Design That Enables Diversity: The Complications of a Planning Ideal

Emily Talen

This article reviews the literature on place diversity and the quest to use design to promote social and economic mix in human settlements. The article fits together a large literature on the subject of the interrelationship between diversity and place and explores how diversity could be enabled within the context of the city-planning profession. It argues that the linkage between city planning—defined in its traditional sense as a profession concerned with the design of cities—and place *diversity is understudied. Four distinct though interrelated theoretical bases for diversity are discussed: place vitality, economic health, social equity, and sustainability. The article argues that the promotion of place diversity requires focused effort on the part of planners, and that design-based strategies are an appropriate part of that effort.*

Keywords: *mixed-income housing; social diversity*

Human settlements, planners say, should be socially and economically diverse—mixed in income, mixed in use, and actively supportive of places that commingle people of different races, ethnicities, genders, ages, occupations, and households. New Urbanists, smart-growth advocates, creative-class adherents, sustainability theorists—all have espoused the fundamental goal of what could be called *place diversity* as the cornerstone of their prescriptions for urban reform: that a diversity of people and functions should be spatially mixed. While most recognize the inevitability of differentiation and segregation of the kind Park, Burgess, and McKenzie identified eighty years ago—proclaiming that "competition forces associational groupings" (1925, 79)—it is now understood that planning must try to counterbalance these tendencies by promoting some kind of workable place diversity.

Yet in discussions about how to address segregation—in many ways the antithesis of place diversity—American city planning, in its capacity as a profession that plans and designs cities, has been relatively withdrawn. Peter Hall (2002) observed that the problems of inner-city disinvestment, white flight, and segregation—the most potent manifestations of nondiversity—are problems that, "almost unbelievably," city planning has not been called upon to answer. Unlike citizens in other countries, "Americans are capable of separating problems of social pathology from any discussion of design solutions," focusing instead on "a bundle of policies" (461)—often only weakly related to city planning. While the concepts of "place," "neighborhood structure," and "spatial pattern" have made their way into the prescriptive debate over what to do about residential segregation and lack of place diversity, the planner's unique contribution to this debate seems to be

EMILY TALEN is an associate professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign. Her research focuses on new urbanism and the design of the built environment.

Journal of Planning Literature, Vol. 20, No. 3 (February 2006).
DOI: 10.1177/0885412205283104

missing. The book *Place Matters* (Dreier, Mollenkopf, and Swanstrom, 2001), for example, whose thesis is that "where we live makes a big difference in the quality of our lives," sees the problem and solution for American cities as being "primarily political in nature" (xi). It is an interpretation of *place* that excludes the planning and design of cities.

This is in no small way related to the simple truth that the idea of a "plan" and the reality of "pluralism" seem diametrically opposed. A plan for the physical design of cities is based on what Meyerson and Banfield (1955) disparagingly identified as "a single intention," something regarded as incongruous within a diverse society. Now, plans of the type originally conceived by traditional, Progressive Era planners are being revisited with the explicit intention of using them to foster diversity. City designs advocated by New Urbanists, for example, are predicated on commonality but intended to foster diversity. Planners are therefore being asked to think about the link between design and diversity in an increasingly explicit, and some would say paradoxical, way.

This article attempts to unravel the underlying complexity of this quest. Though many have written on the subject of diversity, the linkage between city planning—defined here in its traditional sense as a profession concerned with the design of cities—and *place* diversity is understudied. Americans are well aware that there is separation in cities, that certain groups of people tend to avoid each other, that certain functions are prevented from locating in the same place—but are there situations where built-form variables intervene? What does city planning have to do with engendering human diversity in a given place? How can the complex encounter between the physical world and the social world be legitimately translated into actionable planning goals? How, practically speaking, are city planners supposed to promote diversity within the context of their profession? I address these questions by fitting together a large if disparate literature on the subject of the interrelationship between city planning, diversity, and place.

Diversity Defined

By many accounts, diversity is an overused term that has become cliché and ill-defined (described recently in the *New York Times* as "a trendy code word," Freedman 2004). "Mixed-use" has had a similar problem of being "overworked" (Wang 1996). Diversity can be narrowly defined, for example, as exclusively referring to racial identity or sexual orientation, or it can be expanded to describe random and chaotic urban conditions. David Brooks (2004) has described diversity in the exurban fringe as a "relentlessly aspiring" cultural zone that includes everything from "lesbian dentists" to "Iranian McMansions." For planners working to achieve place diversity, a "fervently optimistic" array of suburban types does not necessarily contribute to the planning ideal.

Smith (1998) made a distinction between mix/diversity, which refers to a social condition, and integration, which is more of a quantitatively defined demographic condition. He argued that concepts like social mix and diversity had deeper meanings involving moral commitment, positive social contact, and solidarity, but that these attitudes and interactions made measurement difficult. The quantitative measurement of integration, on the other hand, if conceived as a demographic condition, is a more useful research tool because it lends itself to objective measurement. Smith also surmised that integration was describing something more ingrained and stable, whereas mixed or diverse neighborhoods might be characteristic of places in transition.

In this article, I use the term *place diversity* to describe a normative view, pervasive in the field of city planning, that concerns all aspects of human settlement, not just racial integration in residential areas. The term *integration* is less suited since it is often limited to the mixing of racial groups. However, since studies of segregation and integration make up the bulk of the literature, they are an important part of any discussion about place diversity. I treat them as an important component of a broader definition that includes all forms of social and economic mixing—the combination, in particular places, of people of varying incomes, races, genders, ethnicities, household sizes, lifestyles, and, in addition, nonresidential activities comprising different uses and functions of land.

Empirical Background

On a number of indicators (poverty, employment, income), sorting and separation in the American pattern of settlement is as prominent as ever. While racial diversity in the suburbs has increased (Frey 2002) and more immigrants now live in the suburbs than in central cities (Singer 2004), the gaps between city and suburb, between one suburb and another, or between one neighborhood and another have widened in the past half century (Ellen 2000a; Orfield 2002). For Hispanics and Asians, segregation appears to be increasing (Logan et al. 2004). Between 1970 and 2000, there was a 30 percent net increase in class dissimilarity, an increase especially in the concentration of affluence at the neighborhood level (Massey & Fischer 2003). And while downtown neighborhoods are gentrifying, they are not necessarily on their way to becoming mixed income and multiracial; they are instead on their way to becom-

ing middle- and upper-middle-class neighborhoods, and in the process simply shifting concentrated poverty from one location to another (Powell 2002). Pendall (2001) argues that density exacerbates segregation by housing type and class because laws, lending policies, and industry behavior favor large, uniform types of developments, and because gentrification is more likely to occur in high-density neighborhoods where "proximity-related benefits" increasingly enter "people's utility functions" (Pendall and Caruthers 2003, 547; see also Kahn 2001).

Even where integration appears to be on the rise, it may not exist at a meaningful spatial level. A recent study of "melting pot suburbs" in the San Francisco Bay Area argued that suburban multiculturalism was mostly a myth, and that suburbs were simply patterning themselves into new forms of segregation (Rehn 2002). There is evidence that suburbs are differentiating themselves along race and class lines. As Briggs (2005) put it, even though we became more diverse in the 1990s, "it is not the fact of containment that changed significantly, just the shape of the container" (8). Thus we now have more poor and minorities in the suburbs, but that does not necessarily mean we are integrating people in meaningful ways. Neither does an increase in aggregate diversity mean an increase in neighborhood integration. In the southern United States, levels of black suburbanization are relatively high, but they tend to be in the form of clustered housing at the periphery, separate from new white suburbs. And the spatial extent of census tracts may be large enough to include both types of segregated communities, statistically masking the experience of segregation (Rehn 2002).

Much less is known about the empirical trends of land-use separation versus land-use mix. Most observers agree that in the U.S., the mixing of uses in human settlements has been in decline for a century. The separation of the metropolis into a rigid system of functional land-use categories gained momentum when zoning began to proliferate in the 1920s. Prior to that time, functional integration was widespread. Even after the end of the nineteenth-century walking city, industrial zones were combined with worker housing in zones of planned industrial "recentralization" (as in the *Regional Plan of New York & Its Environs*, 1929–1931), and industry expansion in some areas was combined with a planned mix of commercial and residential land use, especially prior to 1950 (Hise 2001). But where the mix was unplanned, newer neighborhoods near the industrial zone constituted "a strange hodgepodge of apartments, bungalows, and vacant lots" (Fishman 2000, 78). Now, land-use mix is likely to be similarly unplanned. Many suburban residential areas are both increasing in density as well as nucleating, whereby residential areas are located next to retail facilities despite regulations that continue to encourage land-use separation (Moudon and Hess 2000). At the very least, these changes in land-use patterning mean we can no longer think in terms of predictable patterns of diversity determined by core and periphery locations. Whether these patterns constitute the diverse human settlement as theorized by planners is another question.

This article will not discuss the underlying reasons *why* American cities tend to be nondiverse, but a brief overview of the primary reasons they do tend to be nondiverse is warranted. In addition to the human ecology perspective that equated social mobility with spatial mobility (Park, Burgess, and McKenzie 1925), explanations often focus on individual behavior and the "discourse of urban fear" that encodes class separation (Low 2003, 387; Ellin 1997), or the way in which ethnic and cultural differences bear out in differentiating space and place (Kefalas 2003). Economists have argued that social mix may be a theoretical impossibility, and that "even with elimination of all institutional practices that hinder spatial integration, market-based factors would still drive some forms of spatial segregation in a metropolitan area" (Wassmer 2001, 2). Spatial segregation is the inevitable result of a fragmented system of government (Downs 1994) and increasing "geopolitical fragmentation," but it is also a result of the fact that higher-income households are able to outbid others for locations closest to the most desirable neighborhood attributes, resulting in a clustering of high-income groups (Vandell 1995). On the other hand, sociologists have found that social homogeneity can strengthen social support networks, help protect against discrimination, and help to preserve cultural heritage (Suttles 1972). The partitioned city is thus a reality of consumer choice, discrimination in institutions and governance, neighborhood dynamics, and macrobased explanations involving political economy and social change (van Kempen 2002; Grigsby et al. 1987).

