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1. INTRODUCTION
SOCIAL DIVERSITY AND DESIGN

Driving south of Chicago along the historic Lincoln Highway, one passes through the strangest juxtaposition of rich and poor places. Along one stretch of the highway is Ford Heights, considered to be the poorest suburb in Chicago, if not the nation. Residents there had a median household income of $16,800 in 2010. A short drive down the road lies Park Forest, a middle-class planned community with a median household income that is three times as much. There is no disguising the inequality. At one moment you are passing boarded up buildings and liquor stores. Ten minutes later, you are whizzing by Starbucks, Home Depot and packed parking lots in front of strip malls.

One can take almost any road through Chicago and traverse similar, strangely abrupt transitions between where the rich live and where the poor live. What is striking is how visible these differentials are, and how coarse the grain is: one neighborhood is poor, one neighborhood is rich, another is middle-class. This is the common, taken-for-granted, vernacular landscape of America. And although neighborhoods in the U.S. are getting more racially and ethnically diverse (Lee & Hughes, 2015), this is not the case for class and income.¹

How, and when, did all this spatial sorting occur? When did it become acceptable for communities along the same stretch of road to have such vastly different social and economic prospects? It was not always so. Historians tell us that socially mixed settlements and neighborhoods were the norm until the 19th century, a result of economic necessity: nobles needed to be near their serfs in the medieval city, while workers and owners needed to be close to factories in the early industrial city. People lived where they worked, not where their social class was geographically confined. In many European cities, rich and poor were separated through vertical zoning within apartment buildings, but out on the street, classes shared the public realm. In Chicago before 1850, “money bought dry ground, not segregation by income” (Massey & Denton, 1993; Bowden & Kreinberg, 1981, p. 116).

¹ “Class” is a term sociologists use to refer to different types of hierarchical distinctions between groups. This can be based on income, wealth, occupation, education, or other variables. Thus class has a broader definition than income. For further reading see David B. Grusky and Szonia Szelenyi, Editors. 2006. Inequality: Classic Readings in Race, Class, And Gender. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
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But as industrialization progressed in the 19th century, class consciousness became accentuated. In the American city, where ethnically distinct but economically mixed neighborhoods had been formed, class began to trump ethnic affiliation as the main driver of social geography. Olivier Zunz’s (1982) study of Detroit showed how a “silent social revolution” in the first decades of the 20th century created urban worlds defined more and more by class and industrial production and consumption than by strong ethnic bonding or proximity to workplace. New transportation technologies made the spatial sorting that much easier. There were still ethnic divisions, but 19th century neighborhoods and railroad suburbs formerly composed of multiple classes were being replaced by neighborhoods sorted by class and race.

Thus the story of 20th century urban America is a story of manifested social division. Industrialization brought rising affluence, the growth of the middle class, cheap cars, cheap oil, highways and government subsidies, which, combined with racial and class intolerance, created a toxic mixture that sparked the most extraordinary sprawling out and spatial sorting of cities the world had ever seen. Separation by use mirrored separation by class, and already by 1900, U.S. cities were exhibiting a segregated land use pattern where commercial and office space occupied the center and residential uses were pushed to the periphery (Jackson, 1985). By the 1920s, the connection between social segregation and cities was set. Harvey Warren Zorbaugh, in his classic 1929 study *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, wrote “there is no phenomenon more characteristic of city life, as contrasted with the life of the rural community or the village, than that of segregation” (Zorbaugh, 1929, p. 232). Louis Wirth reached a similar conclusion in “Urbanism as a Way of Life”, noting that urban populations were both highly differentiated and increasingly subordinated to mass culture (Wirth, 1938).

