

Mitigation Strategies for Segregation by Design

Michael E. Willis, FAIA

March 30, 2017

# MITIGATION STRATEGIES

What my practice has taught me about Rebuilding Communities

I attended a panel in March 2016 in Cambridge, MA hosted by Washington University and the Harvard Graduate School of Design looking at St. Louis' Pruitt-Igoe housing project, its symbolic failure, and what it meant for the future of rebuilding communities. The conference would also explore themes of modernism in general; who has the power to impose social and spatial order, agency in design, and inequalities that are the outcomes of such policy and design decisions. All those themes were of relevance to the discussion.

## **Deconstructing the Most Famous Photo in Modern Architecture:**

### **The Implosion of Pruitt-Igoe**



I've been thinking about how to respond to this subject for some time. As it happens, the famous picture of Pruitt-Igoe being blown up has been following me around for most of my career. I've

seen it featured at conferences all over, including Berlin in 1984 at the Internationale Bauausstellung (IBA) conference in a mural-sized image in a conference focusing on historic and post-war city design. Pruitt-Igoe's got staying power because architects, city planners, sociologists, politicians, and citizens still want to understand what happened. Not least to learn how we can learn from its bountiful mistakes.

Pruitt-Igoe was a segregated development--Pruitt for the black families, Igoe for the white families. I was five years old when my family of eight moved to the Pruitt Homes in 1956, at 2140 Cass Avenue, the first residents of our apartment on the first floor, looking much like the hopeful family in the advertising for the project, in Sunday clothes and dreaming of inhabiting those "streets in the sky". And yes, there were white families and kids on the playgrounds. At first. That demographic disappeared from the housing complex soon after opening.

In 1972, I was 20 years old when I joined a group of Washington University architecture students who went to the site to see it come down. Once again, the writer Charles Jencks will be quoted here writing famously, "happily, we can date the death of Modern Architecture to a precise moment in time. Modern Architecture died in St. Louis, Missouri on July 15, 1972, at 3:32 pm (or thereabouts)". That was the day the first buildings were imploded. I think that pronouncement of "the death of Modern Architecture" was exaggerated and not a little self-serving--since Jencks was eager to identify a movement in its place--outlined in his 1977 book, "Post-Modern Architecture". The obituary for modern architecture was not quite accurate as I will point out later.

Since that time I've had the occasion to think about the subject, go over its many failings and take a position on it. Before I talk about what I've learned about rebuilding communities, I want to deconstruct that famous photo, and ask the fanciful question:

*What if it was rising instead of falling?*

"What if it was trying to rise above the set of built-in failures of its design, location, removal from the city street grid, the absence of maintenance, remoteness, social abandonment, legal, racial segregation--except for the playgrounds--and pure chilliness of design? What if it was taking on the mantle of its failure, fighting gravity's pull and saying: "I am going to rise from this dust, I will honor the families who came to me, went to movies in my basements, ran over my fields disconnected from the city grid, walked the flights of concrete block stairs and corridors to small, Hotpoint-applianced apartments, who brought their untold number of children to me to be raised, to be housed, to be safe. I am going to rise like Lazarus from this dust and sit in a park, and there I will be, in the connected city grid of streets, no more than 3 stories high, close to the stores, buses and places where poetry is read and people laugh and snap their fingers to jazz. Connected to the corners, to the heart of the city. Then, when you walk out my doors, you will be able to walk to school. To work. To the bus. To the train. And afterwards, when the long day ends, take your cooler to my small green lawns, sit in the shade of the trees, and think about the dignity of your lives. And when you return home, I will fulfill my promise to protect you."

*What if it was rising instead of falling?*

Now that I've got that out of my system I can get to the heart of the question.

It is easy to characterize the architectural design of "classic modernism" as a top-down affair. Earnest young men--and they were mostly men--in their bow ties and crew cuts, looking at the blighted cities--in many cases defined *by them* as such--and taking the holy tabula rasa approach, springing from the Euro-Corbusian roots of the "new-clear" blocks (pun intended) of white boxes in Stuttgart or Berlin or Vienna, arrayed in orderly rows. One can still see the attractiveness of the overarching idea--clean boxes instead of broken bricks, sanitary breezeways instead of mean streets. This is the magical thinking that uprooted millions of people and remade whole districts in cities across the country to the benefit of few.

