Cities & Planning Series

The *Cities & Planning Series* is designed to provide essential information and skills to students and practitioners involved in planning and public policy. We hope the series will encourage dialogue among professionals and academics on key urban planning and policy issues. Topics to be explored in the series may include growth management, economic development, housing, budgeting and finance for planners, environmental planning, GIS, small-town planning, community development, and community design.

William Peterman

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AND COMMUNITY-BASED DEVELOPMENT

The Potential and Limits of Grassroots Action

Cities & Planning

SAGE Publications
International Educational and Professional Publisher

resident-managed public housing. I contend that even though Monti developed the conditions as appropriate only in the narrow instance of a public housing community, they are, with some modification, valid over a broad range of community development and neighborhood planning situations.

After presenting and discussing the conditions necessary for community empowerment, I return briefly to each of the four case studies to show how the conditions were or were not met in each case. My argument is that the successes or failures in each case—that is, the successes or failures of reaching the desired community goals and objectives—can be accounted for by attention or lack of attention to the four conditions.

The concluding chapter of the book is an attempt to assess and summarize what planners and other urban specialists can expect to accomplish through a community-based approach to planning. Ideas as to how planning proceeds in a neighborhood setting and the conditions under which it can succeed are presented as a "tool kit," intended to provide planners and community leaders with appropriate and useful procedures for doing neighborhood-based planning and development.

This book is intended to be of interest to a variety of readers. It should be of special interest to individuals who are directly involved in neighborhood planning and development activities. This includes not only public planners and planners with not-for-profit community-oriented agencies and organizations but also staff of community development corporations and social service agencies concerned about neighborhood and community viability. Community organizers should also find the book useful in their efforts to create viable and active neighborhood organizations. Planning students and educators should also be interested in the book because it not only shows how neighborhood planning is done, but it also lays out at least a rudimentary theory of the neighborhood development process and raises basic questions about notions of neighborhood and community. And finally, individuals simply interested in neighborhoods and neighborhood organizations and how they work may find the case studies in Chapters 5 through 8 interesting reading because they tell the stories of real people in real situations and depict the struggles that people undertake in attempting to preserve and revitalize their neighborhoods and communities.

CHAPTER

NEIGHBORHOODS, COMMUNITIES, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

In the first part of this chapter, I explore the notions of neighborhood and community as they are commonly used by planners, community developers, and neighborhood people themselves. This is followed by a similar discussion of the notions of neighborhood planning and how it is carried out. The chapter serves to lay out the context for a discussion of efforts to revitalize neighborhoods through community development and thus sets the stage for the case studies presented in Chapters 5 through 8.

THE VARIED MEANINGS OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY

The terms *neighborhood* and *community* are commonly used in conversation, speech, and writing to describe certain urban places as though everybody knows and agrees as to what they mean. Yet, as I will argue, there does not seem to be a consensus as to just what a neighborhood or a community is. Furthermore, the common images associated with these words may be inappropriate as a model for doing meaningful neighborhood planning or community development.

More than simple academic interest should cause us to be concerned about the meanings of neighborhood and community. Policies, programs, and actions intended to improve the physical, social, cultural, and economic well-being of people living in places called neighborhoods or communities are frequently based implicitly on presumed shared definitions of these terms. Whether these definitions are appropriate and whether they are indeed shared may have a significant impact on what policies, programs, and actions are selected and how we view the outcomes of their implementation.

Quite often, writers and speakers referring to neighborhoods or communities do not tell us what they mean by these words. For the most part, *neighborhood* and *community* exist as undefined terms.[1] Thus, it should not be surprising that people often have different and sometimes contradictory notions as to what they mean, and this can result in different and sometimes contradictory proposals for neighborhood improvement.

Before exploring possible paths to grassroots neighborhood redevelopment, it will be useful, perhaps even necessary, to explore some of the more common meanings of *neighborhood* and the ways in which policymakers, planners, and community activists fashion revitalization strategies based on these meanings. The differences between the meanings of neighborhood and community will also be briefly explored. This will allow us in the next chapter to make sense of the notion of *empowerment*, another term whose meaning often remains undefined, and to consider how neighborhoods or communities can be empowered for action and development through community organization.