![Figure 1.1](image)

*The ultimate segregation: Cabrini-Green public housing on Chicago’s North Side, most of which is being demolished.*
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We developed whole systems that maximized profits through homogeneity. Global distribution, financial markets and lending institutions structured themselves around homogenous clustering and centralized notions of cultural authority. Clustered social spaces began to dictate business decisions (Metzger, 2000; Weiss, 1988, 2000). And where social institutions made progress in breaking down barriers to integration, the corresponding physical design of cities thwarted the translation of this progress in broader terms. For example, although school desegregation made some headway after 1970, the positive effects were short-lived because the larger society remained segregated outside of the schools (Milner & Howard 2015; Shedd 2015), bolstered by school finance policies that had the effect of spatially segregating households by income (Nechyba, 2001).

It was not that we became worse people. Prior to the 20th century, social distance was maintained in other, often more perverse ways. Jim Crow laws are a notorious example. But unfortunately – or perhaps inevitably – as one kind of social barrier eroded, another arose in its place. This time, the separations were physical and etched into the built landscape like never before. As one author put it, “It is precisely because today’s middle classes are less able to exploit the working classes that our cities have become more segregated than they were” (Olsen, 1986, p. 133). As people were socially freer to move about, the means of separation from each other were encouraged by technological advance, especially the automobile. Spatial mobility and social mobility became one and the same.

Where pre-20th century urban form accommodated social mixing, urban form after the 1920s thwarted the ability of classes to mix, even if they had wanted to. Racial prejudice complicated and accentuated the situation. Middle-class Blacks had few housing opportunities outside of Black neighborhoods since White middle-class neighborhoods were resistant to Blacks moving in, even if they were of the same economic class. In post World War II America, many Whites believed that the only physical context associated with Blacks was urban blight. That degraded conditions were often a result of crowding due to a lack of alternative housing choices was unlikely to be considered (see Kefalas, 2003; Pattillo-McCoy, 2013; Sugrue, 2014). And since the built environment failed to accommodate increased density gracefully, residents of neighborhoods consisting exclusively of single-family homes became alarmed whenever houses were subdivided to accommodate poor families.

The consequences of failing to deliver an urban framework more supportive of social diversity have been monumental. Most damaging has been the concentration of poor people in the inner city. Now, we can only wonder what might have occurred if we had not retreated from diverse environments that permitted a wider social range, what a commitment to diversity might have meant for those seeking to escape the high real estate costs of the inner city and later, the federal bulldozer.
Suburbs have now become more socially diverse (Pfeiffer, 2014), but they have done so in spite of their physical form, not because of it. What has emerged are suburbs that are “collectively heterogenous but individually homogenous”, where people sort themselves out into “lifestyle enclaves” (Putnam, 2000). Most suburban neighborhoods are still being built for one social class or another, whereby market segmentation strictly divides neighborhoods into pods of distinct income categories.

Would these segregated social patterns have been different if American settlements had been physically structured to accommodate people of all social and economic means?

Different professions and disciplines will have different ways of addressing the problem of social sorting. Our interest – and the subject of this book – is the planning and design response. We will focus on what we call place diversity – the phenomenon of socio-economically diverse peoples sharing the same neighborhood, where diversity is defined by a mix of income levels, races, ethnicities, ages, and family types. We will argue that good urban form can help sustain diversity. Just what “good urban form” means in the context of diversity, and how it is possible to justify such assertions, is our main concern.

Place diversity is diversity that exists within the realm of “everyday life” activities – attending school and shopping for groceries, for example. It concerns neighborhoods, whose pattern, design, and level of resources constitute the “things that really count” – schools, security, jobs, property values, amenities (Pattillo-McCoy, 2013, p. 30). While we do not use precise spatial definitions for the terms “neighborhood” and “community”, the idea of place diversity is probably most meaningful at a scale that falls somewhere in between Suttles’ (1972) “defended neighborhood” (a small area possessing a definite identity) and the “community of limited liability” (a larger, often government-defined district). Neighborhoods are to be distinguished from crowded urban places in downtowns and shopping malls – Millenium Park or The Galleria – that are full of social complexity, but where there is little sense of collective ownership or sharing of space for daily life needs.

