

Toward an Urban Design Manifesto

Allan Jacobs and Donald Appleyard

A 1987 prologue

It is about six years since Donald Appleyard and I completed "Toward a New Urban Design Manifesto." In large measure it was student-generated, growing out of a first-time course that Donald and I gave, "Theories of Urban Form."

The course examined the physical forms of urban development associated with particular periods, or with design movements, or with ideas about urban form—ideas such as the livable city or the new towns' movement, or the Charter of Athens. We tried to distill the essential urban physical characteristics of each period and of each idea and attempted to assess them against values such as health and comfort, self-reliance, opportunity, and accessibility. Students, as always in the good classes, contributed to the research, the presentations, and the debates as much as Donald or I did.

We concluded, among many conclusions, that the new towns and garden city movements, on the one hand, and the cities inspired by the Charter of Athens and the International Congress of Modern Architecture, on the other hand, were perhaps the most powerful influences on the form of today's cities as we experience it. I think they are still, even though we have turned slightly back toward the importance of the street in city design. We, like others, were pleased with neither movement's principles. At a final class session, students suggested we write our own manifesto, a "Berkeley Design Manifesto," they called it. It was time for something different, something better to help guide our work and perhaps the efforts of others as well—an assertion of what was right.

Donald and I took their challenge. How could we not? "Toward a New Urban Design Manifesto" was the result.

We had an opportunity to test our conclusions at a major address that was part of the American Planning Association Conference in San Francisco in 1980. The response was better than we might have expected, just as it has been at the numerous other occasions when it has been presented in one form or another. It was not so warmly received, however, by the editors and reviewers of JAPA, who wondered where the research was to support our assertions.

Jacobs is a professor of city and regional planning at the University of California, Berkeley, and a principal with Aidala and Jacobs, San Francisco. The late Donald Appleyard was a professor of city and regional planning and landscape architecture at the University of California, Berkeley.

The International Congress of Modern Architecture people rightly understood that their professional experience had the value of research—a lesson that academics too often have difficulty accepting.

What follows, then, is an assertion of what urban places ought to be. That is what manifestoes are all about. It stems from many sources: social and economic ideas and values of what "good" communities could be; environmental research of the kind that Donald did with livable streets and that others, such as Whyte and Bosselman, do with regard to urban places that are comfortable, enjoyable, and participatory; and our experiences of working in and studying cities. After a while one knows and accepts that the research into what makes good places to live will be endless, often without conclusion, and always value-laden. There comes a time when one says, "Well, I must take a leap. All of the experience has taught me something. It may be unprovable, but I think I know what a good place is." Donald and I had reached such a point, although I think he was always more comfortable with socioeconomic values than with physical assertions.

Readers will see similarities between our idea and the more urban parts of Kevin Lynch's place utopia. That makes sense. Donald and Kevin went back a long time together. We all talked frequently, and we shared values and an approach to our work.

I think the work still holds up. It begins a picture of the kind of city that good urban places could be. The word "Toward" in the title is important. It bespeaks the need for a lot more work and research on all the terribly important pieces that make up good living environments. Had Donald lived, I think he would be working in just that direction, fishing out what is missing. In the meantime, I think he would have wanted this work published.

Today I think I would stress more strongly the section on livable streets and neighborhoods. I am convinced that many of the standards we imposed on city building, usually in the name of health and safety—road widths, auto lane widths, and parking standards are my most hated favorites—run counter to good city design. No, they actually prevent or ruin urbanity. It is so easy to conclude that "a little more won't hurt," or to round off a size to the next highest number divisible by two, or to be cowed by years of lawsuits over the competence of our conclusions into making things bigger, safer. And thus we destroy cities.

Perhaps also our proposed minimum density could be somewhat higher. Under integration of activities I would stress more strongly the need for integrating places of residence with other uses. We know all about mixed-use projects that consist of shopping and office activities, but we do not insist as much as we should on living-working-shopping mixes. I would not make changes to the sections

on buildings that define public ways or the appropriateness of many modest-sized buildings rather than fewer large ones.

But enough of this; it is better that the reader read for himself a vision for better urban living places.

A. J.

We think it's time for a new urban design manifesto. Almost 50 years have passed since Le Corbusier and the International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM) produced the Charter of Athens, and it is more than 20 years since the first Urban Design Conference, still in the CIAM tradition, was held (at Harvard in 1957). Since then the precepts of CIAM have been attacked by sociologists, planners, Jane Jacobs, and more recently by architects themselves. But it is still a strong influence, and we will take it as our starting point.

