

# Allan B. Jacobs

---

## Looking Back

---

Originally published as Chapter Twelve of *Making City Planning Work*, American Society of Planning Officials, Chicago, Illinois, pp. 303-317: 1978.

COMPREHENSIVE, CITYWIDE, LONG-RANGE physical planning is important and can work. The idea of a comprehensive plan that contains policies, principles, and visions of what a community wants to be in relation to its physical development, to serve as the basis for both immediate and long-range actions and for legislation geared to its achievement—the idea of such a plan as a foundation of city planning is valid, and it is borne out by much of the work that was done in San Francisco.

Measured against a demanding model of what a comprehensive plan should be, as best set forth in Jack Kent's *Urban General Plan*, our San Francisco efforts may be found wanting in some respects.<sup>1</sup> But failure to reach an ideal in its entirety does not make it less than worthy. It would be hard to say that the master plan documents adopted between 1971 and 1974 constituted what Kent describes as a "unified general physical design for the community." There was no single, overall, published, comprehensive framework or idea about the city to which all of the separate plan elements related. If pressed, I could verbalize such a plan. It would call for respect for and maintenance and improvement of the existing physical character of the city. It would respond to important social and economic issues within that framework. It would not be a plan that called for major, citywide physical change. But we never published such a document. We simply never got to it, although we had the matter on our agenda.

On the other hand, the master plan elements for residence, transportation, urban design, and recreation and open space go a long way toward meeting that part of Kent's definition. Moreover, the elements are consistent with each other or were made so as each new element was adopted. Further, the plans were based in large measure on an assessment of the social needs of the residents, particularly those for whom public support seemed most in order.

Long-range, citywide plans of the kind that have been discussed here can, of course, be responsive to social and economic issues. Maintaining existing residential areas and adapting them to contemporary living standards instead of tearing them down, addressing housing needs of low- and moderate-income people, providing recreation and open space facilities in high-need areas, emphasizing the use of mass transit, keeping automobiles out of neighborhoods, protecting and enhancing views and the physical scale and character of the city—these are a few of the kinds of people-felt issues that the master plan elements responded to. They were real. In addressing them I do not recall making major compromises with long-range objectives or visions.

Photograph by: Stip Lowmney, 1998.



### Professor

Department of City and Regional Planning  
University of California, Berkeley

Allan Jacobs has worked as a city planner-urban designer in Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Boston, Calcutta, and San Francisco. As a consultant, he has had major commissions in Los Angeles, Pasadena, Portland, Ahmedabad (India) and Curitiba (Brazil), with which he has a continuing relationship. He was San Francisco's Director of City Planning from 1967 to 1975. During that period he produced the San Francisco Urban Design Plan, a first of its type.

At Berkeley, Jacobs teaches, conducts research and writes about urban design, and mostly these days about streets. His latest book, *Great Streets*, is a major reference book having to do with the physical, designable qualities of the best streets. Other books are *Making City Planning Work* (from which this selection is excerpted), and *Looking at Cities*. He is continuing his research on streets and spaces at the same time that he is writing a book on boulevards.

Jacobs' share of awards include a Guggenheim Fellowship (1981-82), an award by the National Endowment for the Arts with which he produced his large photo exhibit of San Francisco (1975), a fellowship to the American Academy in Rome (1986), and major achievement awards by the American Institute of Architects (1995) and the American Institute of Planners (1985).

He was born in Cleveland, Ohio, and lives in San Francisco.

## EDUCATION

He studied architecture at Miami University, in Oxford, Ohio, and went on to Harvard and to the University of Pennsylvania, where he received his Master's Degree in City Planning. He studied as well at the University College, London, as the recipient of a Fulbright Fellowship.

Each of the master plan elements was accompanied by a set of recommendations for programs and actions to carry it out. The programs were successful in varying degrees. We have seen that the programs that were most directly under the control of the planning department, especially those that could be achieved through legislative action, had a higher success rate than those that required actions on the part of others. It was not always possible to get the mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or other departments to endorse our policies or to pursue the programs intended to carry them out. And the capital improvement program was never the priority-setting and coordinating tool that it might have been. It suffered from a dearth of funds, and I was never able to get the commission to assert itself strongly in the process. I could not effectively orchestrate the capital budgeting process with all the actors involved around city hall.

Nevertheless, the plans and programs were there. Their purposes were clear when they were followed, and their mere existence in print provided information and a starting point for those citizens who were concerned about the future of their city.