This book explores how planning and design could be used to support socially diverse places. To understand the possibilities of a design response, we study places that already are socially diverse and suggest ways that the built environment could be leveraged to support their diverse social makeup. What is the physical context of socially diverse neighborhoods, and what does it mean for the residents who live there? Do diverse places look like Jane Jacobs’ Greenwich Village, or do they take on a variety of forms? Have these places been responsive to the needs of a diverse neighborhood, in terms of their physical design?

---

2 We use the terms “planning and design” to indicate strategies related to intervening in the form and pattern of the built environment. The strategies relate solely to the physical environment and its alteration. Often the strategies focus on identifying specific places for intervention. This is not “urban design” in the conventional architect’s sense, which is often focused solely on the aesthetic experience of a small group of spaces or buildings. Our sense of urban design is broader, as will be revealed in this book. The interrelated term “urbanism” refers to the study, planning and design of streets, spaces and neighborhoods, with an emphasis on urban morphologies, block structure, urban spaces, and their geographic context.
What could be the basis of a shared aesthetic in diverse places? Given that place-based identity and affection seem so easily associated with “landscapes of privilege” and exclusion, how do diverse places find a shared definition of place? (Duncan & Duncan, 2004).

Some planners may be skeptical about the wisdom of using design to support diversity. Partly this is a matter of the divorce between social goals and urban design that has been brewing since the demise of modernist urbanism. Cuthbert may be right: “major theorists in the discipline present us with concepts of urban form that are unrelated, largely devoid of any social content and alienated from any serious socio-economic and political base” (2006, p. 21). Thus Jon Lang, in his book Urban Design: A Typology of Procedures and Products, states that it is the market that should provide people with choices, and that if the market fails to provide them, well, “these questions are not urban design ones”. He advocates designing sub-areas “with one population in mind” as a way to “avoid conflict”, while delegating larger, macro areas as the locus of integration (Lang, 2005, p. 369). Besides the anti-progressiveness involved, the problem with Lang’s view is that it leaves diverse places behind, providing them with no specific design support, nor any legitimate claim that an approach tailored to their unique social makeup might be needed.

Our basic thesis is that there are design principles that can help sustain diverse neighborhoods. Modernist urbanism, with its emphasis on functionalism, automobile accommodation and land use separation, exacerbated the key design requirements of diverse places: mix, connection, and security. As cities expanded and grew in the 20th century, design ideology and technological “progress”, along with other social and economic factors, fueled a built environment conducive to social separation. The result is that we are now left with a physical framework that seems hostile to, rather than supportive of, social diversity.
Fortunately, every city has at least some places that have managed to attract and retain diversity. By focusing on those places in the City of Chicago as a case study, we hope to shed light on the ways that the planning and design of built environments can help those neighborhoods achieve stability. Can we leverage the built environment to promote social diversity? Can we help equalize access to social and economic resources by encouraging an urban form more conducive to an integrated population?

Complications of the Diversity Ideal

American ideals speak directly to the need for place diversity. Not only is social inequality viewed as a significant threat to democratic society (Bishop, 2009; Ehrenreich, 2011), but the idea that it is possible to be “separate but equal” has been rejected unequivocally. The segregation and separation that has come to characterize the American urban pattern goes against the basic underlying ethos of American idealism – a pluralist society rooted in the notion of human equality. Not only does separation challenge the basic foundation of a democratic society, but it engenders profound differences in access – access to financial resources, community services, public facilities, social networks, and political power. In addition, it limits our ability to encourage tolerant attitudes and capitalize on the creative aspects of human diversity.

At the same time, there is a certain acceptance of the inevitability of differentiation and segregation of the kind Park et al. identified more than 80 years ago – proclaiming that “competition forces associational groupings” (1925, p. 79). They made clear that the result of “continuous processes of invasions and accommodations” was a subdivided residential pattern of varying classes and associated land values, mores, and degrees of “civic interest”. Where one neighborhood

Figure 1.3
In a neighborhood, social diversity is about collective life and the sharing of space for daily needs, as opposed to random encounters with strangers.
might be “conservative, law-abiding, civic-minded”, another would be “vagrant and radical” (1925, p. 78–79). Such differentiation and segregation developed along racial, linguistic, age, sex and income lines, forming units of communal life that they termed “natural areas”. Zorbaugh’s 1929 study of Chicago’s Near Northside showed just how stark the contrast between “The Gold Coast and the Slum” had become.