Make no mistake: the charter was, simply, a manifesto—a public declaration that spelled out the ills of industrial cities as they existed in the 1930s and laid down physical requirements necessary to establish healthy, humane, and beautiful urban environments for people. It could not help but deal with social, economic, and political phenomena, but its basic subject matter was the physical design of cities. Its authors were (mostly) socially concerned architects, determined that their art and craft be responsive to social realities as well as to improving the lot of man. It would be a mistake to write them off as simply elitist designers and physical determinists.

So the charter decried the medium-size (up to six stories) high-density buildings with high land coverage that were associated so closely with slums. Similarly, buildings that faced streets were found to be detrimental to healthy living. The seemingly limitless horizontal expansion of urban areas devoured the countryside, and suburbs were viewed as symbols of terrible waste. Solutions could be found in the demolition of unsanitary housing, the provision of green areas in every residential district, and new high-rise, high-density buildings set in open space. Housing was to be removed from its traditional relationship facing streets, and the whole circulation system was to be revised to meet the needs of emerging mechanization (the automobile). Work areas should be close to but separate from residential areas. To achieve the new city, large land holdings, preferably owned by the public, should replace multiple small parcels (so that projects could be properly designed and developed).

Now thousands of housing estates and redevelopment projects in socialist and capitalist countries the world over, whether built on previously undeveloped land or developed as replacements for old urban areas,

attest to the acceptance of the charter's dictums. The design notions it embraced have become part of a world design language, not just the intellectual property of an enlightened few, even though the principles have been devalued in many developments.

Of course, the Charter of Athens has not been the only major urban philosophy of this century to influence the development of urban areas. Ebenezer Howard, too, was responding to the ills of the 19th-century industrial city, and the Garden City movement has been at least as powerful as the Charter of Athens. New towns policies, where they exist, are rooted in Howard's thought. But you don't have to look to new towns to see the influence of Howard, Olmsted, Wright, and Stein. The superblock notion, if nothing else, pervades large housing projects around the world, in central cities as well as suburbs. The notion of buildings in a park is as common to garden city designs as it is to charter-inspired development. Indeed, the two movements have a great deal in common: superblocks, separate paths for people and cars, interior common spaces, housing divorced from streets, and central ownership of land. The garden city-inspired communities place greater emphasis on private outdoor space. The most significant difference, at least as they have evolved, is in density and building type: the garden city people preferred to accommodate people in row houses, garden apartments, and maisonnettes, while Corbusier and the CIAM designers went for high-rise buildings and, inevitably, people living in flats and at significantly higher densities.

We are less than enthralled with what either the Charter of Athens or the Garden City movement has produced in the way of urban environments. The emphasis of CIAM was on buildings and what goes on within buildings that happen to sit in space, not on the public life that takes place constantly in public spaces. The orientation is often inward. Buildings tend to be islands, big or small. They could be placed anywhere. From the outside perspective, the building, like the work of art it was intended to be, sits where it can be seen and admired in full. And because it is large it is best seen from a distance (at a scale consistent with a moving auto). Diversity, spontaneity, and surprise are absent, at least for the person on foot. On the other hand, we find little joy or magic or spirit in the charter cities. They are not urban, to us, except according to some definition

one might find in a census. Most garden cities, safe and healthy and even gracious as they may be, remind us more of suburbs than of cities. But they weren't trying to *be* cities. The emphasis has always been on "garden" as much as or more than on "city."

Both movements represent overly strong design reactions to the physical decay and social inequities of industrial cities. In responding so strongly, albeit understandingly, to crowded, lightless, airless, "utilitiless," congested buildings and cities that housed so many people, the utopians did not inquire what was *good* about those places, either socially or physically. Did not those physical environments reflect (and maybe even foster) values that were likely to be meaningful to people individually and collectively, such as publicness and community? Without knowing it, maybe these strong reactions to urban ills ended up by throwing the baby out with the bath water.