The pattern of separation is both well-studied and widely critiqued. A wealth of scholarship has focused on the effect of planning policy and regulation on the isolation of poor and minority groups, notably Anderson's *The Federal Bulldozer* (1964), Frieden and Kaplan's *The Politics of Neglect* (1975), Kushner's *Apartheid in America* (1982), Keating's *The Suburban Racial Dilemma* (1994), or Thomas and Ritzdorf's *Urban Planning and the African American Community* (1997). Separation is investigated as an historical phenomenon maintained through the construction of boundaries or zones (Hise 2004), as an existing condition of cities, or in terms of the social and economic processes that underlie and procure it (Marcuse and van Kempen 2002). Obvious examples include the tendency to isolate urban func-

tions such as shopping into single-use "districts," the enforcement of social segregation by zoning for separate housing-unit types, and planning near monolithic elements such as express highways without simultaneous consideration of the full range of urban social and economic diversity. Less obvious but equally insidious ways include the designation of "neighborhood units" that exclude minorities (Silver 1985), public works projects designed to displace blacks (Caro 1974), the push for "cold war utopias" in the form of peripheral, low-density development (Mennel 2004), or the way in which planning policies fail to support nontraditional family configurations more prevalent among African Americans (Ritzdorf 1997).

Some have documented how the solidity of separation is only reinforced by the planning response, and that new developments that attempt to mix income groups have not been highly successful. One study of "mixed-use in theory and practice" in Canada concluded that mixed-use promises much but delivers little because it operates amidst "social and economic forces" that promote land-use separation (Grant 2002, 71). These "forces" ensure that income- and race-based polarization will continue to occur between city and suburb. Not only that, but the mixed-use environments that are created for wealthy areas differ significantly from those in low-income areas in that the former type of mix experiences much lower exposure to health risks. "Mixed-use" in low-income communities, on the other hand, can very well translate to "high levels of cancer, birth defects, asthma, respiratory disease, hearing loss, lack of sleep and stress" (Angotti and Hanhardt 2001, 150).

While some have argued that social diversity is essential for building "civic capacity" (Oliver 2001), others have pointed out that the correlation between diversity and conflict has a significant "downside" that is routinely overlooked. Skerry (2002) uncovered a number of studies that have concluded that diversity is a mixed blessing: It poses problems for community policing efforts, it impedes the ability to maintain social cohesion, it correlates with a weak labor movement, and, in general, it creates dissension and conflict. He points to a study by psychologists Williams and O'Reilly (1998) that reviewed forty years of research on racial and ethnic diversity and concluded that diversity is likely to "impede group functioning." In addition, even where diversity does exist in a given location, people find other, nonspatial ways of maintaining separation: upstairs/downstairs, as in Haussmann's Paris; back of streets and front of streets, as in Engels' Manchester; and front building/back building, as in Berlin's "Mietskasernen" (Marcuse and van Kempen 2002, 23). Anthropologists study the various "codes of deference" that have been used to maintain social separation whenever spatial segregation wasn't practical—rules about clothing, for example (Espino 2001, 1).

Yet despite all of the inertia toward separation, despite the weak record on successfully creating mixed-use, mixed-income environments, and in spite of arguments that proclaim diversity to be nonviable, planners maintain theoretical positions that support the need for place diversity.

THEORIES OF DIVERSITY

The concepts and theories that are used to support place diversity as a normative goal in city planning can be organized under four headings: place vitality, economic health, social equity, and sustainability. The categories reflect the fact that more than one type of diversity is relevant in planning. Despite this variability, these are interrelated categories, all used to justify the need for place diversity and the importance of city planning in procuring it.

It is important to note that the theories of diversity included here involve more than one geographic scale. Although the planner's role in social mixing is often conceived at the neighborhood level, ideas about certain types of diversity, such as economic diversity, may be more relevant at a larger geographic scale, such as the metropolitan region. Yet these varying scales are interwoven: diversity at the neighborhood level may be impacted by citywide diversity levels, and vice versa. For this reason, I take a broad view of the different theoretical discourses that are relevant to place diversity.

Place vitality

On a theoretical level, much scholarship has investigated the city as the locus of difference, diversity, and ultimately equality, in for example the writings of Harvey (2000) and Lefebvre (1991). There is a pervasive view among intellectuals that diversity is a positive force in a global society, constituting a mode of existence that enhances human experience. Even where urban cultural diversity is marketed and sold as a tool of economic development (Lang et al. 1997), the forging of diverse urban lifestyles can still be regarded as an essential asset of cities (Zukin 1998). Allan Jacobs and Donald Appleyard (1987) wrote a widely cited manifesto in which they argued that diversity and the integration of activities were necessary parts of "an urban fabric for an urban life" (113). As another urbanist put it, "the simple truth is that the combinations of mixtures of activities, not separate uses, are the key to successful urban places" (Montgomery 1998, 98). The notion of "quality" in the built environment is routinely measured on the basis of three notions of diversity—variety,

choice, and interest (Smith et al. 1997). For Jane Jacobs (1961), diversity was "by far" the most important condition of a healthy urban place.

Diversity is conceptualized as increasing the functionality of cities. Feminists call for building an "infrastructure for everyday lives" as a counterresponse to various separations (of uses, for example) that are largely the result of "hegemonic assumptions about the respective roles of men and women" (Gilroy and Booth 1999, 307). Lewis Mumford wrote about the importance of social and economic mix often, citing the "many-sided urban environment" as one with more possibilities for "the higher forms of human achievement" (1938, 486). At mid-twentieth century, the rejection of suburbia by intellectuals and planners was based on a perception that it lacked diversity and therefore was "anathema to intellectual and cultural advance" (Sarkissian 1976, 240). Mumford's ideas about human diversity were strongly influenced by Patrick Geddes, and both men saw the advantage and positive stimulation of cities because of the way they accommodate "the essential human need for disharmony and conflict" (1938, 485). Planners, in their plans for the physical design of cities, were supposed to foster this wherever possible to achieve the mature city: "A plan that does not further a daily intermixture of people, classes, activities, works against the best interests of maturity" (Mumford 1968, 39). Now, this increased functionality has broadened to include the creation of "undirected hetero-zone spaces," and might include locations for "work-play," "live-work," or "play-live" (Boyer 1990; Ellin 1996).

Jacobs identified particular "generators of diversity" that connected city design to diversity directly—mixed primary uses, short blocks, buildings of varying age, and a "sufficiently dense concentration of people" (Jacobs 1961, 143–151). What counts is the "everyday, ordinary performance in mixing people," forming complex "pools of use" that will be capable of producing something greater than the sum of their parts (164–5). City variety was of all kinds, and was interlinked: physical, social, cultural, economic, temporal, and all intimately related. Because these generators provide different kinds of uses and different kinds of users, they are mutually supportive. The reciprocal nature of these relationships is good for urban vitality because it ensures that urban spaces will be maximally used, at all times of the day.

Jacobs identified an underlying system of order in urban diversity, which she termed "organized complexity" (Jacobs, 1961). Others have advanced similar notions. Eliel Saarinen thought the diversity of urban elements could be brought into "a single picture of rhythmic order" (1943, 13), while Melvin Webber's "Order in Diversity" (1963) lamented the mistaking of complexity for chaos. On the other hand, an urban place can reveal its underlying homogeneity precisely because it *is* chaotic. A commercial street that looks garish is not diverse but instead homogenous, and, because of its lack of diversity, conveys no underlying sense of order. Extreme variations in color, form, and texture are merely buildings crying out to be recognized amidst an overbearing pattern of sameness, something Venturi et al. (1977) discovered in the architecture of Las Vegas.

Diversity is seen as the primary generator of urban vitality because it increases interactions among multiple urban components. A "close-grained" diversity of uses provides "constant mutual support," and planning must, Jacobs argued, "become the science and art of catalyzing and nourishing these close-grained working relationships" (14). The separation of urbanism into components such as land-use categories, abstracted calculations—miles of highways, square footage of office space, park acreage per capita—all lead to, as Mumford termed it, the "anti-city" (1968, 128). Jacobs similarly berated planners for treating the city as a series of calculations and measurable abstractions that rendered it a problem of "disorganized complexity" and made planners falsely believe they could effectively manipulate its individualized components.

Economic Health

That urban diversity, the "size, density, and congestion" of cities, is "among our most precious economic assets," is by now established economic doctrine (Jacobs 1961, 219). While this view is closely related to the theory of place vitality, its exclusive focus is on economic activity, thereby involving a larger geographic scale than that involved in considerations of *place*. Of special concern is that diversity of industries in close proximity generates growth rather than specialization within a given industry (Glaeser et al. 1992). The richness of human diversity becomes an economic asset because innovation within firms can come from spillovers outside the firm. Spillovers depend, to some degree, on spatial proximity because distance affects knowledge flows (Glaeser 2000). The scale at which diversity is able to create spillovers that contribute to innovation and vitality depends on the scale at which cross-cultural knowledge spillovers are likely to occur. Thus, whether there is a creative economic dynamic generated from diversity is very much scale dependent.