NEIGHBORHOOD AS CONCEPT

In tracing the historical notion of the "neighborhood," we can turn to the writings of Lewis Mumford. In his seminal work, *The City in History* (1961), Mumford argues that by 2000 B.C., the physical characteristics of the city had been created and that the physical structures of the ancient Middle Eastern city would have been familiar to a 19th-century observer. Citing Leonard Woolley's excavations of the ancient Mesopotamian city of Ur, Mumford notes that the ancient city consisted of a "series of more or less coherent neighborhoods in which smaller shrines and temples serve for the householder" (p. 74). The temple, Mumford states, was the focus of the neighborhood unit.

According to Mumford (1961), the neighborhood was a concept familiar to Greek city planners and a component of Greek city plans and planning as it developed during the seventh century B.C. The Greek form of planning, known as *Milesian*, was based on the standard gridiron and divided the city into definite "neighborhoods," which were physical entities that took the shape of superblocks. Mumford contends that this appears to be the "first historic example of a deliberately fabricated neighborhood unit" (p. 193).

However, the neighborhoods of Greek planned cities and later of Roman cities appear to be unlike what we refer to as neighborhoods today in that they appear to primarily have been physical structures, designed to provide a certain orderliness to the overall urban fabric. The social and cultural elements that seem to be embodied in the modern notion of neighborhood appear to have been absent.

This, however, changed in medieval Europe, Mumford (1961) claims. In the medieval city, Mumford states that neighborhoods were "a congeries of little cities, each with a certain degree of autonomy and self-sufficiency, each formed so naturally out of common needs and purposes that it only enriched and supplanted the whole" (p. 310).[2]

We need to question Mumford's (1961) assertions about the historical existence and role of neighborhoods as basic elements of cities. It is likely that Mumford is guilty of "retrospective modernism" (see McIlwain, 1936-1937), that is, viewing the past through criteria applicable, if at all, only in the present. His assertions about neighborhoods are contradicted by Sacks (1989), who has extensively studied medieval

Bristol in England.[3] Sacks states that although the concept of community would have been familiar to the residents of medieval Bristol, they would not have understood it as relating to a bounded social system of place but rather to the more partial, impersonal, and transitory relationships found in society at large. Mumford's "congeries of little cities" may reflect 19th- and 20th-century thought rather than the reality of the 15th and 16th centuries.

Current research seems to suggest that the idea of neighborhood, at least as it is commonly and currently articulated by urban planners, is of more recent origin and that its roots are more likely to be found in the suburbs than in the ancient cities of Ur. Indeed, a review of how the concept of the neighborhood as "urban village" came to be so accepted within the planning profession can lead to a conclusion that neighborhoods are neither as universal nor as integral to urban areas as planners often contend.

According to Southworth and Ben-Joseph (1995), social reformers of the late 19th century saw suburbanization as a vital force and viewed it as a mechanism for rehabilitating the city. Suburbanization was seen as an antidote for urban social ills, which for the most part were seen to be the result of overcrowding and poor sanitation. Thus, originally designed for the upper classes, suburbs also became the model for middle-class developments as well and an ideal to be achieved if possible even in poor communities. This led participants at the First National Conference on City Planning and the Problems of Congestion, held in Washington, D.C., in 1909, to call for encouraging developers to build at the edge of cities to relieve congestion and for establishing regulations for proper land subdivision (Southworth & Ben-Joseph, 1995).

Many urban social reformers at the beginning of this century were influenced by the utopian garden city model put forward by Ebenezer Howard (1902/1945). Howard proposed an urban design that he felt incorporated the best of both the city and the country. His goal was to eliminate both the evils of the city and the bucolic boredom of the countryside and to create a self-sufficient village within a city. Howard placed culture and commerce at the center of his urban unit surrounded by residences. The residential area, in turn, was surrounded by a "green belt" through which paths and roads led to factories. Thus, the workplaces were accessible to but removed from the residential

areas, which at least partially solved the problems of pollution and other negative externalities associated with industrial activity.