In the meantime we have had a lot of experience with city building and rebuilding. New spokespeople with new urban visions have emerged. As more CIAM-style buildings were built people became more disenchanting. Many began to look through picturesque lenses back to the old preindustrial cities. From a concentration on the city as a kind of sculpture garden, the townscape movement, led by the *Architectural Review*, emphasized "urban experience." This phenomenological view of the city was espoused by Rasmussen, Kepes, and ultimately Kevin Lynch and Jane Jacobs. It identified a whole new vocabulary of urban form—one that depended on the sights, sounds, feels, and smells of the city, its materials and textures, floor surfaces, facades, style, signs, lights, seating, trees, sun, and shade all potential amenities for the attentive observer and user. This has permanently humanized the vocabulary of urban design, and we enthusiastically subscribe to most of its tenets, though some in the townscape movement ignored the social meanings and implications of what they were doing.

The 1960s saw the birth of community design and an active concern for the social groups affected, usually negatively, by urban design. Designers were the "soft cops," and many professionals left the design field for social or planning vocations, finding the physical environment to have no redeeming social value. But at the beginning of the 1980s the mood in the design professions is conservative. There is a withdrawal from social engagement back to formalism. Supported by semiology and other abstract themes, much of architecture has become a dilettantish and narcissistic pursuit, a chic component of the high art consumer culture, increasingly remote from most people's everyday lives, finding its ultimate manifestation in the art gallery and the art book. City planning is too immersed in the administration and survival of housing, environmental, and energy programs and in responding to budget cuts and community demands to have any clear sense of direction with regard to city form.

While all these professional ideologies have been working themselves out, massive economic, technological, and social changes have taken place in our cities. The scale of capitalism has continued to increase, as has the scale of bureaucracy, and the automobile has virtually destroyed cities as they once were.

In formulating a new manifesto, we react against other phenomena than did the leaders of CIAM 50 years ago. The automobile cities of California and the Southwest present utterly different problems from those of 19th-century European cities, as do the CIAM-influenced housing developments around European, Latin American, and Russian cities and the rash of squatter settlements around the fast-growing cities of the Third World. What are these problems?

Problems for modern urban design

Poor living environments. While housing conditions in most advanced countries have improved in terms of such fundamentals as light, air, and space, the surroundings of homes are still frequently dangerous, polluted, noisy, anonymous wastelands. Travel around such cities has become more and more fatiguing and stressful.

Giantism and loss of control. The urban environment is increasingly in the hands of the large-scale developers and public agencies. The elements of the city grow inexorably in size, massive transportation systems are segregated for single travel modes, and vast districts and complexes are created that make people feel irrelevant.

People, therefore, have less sense of control over their homes, neighborhoods, and cities than when they lived in slower-growing locally based communities. Such giantism can be found as readily in the housing projects of socialist cities as in the office buildings and commercial developments of capitalist cities.

Large-scale privatization and the loss of public life. Cities, especially American cities, have become privatized, partly because of the consumer society's emphasis on the individual and the private sector, creating Galbraith's "private affluence and public squalor," but escalated greatly by the spread of the automobile. Crime in the streets is both a cause and a consequence of this trend, which has resulted in a new form of city: one of closed, defended islands with blank and windowless facades surrounded by wastelands of parking lots and fast-moving traffic. As public transit systems have declined, the number of places in American cities where people of different social groups actually meet each other has dwindled. The public environment of many American cities has become an empty desert, leaving public life dependent for its survival solely on planned formal occasions, mostly in protected internal locations.

Centrifugal fragmentation. Advanced industrial societies took work out of the home, and then out of the neighborhood, while the automobile and the growing scale of commerce have taken shopping out of the local community. Fear has led social groups to flee from each other into homogeneous social enclaves. Communities themselves have become lower in density and increasingly homogeneous. Thus the city has spread out and separated to form extensive monocultures and specialized destinations reachable often only by long journeys—a fragile and extravagant urban system dependent on cheap, available gasoline, and an effective contributor to the isolation of social groups from each other.

Destruction of valued places. The quest for profit and prestige and the relentless exploitation of places that attract the public have led to the destruction of much of our heritage, of historic places that no longer turn a profit, of natural amenities that become overused. In many cases, as in San Francisco, the very value of the place threatens its destruction as hungry tourists and entrepreneurs flock to see and profit from it.

Placelessness. Cities are becoming meaningless places beyond their citizens' grasp. We no longer know the origins of the world around us. We rarely know where the materials and products come from, who owns what, who is behind what, what was intended. We live in cities where things happen without warning and without our participation. It is an alien world for most people. It is little surprise that most withdraw from community involvement to enjoy their own private and limited worlds.