The St. Louis version of this modernist utopia aimed to replace the uncertain messy reality of this city with a completed vision of architecture and social engineering--Blacks here, whites there--remember segregation was legal then--and along the way wiping out that 19th century notion of small, walkable blocks. That was perhaps the biggest existential urban design crime of all, literally changing the way a person existed in 3-dimensional space. Once defined by the scale of 200-foot blocks punctuated by streets, to slabs of no fixed limits, vanishing into the horizon.

Planning approvals coming not from citizens--unheard of at that time anyway--but coming from the Federal government, dictated and approved by the local planning directors/czars, whether their names were Robert Moses (New York), Edward Bacon (Philadelphia), Justin Herman (San Francisco) or Harland Bartholomew (St. Louis). They were the absolute masters of the process with self created political autonomy and practically no oversight, with no perceived need to involve any other voices in the destruction and/or wholesale remaking of neighborhoods. They were the experts. The City Planners Down from the Mountain. They had carte blanche, with an aspirational goal--to remove the created notion of "blight", to house waves of the economically and racially segregated, in new boxes that promised hygiene, fresh air on the 11th floors, and a landscape that belonged to everybody. And nobody.

I suppose in a way, we ought to thank them. Because of the spectacular failure of this grand experiment in cities across the country, visited on people with no choice or say, we have evolved a new approach to project development in which it is not only unthinkable *not* to involve the end users in their neighborhoods, but absolutely critical to a project's success.

Because we no longer have legal enforced segregation but a kind of segregation by inertia, we can look at the problems of housing with a humbled perspective, but with a whole new set of tools, precedents and examples aided and abetted by an newly energized strategy: talking to the stakeholders, showing how their comments are a part of creating their city, folding in those things that all neighborhoods call for--connectedness, transportation (we may have a "transportation desert" we must address), commercial centers one can walk to, to schools and food, to libraries and a sense of personal safety and security.

If I had to choose one major failing of planning from among the many, it was the removal of Pruitt-Igoe from the normal connected grid of streets, making a de-facto island of the massive development, impossible to patrol, creating a no-man's land that effectively abandoning those within its perimeter to chaos and alienation. The bad actors knew that if they ran into the interior from Cass or Jefferson, no cop car would enter the grounds and none of them would get out of the cars and chase the bad actors on foot.

This has been played out in housing projects large and small--including my firm MWA's own Iris Courts in Portland, now called Humboldt Gardens. The bad actors understood how to use the perimeter of these projects with its barricaded streets as two-way filters. The concrete barrels that blocked streets which were meant to control crime, ending up augmenting it. Robbing the inhabitants of what others take for granted--the quiet enjoyment of their own residential blocks. Calling them hostages would not be too strong. I could cite specific examples, but the principle holds.

No middle class family, if there still are any, would think about moving to any neighborhood that did not have strong schools, or those which they considered unsafe. For that sense of safety and good schools a family would pay any price for housing in those neighborhoods in which they stand. You know that's true. You've already been told by Kevin Lynch, Jane Jacobs, Oscar Newman, by the Zillow reports on neighborhoods, and by the evidence of your own eyes as you walk through the good and desirable neighborhoods.

I stopped being being surprised by the question: "what do people in affordable housing want?" All people want the same things. Walkable blocks, with transportation, connected to schools, services, and open space, not isolated from the rest of the city. Yes, cities change. Brooklyn to a certain segment of the population used to be undesirable, so too, the South of Market area in San Francisco. Those cities are now financially out of reach for many, but very cool for the few. But what makes them work is easy to describe, but what makes it so hard to do?

This is where architects can use their vote. We are the designers. We know how to make ideas take form and actually get buildings built. But we are called to look at the successes and the failures and not make the mistake of hubris. We may get it wrong, but it won't be because we didn't learn from the mistakes of the past. We will move toward the right answer. But together. It is fair to say that architecture cannot solve social problems, but it can exacerbate them.

*What if it was rising instead of falling?*

### ***Is Modernism Dead?***

The short answer is no. I took a trip to Stuttgart, Germany the same year as the 2016 WUSTL/GSD Conference. It gave me a fresh chance to compare a failed icon of modern architecture from one of the sources of modernism, the Weissenhof Siedlung, built as a result of the 1927 Stuttgart, Germany IBA. This iconic 1927 complex of mostly white boxes by Gropius, the brothers Bruno and Max Taut, Le Corbusier, Behrens, J.J.P. Oud, Mart Stam, and Hans Poelzig, among others. These were the top architects of their time involving themselves in the design of

prototypical "future workers" housing, led by Mies van der Roë. Imagine that. I went to see what can still serve as a benchmark in many ways. It is still occupied and serves as a model of close-in, connected urban housing. It is not a museum. The buildings are still vital, receiving new paint and a steady stream of renters..