Howard, himself, had been influenced by the efforts of George Pullman to create a "worker's paradise" and had visited what may be one of the best examples of a fully developed garden city in the United States. The town of Pullman, for which construction had begun in 1880 on open land south of Chicago, was designed by the well-known architect Solan Beman, following the railroad car industrialist Pullman's instructions. Pullman Town contained a variety of housing types ranging from the plant manager's stately home (currently used as a restaurant) to dormitories for unmarried workers. All were in close proximity to each other and to the Pullman Palace Car Factory. Everyone could walk to work, partake of cultural offerings, and recreate along the shore of Lake Calumet, which bordered the town (Smith, 1995).[4]

Many urban residential developments at the beginning of this century were a blend of Howard's (1902/1945) garden city concept and a reworking of Olmsted and Vaux's 1868 plan for the Chicago suburb of Riverside (Langdon, 1994). Like Howard's garden city, the plan of Riverside attempted to bring the countryside into the city but did so by creating large lots, winding streets, and a "common" or public space for recreation and location of public buildings such as a village hall and village library. Spaces were also set aside in the plan for churches as well as schools. The "long common" and other open spaces along the banks of the DesPlaines River provided Riverside with both a rural image and places where local residents could gather for social and other community events.

In reality, however, as Kunstler (1993) has pointed out, Riverside was little more than a real estate development, lacking much of what made Howard's (1902/1945) utopian scheme complete: workplaces, commerce, and housing options. The fathers of Riverside's families worked in downtown Chicago, taking the train to Chicago's Loop each morning and returning in the evening. The train also brought to Riverside those items that the "lady of the house" needed to prepare meals and undertake other domestic chores. And Riverside's houses were required to cost at least $3,000, roughly the annual income of a doctor in 1870. The result was the creation of a socially one-dimensional community (Kunstler, 1993).

The attempt by Olmsted and Vaux to make Riverside a village in a city was copied a generation later by pioneering land developers of the early 20th century. These developers created suburban-like, almost always wealthy subdivisions, and they incorporated into them elements that today are frequently considered to be characteristics of all healthy neighborhoods. In a real sense, these upper-income communities became the norm for the ideal urban neighborhood, and this ideal seems to be held as the model, even in places where there are few if any of the physical characteristics of these planned neighborhoods and in places where the residents are far less wealthy.

The pioneering land developers borrowed from both the garden city and the Riverside models. Because homeownership at the time was limited to the wealthy and near wealthy,[5] these planned developments consisted primarily of single-family detached owner-occupied homes. Land, of course, was set aside for schools and churches. Public parks and playgrounds, however, were often limited or completely absent out of fear that outsiders might be attracted to them. Open spaces were thus usually restricted to small plots of ground for growing flowers or for locating gates or other kinds of identifiable entryways into the community.[6]

The better developments also provided for retail activity. Kansas City developer J. C. Nichols pioneered the concept of the outlying shopping center with his Colonial Shops in 1907, followed in 1923 by the first fully automobile-oriented shopping district in the United States, the Country Club Plaza (Worley, 1990). Like Riverside, Nichols's planned real estate developments omitted the workplace and offered no opportunities for lower-class households.

The developers also were pioneers in creating community organizations, incorporating the concept of the neighborhood association into their new subdivisions. Rudimentary homeowners associations had existed in England since as early as the mid-18th century and in one or two places in the United States by the mid-19th century. But it was J. C. Nichols, beginning in 1910 in Kansas City, who refined the idea and created the first "true" homeowners association (Worley, 1990). Nichols's intent was to get the homeowners to self-police his subdivisions, which he accomplished by transferring the enforcement of deed and other restrictions and the approval of building plans to the association. Homeowner associations remain a feature of suburban subdivisions today and are the model for "civic associations" found in many city neighborhoods. Where they exist in cities, they almost always favor homeownership over renting and gentrification over the status quo.