Richard Florida has been particularly explicit in arguing for the importance of diversity in economic terms. His creative capital theory states that high densities of diverse human capital (the proportion of gay households in a region is one measure), not diversity of

firms or industries in the conventional economic view, is what promotes innovation and economic growth (Florida 2002a). Diversity attracts talent, the kind of talent needed to stimulate economic growth. His notion of diversity is not necessarily about socioeconomic diversity, and in fact is more about people who are "nonstandard" in the sense that they "defy classification based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual preference or appearance" (Florida 2002a, 79). In his view, cities that are open to "diversity of all sorts" are also the ones that "enjoy higher rates of innovation and high-wage economic growth" (Florida 2004, 1). Further, there is a link to the physical structure of cities in the sense that top-down government planning projects such as stadiums and convention centers are seen as part of the problem, not the solution. Therefore cities should be focused on ways to attract human capital, focusing on what is good for people rather than on, more conventionally, what is good for business. This naturally leads to an elevation of the qualities of place, since "talent does not simply show up in a region" (Florida 2002b, 754).

Economists maintain that diverse human populations are more productive because they are more apt to promote new ways of thinking (Lazear 2000). More practically, diversity is seen as a way to increase a city's tax base: promoting "close-grained, deliberate, calculated variation in localized tax yields" is simply a fiscally healthy approach (Jacobs 1961, 254). It was recently shown that more diversity in metropolitan areas is correlated with lower unemployment and less instability (Malizia and Ke 1993). There are costs to an "urban diversity lifestyle"—pressure on public space, reduced incentive to fund public schools, dependence on property developers—but there is also cultural vitality, employment growth, economic revitalization, and a forging together of social polarities in common space (Zukin 1998).

Diversity is believed to generate creativity, making cities "attractive to the skilled migrants that have been so integral to the economic success of cities around the world" (Brooke 2003, 28). Studies have attempted to show that immigration is an economic stimulus, and that the economic health of the United States can be tied to its historical openness to foreigners (Zachary 2000; Saxenian 1999). In *The Global Me*, Zachary (2000) proclaims that diversity is the defining characteristic of the wealth of nations, a diversity composed of new world citizens who possess multiple "ethnoracial affiliations." Di Lavoro (2003) points out that it is possible to find a historical relationship between religious tolerance and innovation, starting with the rise of capitalism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Intolerance, on the other hand, correlates with "crisis and slackness in business" (13).

The economic growth of a region has been linked to social inequality—the performance of metropolitan economies is better where city and suburb have less income disparity (Ledebur and Barnes 1993). At the same time, the economic costs of segregation tend to fall disproportionately on minorities (Cutler and Glaeser 1997). Interaction or the opportunity for interaction among diverse peoples is believed to be necessary for overcoming certain types of social problems. Place diversity is important because it may help build social capital of the "bridging" kind by widening networks of social interaction. Where there is less social diversity and more segregation, there is likely to be less opportunity for the creation of these networks, which may have the effect of prolonging unemployment in poor neighborhoods (Granovetter 1983).

It should be acknowledged that diversity is also recognized as being problematic in some cases. One theory is that economies with little social diversity are better able to evolve mechanisms that allocate resources efficiently. If there are too many competing "preferences and endowments," diversity can "interfere with the efficient performance of markets" (Chichilnisky 1994, 427). On the other hand, if a market economy requires a healthy democracy, diversity, along with whatever conflict that generates, may be a necessary precondition. As one researcher put it, "it is discourse over conflict, not unanimity, that helps democracy thrive" (Patricia Gurin, quoted in Skerry 2002, 23).

Social Equity

The social equity dimension of place diversity involves two notions. First is the idea that social mixing in one place is more equitable because it ensures better access to resources for all social groups—it nurtures what is known as the "geography of opportunity." In the second sense, diversity is seen as an utopian ideal—that mixing population groups is the ultimate basis of a better, more creative, more tolerant, more peaceful and stable world. Under the first objective, place diversity is a matter of better distribution and improved access to resources—a matter of fairness. Under the second, even those in higher-income brackets can take advantage of the creativity, social capital (see Putnam 2000), and cross-fertilization that occurs when people of different backgrounds, income-levels, and racial and ethnic groups are mixed.

Sarkissian (1976) reviewed the history of attempting to mix social groups via town planning (see also Cole and Goodchild 2001). She identified the various goals of social mixing, such as: to raise the standards of the lower classes, to encourage aesthetic diversity and cultural cross-fertilization, to increase equality of opportunity, to promote social harmony, to improve the phys-

ical functioning of the city (better access to jobs and services), and to maintain stable neighborhoods, whereby one can move up or down in housing expenditure and remain in the same neighborhood. Empirical studies of stable, diverse neighborhoods have documented the fact that integration and stability can in fact coexist (Ellen 1998; Lee and Wood 1990; Maly 2000; Ottensmann 1995).

The idea of calculated social mixing in cities and towns—deliberately attempting to put people of different means and backgrounds in the same place—was borne in the nineteenth century by idealists and social critics who deplored the living conditions of the poor. Social equality was improved by limiting the degree to which the poor were isolated, an idea Sarkissian labels "romantic and conservative" (234). Post–World War II planners talked about the need for planning to foster a "spirit of fellowship" (Mann 1958, 92). Nathan Glazer emphasized the importance of creating social mix through urban planning as a way of promoting community stability (1959), and Lewis Mumford wrote about the importance of using the physical environment to foster a better "social bond" (1968, 39). Housing activist Catherine Bauer held similar views about the importance of social mixing (Bauer 1951).

Using the physical environment to promote racial justice was also a stated goal in post–World War II planning. Books such as Charles Abrams's *Forbidden Neighbors* (1955) were about racial justice through integration, arguing the case for residential social mix "from every conceivable angle" (Sarkissian 1976, 239). Urban-renewal programs in the fifties were actually based on the presumption that social mix could make communities more stable (Glazer 1959). Famous examples of new town development in the 1960s, such as Columbia, Maryland, and Reston, Virginia, were planned for racial and economic mixing.

Massey and Denton (1993) traced the history of racial segregation in its physical context, noting that the spatial structure of the preautomobile city was conducive to a more even distribution of the urban population, consequently producing a more diverse spatial pattern. Land use was not specialized, densities were relatively low, and, in most cases, there was no easy escape to a distant suburb. Diversity did not translate to social equality, but in spatial terms, "the social worlds of the races overlapped" (Massey and Denton 1993, 26). After the 1920s, urban form thwarted the ability of social groups to mix, even if they wanted to. Middle-class blacks found it difficult to remain in black neighborhoods because there were few opportunities for them to upgrade in their existing neighborhoods in terms of housing and amenities. This created an impossible situation, since white middle-class neighborhoods were resistant to blacks moving in, even if they were of the same economic class.

Social critics are mostly united in the view that diversity in residential areas is critical for social equity reasons. Social divisions are manifested in spaces and landscapes that reflect separation, for example, in education and housing. In turn, these spaces and landscapes reinforce social divisions. Lack of social diversity creates neighborhoods that experience concentrated poverty leading to disinvestment in the built environment. Poor physical conditions and lack of facilities play a role in perpetuating the "American Apartheid," since it is unlikely that higher-income social groups will be attracted to places with bad physical qualities and few facilities. In addition, growing up in a neighborhood consisting only of poor families may decrease one's life chances because of the influences neighborhoods exert (Ellen and Turner 1997; Goering and Feins 2003).

Many argue that bringing people in contact with one another—the "neighborhood contact hypothesis"—reduces racial prejudice and raises the bar on the neighborhood tipping point (the point at which neighborhoods "tip" to one race; see Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2002). While residential segregation may have been the "forgotten factor in American race relations" during the 1980s (Massey and Denton 1993, 4), the 1990s refocused attention on the need to integrate different types of housing. Building up diversity through deliberate social mixing in programs like scattered-site housing are based on the belief that revitalizing poor neighborhoods solely through community development has "almost universally failed" (Downs 1999, 967).

Ecology and Sustainability

Relating human diversity to biological diversity was explored early on by ecologically oriented planners such as Patrick Geddes (1915) and Lewis Mumford (1925), and later by Ian McHarg (1969). The meaning of an ecologically informed urban planning meant, essentially, a regionalism in which diversity thrived in the form of close-knit communities well integrated within a larger ecological region. Similarly, McKenzie, Park, and other theorists of the Chicago school in the 1920s and 1930s recognized that cities are locations for complex, interconnected lives, and that human life is richer because of it. E. W. Burgess and Robert Park provided highly influential, generalized descriptions of the residential structure of Chicago in the 1920s (Park, Burgess, and McKenzie 1925), modeled directly on these ecological processes. These and other members of the Chicago School found an observable spatial pattern of social characteristics that was connected to the natural world in that, according to Park, "all living organisms, plants and animals alike, are bound together in a vast system

of interlinked and interdependent lives" (Park 1952, 145). Recent urban ecological work has rediscovered the relevance of the Chicago School, extending the conceptualization of ecology to incorporate the full range of environmental phenomena—from natural ecosystems to urbanized cores (Breslav et al. 2000).

Out of the classic works on biodiversity (Wilson 1988), planners have drawn increasingly stronger connections between the diversity of plant and animal species and the need to foster a heterogeneous human pattern. This may be based more on normative idealism than empirical evidence, but linkages are nevertheless made by drawing analogies between biological and social phenomena. The natural world may be used as a model to manage industrial activities (Andrews 1999), or cities may be viewed as "self-organizing systems" of complexity that mirror the kind of self-organizing complexity witnessed in nature (Allen 1999). One approach used the metaphor of "resilient cities," which implies flexibility, adaptability, and diversity, to improve the link between ecological science and urban design (Pickett et al. 2004). It is also argued that cultural and natural diversity benefit from difference in parallel ways, for example, by aiding processes of self-renewal, made possible because "not all the eggs have been placed in a single basket" (Steiner 2002, 34).