Injustice. Cities are symbols of inequality. In most cities the discrepancy between the environments of the rich and the environments of the poor is striking. In many instances the environments of the rich, by occupying and dominating the prevailing patterns of transportation and access, make the environments of the poor relatively worse. This discrepancy may be less visible in the low-density modern city, where the display of affluence is more hidden than in the old city; but the discrepancy remains.

Rootless professionalism. Finally, design professionals today are often part of the problem. In too many cases, we design for places and people we do not know and grant them very little power or acknowledgment. Too many professionals are more part of a universal professional culture than part of the local cultures for whom we produce our plans and products. We carry our "bag of tricks" around the world and bring them out wherever we land. This floating professional culture has only the most superficial conception of particular place. Rootless, it is more susceptible to changes in professional fashion and theory than to local events. There is too little inquiry, too much proposing. Quick surveys are made, instant solutions devised, and the rest of the time

is spent persuading the clients. Limits on time and budgets drive us on, but so do lack of understanding and the placeless culture. Moreover, we designers are often unconscious of our own roots, which influence our preferences in hidden ways.

At the same time, the planning profession's retreat into trendism, under the positivist influence of social science, has left it virtually unable to resist the social pressures of capitalist economy and consumer sovereignty. Planners have lost their beliefs. Although we believe citizen participation is essential to urban planning, professionals also must have a sense of what we believe is right, even though we may be vetoed.

Goals for urban life

We propose, therefore, a number of goals that we deem essential for the future of a good urban environment: livability; identity and control; access to opportunity, imagination, and joy; authenticity and meaning; open communities and public life; self-reliance; and justice.

Livability. A city should be a place where everyone can live in relative comfort. Most people want a kind of sanctuary for their living environment, a place where they can bring up children, have privacy, sleep, eat, relax, and restore themselves. This means a well-managed environment relatively devoid of nuisance, overcrowding, noise, danger, air pollution, dirt, trash, and other unwelcome intrusions.

Identity and control. People should feel that some part of the environment belongs to them, individually and collectively, some part for which they care and are responsible, whether they own it or not. The urban environment should be an environment that encourages people to express themselves, to become involved, to decide what they want and act on it. Like a seminar where everybody has something to contribute to communal discussion, the urban environment should encourage participation. Urbanites may not always want this. Many like the anonymity of the city, but we are not convinced that the freedom of anonymity is a desirable freedom. It would be much better if people were sure enough of themselves to stand up and be counted. Environments should therefore be designed for those who use them or are affected by them, rather than for those who own them. This should reduce alienation and anonymity (even if people want them); it should increase people's sense of identity and rootedness and encourage more care and responsibility for the physical environment of cities.

Respect for the existing environment, both nature and city, is one fundamental difference we have with the CIAM movement. Urban design has too often assumed that new is better than old. But the new is justified only if it is better than what exists. Conservation encourages

identity and control and, usually, a better sense of community, since old environments are more usually part of a common heritage.

Access to opportunity, imagination, and joy. People should find the city a place where they can break from traditional molds, extend their experience, meet new people, learn other viewpoints, have fun. At a functional level, people should have access to alternative housing and job choices; at another level, they should find the city an enlightening cultural experience. A city should have magical places where fantasy is possible, a counter to and an escape from the mundaneness of everyday work and living. Architects and planners take cities and themselves too seriously; the result too often is deadliness and boredom, no imagination, no humor, alienating places. But people need an escape from the seriousness and meaning of the everyday. The city has always been a place of excitement; it is theater, a stage upon which citizens can display themselves and see others. It has magic, or should have, and that depends on a certain sensuous, hedonistic mood, on signs, on night lights, on fantasy, color, and other imagery. There can be parts of the city where belief can be suspended, just as in the experience of fiction. It may be that such places have to be framed so that people know how to act. Until now such fantasy and experiment have been attempted mostly by commercial facilities, at rather low levels of quality and aspiration, seldom deeply experimental. One should not have to travel as far as the Himalayas or the South Sea Islands to stretch one's experience. Such challenges could be nearer home. There should be a place for community utopias; for historic, natural, and anthropological evocations of the modern city, for encounters with the truly exotic.

Authenticity and meaning. People should be able to understand their city (or other people's cities), its basic layout, public functions, and institutions; they should be aware of its opportunities. An authentic city is one where the origins of things and places are clear. All this means an urban environment should reveal its significant meanings; it should not be dominated only by one type of group, the powerful; neither should publicly important places be hidden. The city should symbolize the moral issues of society and educate its citizens to an awareness of them.