As time passed and with a growing and more solidly based set of plans to rely upon, individual short-range proposals—both public and private—could be viewed in the light of long-range considerations. As a result, we had fewer Transamericas and U.S. Steels. We could review the location of a subsidized housing development in the context of the housing plan element. We could measure a neighborhood rezoning proposal against the housing and urban design elements. When a piece of public land was to be sold or leased, we could check it against a policy of the plan, as we could the vacation or widening of a street. We could relate a small renewal project in Chinatown to both the citywide and neighborhood plans that we had prepared, and we could advocate such a project. City planning was especially pleasing when the projects and programs were clearly the outcome of our plans. We were exhilarated when all our research, meetings, presentations, reconsiderations, confrontations, and responses to demands led to concrete actions, or even when all we knew was that the ideas had a fighting chance of becoming reality.

We were not always effective, nor did we win all our battles. Often, our mouths were too big for our stomachs in that we simply proposed much more than we, or anyone else, could implement. And the dictates of our plans were not adhered to in every case where we had discretion. I was furious when the planning commission or the Board of Supervisors overruled my staff on an issue—a major development proposal for instance—about which I felt the plans were clear. We could at least do battle. As the plans became clearer, it became harder for the commissioners to overrule the planners, especially if the commission had voted for the plans. Increasingly, too, people became aware of what was in the plans, and they used them to advocate or oppose projects. And they demanded changes in the plan as well.

In some cases, the mere existence of a plan or a proposal for a plan stimulated debate over issues that would ultimately have to be decided; for example, the location of public facilities such as police stations, the distribution of low-income housing, and the height of buildings in outlying neighborhoods. That, too, is comprehensive planning at work.

In *Land and the Environment: Planning in California Today*, Paul Sedway and Thomas Cooke list six functions of local planning.<sup>2</sup> The first is “long-range goal and policy making,” which I assume includes the kind of citywide physical planning I have been addressing. Another possible function is “middle range pro-

gramming and assessment of alternatives,” which I think relates to planning and assessing more detailed programs involving immediate community issues, physical and otherwise (perhaps our neighborhood plans and our involvement with the FACE and RAP programs fall into this category). Sedway and Cooke also refer to the function of coordinating the programs of other agencies; the function of compiling and conveying information; incremental decision making on particular issues as they arise; and a line function that includes such things as zoning administration, subdivision approval, design review, and master plan referral. If we add the design and implementation of large-scale urban development projects, we have a reasonably inclusive list of the kinds of activities that might normally engage city planners. All of these activities are important, but all but one—conveying information—are found wanting without some framework within which to function and make recommendations. That framework is the general or master plan. Without it city planners have a much harder time explaining why their ideas and their proposals are preferable to anyone else’s. There were times when I might have argued otherwise, most notably in the early San Francisco months when I was impatient to get on with the action, to respond to the burning issues. But then, that has so often been our way, and we continue to have the same burning issues. Taking the time to decide what we want our communities to be and then acting to achieve those goals seemed more and more worthwhile in San Francisco as time passed. It was a route that proved more practical as well.

The emphasis of city planning upon the physical nature of the city is perfectly reasonable, although no one would deny for a moment that the man-made physical environment should be responsive to people and to social and economic issues and aspirations. Of course, economic well-being and social relationships and services are at least as important as the physical settings within which they get acted out. It is more than reasonable, too, that those concerned with planning the physical environment should have their marching orders determined by social and economic policies that they may not have planned. But this does not make a fundamental orientation to planning the physical environment unimportant or less than socially relevant if it is not so comprehensive as to include within its realm planning for all related matters.

Planning for the physical environment can be responsive to social issues without taking direct, formal responsibility for social planning. It seems to me that when city planners have not planned as well as they might—especially when they have not considered social imperatives and economic realities adequately (to their own everlasting criticism and guilt)—they have too often responded to their failings by extending the scope of their planning.<sup>3</sup> It would have been better to have been more systematic and rigorous in the first

place, including as many relevant factors as possible but still focusing on planning for the urban physical environment—in short, to do better what city planning started out to do.

Ever since I was awarded a degree in city planning from a school that stressed, I thought, the worthiness of comprehensive, long-range physical planning for urban areas, I have heard that whole notion criticized. Repeatedly, I have heard the quality, content, usefulness, and effectiveness of the comprehensive plan challenged, as often as not by those who teach city planning. The critics say that the comprehensive plan is too vague, too subjective, too biased, too specific. It is elitist and divorced from the people, they add, full of end-state visions that are unrelated to the real issues of a dynamic world. Besides, it is impossible to achieve, “pie in the sky.”