The connection between ecology and diversity in a planning context often rests on the theory of sustainability (National Research Council 1999). In fact, most texts on sustainability in cities are likely to feature diversity as a fundamental goal. The recent book *Building Sustainable Urban Settlements* (Romaya and Rakodi 2002), for example, lists "mixed land uses" first under its set of principles for building sustainable settlements. Beatley and Manning (1997, 36) define the sustainable community as "one in which diversity is tolerated and encouraged," where "sharp spatial separation or isolation of income and racial groups" is nonexistent, and where residents have equal access to "basic and essential services and facilities." Steiner (2002) posits the notion of "unity in diversity" as a fundamental principle of human ecology. It is through diversity that pluralist societies, defined as "heterogeneous groups within a space" achieve unity (34).

Calls by ecologically oriented planners to foster diversity in human realms translate to certain principles of physical form. Calthorpe (1993), for example, defines his work as one of attempting to give specific form—for buildings, neighborhoods, and communities—to diversity and interdependence. Elements of sustainable city form include containment, public transport, access to services, housing variety, self-sufficiency, adaptability, local autonomy, and other "sustainability characteristics" that are tied to the need for social and economic diversity. Reduction of travel costs, and therefore energy consumption, is often a primary motivation. The "land use–transport connection" is put forth as a counterresponse to the problem of nondiversity, that is, functional isolation (Newman and Kenworthy 1996). The connection is supported by empirical research that shows a correlation between mixed land use and nonautomobile-based modes of travel (Handy 1996).

The application of ecological theory to human environments is continuously pushed in new directions (Berry 2001). Planners are called upon to form better links between land-use planning and local biology by, for example, implementing "nature-friendly" land-use ordinances that can help conserve species diversity (McElfish 2004). New urban ecologists argue that certain ecological principles may be applicable to human environments and metropolitan spatial development (Gottdiener and Feagin 1998; Collins et al. 2000). Recent calls for "a new paradigm for transdisciplinary landscape ecology" in which "multifunctionality in landscapes" is the norm is essentially about managing landscapes for multiple uses as a counterstrategy to the Western tendency to segregate functions (Naveh 2004, 33; Brandt and Vejre 2004). Planners are instructed to "weave together" a diversity of elements, like "a quilt held together with threads," in their approach to planning for communities. Principles of landscape ecology can then become "the new civics of sustainability" (Dramstad et al. 1996, 5).

DESIGN IMPLICATIONS

The summary above was meant to show that there is strong theoretical support for diversity in human settlement, and that it comes from multiple sources, often operating at different geographic scales. It also showed that different types of diversity require different types of justification. In this section I argue that, despite this strong multidimensional backing, the translation to principles of physical planning and design has been underdeveloped. While there are notable exceptions, such as the work of Dolores Hayden (1986, 2003), Jonathan Barnett (1995), and the New Urbanists (Duany, Plater-Zyberk, and Speck 2000) who write about the need to foster diversity through design, it is not a mainstream topic. In fact, planners who talk about "diversity" in the context of urban planning may not be particularly interested in exploring the design linkage. For example, Sandercock (1998, 5, 119) stresses that the "normative cosmopolis," the "utopia with a difference," is something that planners must try to evolve, but something to which she "will not ascribe built form." Thomas's (1997, 258) approach to building "unified diversity for social action" is mostly focused on the

need for better planning education. And Friedmann's call for an "open city" of diverse peoples is accomplished by reducing the urban ecological footprint, chartering local citizenship, meeting basic human needs, and promoting new forms of governance (2002). Given the way in which physical solutions have been cast as cure-alls throughout much of planning's history, critics are right to guard against letting planners get away with "place" remedies at the expense of people, institutions, and political process. However, I find the response is missing something. There is regular critique of the notion that the physical environment is crucial in determining social well-being and equality (Pendall and Caruthers 2003), but the planning response seems unnecessarily limited in its exclusion of design considerations.

Social scientists have been particularly adept at pointing out the connections between physical environment and social phenomena, often focusing on the strong links that can be made between social and spatial isolation and integration (Massey and Denton 1993). They often emphasize *neighborhood* as the context of social problems, from high unemployment (Granovetter, 1990) to crime (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). But their interest is not the design of neighborhoods and cities, and when social scientists speak about the "context" of neighborhood they are speaking about the traits of the people who live there. They may emphasize the "political economy of place" (Logan and Molotch 1987) or the "social production of space" (Castells 1983), but this excludes the design and construction of place. Thus Massey and Denton repeatedly point to the fact that southern areas are often better at integration because of their "distinctive ecological traits" (1993, 73), but nowhere is physical change pursued as a target for reform. Human geographers study intently "the importance of spatiality in the processes of social reproduction," but the spaces to be studied, the "discourse-producing sites" like prisons, schools, and hospitals, are largely decontextualized (Livingstone et al. 1998, 145). In effect, the physical environment is relied on as an explanation for social segregation, but the remedies do not focus on its rehabilitation.

One exception, of course, is the Department of Housing and Urban Development's HOPE VI housing program, perhaps the best-known recent attempt to use design (specifically, the mix of housing types) to foster diversity. While critics have questioned its implicit determinism and overreliance on design at the expense of meaningful public engagement (Feldman and Stall 2004), the program is defended as a viable alternative to segregated public housing (Bohl 2000). Some argue that programs like HOPE VI and Section 8, which are intended to move families to diverse neighborhoods with less poverty, have had limited effect because of the disruption of local social networks, but this may be a short-term problem (Clampet-Lundquist 2004).

Empirical studies of publicly funded attempts to mix housing types and create socially diverse neighborhoods have been generally positive, although there are complaints that the projects do not always go far enough (Popkin et al. 2004), and that mixed-income housing should not be seen as a "silver bullet" that overcomes poverty (A. Smith 2002). A study of the Lake Parc Place mixed-income housing development in Chicago found that the development "accomplished the prerequisites for making mixed-income housing into a community" (Rosenbaum et al. 1998, 703). A study of "scattered-site" public housing showed that residents of target neighborhoods did not "flee" or engage in panic selling, and housing prices did not decline (Briggs et al. 1999). Another study showed that the deconcentration of assisted housing can have "positive or insignificant effects" in terms of property value and crime if the target neighborhood is not already low valued (Galster et al. 2003). In fact, rehabilitation of public-housing sites has been shown to have positive effects for surrounding areas (Ding and Knaap 2002).

These studies are significant for two reasons. First, the studies of mixed-income projects reveal that stratification by status and income is not an inevitable feature of American society (see Ryan et al. 1974). Despite the caveats, partial successes, and complexities, there is still an underlying, if incomplete, sense of positive accomplishment. Second, these studies almost always include a statement about the importance of design, suggesting, for example, that "the size, design, condition, location, and cost" of mixed-income housing "are extremely important" (Ding and Knaap 2002). Galster's study argued that design issues are critical, especially site layout, concentration, development type, and scale (Galster et al. 2003, 175). A Massachusetts study of mixed-income housing showed that tenant satisfaction did not have to do with "subjective evaluations of neighbors," but was instead related to "the quality of the development's design, construction, and management" (Schwartz and Tajbakhsh 1997, 76, 80). Thus, in addition to addressing programmatic concerns such as tenant screening, counseling, and project management, there is a corresponding need to address context, place, and design.

Yet apart from some involvement in public-housing programs like HOPE VI, the planning profession has not spent much effort attempting to flesh out the use of design to promote diversity. Witold Rybczynski recounts the history of planning's retreat from design in general, asserting that planning's many design mistakes—superblocks, high-rise public housing, slum

clearance, government complexes—and their astounding failure caused planners to withdraw from the task of city building altogether. Planners now "mediate, animate, negotiate, resolve conflicts, find the middle ground," which may be "honorable," but "it leaves the creation of an urban vision entirely to others" (Rybczynski 2000, 216).

At the same time, planners are admonished for failing to articulate the principles commonly related to diversity, for example, "mixed-use" (Molinaro 1993). Critics proclaim that mixed-use zoning may simply encourage "picturesque sprawl" and actually lessen affordability (Leung 1995). And there seems to be limited empirical understanding of whether mixed-population groups in a given neighborhood contribute to planning goals anyway; that is, whether it means residents are going to the same schools, shopping at the same stores, and participating together in the local community in meaningful ways.

It is conceivable that this detachment from the physical context of diversity is related to the phenomenon in contemporary society of what Borgman (1987) calls "place-bound identity." Much has been written about the loss of localized form as a context for production and consumption—the substitution of "flows and channels" for spatial places (Castells 2003, 60). We consume without being affected or inhibited by the context of production, including whatever behind-the-scenes social and economic realities our consumption may require. Perhaps under these circumstances, leveraging place to support diversity seems illogical.

Planners may also find it difficult to address the critique that using place to support diversity is not only determinist and controlling, but also requires constructing what Harvey (1989, 303) calls a "localized aesthetic image" that supports the "capitalist hegemony over space." Even the use of "spatial metaphors" such as "concentration" or "deconcentration" of poverty is seen as superficial in that it disguises the underlying political and economic processes of poverty and provides "justification for simplistic spatial solutions to complex social, economic, and political problems" (Crump 2002, 581). The role for planners seems elusive, as urban designers glamorize "the authenticity of disequilibrium," an urbanism pitted against the "humanly alienating, mechanistic, equilibrium" of a city plan (Akkerman 2003, 76). In any event, city dwellers, free from plans, legitimately find authenticity through self-diversification (Harvey 1989).