City planners are left trying to balance the inevitability of place homogeneity with the intolerability of segregation. They are buttressed by American proclamations about the importance of equality and pluralism, but they are constrained by the assumption that, in American society, it is somehow “natural” to associate social mobility with spatial mobility. One moves up in the world by moving out to a “better” neighborhood in a completely different location, a process of assimilation with distinct spatial consequences (Peach, 2001).

Even amongst social critics who are most concerned with the deleterious effects of social segregation and concentrated poverty, it is assumed that what is needed is better spatial mobility, not better planning and design to accommodate diversity. Massey and Denton in their well-known book *American Apartheid* (1993) rightfully lament the persistence of residential segregation among Blacks, but see the inequity as a matter of Blacks being prevented from participating in the “process of normal spatial mobility”. Neighborhood status conceptualized as moving from “declining” to “upgrading” legitimizes the idea that neighborhoods can rightly be of one homogenous, socioeconomic type or another.

Planners are in the unfortunate position of having encouraged social and economic sorting in the first place. Lewis Mumford argued half a century ago that the mechanisms largely put into place with the help of planners—zoning and highways, for example—had reduced the city’s capacity to foster its primary function of human exchange—“the maximum interplay of capacities and functions” (Mumford, 1949, p. 38). Modern city planning was devoted to creating an “armature” of “conflict avoidance” (Sorkin, 1999, p. 2). Through transportation, land use, zoning, housing, mortgage lending, energy, school finance, and many other types of policies, planners have been notoriously complicit in the sorting of social groups and economic functions. And each system is inter-linked, one feeding into and sustaining the other.

But while planning and design of the built environment are believed to have played a strong role in fostering the patterns of segregation that characterize American cities, design reform is not always looked to as a way to reverse the situation. In discussions about how to address the antithesis of place diversity—segregation—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 non-diversity—are problems that, “almost unbelievably”, city planning has not been called upon to answer. Unlike 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” (p. 461) – often only weakly related
Jane Jacobs did the most to articulate the fundamental connection between place and diversity. She pronounced that diversity corresponds to physical forms and patterns that maintain human interactions – relationships and patterns of relationships. Her definition of diversity consisted of a mix of uses, including variety in “cultural opportunities”, the inclusion of a “variety of scenes”, and “a great variety [in] population and other users” (Jacobs, 1961, p. 143–151). On the effect of the physical environment on human diversity she was not ambiguous: there are physical qualities that create diversity in uses and users, and this is the basis of a well-functioning, vital and healthy city. Her propositions – mixed primary uses, mixed ages, short blocks, concentration – have been the guiding principles for planners who came of age after modernist urbanism and urban renewal had done their damage.

But in terms of implementation her arguments have been problematic. How can her principles ever be employed in the vast number of places that do not have the kind of concentration she required? After all, Manhattan density is unique in the U.S. Related to this, how do we reconcile her views connecting diversity and intensity with Lewis Mumford’s (1937) views that “limitations on size, density, and area are absolutely necessary to effective social intercourse”? How can we explain the fact that social diversity in the U.S. is most often located in places that do not conform to Jacobs’ conditions of diversity? How do we deploy Jacobsian conditions for generating diversity in places that could never hope to satisfy her criteria, especially the one about concentration? Clearly, we have to come to terms with the fact that building diversity can not rest on the core of big cities alone, and that it will involve engaging with the “semi-suburbs”, as Jacobs disdainfully called them. In fact, it is in human settlements outside of large, dense metropolitan cores that place diversity is most encountered.