That does not mean everything has to be laid out as on a supermarket shelf. A city should present itself as a readable story, in an engaging and, if necessary, provocative way, for people are indifferent to the obvious, overwhelmed by complexity. A city's offerings should be revealed or they will be missed. This can affect the forms of the city, its signage, and other public information and education programs.

Livability, identity, authenticity, and opportunity are characteristics of the urban environment that should

serve the individual and small social unit, but the city has to serve some higher social goals as well. It is these we especially wish to emphasize here.

Community and public life. Cities should encourage participation of their citizens in community and public life. In the face of giantism and fragmentation, public life, especially life in public places, has been seriously eroded. The neighborhood movement, by bringing thousands, probably millions of people out of their closed private lives into active participation in their local communities, has begun to counter that trend, but this movement has had its limitations. It can be purely defensive, parochial, and self-serving. A city should be more than a warring collection of interest groups, classes, and neighborhoods; it should breed a commitment to a larger whole, to tolerance, justice, law, and democracy. The structure of the city should invite and encourage public life, not only through its institutions, but directly and symbolically through its public spaces. The public environment, unlike the neighborhood, by definition should be open to all members of the community. It is where people of different kinds meet. No one should be excluded unless they threaten the balance of that life.

Urban self-reliance. Increasingly cities will have to become more self-sustaining in their uses of energy and other scarce resources. "Soft energy paths" in particular not only will reduce dependence and exploitation across regions and countries but also will help reestablish a stronger sense of local and regional identity, authenticity, and meaning.

An environment for all. Good environments should be accessible to all. Every citizen is entitled to some minimal level of environmental livability and minimal levels of identity, control, and opportunity. Good urban design must be for the poor as well as the rich. Indeed, it is more needed by the poor.

We look toward a society that is truly pluralistic, one where power is more evenly distributed among social groups than it is today in virtually any country, but where the different values and cultures of interest- and place-based groups are acknowledged and negotiated in a just public arena.

These goals for the urban environment are both individual and collective, and as such they are frequently in conflict. The more a city promises for the individual, the less it seems to have a public life; the more the city is built for public entities, the less the individual seems to count. The good urban environment is one that somehow balances these goals, allowing individual and group identity while maintaining a public concern, encouraging pleasure while maintaining responsibility, remaining open to outsiders while sustaining a strong sense of localism.

An urban fabric for an urban life

We have some ideas, at least, for how the fabric or texture of cities might be conserved or created to encourage a livable urban environment. We emphasize the structural qualities of the good urban environment; qualities we hope will be successful in creating urban experiences that are consonant with our goals.

Do not misread this. We are not describing all the qualities of a city. We are not dealing with major transportation systems, open space, the natural environment, the structure of the large scale city, or even the structure of neighborhoods, but only the grain of the good city.

There are five physical characteristics that must be present if there is to be a positive response to the goals and values we believe are central to urban life. They must be designed, they must exist, as prerequisites of a sound urban environment. All five must be present, not just one or two. There are other physical characteristics that are important, but these five are essential: livable streets and neighborhoods; some minimum density of residential development as well as intensity of land use; an integration of activities—living, working, shopping—in some reasonable proximity to each other; a manmade environment, particularly buildings, that defines public space (as opposed to buildings that, for the most part, sit in space); and many, many separate, distinct buildings with complex arrangements and relationships (as opposed to few, large buildings).

Let us explain, keeping in mind that all five of the characteristics must be present. People, we have said, should be able to live in reasonable (though not excessive) safety, cleanliness, and security. That means *livable streets and neighborhoods*: with adequate sunlight, clean air, trees, vegetation, gardens, open space, pleasantly scaled and designed buildings; without offensive noise; with cleanliness and physical safety. Many of these characteristics can be designed into the physical fabric of the city.

The reader will say, "Well of course, but what does that mean?" Usually it has meant specific standards and requirements, such as sun angles, decibel levels, lane widths, and distances between buildings. Many researchers have been trying to define the qualities of a livable environment. It depends on a wide array of attributes, some structural, some quite small details. There is no single right answer. We applaud these efforts and have participated in them ourselves. Nevertheless, desires for livability and individual comfort by themselves have led to fragmentation of the city. Livability standards, whether for urban or for suburban developments, have often been excessive.