Design Strategies

I think the aversion to designing for diversity should be addressed by proclaiming what the limitations of design are—having a clearer sense of what can or cannot be accomplished—but not foregoing the idea that physical design has a legitimate role to play in enabling diversity. The appropriate question for planners is not whether the built environment *creates* diversity, but whether diversity thrives better, or can be sustained longer, under certain physical conditions that planners may have some control over. We know how the built environment readily separates people and functions (from gates and highways to single-use subdivisions and corridors), but how can the design of place be enlisted to bring them together in meaningful ways? While it is important to recognize what Putnam calls the "multiple, cross-cutting dimensions of differentiation" in American society, there may be ways to craft "cross-cutting identities" that can "enable connection across perceived diversity" (Putnam and Feldstein 2003, 282). The question for planners is, how does place provide "cross-cutting identities" that enable, sustain, or manage diversity?

Pursuing this objective requires, first, that planners accept it as their legitimate function. They would have to be open to the possibility that design can enable diversity, and that to effectuate this, certain skills and types of knowledge would need to be nurtured more explicitly. For example, they would need to develop a better understanding of the difference between redevelopment that contributes to loss of diversity and redevelopment that genuinely brings increased diversity. Establishing income diversity by facilitating the location of wealthier households in poorer neighborhoods could have the effect of raising municipal revenue, stimulating retail activity, increasing demand for various social and civic services, and even helping to stimulate new jobs (Freeman and Braconi 2004, 39). But as it stands, urban revitalization is often criticized for nurturing gentrification and displacement, focusing exclusively on the incoming middle class rather than "extant social groups" through "rampant neoliberal urban policy" (Slater et al. 2004, 1148). To work toward stability and discourage displacement, to simultaneously support homeownership and rental housing, to successfully integrate a range of housing types and densities, levels of affordability, a mix of uses, and neighborhood and social services—all of this together requires wholistic attention that includes the physical form of communities and the characteristics that may help to retain diversity, in addition to the programmatic and process-oriented requirements.

The fact that growth management and other responses to sprawl have not necessarily translated to human diversity underscores the fact that design of place may be a neglected factor. Intuitively, it seems to most researchers that sprawl should be bad for diversity (by definition), and the policy of promoting higher

density and compact urban form surrounded by green belts would somehow make human diversity a more likely occurrence. Powell (2002) unequivocally blames sprawl for the persistence of racial inequality, and there are persuasive reasons for making a link between wealthy white suburbs and disadvantaged poor households in the city (Bullard et al. 2000; Orfield 2002). But such relationships are becoming more complex. Sprawl has been shown to be more diverse than the compact city in some cases (Pendall and Carruthers 2003; Downs 1999). Infill development in the city, on the other hand, often does not address affordability problems, as one quantitative study of housing patterns across the United States showed (Steinacker 2003). In short, low-density, spread out development may have the effect of increasing choices for a wider range of socioeconomic groups than compact cities can ever hope to (Glaeser and Vigdor 2003; Kahn 2001). If diversity in human settlement is becoming a matter of apartment complexes on highway interchanges nearby affluent, single-family housing, or, gated condominium developments in the central city, there is much to be improved.

How, then, should planners use design—here defined as physical intervention in the form and pattern of the built environment—to enable diversity? What kinds of design strategies should planners be concerned about? In this section I summarize some recurrent ideas, focusing especially on neighborhoods, public places, and housing. The discussion is meant to be illustrative of the kinds of issues planners might be involved with if they attempt to use design to enable diversity. What is suggested here is a point of departure for elaborating a more explicit connection.

At the neighborhood level, two types of diversity are important: social diversity and functional or land-use diversity. In fact, the two are codependent. Sociologists who study place diversity have been the most explicit in their identification of the link between social diversity and neighborhood functionality. The work of Philip Nyden and colleagues (Nyden, Maly, Lukehart, 1997; Nyden et al., 1998) on the phenomenon of "stable diverse" neighborhoods found that economic diversity (stores and restaurants) and the existence of "social seams" in the form of schools, parks, or a strip of neighborhood stores were common denominators of the stable, diverse neighborhood. Powell (2003, 183) considers the spatial resources of neighborhoods as necessary for creating what he calls "opportunity-based housing," which has to do with the "resources and services that contribute to individual and family stability and advancement," such as child care. Others have pointed to the critical importance of a neighborhood's "institutional base," particularly the presence of religious institutions (Rose 2000). Clampet-Lundquist (2004) suggested that housing mobility programs, which are intended to create mixed-income environments, would produce better family outcomes if there were a more concerted effort to "connect relocated families with institutions in their new neighborhoods," which are a way to promote "strong cross-status ties in mixed-income neighborhoods" (443).

Thus equipping a neighborhood with nonresidential uses—services, facilities, amenities, and the whole range of public and quasi-public resources—may play a role in supporting diversity. The public realm, in the form of parks, plazas, streets, and other elements, may act in particular as both mitigator and generator of diversity. In the latter sense, locating public facilities along the edges of segregated areas is a way of bringing people together and connecting disparate space (Marcuse 2001). Angotti and Hanhardt (2001) argue that public space, including streets, parks, and sidewalks, is an important, though forgotten, factor in the ability to successfully mix residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Such spaces may sustain diversity by offering shared space as opposed to places of privatized residential space, therefore providing a better chance for informal, collective control as well as a sense of shared responsibility.

The promotion of neighborhood functionality requires permitting diverse uses within a neighborhood, which in turn may require design control to ensure compatibility and acceptance. There may also be a need to encourage multiple rather than singular ownership. One idea, advanced by Jane Jacobs and others, is that diversity of uses requires a "fine grain" in the urban texture, by having small lot sizes and small block sizes. Small blocks are more likely to encourage a diversity of building types and uses.

Another distinction about the role of neighborhood in diversity-building is the importance of neighborhood delineation and identification. While neighborhood-based design has been ridiculed as tending to promote the opposite of diversity (Bannerjee and Baer 1984; Sandercock 1998), it has not been convincingly argued that segregation is somehow intrinsic to the concept of neighborhood. In fact, it has been argued that successful place diversity *requires* neighborhood organization. Lewis Mumford, for example, suggested that the idea of neighborhood-based organization in the city was formed precisely to break down segregation (1968, 60). The basis of argument is that the provision of an identifiable neighborhood structure—which may include edges, a center, or appropriately located facilities—allows the mix of people and functions to be seen in interrelationship, as part of a larger whole. This may be an important condition of making diversity "work," whereby a supporting framework (neighbor-

hood) contextualizes the individual parts that constitute place diversity. In turn, neighborhood structure may mitigate the stress of place-based diversity by facilitating these interconnections. Jane Jacobs advocated neighborhood structure as a means of "informal and formal self-management of society" (1961, 114).

It is within the neighborhood that diversity can, under the right circumstances, be understood as an asset. Neighborhood-level services and facilities become collective resources. And elements not normally thought of as assets may have a better chance of acceptance if a neighborhood structure is there to sustain them. For example, one study showed that the neighborhood plan was critical for garnering support for new affordable, infill housing, because it embedded the infill within a larger context (Deitrick and Ellis 2004). A focus on neighborhood organizes diversity in a way that can "envision each building, each development project, in relation to a positive ideal" (Brain 2005, 232). In physical design terms, this may require viewing the neighborhood as a phenomenon of form more than a phenomenon of sorted uses. The neighborhood can be used as a framework to channel individual choices toward something tangible that is collectively experienced.

Physical planning affects both the spatial location of facilities as well as their individual design. Planners can make use of studies that show that users will frequent public space most often if they can walk to it, and if it is within three to five minutes walking distance from their residence or workplace (Kaplan and Kaplan 1989). Design considerations should therefore involve the spatial positioning of discrete public spaces relative to surrounding population. Following on Jacobs, there is the view that "public spaces work best when they establish a direct relationship between the space and the people who live and work around it" (Thompson 2002, 61). Many planners have also called for a neighborhood center or "central nucleus," either through "pulling together on a more adequate site plan institutions that had been set down more or less at random" or by "abetting the deliberate recentralization of institutions" (Mumford 1968, 71).

Design of public places can facilitate exchange, an important factor in enabling diversity. Streets provide a primary place of exchange. They have an obvious effect on separation, but they can also tie diverse elements together and enliven the street for the purpose of exchange (Jacobs 1961). Streets also facilitate movement, and one issue to address is whether there is a balance between movement for the purpose of planned exchange versus movement intended for spontaneous exchange. It is not uncommon for one form of exchange to be privileged over the other (Engwicht 2003). However, movement for spontaneous exchange may be particularly important in supporting diversity. Spontaneous exchange is not only a source of vitality in urban contexts, but also is a type of social exchange relied on most heavily by children and the elderly.

The physical, shared resources of a place—what kind and how they are integrated, designed, and located—can be looked at as the material aspect of what social researchers refer to as a neighborhood's "structural strength" (Ellen 2000b). While it is true that a significant part of these "structural" resources are nonphysical and do not entail design—social services and housing assistance programs, for example—they also have a definite physical and locational aspect. Researchers have often pointed to the critical importance of a neighborhood's "institutional base," particularly the presence of religious institutions (Rose 2000) or commercial facilities (Nyden et al. 1997), in maintaining sustaining social diversity. Clampet-Lundquist (2004) suggested that housing-mobility programs would produce better family outcomes if there were a more concerted effort to "connect relocated families with institutions in their new neighborhoods" and look for ways to promote "strong cross-status ties in mixed-income neighborhoods" (443). Planners can play a role in determining what the site design and physical planning characteristics are that might foster these connections positively.