There are certainly elements of truth in these assertions. But, in general, they coincide neither with my sense of reality nor with the centrality of the idea. Comprehensive plans have always been policy documents, even if they have not been read that way. They have become less and less end-state, static pictures of the future. They regularly deal with pressing current issues: housing, transportation, jobs, public services, open space, urban design. Often they are prepared concurrently with programs that are geared to their achievement, and some of these are quite innovative. Far from being divorced from the people, comprehensive plans dealing with land use are required and demanded by citizens and elected officials alike. There is no reason that plans cannot be responsive to felt issues in any case. Any planning efforts are remarkable in a society that could never be accused of having a bias toward city planning in the first place, a society that has tended to look at land and urban environments as little more than high-priced consumable commodities. And isn’t it grand that plans are visionary! Why shouldn’t a community have a view, a vision of what it wants to be, and then try to achieve it?

For many years now, since Robert Walker wrote *The Planning Function in Urban Government* in 1941, a growing body of practical wisdom has been calling for city planning to be located in the office of the chief executive: the mayor or the city manager.<sup>4</sup> The federal establishment, increasingly involved in the nuts and bolts of local government, including its city planning, prefers to have city planning located centrally. But I would be very cautious about giving up the semi-autonomous planning commissions. If the objective of city planning is to be able to prepare plans and then to have them carried out, then it is not at all clear to me that such an objective can be most easily achieved by working from within the office of a mayor of a large city.

Most big city mayors are not oriented to planning, especially to long-range city planning. Furthermore, the business and labor interests that are most influential in electing

and supporting big city mayors will not necessarily share the concerns of the planners, particularly when the latter are not hell-bent for maximizing development. Big city mayors and the interests that elect them are more often attuned to quantity of urban development than to quality or to moderation. In the best of circumstances, it is difficult for a mayor to be concerned with the "long run," especially when he or she holds office for four years and is besieged with problems that require immediate answers. There may, of course, be nothing wrong with that state of affairs. City planners should be expected to work with chief executives, as well as with legislators and others, on all kinds of physical development issues. But that need not be done from within the office of the executive. It might even be more difficult from within than from outside. It is possible to advocate a city planning position to the mayor from within that office, but that may be the end of the line if the mayor disagrees. Besides, what is there to lead to a conclusion that city planners will be given critical positions or listened to any more if they are in chief executives' offices than if they are not? Independence is required if city planning recommendations are to be made public as a matter of course.

Considering the always-present demands of the moment that occupied the mayor's office in San Francisco, I cannot imagine that we could have devoted adequate time to long-range plan making had we been a part of that office, certainly not to the extent we did. There would always have been more urgent things to do. Nor can I imagine that the plan elements addressed to housing, urban design, and recreation and open space would have come out the way they did. Long-range plans would have been milder, less far-reaching, more oriented to executive discretion. It would also have been more difficult to advocate their implementation as strongly as we did.

City planning under a commission need not be out of the mainstream of decision making if the commission and the staff choose not to be. There is little to stop them from being involved and responsive to the needs of the city. City planners under a commission can have considerable freedom to innovate and to work for their own plans and those causes they conclude to be consistent with their city planning charge. They can explore ways of implementing plans on their own, yet within the framework of the government that establishes the planning department in the first place. In the beginning, I looked at the commission as a somewhat unnecessary appendage to the city planning staff, as a barrier that prevented us from working directly with the mayor and the Board of Supervisors, with other departments, and with the people themselves. In time, I changed my mind, even when we disagreed most violently and when the commission failed to support the staff on what I felt were critical matters. Commissioners know things about a community that a staff will

never know. Their views are not necessarily elitist, even when they come from the ranks of wealth and power. A commissioner can provide a buffer from the demands of the moment. Perhaps most important, as I have noted elsewhere, city planners under a commission have the freedom to respond to and build a citywide planning constituency as well as separate, issue-oriented coalitions. That can be pretty heady business. Ultimately, it means that the planners' proposals can come before elected officials with considerable force and that they can achieve strong backing, assuming of course that what the planners produce is worthy.