Our approach to the details of this inclusive physical characteristic would center on the words "reasonable, though not excessive. . . ." Too often, for example, the requirement of adequate sunlight has resulted in buildings and people inordinately far from each other, be-

yond what demonstrable need for light would dictate. Safety concerns have been the justifications for ever-wider streets and wide, sweeping curves rather than narrow ways and sharp corners. Buildings are removed from streets because of noise considerations when there might be other ways to deal with this concern. So although livable streets and neighborhoods are a primary requirement for any good urban fabric—whether for existing, denser cities or for new development—the quest for livable neighborhoods, if pursued obsessively, can destroy the urban qualities we seek to achieve.

A *minimum density* is needed. By density we mean the number of people (sometimes expressed in terms of housing units) living on an area of land, or the number of people using an area of land.

Cities are not farms. A city is people living and working and doing the things they do in relatively close proximity to each other.

We are impressed with the importance of density as a perceived phenomenon and therefore relative to the beholder and agree that, for many purposes, perceived density is more important than an "objective" measurement of people per unit of land. We agree, too, that physical phenomena can be manipulated so as to render perceptions of greater or lesser density. Nevertheless, a narrow, winding street, with a lot of signs and a small enclosed open space at the end, with *no people*, does not make a city. Cities are more than stage sets. Some minimum number of people living and using a given area of land is required if there is to be human exchange, public life and action, diversity and community.

Density of people alone will account for the presence or absence of certain uses and services we find important to urban life. We suspect, for example, that the number and diversity of small stores and services—for instance, groceries, bars, bakeries, laundries and cleaners, coffee shops, secondhand stores, and the like—to be found in a city or area is in part a function of density. That is, that such businesses are more likely to exist, and in greater variety, in an area where people live in greater proximity to each other ("higher" density). The viability of mass transit, we know, depends partly on the density of residential areas and partly on the size and intensity of activity at commercial and service destinations. And more use of transit, in turn, reduces parking demands and permits increases in density. There must be a critical mass of people, and they must spend a lot of their time in reasonably close proximity to each other, including when they are at home, if there is to be an urban life. The goal of local control and community identity is associated with density as well. The notion of an optimum density is elusive and is easily confused with the health and livability of urban areas, with life styles, with housing types, with the size of area being considered (the building site or the neighborhood or the city), and with the economics of development. A density that might be best for child rearing might be less than adequate to

support public transit. Most recently, energy efficiency has emerged as a concern associated with density, the notion being that conservation will demand more compact living arrangements.

Our conclusion, based largely on our experience and on the literature, is that a minimum net density (people or living units divided by the size of the building site, excluding public streets) of about 15 dwelling units (30–60 people) per acre of land is necessary to support city life. By way of illustration, that is the density produced with generous town houses (or row houses). It would permit parcel sizes up to 25 feet wide by about 115 feet deep. But other building types and lot sizes also would produce that density. Some areas could be developed with lower densities, but not very many. We don't think you get cities at 6 dwellings to the acre, let alone on half-acre lots. On the other hand, it is possible to go as high as 48 dwelling units per acre (96 to 192 people) for a very large part of the city and still provide for a spacious and gracious urban life. Much of San Francisco, for example, is developed with three story buildings (one unit per floor) above a parking story, on parcels that measure 25 feet by 100 or 125 feet. At those densities, with that kind of housing, there can be private or shared gardens for most people, no common hallways are required, and people can have direct access to the ground. Public streets and walks adequate to handle pedestrian and vehicular traffic generated by these densities can be accommodated in rights-of-way that are 50 feet wide or less. Higher densities, for parts of the city, to suit particular needs and lifestyles, would be both possible and desirable. We are not sure what the upper limits would be but suspect that as the numbers get much higher than 200 people per net residential acre, for larger parts of the city, the concessions to less desirable living environments mount rapidly.

Beyond residential density, there must be a minimum intensity of people using an area for it to be urban, as we are defining that word. We aren't sure what the numbers are or even how best to measure this kind of intensity. We are speaking here, particularly, of the public or "meeting" areas of our city. We are confident that our lowest residential densities will provide most meeting areas with life and human exchange, but are not sure if they will generate enough activity for the most intense central districts.

There must be an *integration of activities*—living, working, and shopping as well as public, spiritual, and recreational activities—reasonably near each other.

The best urban places have some mixtures of uses. The mixture responds to the values of publicness and diversity that encourage local community identity. Excitement, spirit, sense, stimulation, and exchange are more likely when there is a mixture of activities than when there is not. There are many examples that we all know. It is the mix, not just the density of people and uses, that brings life to an area, the life of people

going about a full range of normal activities without having to get into an automobile.