Perhaps the most direct way to enlist design in enabling diversity is by integrating different types of housing in one place. There are two approaches: constructing new, mixed-housing type developments; or infilling new types of housing units either on vacant parcels or through the addition of smaller accessory units wherever possible (over garages, over stores). Design may be important to facilitate a transformation away from the idea that neighborhoods represent monocultural social standing that one uses as a platform, "a stepping stone in a trajectory of ascendance through a geography of status and income" (Espino 2001, 6). Diversity may be sustained by providing tangible opportunities for residents to improve their standing "in place." Efforts to stimulate age diversity through physical planning by allowing residents to age in place in accessory apartments has been shown to be effective (Chapman and Howe 2001).

Strategies for mixing housing in otherwise single-family neighborhoods include allowing corner duplexes, walk-up apartments on side streets, duplexes that look like single-family homes, and accessory units over garages. There may be a focus on reversing the rules by which social segregation occurred: allowing multi-family units where they have been excluded, and eliminating minimum lot size, maximum density, minimum setbacks, and other rules that work to prevent housing unit diversity. But stable residential diversity

requires more than changing the rules. We know from studies of mixed-income housing developments that there needs to be a sufficient level of higher-income housing to sustain diversity (Brophy and Smith 1997), and that, at the same time, strategies are needed to create stability in the face of gentrification pressure. Minimizing renter displacement and sustaining an appropriate level of higher-income housing is likely to require some consideration of design.

It can mean, for example, that there is a need to better understand heterogeneity and uniformity in housing design. Although subsidies and housing consumption restrictions are unlikely, many argue that there should nevertheless be no difference in the design and quality of housing for different income categories (Brophy and Smith 1997). This was an approach Progressive Era planners like Raymond Unwin promoted enthusiastically (Unwin 1909). On the other hand, architectural variety is seen as a way of promoting multiculturalism. Planners may reject the uniformity of modernist urbanism and promote instead a postmodern, multicultural, contemporary city "that harmonizes distinctive aesthetics, structures, and practices" (Qadeer 1997, 493). In either case, supporting diversity through design will need to involve serious consideration of the overall context of particular neighborhoods. It will require balancing design principles of place diversity with the appropriate, corresponding conditions. As one study showed, going halfway with a diversity agenda—"a granny flat slapped on to the back of a single-family detached suburban home"—may result in neighborhoods "that please no one" (Lang 2004, 9).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this article is to review and critically analyze the complex relationship between physical planning and the ideal of sustaining and enabling—even promoting—place diversity. There exists a strong, multi-disciplinary lineage of theoretical support for place diversity. I have argued that the normative ideal of diversity in city planning originates from four distinct though interrelated sources. Diversity is promoted on the grounds of encouraging a more vital urbanism, achieving social equity, building economic health, and improving sustainability. Further, in each of these cases, there is an underlying conception that the physical environment can play a role in procuring diversity. To illustrate the kind of subject matter this might involve, I have outlined some ways in which the link between the physical environment and diversity could be explored.

This is not to say that the recurrent difficulties that arise in attempting to develop a normative argument for fostering diversity via city planning can be avoided. There is a lot more to designing for diversity than ensuring a neighborhood structure or a certain quantity of amenity, public place, or housing type. We know from studies that compare revitalization across different neighborhoods that physical elements such as parks, public-housing units, and brownfields ripe for redevelopment are not necessarily predictors of neighborhood revitalization (Zielenbach 2000). We still do not know what the appropriate scale of diversity may be, how fluid it is, how it might change under different circumstances, or how it changes under different levels of urban intensity. Gans suggested that we may not need social heterogeneity at the neighborhood level, only at the community level (Gans 1961). Advocates of public housing have debated the measurement and meaning of "integration" in similar terms (Nyden et al. 1998). These are all issues that remain to be explored.

Planners need to be on the frontline of these efforts. This means they will need to address head-on the relevant critiques, such as the idea that "mixed-use" is untenable. Proposals for mixed-use developments are regularly viewed as expressions of market fragmentation and a reflection of the "polarization of urban space" (Knox 1991, 203). Efforts to "force" diversity into existence can be resisted as inauthentic attempts to contrive a false type of urbanity. They may be seen as predominantly for the affluent in spite of integrative goals, or, if in the form of "town centers," they may be perceived as attempts to commodify a nostalgic notion of the American small town. Contemporary observers may view such proposals for changing the physical landscape as negligent of "dominant and oppressed cultures, power and powerlessness" (Ellin 1996, 157).

Addressing these issues will require a more nuanced and complete understanding of place diversity. What thresholds need to be met before the benefits of social mixing take effect? Quercia and Galster (1997) hypothesized that attracting the middle class to the central city was probably of benefit only if certain thresholds were met, in addition to scale and time considerations. In terms of mixing functions, there is a need to explore how human settlements that do not rely on street-level microeconomics to generate diversity (as Jane Jacobs hoped) can promote diversity in other ways. How can place diversity be supported in a world where jobs require flexibility, consumers seek wide access to a regional market, and social networks extend far beyond the local neighborhood?

With clear knowledge about the kinds of environments that are most likely to enable or sustain place diversity, planners can look for ways to maintain them. They could start by actively supporting places that are

already diverse. As Rowley (1996) concluded, "we must treasure mixed-use diversity wherever we find it" as a way of counterbalancing inauthentic, new mixed-use developments that are only "a very pale imitation of the genuine article" (95). Planners could take the view that locations of "interclass contact conducted in a mode of good will" are nothing less than "the lymphatic system of democratic metropolis" (Delany 1999, 83). It is a matter of not only looking for ways to stabilize place diversity where it exists, but thoroughly considering, and learning from, the characteristics of their physical design.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Charles. 1955. *Forbidden neighbors*. New York: Harpers.

Akkerman, Abraham. 2003. Harmonies of urban design and discords of city form. In *Designing cities: Critical readings in urban design*, A. R. Cuthbert, ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Allen, Peter M. 1999. *Cities and regions as self-organizing systems: Models of complexity.* Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

Anderson, Martin. 1964. *The federal bulldozer—A critical analysis of urban renewal 1949–1962*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Andrews, Clinton J. 1999. Putting industrial ecology into place. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 65(4): 364–376.

Angotti, Tom, and Eva Hanhardt. 2001. Problems and prospects for healthy mixed-use communities in New York City. *Planning Practice and Research* 16(2): 145–154.

Banerjee, Tridib, and William C. Baer. 1984. *Beyond the neighborhood unit*. New York: Plenum Press.

Barnett, Jonathan. 1995. *The fractured metropolis*. New York: Harper Collins.

Bauer, Catherine. 1951. Social questions in housing and community planning. *Journal of Social Issues* 7:1–34.

Beatley, Timothy, and Kristy Manning. 1997. *The ecology of place: planning for environment, economy, and community.* Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Berry, Brian J. L. 2001. A New Urban Ecology? *Urban Geography* 22(8): 699–701.

Bohl, Charles. 2000. New Urbanism and the city: Potential applications and implications for distressed inner-city neighborhoods. *Housing Policy Debate* 11(4): 761–801.

Borgman, Albert. 1987. *Technology and the character of contemporary life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boyer, M. Christine. 1990. Erected against the city: The contemporary discourses of architecture and planning. *Center 2: Architecture vs. Planning* 36–43.

Brain, David. 2005. From good neighborhoods to sustainable cities: Social science and the social agenda of the new urbanism. *International Regional Science Review* 28: 217–238.

Brandt, Jesper, and Henrik Vejre. 2004. *Multifunctional landscapes volume I: Theory, values and history.* Boston, MA: WIT Press.

Breslav, Marc A., Alan R. Berkowitz, Charles H. Nilon, and Karen Hollweg. 2000. Cities are ecosystems!: New trend to study urban areas. *Ecological Economics* 32:337–339.

Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 2005. *The geography of opportunity: Race and housing choice in metropolitan America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Briggs, Xavier de Souza, Joe T. Darden, and Angela Aidala. 1999. In the wake of desegregation: Early impacts of scattered-site public housing on neighborhoods in Yonkers, New York. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 65(1): 27–49.

Brooke, Nicholas. 2003. Focus on global issues: What makes for a successful city. *Real Estate Issues* 28(4): 28–29.

Brooks, David. 2004. Our sprawling, supersize utopia. *The New York Times*. April 4, 2004.

Brophy, Paul C., and Rhonda N. Smith. 1997. Mixed-income housing: Factors for success. *Citiscape: a Journal of Policy Development and Research* 3(2): 3–31.

Bullard, Robert D., Glenn S. Johnson, and Angel O. Torres. 2000. *Sprawl city: Race, politics and planning in Atlanta*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Calthorpe, Peter. 1993. *The Next American Metropolis: Ecology, Community, and the American Dream*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Architectural Press.

Caro, Robert A. 1974. *The power broker: Robert Moses and the fall of New York*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Castells, Manuel. 1983. *The city and the grassroots: A Cross-cultural theory of urban social movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2003. The new historical relationship between space and society. In *Designing Cities: Critical Readings in Urban Design*, Alexander R. Cuthbert, ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chapman, Nancy J., and Deborah A. Howe. 2001. Accessory apartments: Are they a realistic alternative for ageing in place? *Housing Studies* 16(5): 637–651.

Chichilnisky, Graciela. 1994. Social diversity, arbitrage, and gains from trade: A unified perspective on resource allocation. *The American Economic Review* 84(2): 427–34.

Clampet-Lundquist, Susan. 2004. HOPE VI relocation: Moving to new neighborhoods and building new ties. *Housing Policy Debate* 15(2): 415–447.

