation. Dept.
of City & Regional Planning, University of California at Berkeley.

Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities.* New York,
NY: Vintage Books.

Krier, Leon. 1992. *Architecture and urban design 1967-1992.* Edited by Rich-
ard Economakis. New York, NY: St. Martins Press.

Le Corbusier (pseud.). 1987. *City of To-morrow and its Planning.* Translated
by Frederick Etchells from the 8th French Edition of *Urbanisme.* New York,
NY: Dover Books.

Zaitzevsky, Cynthia. 1982. *Frederick Law Olmsted and the Boston Park Sys-
tem.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.