With the help of Nichols's land development company, the homeowners associations sponsored a variety of social and cultural activities, including lawn decorating competitions, women's clubs, and a model sailboat competition. Although on the surface all these activities appeared to be a means for creating community, their real purpose was to make sure that the homeowners would become a type of neighborhood "police" and that community standards would be maintained (Worley, 1990).

When the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA) was formed in 1923, its founders, including Lewis Mumford, adopted the garden city ideal of Ebenezer Howard as the model for creating and maintaining the sense of community in residential neighborhoods (Southworth & Ben-Joseph, 1995). Their actual model of the ideal neighborhood, however, more closely resembled the middle- to upper-income real estate developments, such as those of J. C. Nichols, with which they were familiar.

Shortly after the RPAA was formed, Clarence Perry, another founding member, began promoting the concept of "the neighborhood unit" (Perry, 1929) as a "fractional urban unit that would be self-sufficient yet related to the whole" (Southworth & Ben-Joseph, 1995, p. 71). Perry's notion was closely tied to the creation of traffic systems that protected neighborhoods by establishing a hierarchy of streets and keeping main thoroughfares out of existing or planned neighborhoods.

Southworth and Ben-Joseph (1995) credit the introduction of the principles for residential street systems in the New York region, which were laid out by Perry and Thomas Adams in Volume 7 of the New York regional plan of 1929, as being an important step toward the acceptance within the planning profession of the residential neighborhood as a unique entity to be protected and deliberately planned. Many of the physical design characteristics identified by Perry and Adams, including cul-de-sacs, residential streets, and the separation of vehicles and pedestrians, were also incorporated into the 1928 plan of Radburn, designed by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright, to be an "American garden city" (Stein, 1951, p. 23).

It was during the depression that the planning profession completely adopted the notion and concept of the neighborhood unit. President Hoover's Conference on Home Building and Homeownership (1932) recommended the use of neighborhood unit principles in designing residential areas, and the newly formed Federal Housing Administration (FHA), in its 1936 bulletin on *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses*, indicated a preference for neighborhood planning based on the works of Clarence Perry, Clarence Stein, and British neighborhood planning advocate Raymond Unwin (FHA, 1936). Thus, by the advent of World War II, the planning profession, at least, was wedded to the concept of neighborhood and of neighborhood planning.

Planners drew considerable support for their developing notion of the neighborhood as a self-contained urban unit from pioneering work in the field of urban sociology, particularly the work being done at the newly organized University of Chicago school of sociology (Park, Burgess, & McKenzie, 1925). Borrowing from the field of plant ecology, the Chicago sociologists had developed a theory of "human ecology" in which the relationships between individuals, families, groups, and institutions formed into a "natural organization" based on their common location. Natural communities, which were differentiated by segregation into economic and cultural groupings, were viewed as the way individuals "who compose the group [are given] a place and a role in the total organization of city life" (Burgess, 1925b, p. 56).

Furthermore, these sociologists saw the neighborhood as being a mechanism for maintaining urban stability. Burgess (1925a, p. 151), for example, argued that the "village type of neighborhood" and its neighborhood centers acted as a safeguard for youth. Centers or places of congregation outside of the local community, such as the public dance hall, he argued, promoted personal disorganization, delinquency, and promiscuity.

Mobility and change were viewed by the Chicago sociologists as threats to neighborhood stability and the social order. "Where mobility is the greatest and where in consequence primary controls break down completely," Burgess (1925b) argued, "there develop areas of demoralization, of promiscuity, and vice" (p. 59). Not surprisingly, mobility was often equated with the "invasion" of community by undesirable elements, such as foreign races or Negroes (McKenzie, 1925, p. 76).