Cole, Ian, and Barry Goodchild. 2001. Social mix and the "balanced community" in British housing policy—a tale of two epochs. *GeoJournal* 51: 351–360.

Collins, James, et al. 2000. The New Urban Ecology *American Scientist* 88:5.

Crump, J. 2002. Deconcentration by demolition: public housing, poverty, and urban policy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20: 581–596.

Cutler, David, and Edward Glaeser. 1997. Are Ghettos Good or Bad? *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(3): 827–872.

Deitrick, Sabina, and Cliff Ellis. 2004. New Urbanism in the inner city: A case study of Pittsburgh. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(4): 426–443.

Delany, Samuel R. 1999. . . . Three, two, one, contact: Times Square red, 1998. In *Giving ground: The politics of propinquity* Joan Copjec and Michael Sorkin, eds. London: Verso.

Di Lavoro, Nota. 2003. Economic growth, innovation, cultural diversity. Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei working paper series. Available at: http://www.feem.it/

Ding, Chengri, and Gerrit Knaap. 2002. Property values in inner-city neighborhoods: The effects of homeownership, housing investment, and economic development. *Housing Policy Debate* 13(4): 701–727.

Downs, Anthony. 1994. *New visions for metropolitan America*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

———. 1999. *Some realities about sprawl and urban decline. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.*

Dramstad, Wenche E., James D. Olson, and Richard T. T. Forman. 1996. *Landscape ecology principles in landscape architecture and land-use planning*. Cambridge, MA and Washington, D.C.: Harvard University and Island Press.

Dreier, Peter, John Mollenkopf, and Todd Swanstrom. 2001. *Place matters: Metropolitics for the twenty-first century. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.*

Duany, Andres, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck. 2000. *Suburban nation: The rise of sprawl and the decline of the American dream*. New York: North Point Press.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould. 1998. Stable racial integration in the contemporary United States: An empirical overview. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 20(1): 27–42.

———. 2000a. *Sharing America's neighborhoods: The prospects for stable, racial integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2000b. Race-based neighborhood projection: A proposed framework for understanding new data on racial integration. *Urban Studies* 37(9): 1513–1533.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Margery Austin Turner. 1997. Does neighborhood matter? Assessing recent evidence. *Housing Policy Debate* 8(4): 833–866.

Ellin, Nan. 1996. *Postmodern urbanism*, p. 157. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

———. 1997. *Architecture of fear*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press.

Engwicht, David. 2003. *Creating creative cities*. Creative Communities International. Available at http://www.lesstraffic.com/Articles/Place/creative.htm.

Espino, N. Ariel. 2001. Inequality, segregation and housing markets: A theoretical overview and a qualitative profile of the U.S. case. Paper presented at the "International Seminar on Segregation in the City," July 26–28, 2001, at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Feldman, Roberta, and Susan Stall. 2004. *The dignity of resistance: Women residents' activism in Chicago public housing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, Robert. 2000. The metropolitan tradition in American planning. In *The American planning tradition*, Robert Fishman, ed. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Florida, Richard. 2002a. *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.

———. 2002b. The economic geography of talent. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 92(4): 743–755.

———. 2004. Revenge of the squelchers. *The next American city.* Available at http://www.americancity.org.

Freedman, Samuel G. 2004. Still separate, still unequal. *The New York Times*. May 16, 2004.

Freeman, Lance, and Frank Braconi. 2004. Gentrification and displacement: New York City in the 1990s. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(1): 39–53.

Frey, William H. 2002. City families and suburban singles: An emerging household story from Census 2000. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Frieden, Bernard, and Marshall Kaplan. 1975. *The Politics of neglect*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Friedmann, John. 2002. City of fear or open city? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 68(3): 237–243.

Galster, George C., Peter A. Tatian, Anna M. Santiago, Kathryn L. S. Pettit, and Robin E. Smith. 2003. *Why not in my backyard? Neighborhood impacts of deconcentrating assisted housing*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Gans, Herbert. 1961. The balanced community: Homogeneity or heterogeneity in residential areas? *American Institute of Planners Journal* 27(3): 176–184.

Geddes, Patrick. 1915. *Cities in evolution*. London: Williams & Norgate.

Gilroy, Rose, and Chris Booth. 1999. Building an infrastructure of everyday lives. *European Planning Studies* 7(3): 307–325.

Glaeser, Edward. 2000. The future of urban research: Nonmarket interactions. *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs* 101–150.

Glaeser, Edward L., and Jacob Vigdor. 2003. Racial segregation: Promising news. In *Redefining urban and suburban America, evidence from census 2000*, Bruce Katz and Robert E. Lang, eds. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Glaeser, Edward, H. D. Kallal, J. A. Scheinkman, and A. Shleifer. 1992. Growth in cities. *Journal of Political Economy* 100(6): 1127–1152.

Glazer, Nathan. 1959. The school as an instrument in planning. *American Institute of Planners Journal* 25(4): 191–199.

Goering, John, and Judith D. Feins. 2003. *Choosing a better life? Evaluating the moving to opportunity social experiment*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

Gottdiener, Mark, and Joe R. Feagin. 1998. The Paradigm Shift in Urban Sociology. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 24:163–187.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1983. The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological Theory* 1: 201–233.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1990. The old and the new economic sociology: A history and an agenda. In *Beyond the marketplace: Rethinking economy and society*, R. Friedland and A. F. Robertson, eds. New York: Aldine.

Grant, Jill. 2002. Mixed-use in theory and practice: Canadian experience with implementing a planning principle. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 68(1): 71–84.

Grigsby, W., M. Baratz, G. Galster, and D. MacLennan. PROVIDE AUTHORS' FULL NAMES 1987. The Dynamics of neighbourhood change and decline. Oxford: Pergamon.

Hall, Peter. 2002. *Cities of tomorrow: An intellectual history of urban planning and design in the twentieth century.* 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Handy, Susan. 1996. Understanding the link between urban form and nonwork travel behavior. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15:183–98.

Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of postmodernity.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 2000. *Spaces of hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hayden, Dolores. 1986. *Redesigning the American dream*. New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 2003. *Building suburbia: Green fields and urban growth, 1820–2000*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hise, Greg. 2001. "Nature's workshop" industry and urban expansion in Southern California, 1900–1950. *Journal of Historical Geography* 27(1): 74–92.

———. 2004. Mexicans and that sort of thing: Race and social distance in Los Angeles. Paper presented at the symposium "Constructing race: The built environment, minoritization, and racism in the United States." University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, March 5–6.

Ihlanfeldt, Keith R., and Benjamin P. Scafidi. 2002. The neighborhood contact hypothesis: Evidence from a multicity study of urban inequality. *Urban Studies* 39(4): 619–641.

Jacobs, Allan, and Donald Appleyard. 1987. Toward an urban design manifesto. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 53(1): 112–120.

Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Vintage Books.

Kahn, Matthew E. 2001. Does sprawl reduce the Black/White housing consumption gap? *Housing Policy Debate* 12(1): 77–86.

Kaplan, R., and S. Kaplan. 1989. *Experience of nature: A psychological perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Keating, W. Dennis. 1994. The suburban racial dilemma: Housing and neighborhoods. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kefalas, Maria. 2003. *Working-class heroes: Protecting home, community, and nation in a Chicago neighborhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Knox, Paul L. 1991. The restless urban landscape: Economic and sociocultural change and the transformation of metropolitan Washington, D.C. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81(2): 181–209.

Kushner, James A. 1982. *Apartheid in America: An historical and legal analysis of contemporary racial residential segregation in the United States*. Millwood, NY: Associated Faculty Press.

Lang, R. E., Hughes, J. W., and Danielsen, K. A. 1997. Targeting the suburban urbanites: Marketing central-city housing. *Housing Policy Debate* 8: 437–470.

Lang, Robert E. 2004. Valuing the suburbs: Why some "improvements" lower home prices. *Opolis: An International Journal of Suburban and Metropolitan Studies* 1(1): Article 3. Available at: http://repositories.cdlib.org/cssd/opolis/vol1/iss1/art3/

Lazear, Edward. 2000. Diversity and immigration. In NBER Conference Volume: Issues in the economics of immigration, George Borjas, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ledebur, L. C., and W. R. Barnes. 1993. *All in it together: Cities, suburbs and local economic regions*. Washington, D.C.: National League of Cities.

Lee, B., and P. Wood. 1990. The fate of residential integration in American cities: Evidence from racially mixed neighborhoods, 1970–1980. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 12(4): 425–436.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The production of space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Leung, H. L. 1995. A new kind of sprawl. *Plan Canada* 35(5): 4–5.

Livingstone, David N., Margaret C. Keane, and Frederick W. Boal. 1998. Space for religion: a Belfast case study. *Political Geography* 17(2): 145–170.

Logan, John, and Harvey Molotch. 1987. *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Logan, John R., Brian J. Stults, and Reynolds Farley. 2004. Segregation of minorities in the metropolis: Two decades of change. *Demography* 41(1): 1–22.

Low, Setha M. 2003. The edge and the center: Gated communities and the discourse of urban fear. In *The anthropology of space and place: Locating culture*, Setha M. Low and Denise Lawrence-Zuniga, eds. Oxford: Blackwell.

Malizia, Emil E., and Shanzi Ke. 1993. The influence of economic diversity on unemployment and stability. *Journal of Regional Science* 33(2): 221–236.

Maly, Michael T. 2000. The neighborhood diversity index: A complementary measure of racial residential settlement. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 22(1): 37–47.

Mann, P. 1958. The socially balanced neighborhood. *Town planning review* 29:91–98.