Stuttgart has maintained a strong Modernist and Post-Modernist tradition, from the Weissenhof project in 1927, up to James Stirling and Michael Wilford's Post-Modern epitome, the 1970-1984 Neue Staatsgalerie and beyond. The current crop of fine architects in the area include David Chipperfield's hotel close by next to the U-Bahn/ underground train station in the Killesberg Park district and a great series of commercial and museum projects. Also not far from the Weissenhof Siedlung neighborhood, itself adjacent to new modernist housing complexes.

What impressed me about the architecture of Stuttgart was how it embraces classical modernism and creates a texture suited to its times, without nostalgia, without slavish imitation, but with a sense of openness and even fun. Nothing that current architects can't embrace with enthusiasm.

I want to look at my own examples of this notion of "transformational neighborhood building" out of former public housing projects, from Mandela Gateway in Oakland, Iris Court, and Stephens Creek Crossing in Portland, Oregon. As the main case study, I chose to use a signature example of one of these public-private housing developments, Faubourg Lafitte in New Orleans, Louisiana, as a model for rebuilding a segregated neighborhood.

### **The Preambles: Mandela Gateway, Iris Court, and Stephens Creek Crossing**

Here is what Mandela Gateway, Humboldt Gardens and Stephens Creek had in common-- progressive forward-looking clients who knew how to aggressively assemble financing for the projects, how to make them attractive to mixed-income and market rate clients, and how to negotiate for additional property that made the housing even more desirable and more financially feasible.

#### **Mandela Gateway, Oakland, California**

The client for Mandela was Bridge Housing of San Francisco. Bridge was led by Carole Galante who was the chief after the legendary and charismatic Don Turner who founded the company and led it until he died in a plane crash in 1996 with Ron Brown the US Secretary of Commerce on a trade mission to Croatia. Carole picked up the mantle and made certain that Bridge continued to honor the legacy of its founder.

Mandela started with a master plan produced by MWA, and bringing stakeholders from the West Oakland community; the Oakland Housing Authority, the City of Oakland, and the Bay Area Rapid Transit Agency (BART). The aim was to convene all the stakeholders in order to get a high-level picture of what would rebuild the traditional black residential and commercial neighborhood; plus tie the location of the West Oakland BART transit station together in a comprehensive plan. MWA was instrumental in facilitating the sometimes difficult conversation with the community over several sessions.

Once the master plan was completed, MWA and Bridge started work on the housing as the catalyst project of the master plan. The genesis of the HOPE VI project was a 46 unit public housing project owned by the OHA. Through negotiations with adjacent private owners and land swaps with the state highway agency Caltrans, Bridge acquired enough land and assembled the mixed-bag of public and private financing including bank funds, State funding, and Low Income Housing Tax Credits, to create a 182 unit project--including 14 affordable, for-sale homes.

The project included 16,000 SF of neighborhood serving retail at the street, three stories of housing above a concrete podium, facing the transit station street, and stepping down to the scale of the 2 and 3 story traditional neighborhood on the parallel street. As the major benefit of the Mandela's location, the train from the West Oakland BART station will get you to downtown San Francisco in 7.5 minutes. The 168 unit rental project opened in 2005, and the separately financed 14 for-sale homes opened in 2007, for a total of 182 homes. Mandela Gateway continues to be a beacon in West Oakland.

### **Iris Court becomes Humboldt Gardens Mixed-Use Development**

Iris Court was a small public housing project in North Portland, the traditional center of Portland's small black neighborhood. As was the case with Mandela, Iris Court was led by a progressive client, the Housing Authority of Portland, now called Home Forward. HAP was started out with a workshop process that MWA facilitated--bringing together the residents, some who required Spanish language translation services, and the surrounding neighborhood of "newcomers" moving into North Portland because of the relative lower housing costs. The L-shaped site was also burdened by "crime mitigation measures" put in place in the 1980s which included blocking the single street from the main grid of streets. Over time, this measure had the reverse effect--the area's bad actors knew just where to stand to make sure that when the police cars came, they would melt to the other side of the barriers, and by the time the cars circumnavigated the block to get in from the other side, they were gone. This unintended effect also meant that emergency vehicles had to figure out how to get into the small neighborhood.