Thus, although the concept of the neighborhood as a "village" within a larger urban agglomeration of places may have ancient historical antecedents, its planning roots are likely more recent and are associated with the creation of middle- and upper-middle-class residential havens where lifestyles and property values could be protected. This inherently conservative notion was further buttressed by the creation of neighborhood or homeowners associations that served to maintain internal order and to keep out undesirable influences whether they were "incompatible" land uses or "incompatible" individuals or groups.

ALTERNATIVE NOTIONS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Although the notion of the neighborhood as an urban village still occupies a central place in the thinking of many planners and others interested in neighborhood development and is supported by the early work in urban sociology, it may well be an outmoded and limiting idea. More recent sociologists, such as Gerald Suttles (1972) and Herbert Gans (1991), are critical of the simple Burgess model. Both Suttles and Gans argue that the ecological model of the city is too simplistic and results in a false impression of the city and of urban life.

Suttles (1972) argues that the ecological model is the simplest form of a folk model in which the interactions of urban residents are seen as not extending beyond physical or primordial barriers. He notes that most urban residents do not limit their relationships to those people who live in their local community. Instead, urban residents create and maintain relationships throughout the urban area. These relationships take different forms. Even when there are close ties between individuals in a "neighborhood," the ties usually are found only among immediate neighbors, those found on the face block at what might be considered the subneighborhood level and not among "neighbors" at large.

Gans (1991) argues that the urban ecologists misread the city because they focused too narrowly on their studies of ethnic and immigrant slums that were prevalent at the time. Like Suttles (1972), Gans contends that most urban residents do not limit their contacts to those

in close proximity and are more likely to organize around issues relating to social and economic class rather than physical neighborhoods. Even where neighborhoods do exist, the social and economic linkages that the residents create and maintain are not likely to be limited to the neighborhood, even when the neighborhood is highly identifiable and its boundaries distinct.

Gans (1991) identifies five major types of "inner-city" residents: the cosmopolites, the unmarried or childless, the ethnic villagers, the deprived, and the trapped and downwardly mobile. Cosmopolites, who choose to live in places where they can be near to a city's cultural facilities, and the unmarried or childless, who tend to be transient residents, are likely to view the entire urban area as their activity realm. The deprived and the trapped and downwardly mobile[7] have few choices as to where they live, and they tend to be found in areas of the city where there are few if any of the characteristics usually attributed to neighborhoods. Only the "ethnic villagers" tend to isolate themselves and to live in places that can justifiably be called "urban villages." Such ethnic neighborhoods, however, persist only as long as there is a continuing influx of immigrants because older residents die off and their children tend to relocate elsewhere.

Suttles (1972) and Gans (1991) do not deny the existence of neighborhoods, that is, recognizable communities of locations at a somewhat higher level of geographical abstraction. But both argue that neighborhoods are not universal. That is, not every urban place can be thought of as part of a neighborhood. Gans goes further to say that for the most part, there are few differences between most residential areas in a city and the residential areas of its suburbs. Thus, it is incorrect to suggest that there are significant differences between the lifestyles of many urbanites and many suburbanites.

Suttles (1972) defines two higher orders of linkages that exist among urban residents, what he calls the *community of limited liability*, a term previously used by Janowitz (1952), and an *expanded community of limited liability* (Suttles, 1972, pp. 54-64). In each of these higher-order abstractions of geographical space, the linkages between individuals and place weaken, but the fact that people do not live in geographical proximity does not mean that they cannot be connected in a variety of ways, such as by religion, politics, or other common interests. What we

have been led to believe are self-contained idealized neighborhoods, Suttles contends, are more often than not the product of "some outsider; a government surveyor, a developer, a Realtor, founding father, booster, or newspaper man" (Suttles, 1972, p. 52).