There are other complications concerning the link between diversity and design. Some believe that diversity is just as likely to reside in one type of environment as another (Bruegemann, 2006). Others view the attempt to connect physical form to social goals as overly controlling (Talen, 1999). And not everyone agrees that place diversity should be a key goal. Highly diverse situations may be regarded as too chaotic, while non-diversity or monocultural conditions may be seen as calming. Then there is the view that if you really want to make people’s lives better, your strategy ought to be about changing political and economic structures, not rearranging the form of the built environment. Diversity should be “grown” in place, not dependent on some form of intra-urban social migration resulting in gentrification.
and displacement. Jane Jacobs called the former “unslumming”.

Despite the skepticism, the need to support social mix through the mechanisms of planning and design has long been a concept embedded in city planning idealism. The 20th century began with demands that city reformers do something about the “monotony” of the slums, and the earliest proposals – those of Ebenezer Howard, for example – called for settlements that were internally focused but complete in their provision of the diverse and essential needs of life. Lewis Mumford, Jane Jacobs, Kevin Lynch, William Whyte, and Eliel Saarinen are only a few of the urbanists who thought deeply about the physical context of diversity.

This tradition continues now. City planners are everywhere rallying against social and economic segregation (Talen & Koschinsky, 2014). They are urging a better understanding of the inequities their policies and practices have caused (Ehrenhalt, 2012; Angotti & Morse, 2016). They are being admonished to be sensitive to difference (Landry & Wood, 2012;), to develop an understanding of the effect of multiculturalism on planning (Burayidi, 2000; Innes & Booher, 2010), and to better recognize the very different social expectations and customs that emerge when new residents move into and gentrify existing neighborhoods (Freeman, 2005; Agyeman, 2013). And those connected to New Urbanism, Smart Growth, Livable Communities and related movements are calling for physical designs that explicitly support diversity (Talen, 2013).
Plan of the Book

This book addresses the physical requirements of socially diverse neighborhoods. There are three main parts. In the first part, we set the stage and make the argument: how separated are we, and how prevalent are diverse neighborhoods? More importantly, why is diversity within one neighborhood important, and what does design have to do with it? The second part of the book lays the groundwork for the design proposals we subsequently present in Part Three. Using the City of Chicago and its surrounding suburban areas as a case study, we investigate whether social mixing is related to particular patterns and structures found within the urban environment. We then summarize the results of 85 interviews of residents who live or work in six of Chicago’s most socially diverse neighborhoods.

In Part Three, we present our specific strategies and design proposals. There is much to draw from, including nearly a century of scholarship on the effect of physical form on social/psychological phenomena (e.g., behavior, community formation, social interaction, and sense of place). From the city planner’s point of view, the connection between design and social diversity is not whether the built environment creates diversity, but whether diversity thrives better, or can be sustained longer, under certain physical conditions that designers may have some control over. Since we seem to know a great deal about how planning and design directly or indirectly prevents diversity – e.g., single use zoning, minimum lot sizes, parking requirements, planned (and gated) communities, privatized amenities, excessive road width – it should not be unreasonable to assume that the opposite effect is possible. This is not about determinism but responsiveness – can the physical environment be designed in such a way that diversity is supported rather than prevented? Are there certain physical contexts that diversity seems to thrive in, relative to others? If Richard Sennett is right, that we have lost our capacity for the diversity of public life and the social disorder it may entail, how might the physical environment be enlisted in the effort to get that capacity back?

Our hope is that this book will focus more attention on diverse neighborhoods and their needs. If a stable social and economic diversity represents the pinnacle of urban achievement, such places should be cared for, not left to slowly destabilize and decrease in their level of diversity. By contrast, sprawl, defined by its separation of human realms on all levels, has received an extraordinary amount of attention. It has been measured, poked and prodded in all directions. Wouldn’t it make sense to spend at least an equal measure of attention on what could be considered our ultimate planning achievement, the diverse, well-serviced and well-functioning human place?
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