The five workshops we held brought out some raw feelings among the homeowners and the renters of Iris Court, starting out with a high level of distrust among all the parties. It's fair to say that the newcomers wanted to work with Iris Court and not be seen as gentrifiers, but there were some tough conversations among all parties. They all stuck with it until the resolution of a way forward towards a plan.

HAP was determined that the project be done with the consensus of all the stakeholders in order to create this project, and at the end of the process, even the police understood that the barriers had to go, and reconnect Iris Court to the neighboring street grid.

As a result of HAP's negotiating ability, we acquired a State of Oregon parking lot at the corner of N. Alberta and N. Vancouver Streets, which allowed us to bring the project with its vertical "Humboldt" signage down to the corner, and it has become an urban marker and a symbol of wider neighborhood development.

The housing is a total of 74 units on five acres, including 13 two and three story townhouse and flats ranging from one to four bedrooms. The mixed-use building at the corner houses a Head Start center, a Community Policing office and a Neighborhood Networking office on the ground floor with 56 one and two bedroom rental apartments above. The playground we designed at the borderless border of the project is the de facto playground for the whole reinvigorated neighborhood.

Humboldt Gardens sets a remarkable precedent, not for its relatively modest budget, but for the foresight of HAP looking beyond cost into comprehensive ideas that benefit the residents beyond its property-lines.

### **Stephens Creek Crossing, Portland, Oregon**

The client for SCC was Home Forward. This HOPE VI project was initiated not by starting with a design, but by dialog. The original scheme was a 60 unit masonry block housing project built behind a wall of commercial development, in a sloped canyon which flooded in the rains. It was all but invisible to the surrounding neighborhoods. There were informal paths from the housing to the commercial streets by going through the bordering properties. But from the rooftops of the multipurpose building, you could see Mt. Hood. That did give us some magic to work with. We understood that design would be a challenge, but first we had to know who we were working with.

Starting this conversation through the workshop process that we fostered, allowed us to understand the existing condition of the community and its needs. Unlike many cities, Portland's public housing has a mixed race population which is enlivened by Somali immigrants. They all came to the workshops--including city council persons, the adjacent church community on one side, and the Jewish congregation on the other. We brought them all together to create the consensus for us to move forward with the design.

As a result of the workshops, we were empowered to design a mixed use environment which more than doubled the number of units to 122, and included a Children's Center Head Start school, as in Humboldt Gardens. In a brilliant move by Home Forward, they managed to purchase a property on the main road which allowed the Children's Center to break out from the

wall of development enclosing it, and make a presence on the main road, both physically, visually, and psychologically. The residents were no longer invisible, but viable participants, connected to transit and the surrounding community.

The challenges of designing on the steep slopes gave MWA the opportunity to regrade the site, raise the level of the housing, create formal paths to the main streets, to create rain gardens and topographical mitigations for the water flows, and create a new scheme of individual buildings linked by the larger Children's Center and the Opportunity Center which houses management offices, public computers, a classroom, community room, and a modern teaching kitchen, which is linked to a community farm. The Children's Center provides classrooms, administration offices, and a family workshop, in addition to a covered area that encourages outdoor play throughout the seasons.

It is, like Mandela and Humboldt, a much-awarded project, but that isn't the point here. The point is that taking the comprehensive view, and working with the community stakeholders and the city and the financiers, We can make a housing project that acts as much more--the catalyst for a neighborhood plan that works for those who live in it, and those who happen to live adjacent to it. And it does promote the larger story. The larger story of making a place that people want to live in, regardless of economic status. A neighborhood for all. It's no wonder that Portland mayor Charlie Hales remarked of Stephen's Creek:

***"It is inviting to the people that live there and the people that will visit. More importantly, they created a neighborhood there. This, to me, is one of the best examples of how you can create community in new projects."***

### **Rebuilding St. Louis Neighborhoods After Pruitt-Igoe: A Precedent from Faubourg Lafitte, New Orleans, Louisiana on the Mississippi River: Reconstructing a Better Future**

To the main project, I want to address the issues by which we are confronted when looking at an urban condition like Pruitt-Igoe. I want to take the lessons from the three preamble projects, and via the description of a fourth, offer some observations about how to move forward on the world's most famous imploded buildings.