Jane Jacobs is probably the best-known planner who has been critical of the place-based concept of neighborhood. In her 1961 classic, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Jacobs rejects the notions that neighborhoods have identifiable geographic dimensions and that the ideal neighborhood is one that is a cozy, inward-turned, self-sufficient urban village. City people, Jacobs argues, are mobile and can pick and choose from throughout the entire city and beyond both the goods and services they purchase and their friends and associates as well. She argues that any concept of neighborhood must be fluid, allowing for the linking together of people by interest, association, and purpose. But Jacobs cautions that this does not mean that a city does not need neighborhoods because it is her contention that the quality of a city's neighborhoods—the places where people live, recreate, and undertake their round of daily activities—determines the overall quality of urban life.

Rather than considering neighborhoods simply as places, Jacobs (1961, p. 114) says that we need to think of them as mundane organs of self-government. The success or failure of a neighborhood thus depends on its ability to undertake self-governance. In this context, Jacobs posits three kinds of neighborhoods that she feels are useful for consideration: the city as a whole, street neighborhoods, and districts of large, subcity size (Jacobs, 1961, p. 117). In the context of this discussion, Jacobs is apparently thinking only about large cities because she suggests that districts are areas having a population of 100,000 or more.

Although each of the three kinds of neighborhoods has a different function, they can work together in a complex way to enhance urban life. The bulk of the power in a city is to be found in the city as a whole. It is at this level that decisions are made, policies determined, and resources obtained and distributed. It is also where special interest and pressure groups tend to operate. Jacobs (1961) notes that one of the greatest assets of urban life is the ability of people to come together from various parts of a city to promote a common cause or address a common problem.

At the other end of the scale are street neighborhoods consisting in size of at most a block or two. Street neighborhoods have the ability to effectively organize and maintain order in their small area through the "networks of small-scale, everyday public life and thus of trust and social control" (Jacobs, 1961, p. 119). But they are far removed from the sources of political power and have little control over their ultimate destinies. For any street neighborhood to be fully self-governing, it must have access to the city as a whole and to the power and resources it represents.

The function of districts is thus to act as broker between the street neighborhoods and the city as a whole. "The chief function of a successful district is to mediate between the indispensable, but inherently politically powerless, street neighborhoods, and the inherently powerful city" (Jacobs, 1961, p. 121). Unfortunately, as Jacobs notes, it is at the level of the district[8] that cities most often fail. It is not that districts do not exist in cities, but rather they do not function well, and therefore the street neighborhoods are left isolated from the resources and power they critically need.

Therefore, at least according to Jacobs (1961), effective self-governance at the most local level, the street neighborhoods, depends on the existence of effective linkages to the city as a whole that can only be provided through districts. To be effective, districts must contain people who know and understand the needs and concerns at the street level but who also have "access to the political, the administrative, and the special interest communities of the city as a whole" (Jacobs, 1961, p. 119).[9]

This more flexible notion of neighborhood seems to be more consistent with notions of community, for communities of individuals are not necessarily place based. Although many authors, planners, and activists tend to use the words *neighborhood* and *community* interchangeably, the former term is most often associated with specific geography, whereas the latter is most often associated with people living their lives in some common or shared way. A key measure of the strength of a community is not the quality of street maintenance or the aesthetics of a group of buildings but rather the extent to which community members interact with each other, spend time together, rely on each other, celebrate together, mourn together, and simply talk to each other.[10]

COMMUNITIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO NEIGHBORHOODS

In their work, modern-day planners seem to retain the concept of the neighborhood as an urban village at least in their rhetoric. However, by relying on Euclidean zoning as the primary tool for urban spatial organization, they seem to contradict it. Separating different uses by zones makes it difficult to integrate a variety of activities within a single space. The result is most often something that is claimed to be a neighborhood but in reality is little more than a residentially isolated subdivision with gently curving streets, cul-de-sacs, and possibly a convenience store and gas station situated at the point where the local road running into the subdivision connects with the major arterial road running through the region.