Marcuse, Peter. 2001. Enclaves yes, Ghettoes, no: Segregation and the State. Paper presented at the "International seminar on segregation in the city," July 26–28, 2001, at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Marcuse, Peter, and Ronald van Kempen, eds. 2002. *Of states and cities: The partitioning of urban space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Massey, Douglas S., and Mary J. Fischer. 2003. The geography of inequality in the United States, 1950–2000. In *Brookings-Wharton papers on urban affairs 2003*, William G. Gale and Janet Rothenberg Pack, eds. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

McElfish, James M., Jr. 2004. *Nature-friendly ordinances*. Washington, D.C.: Environmental Law Institute.

McHarg, Ian. 1969. *Design with nature*. Garden City, NY: Natural History Press.

Mennel, Timothy. 2004. Victor Gruen and the construction of cold war utopias. *Journal of Planning History* 3(2): 116–150.

Meyerson, Martin, and Edward C. Banfield. 1955. *Politics, planning, and the public interest: The case of public housing in Chicago*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Molinaro, J. 1993. Agree on how to disagree or how to have useful discussions. *Planning Commissioners Journal* 12. Available at: http://www.plannersweb.com.

Montgomery, John. 1998. Making a city: Urbanity, vitality and urban design. *Journal of Urban Design* 3(1): 93–116.

Moudon, Anne Vernez, and Paul Mitchell Hess. 2000. Suburban clusters: The nucleation of multifamily housing in suburban areas of the Central Puget Sound. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 66(3): 243–264.

Mumford, Lewis. 1925. Regions—To Live In. *Survey Graphic* 7(May): 151–152.

———. 1938. *The culture of cities*. London: Secker & Warburg.

———. 1968. *The urban prospect*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

National Research Council. 1999. *Our common journey: A transition toward sustainability*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Naveh, Z. 2004. The importance of multifunctional, self-organising biosphere landscapes for the future of our Total Human Ecosystem—a new paradigm for transdisciplinary landscape ecology. In *Multifunctional landscapes volume I: Theory, values and history*, J. Brandt and H. Vejre, eds. Boston, MA: WIT Press.

Newman, Peter W. G., and Jeffrey R. Kenworthy. 1996. The land use–transport connection: An overview. *Land Use Policy* 13(1): 1–22.

Nyden, Philip, John Lukehart, Michael T. Maly, and William Peterman. 1998. Chapter 1: Neighborhood racial and ethnic diversity in U.S. cities. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 4(2): 1–17.

Nyden, Philip, Michael Maly, and John Lukehart. 1997. The emergence of stable racially and ethnically diverse urban communities: A case study of nine U.S. cities. *Housing Policy Debate* 8(2): 491–533.

Oliver, J. Eric. 2001. *Democracy in suburbia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Orfield, Myron. 2002. *American metropolitics: The new suburban reality*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Ottensmann, J. 1995. Requiem for the tipping-point hypothesis. *Journal of Planning Literature* 10(2): 131–141.

Park, Robert. 1952. *Human communities: The city and human ecology*. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.

Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie. 1925. *The city*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pendall, Rolf. 2001. Exploring connections between density, sprawl, and segregation by race and income in the U.S. metropolitan areas, 1980–1990. Paper presented at the "International seminar on segregation in the city," July 26–28, 2001, at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Pendall, Rolf, and John I. Caruthers. 2003. Does density exacerbate income segregation? Evidence from U.S. metropolitan areas, 1980 to 2000. *Housing Policy Debate* 14(4): 541–589.

Pickett, S. T. A., M. L. Cadenasso, and J. M. Grove. 2004. Resilient cities: Meaning, models, and metaphor for integrating the ecological, socio-economic, and planning realm. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 69:369–384.

Popkin, Susan J., Diane K. Levy, Laura E. Harris, Jennifer Comey, and Mary K. Cunningham. 2004. The HOPE VI Program: What about the residents? *Housing Policy Debate* 15(2): 385–414.

Powell, John A. 2002. Sprawl, fragmentation and the persistence of racial inequality. In *Urban sprawl: Causes, consequences and policy responses*, Gregory D. Squires, ed. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

———. 2003. Opportunity-based housing. In *Toward the livable city*, Emilie Buchwald, ed. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Putnam, R. D. 2000. *Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, Robert, and Lewis M. Feldstein. 2003. *Better together: Restoring the American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Qadeer, Mohammad A. 1997. Pluralistic planning for multicultural cities: The Canadian practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 63(4): 481–494.

Quercia, Roberto G., and George Galster. 1997. Threshold effects and the expected benefits of attracting middle-income households to the central city. *Housing Policy Debate* 8(2): 409–436.

Rehn, Steven D. 2002. *Measuring segregation in melting-pot suburbs: Concepts, methods and a case study.* Master's thesis, Department of Planning, Public Policy & Management, University of Oregon.

Ritzdorf, Marsha. 1997. Family values, municipal zoning, and African American family life. In *Urban planning and the African American community: in the shadows*, June Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Romaya, Sam, and Carole Rakodi, eds. 2003. *Building sustainable urban settlements: Approaches and case studies in the developing world*. London: ITDG Publishing.

Rose, Dina R. 2000. Social disorganization and parochial control: Religious institutions and their communities. *Sociological Forum* 15:339–358.

Rosenbaum, James E., Linda K. Stroh, and Cathy A. Flynn. 1998. Lake Parc Place: A study of mixed-income housing. *Housing Policy Debate* 9(4): 703–740.

Rowley, Alan. 1996. Mixed-use development: Ambiguous concept, simplistic analysis and wishful thinking? *Planning Practice and Research* 11(1): 85–97.

Ryan, William, Allan Sloan, Mania Seferi, and Elaine Werby. 1974. *All in it together: An evaluation of mixed-income multi-family housing*. Boston: Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency.

Rybczynski, Witold. 2000. Where have all the Planners Gone? In *The profession of city planning: Changes, successes, failures and challenges (1950–2000)*, Lloyd Rodwin and Bish Sanyal, eds. Rutgers, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1999).

Saarinen, Eliel. 1943. *The city: Its growth, its decay, its future*. New York: Reinhold Publishing Company.

Sampson, Robert J., Stephen Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 277: 918–24.

Sandercock, Leonie. 1998. *Towards cosmopolis*. Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley & Sons.

Sarkissian, S. 1976. The idea of social mix in town planning: An historical overview. *Urban Studies* 13(3): 231–246.

Saxenian, A. 1999. *Silicon Valley's new immigrant entrepreneurs*. Berkeley: Public Policy Institute of California.

Schwartz, Alex, and Kian Tajbakhsh. 1997. Mixed-income housing: Unanswered questions. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 3(2): 71–92.

Silver, Christopher. 1985. Neighborhood planning in historical perspective. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 51(2):161–174.

Singer, Audrey. 2004. The rise of new immigrant gateways. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Skerry, Peter. 2002. Beyond sushiology: Does diversity work? *The Brookings Review* 20(1): 20–24.

Slater, Tom, Winifred Curran, and Loretta Lees. 2004. Guest Editorial. *Environment and Planning A* 36:1141–1150.

Smith, Alastair. 2002. Mixed-income housing developments: Promise and reality. Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation: Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University. Available at http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/W02-10_Smith.pdf.

Smith, Richard A. 1998. Discovering stable racial integration. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 20(1): 1–25.

Smith, Tara, Maurice Nelischer, and Nathan Perkins. 1997. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 39:229–241.

Steinacker, Annette. 2003. Infill development and affordable housing: Patterns from 1996 to 2000. *Urban Affairs Review* 38(4): 492–509.

Steiner, Frederick. 2002. *Human ecology: Following nature's lead*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Suttles, Gerald. 1972. *The social construction of communities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Thomas, June Manning. 1997. Coming together: Unified diversity for social action. In *Urban planning and the African American community: In the shadows*, June Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Thomas, June Manning, and Marsha Ritzdorf, eds. 1997. *Urban planning and the African American community: In the shadows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Thompson, Catharine Ward. 2002. Urban open space in the 21st century. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 60:59–72.

Unwin, Raymond. 1909. *Town planning in practice: An introduction to the art of designing cities and suburbs*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Vandell, Kerry D. 1995. Market factors affecting spatial heterogeneity among urban neighborhoods. *Housing Policy Debate* 6:103–139.

van Kempen, Ronald. 2002. The academic formulations: Explanations for the partitioned city. In *Of state and cities: The partitioning of urban space*, Peter Marcuse and Ronald van Kempen, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Venturi, Robert, Denise Scott-Brown, and Stephen Izenour. 1977. *Learning from Las Vegas*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wang, Vincent. 1996. Mixed-use: The answer to the successful urban environment. *Built Environment* 22(4): 312–314.

Wassmer, Robert W. 2001. The economics of the causes and benefits/costs of urban spatial segregation. Paper presented at the "International seminar on segregation in the city," July 26–28, 2001, at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Webber, M. M. 1963. Order in diversity: Community without propinquity. In *Cities and space: The future use of urban land*, L. Wingo, ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Williams, K. Y., and C. A. O'Reilly. 1998. Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, B. Staw and R. Sutton, eds. vol. 20, 77–140. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wilson, E. O. 1988. *Biodiversity*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Zachary, Pascal G. 2000. *The global me: New cosmopolitans and the competitive edge—picking globalism's winners and losers*. New York: Perseus Books.

Zielenbach, Sean. 2000. *The art of revitalization: Improving conditions in distressed inner-city neighborhoods*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Zukin, Sharon. 1998. Urban lifestyles: Diversity and standardization in spaces of consumption. *Urban Studies* 35(5): 825–839.