On 30 March-1 April 2016, was on a panel convened by Washington University and Harvard's Graduate School of Design to talk about the failures of public housing symbolized by Pruitt-Igoe, and to sort out where we would go from there. Not just talk about the failures, but how to build resilient communities going forward.

The goals for me, were to bring together the wide range of theories and ideas that were examined during the day's sessions, and to engage in a conversation about next steps. We were asked to consider a couple of questions.



1. What social, spatial, political, and/or economic projects should be researched, designed, or implemented in order to put St. Louis on a different trajectory?

In talking with a number of colleagues re social mobility, the hallmark has been that the new emerging groups had urban (**spatial**) fabric to move into--that's how the formerly Irish Mission District neighborhood in San Francisco became the Latino neighborhood. They didn't bring the houses or the architecture with them--that 'spatial' fabric, along with transportation, was pre-existing. Re the **social**, it didn't happen all at once, there was a gradual increase of a population relative to another--similar to San Francisco's Chinatown and adjacent Italian neighborhoods in North Beach.

*Conclusion: Preserve the Urban Fabric and let new development happen within it.*

**Politically**, it would be good to see the aldermanic leaders of the 28 Wards, plus the Mayor, plus the business interests working in concert on targeted improvement projects rather than act in competition for scarce resources. It's possible that STL with its newly emerging innovation economy based in the research universities (Washington University/ Saint Louis University/ University of Missouri St. Louis) would be that business partner. I've just been in Heidelberg Germany where that is happening--the city plus research universities acting as an activists for change to the benefit of both.

*Conclusion: Targeted change, not tabula rasa initiatives means agreement on a larger vision. Takes work.*

**Economically**, there are some good local examples in STL--the development work in the emerging "Botanical Heights" neighborhood--reinforcing the spatial fabric with specific in-fills, creating small places for neighborhood serving commercial, and a great charter school as a magnet for families to come and invest in the neighborhood. This is being done by an independent developer. We could see STL expand that model to other areas.

But why should it?

It helps if there is an outside driver of the change, one that can't be ignored. In New Orleans it was Hurricane Katrina, forcing the city to rethink infrastructure, housing, services, schools, jobs and transportation.

In St. Louis it may well be the research economy competing for the best students in the world, as a kind of positive driver of new projects in the city. In order to keep up it's growth, this economy needs, yes, labs and co-working space, but also housing for the post-doc students who feed the research engines, the staffers, workers, and people who support that economy. Also schools and restaurants and a connection to an international airport, either directly or once removed.

A cost-benefit analysis should show why it makes sense to have those companies build neighborhoods as well as workplaces. The identity, or "brand" of the city is coincident with the "brand" of the research university. They both have to work together.

At our Faubourg Lafitte housing project in New Orleans, we were tasked by our clients, Enterprise Community Partners (a descendent of the James Rouse Corporation) and its

partners Providence Community Housing and L+M Development Partners, with rebuilding a famous neighborhood post-Katrina with new housing and infrastructure.

We had the advantage of working with a plan begun by a series of community workshops led by Urban Design Associates (UDA) of Pittsburgh. These workshops brought the community full circle--from trying to find a way to keep and remodel the existing brick structures, to the point of the community rising to say: Let's build it new, but make it a part of the Treme neighborhood in which Lafitte sits. It is important to note that UDA's process is the same as MWA's in terms of how to work with community in the design process.

Here is a synopsis of Faubourg Lafitte's development process:

- Listen, and then Design: Walk the neighborhood, talk to the community directly and ask them what's needed; then
- "Workshop your way to the Answer" with a diverse Working Group including all stakeholders;
- Rebuild the city grid--connect Transportation to everything and find a way to "Make Walking Irresistible"; then
- Make a project of scale in which the details matter. This means big enough to have a positive impact--a catalyst project that enables the next project and the next, and design detail that speaks to the aspirations of the architecture of the place.

2. What kind of interventions, and at what scale, might have the best outcome for all (or should we prioritize some over others)? How should St. Louis deal with the high-priority issues of mobility, housing, education, policing, and urban design practices to address the injustices and divisions of the past?

**Interventions** should be project based, focused on building and reinforcing the urban fabric. Consider the positive impact if we worked out a plan for **connected blocks** that could be regularly patrolled as opposed to a sealed off moat of single income/racial/economic populations. The only time you would see law enforcement would be in a catastrophic event. Nobody wants that. Think of a plan that will have impact but is achievable: Say, a thousand houses for Millennials in a decade.