Within cities there still exist places that meet the requirements of Suttles's (1972) defended neighborhoods or Gans's (1991) ethnic villages, although increasingly the most common type of defended neighborhood is the planned middle- and upper-middle-class subdivision with its walls and entrance gates,[11] and what may pass for urban villagers are likely to be low-income minorities, victims of discrimination and racial segregation. For the most part, the typical urban dweller lives in a place that, although it may have a neighborhood name, has few if any distinctive characteristics and differs little from other parts of the city.

Thus, although we all live in place-based locations, which we may refer to either as our neighborhood or our community, the boundaries and meanings of these self-defined places are not likely to be exact. Furthermore, what we consider to be our "neighborhood" may be quite different at different times and for different purposes. We may chat with the woman "down the block" when she walks her dog past our house, vote for the alderman in our ward, send our children to the "local" school, and shop at the local mall. All of these "neighborhoods" make up our community.

We also belong to communities not simply of place but of people who share something in common, such as interests, ethnicity, careers, sexual orientation, and religious beliefs. Communities also form

around institutions, such as parents of children attending an elementary school, those men and women who work at the same plant or in the same office, or those who are members of a church.

In reality, we are all members of many communities. And these communities do not exist in isolation. They are interconnected in subtle and intricate ways. And they are not static. They are always changing as members join and leave and as connections to other communities grow or wither.

The above discussion suggests that neighborhood planning is or should be about more than the physical design of local space. And given the more broadly defined notions of neighborhood and community, neighborhood planning certainly should not be about creating isolated, independent, self-sufficient villages in the city. Rather, it should be about building community, and doing this involves identifying not only the local needs but also identifying the ways in which people in neighborhoods link with communities beyond some limited and artificial boundary.

DOING PLANNING AT THE NEIGHBORHOOD LEVEL

Barry Checkoway (1984) has identified two very different approaches to planning at the neighborhood level. He calls the two approaches "subarea planning" and "neighborhood planning." The distinguishing characteristics between the two are far from trivial. Primarily, they differ in terms of who controls the planning process. One is a top-down process; the other is a bottom-up process.

Subarea planning is initiated at the city level and involves the deconcentration of central planning activities to the neighborhood level, whereas neighborhood planning is community based and involves the development of plans and programs by and for community residents themselves. The former is merely, according to Checkoway (1984), "a new form of centralization" (p. 105), and the latter is planning that leads to community empowerment.[12]

SUBAREA PLANNING

Checkoway (1984) traces the roots of subarea planning to the citizen participation movements of the 1960s and the response by government to claims that it was out of touch with the public. Reacting to this claim, planning departments deconcentrated some planning functions or facilities to subareas of the city or to what were identified as neighborhoods. Checkoway states that subarea planning has the following characteristics: It is "usually initiated by municipal officials . . . may follow steps of rational planning . . . may produce written plans . . . [and] help[s] fulfill minimal requirement for citizen participation in federal funding programs" (Checkoway, 1984, p. 103). As depicted, subarea planning has basically the same characteristics as city planning in general, but it is done on a smaller scale.

Subarea planners are supportive of the aims of citizen participation, but their efforts do not lead to citizen control. Instead, they generally attempt to engage citizens by using procedures that are characteristic with actions of informing, consulting, and placating. That is, they act in ways that are characteristic of what Arnstein (1969) has referred to as the middle rungs of the ladder of citizen participation.

Subarea planners also recognize the importance of community organization, and they will often work with community-based organizations in carrying out their planning activities. But they are cautious about becoming advocates for the community, claiming that their jobs and the planning process itself require objectivity and noninvolvement in political action.[13] As Checkoway (1984) points out, neighborhood planners favor reforms but "oppose measures which would transfer power to local territorial or functional units" (p. 104).

Subarea planning continues to be the approach supported by the American Planning Association (APA) and is the type of planning described in both the 1979 neighborhood planning guide for citizens and planners (Werth & Bryant, 1979) and a more recent 1990 guide (Jones, 1990). In the 1990 guide, Jones defines neighborhood planning as being "nothing very different than the other varieties of plans cities produce. It just deals with a smaller geographic area and rounds out the picture of what forms of planning are needed" (p. 3).