We are not saying that every area of the city should have a full mix of all uses. That would be impossible. The ultimate in mixture would be for each building to have a range of uses from living, to working, to shopping, to recreation. We are not calling for a return to the medieval city. There is a lot to be said for the notion of "living sanctuaries," which consist almost wholly of housing. But we think these should be relatively small, of a few blocks, and they should be close and easily accessible (by foot) to areas where people meet to shop or work or recreate or do public business. And except for a few of the most intensely developed office blocks of a central business district or a heavy industrial area, the meeting areas should have housing within them. Stores should be mixed with offices. If we envision the urban landscape as a fabric, then it would be a salt-and-pepper fabric of many colors, each color for a separate use or a combination. Of course, some areas would be much more heavily one color than another, and some would be an even mix of colors. Some areas, if you squinted your eyes, or if you got so close as to see only a small part of the fabric, would read as one color, a red or a brown or a green. But by and large there would be few if any distinct patterns, where one color stopped and another started. It would not be patchwork quilt, or an even-colored fabric. The fabric would be mixed.

In an urban environment, *buildings* (and other objects that people place in the environment) *should be arranged in such a way as to define and even enclose public space, rather than sit in space*. It is not enough to have high densities and an integration of activities to have cities. A tall enough building with enough people living (or even working) in it, sited on a large parcel, can easily produce the densities we have talked about and can have internally mixed uses, like most "mixed use" projects. But that building and its neighbors will be unrelated objects sitting in space if they are far enough apart, and the mixed uses might be only privately available. In large measure that is what the Charter of Athens, the garden cities, and standard suburban development produce.

Buildings close to each other along a street, regardless of whether the street is straight, or curved, or angled, tend to define space if the street is not too wide in relation to the buildings. The same is true of a plaza or a square. As the spaces between buildings become larger (in relation to the size of the buildings, up to a point), the buildings tend more and more to sit in space. They become focal points for few or many people, depending on their size and activity. Except where they are monuments or centers for public activities (a stadium or meeting hall), where they represent public gathering spots, buildings in space tend to be private and inwardly oriented. People come to them and go from them in any direction. That is not so for the defined outdoor

environment. Avoiding the temptation to ascribe all kinds of psychological values to defined spaces (such as intimacy, belonging, protection—values that are difficult to prove and that may differ for different people), it is enough to observe that spaces surrounded by buildings are more likely to bring people together and thereby promote public interaction. The space can be linear like streets or in the form of plazas of myriad shapes. Moreover, interest and interplay among uses is enhanced. To be sure, such arrangements direct people and limit their freedom—they cannot move in just any direction from any point—but presumably there are enough choices (even avenues of escape) left open, and the gain is in greater potential for sense stimulation, excitement, surprise, and focus. Over and over again we seek out and return to defined ways and spaces as symbolic of urban life emphasizing the public space more than the private building.

It is important for us to emphasize *public* places and a *public* way system. We have observed that the central value of urban life is that of publicness, of people from different groups meeting each other and of people acting in concert, albeit with debate. The most important public places must be for *pedestrians*, for no public life can take place between people in automobiles. Most public space has been taken over by the automobile, for travel or parking. We must fight to restore more for the pedestrian. Pedestrian malls are not simply to benefit the local merchants. They have an essential public value. People of different kinds meet each other directly. The level of communication may be only visual, but that itself is educational and can encourage tolerance. The revival of street activities, street vending, and street theater in American cities may be the precursor of a more flourishing public environment, if the automobile can be held back.

There also must be symbolic, public meeting places, accessible to all and publicly controlled. Further, in order to communicate, to get from place to place, to interact, to exchange ideas and goods, there must be a healthy public circulation system. It cannot be privately controlled. Public circulation systems should be seen as significant cultural settings where the city's finest products and artifacts can be displayed, as in the piazzas of medieval and renaissance cities.

Finally, *many different buildings and spaces with complex arrangements and relationships* are required. The often elusive notion of human scale is associated with this requirement—a notion that is not just an architect's concept but one that other people understand as well.

Diversity, the possibility of intimacy and confrontation with the unexpected, stimulation, are all more likely with many buildings than with few taking up the same ground areas.