**Transportation** is key. We don't just have a "food desert" in these underserved communities, but a "transportation desert" that does not connect these populations to schools, work, services, and parks. Yes, I said parks. The City needs to solve this in a comprehensive way. Two hours to get to these essential nodes without a car is unacceptable. You can anecdotally include Millennials in that population. They will be the ones on bikes.

**Poor schools** that do not improve and demonstrably track the economic and social outcomes of its students are unacceptable. Only allow those that do. Charter schools could work. But rebuild the city public schools as well. It shouldn't be a zero sum game. Remember, good schools bring families and long-term commitment to a neighborhood.

**Housing** should be at the scale that makes a difference--our (MWA's) Faubourg Lafitte project in New Orleans is a model. It replaced a series of buildings disconnected from the street with 8 blocks of houses with 517 houses that look and act like the Treme neighborhood in which it sits

Porches next to porches, across the street from the same, 5 blocks from a recently completed \$2 billion investment in two new medical centers--walking distance to the new VA and the University Medical Center which replaced Charité , the city hospital destroyed by Katrina. All that, and it is 6 blocks from the French Quarter. A desirable neighborhood just got better.

To show how far New Orleans has come 10 years after Hurricane Katrina, President Obama dropped by Lafitte to say hello and kiss babies. Lafitte is a symbol of rebirth, and it is also a good place to live.

3. Who should be involved in discussion and action, and how should these individuals or collectivities be gathered together and organized to proceed?

First, let's take a bigger canvass. The Alderman and Mayor's office should be in the room; and the city agencies--after all, Faubourg Lafitte needed to connect into New Orleans' sewer laterals, water systems, and street lights. All the city groups--planning, redevelopment, Land Reutilization, Police and Fire Departments, code enforcement--needs to be operating as a single entity not a series of parallel, project-approval silos. The citizens who have hung in the beleaguered neighborhoods who can give legitimacy to a plan, Planners and architects who listen more than they talk--present company included; and a developer with resources--perhaps the universities and the private tech companies who can move on a targeted catalyst plan of improvement.

All of this should be done in plain sight--all meetings recorded, published online, and available for scrutiny, feedback, and a sign-off by all stakeholders on any plan going forward. The feedback is not meant a veto, but practical comments on how the catalyst project can proceed.

All of this will take resources--for the workshops, to hire design professionals, traffic planners, engineers, financial experts and funders, who have a clear vision on how to proceed.

## SUMMARY

These planning ideas aren't some new fantasies of urban design. To the often asked question: What do these disadvantaged communities want? They want the same thing as everyone in a city wants--an intact, interesting city fabric with a story to tell, walkable blocks, schools, transportation to jobs and services, open space, art, and peaceable enjoyment of where they live. There isn't a different approach for the hipsters in Brooklyn, San Francisco, or Berlin, for people who ride bikes and use public transportation more than drive cars. It's for everyone.

Here are the Four Lessons from Lafitte:

## **Collaboration**

Create a broadly configured working group with a commitment to the Neighborhood, not just to the block

**Permission**

Look beyond your own job description and become an advocate for the Neighborhood

**Responsibility**

Rebuild the Neighborhood, but build it better

**Memory**

Use memory of place to make the rebuilding authentic to the residents.

The conclusion here is that St. Louis is the Story; You are the Storyteller,

In order to make these observations relevant to the 37 or so remaining acres of the Pruitt-Igoe site, it takes leadership outside the design sphere. This isn't a technical question. We know how to design housing, units, open spaces. We know how to frame views and create LEED Gold buildings. What we need, as shown by those who led the development process at Mandela, Humboldt Gardens, Stephens Creek Crossing, and Faubourg Lafitte--is creative leadership that can look outward from the property lines to envision the future, and take the practical, first steps in building it forward. A development that doesn't have to anticipate the timetable of what comes next to it, but through an open sense of design does not preclude the future from happening on its borders. Those borders will get blended in to the adjacent project, and the chapters will continue until the whole book is written and re-written--for that is the way it is in cities--We make them, then we go back and remake them. But the framework remains: Walkable blocks, with transportation, with services and schools, with spaces and parks that allow them to breathe, and a connection to the design history of the place--not blind copies, but contemporary representations of what gave the city its specific character.

We have to be champions of moving the design of neighborhoods forward, in comprehensive planning, in community consensus; and in a connectedness that we can no longer ignore as a driver of forward looking architectural design that works for the entire community.