For a long time we have been led to believe that large land holdings were necessary to design healthy, efficient, aesthetically pleasing urban environments. The

slums of the industrial city were associated, at least in part, with all those small, overbuilt parcels. Socialist and capitalist ideologies alike called for land assembly to permit integrated, socially and economically useful developments. What the socialist countries would do via public ownership the capitalists would achieve through redevelopment and new fiscal mechanisms that rewarded large holdings. Architects of both ideological persuasions promulgated or were easily convinced of the wisdom of land assembly. It's not hard to figure out why. The results, whether by big business or big government, are more often than not inward-oriented, easily controlled or controllable, sterile, large-building projects, with fewer entrances, fewer windows, less diversity, less innovation, and less individual expression than the urban fabric that existed previously or that can be achieved with many actors and many buildings. Attempts to break up facades or otherwise to articulate separate activities in large buildings are seldom as successful as when smaller properties are developed singly.

Health, safety, and efficiency can be achieved with many smaller buildings, individually designed and developed. Reasonable public controls can see to that. And, of course, smaller buildings are a lot more likely if parcel sizes are small than if they are large. With smaller buildings and parcels, more entrances must be located on the public spaces, more windows and a finer scale of design diversity emerge. A more public, lively city is produced. It implies more, smaller groups getting pieces of the public action, taking part, having a stake. Other stipulations may be necessary to keep public frontages alive, free from the deadening effects of offices and banks, but small buildings will help this more than large ones. There need to be large buildings, too, covering large areas of land, but they will be the exception, not the rule, and should not be in the centers of public activity.

All these qualities . . . and others

A good city must have all those qualities. Density without livability could return us to the slums of the 19th century. Public places without small-scale, fine-grain development would give us vast, overscale cities. As an urban fabric, however, those qualities stand a good chance of meeting many of the goals we outlined. They directly attend to the issue of livability though they are aimed especially at encouraging public places and a public life. Their effects on personal and group identity are less clear, though the small-scale city is more likely to support identity than the large-scale city. Opportunity and imagination should be encouraged by a diverse and densely settled urban structure. This structure also should create a setting that is more meaningful to the individual inhabitant and small group than the giant environments now being produced. There is no guarantee that this urban structure will be a more just

one than those presently existing. In supporting the small against the large, however, more justice for the powerless may be encouraged.

Still, an urban fabric of this kind cannot by itself meet all these goals. Other physical characteristics are important to the design of urban environments. Open space, to provide access to nature as well as relief from the built environment, is one. So are definitions, boundaries if you will, that give location and identity to neighborhoods (or districts) and to the city itself. There are other characteristics as well: public buildings, educational environments, places set aside for nurturing the spirit, and more. We still have work to do.

Many participants

While we have concentrated on defining physical characteristics of a good city fabric, the *process* of creating it is crucial. As important as many buildings and spaces are *many participants* in the building process. It is through this involvement in the creation and management of their city that citizens are most likely to identify with it and, conversely, to enhance their own sense of identity and control.

An essential beginning

The five characteristics we have noted are essential to achieving the values central to urban life. They need much further definition and testing. We have to know more about what configurations create public space:

about maximum densities, about how small a community can be and still be urban (some very small Swiss villages fit the bill, and everyone knows some favorite examples), about what is perceived as big and what small under different circumstances, about landscape material as a space definer, and a lot more. When we know more we will be still further along toward a new urban design manifesto.

We know that any ideal community, including the kind that can come from this manifesto, will not always be comfortable for every person. Some people don't like cities and aren't about to. Those who do will not be enthralled with *all* of what we propose.

Our urban vision is rooted partly in the realities of earlier, older urban places that many people, including many utopian designers, have rejected, often for good reasons. So our utopia will not satisfy all people. That's all right. We *like* cities. Given a choice of the kind of community we would like to live in—the sort of choice earlier city dwellers seldom had—we would choose to live in an urban, public community that embraces the goals and displays the physical characteristics we have outlined. Moreover, we think it responds to what people want and that it will promote the good urban life.

Authors' note

This work grew, in part, from a seminar at the University of California, Berkeley, during the spring of 1979. The seminar participants, all students, were Susanne Allen, Hilda Blanco, Karen Burks, Patricia Colombe, Leslie Gould, Moises Kajomovitz, Stanley Kebathi, Vern Liebmann, Jeffery Luxemburg, Daniel Marks, Diana Martinez, Cibele Rumel, Ignacio San Martin, Georgia Schimenti, and Charles Setchell.