Mayor Alioto was not particularly oriented to city planning. Still, a lot of city planning was accomplished while he was in office. At least I would like to think so. Sometimes, the city planning position held sway, even over the mayor's opposition. As it was, he could have rendered city planning less effective had he wished to. If city planning did well under Mayor Alioto, it can be argued that its achievements were his. Fine. The mayor was benevolent in this regard and tolerated many points of view he did not necessarily share. As a person, I think he should be honored for that. My point, however, is that the opportunity to push strong, controversial points of view is greater—the chance for planning to be effective is greater—if city planning is located out of the mayor's office rather than in it.

Alan Altshuler, speaking of the place of the city planning function in government, said that he had "no doubt that any city can find a timid planning director if it wants, one who will be awed by the barrier that veto-group politics poses to the initiation of new ideas. The difficult problem is to give a bold planning director room in which to maneuver, to encourage him to take the risks of initiating. No administrative set-up can make the role of the initiator easy; all that can be done is to make the risks more bearable to bold men."<sup>25</sup> The words "city planners" might have been substituted for "planning director." I believe the risks are more easily and better taken outside of the mayor's office than in, and that the planning commission is as good a place as any other.

Risk taking and effectiveness aside, there is a more compelling reason to have city planning located outside of a chief executive's offices. It has to do with the whole nature of centrality in government. People ought to have more than one place to go in government to get what they want, to have their grievances redressed, to complain, and to propose ideas. If a mayor won't listen, or won't start or stop something, then perhaps the city council will. Or the courts. The same should hold true at the departmental level. If the department of public works refuses to consider methods to restrict traffic in a residential area, then other arms of government, elected and appointed, ought to be available to people. In San Francisco, the planning department and its commission served that function. It acted as a sounding

board, an advocate, an initiator within government, another place for people to go, including a place to complain about bad planning. By the same token, the city planners could be stopped from getting their way. They might be compelled by others to do things they might not wish to do. But that is a reality they should be willing to live with, while at the same time trying to gain more responsibility and to bring about changes in legislation and in the administrative processes of government that will make planning more effective.

If the San Francisco planning department had been in the mayor's office, people would have had one less avenue through which to pursue their concerns. We would have been forever associated with the chief executive. The people at the federal level who were associated with urban affairs never seemed to understand the beauty and health of decentralized government as they used their considerable leverage to encourage communities to copy their favorite model. It is true that government, and perhaps city planning and development, might have been more efficient if it had been centralized, but I do not believe that the main objective of government is to be efficient. Rather it is to respond to the democratically determined needs of its citizens. Responsiveness is more important than efficiency, and I believe that responsiveness is more easily achieved if the planning department is not part of another office. Moreover, the San Francisco experience shows that city planning and plan implementation can indeed take place without centralized leadership and control.

Throughout this volume, I have stressed the importance of having a highly qualified, trained, and dedicated professional staff with expertise in a number of areas of city planning. That notion bears repeating.

My initial, generally unkind, assessment of the quality of the staff I found was probably overdone. It is all too easy for a new boy in town to forget that people and institutions were there before his arrival (they may not even have been awaiting his arrival) and that they had made important contributions to planning and to urban problem solving. Nonetheless, it was necessary to improve that staff. And it was possible to do so. Despite a perfectly terrible civil service system, we could attract bright, energetic, and skilled professionals, mostly young people. They came—as people like that usually do—because there was a challenge, a feeling that there would be a no-nonsense attack on problems. They saw that they would have a chance to direct their skills and enthusiasm to matters that they considered important. Existing staff, too, can and will respond to new challenges.

It is critical, however, to have some professional skills and knowledge. In the early San Francisco years, there were too many people, fresh from some of the best graduate schools, who responded to questions about their abilities by

speaking of their understanding of the problems of the poor and of the minorities, of their desire to “work with the people.” That was not enough. Those qualities should be everyone's.

As our abilities increased, our successes increased. Our most notable successes—with the master plan elements and the legislation prepared to help carry them out; with the various public programs that were prepared, particularly in housing and open space; and with the day-to-day zoning issues—grew from a systematic approach to the work at hand. We did best when we had staff members with the professional skills we needed. To some extent the specific skills of the staff determined the substantive areas we pursued. But even when the expertise was not at hand—in the areas of seismic safety and noise, for instance—we could still do well, with the aid of consultants. However, we could only work well with consultants if we had people on the staff who could relate the subject in question to land-use planning. We did not do as well as I would have liked in dealing with some ad hoc development proposals, with planning for the northern waterfront, and with planning for industry, because we did not have people with sophisticated knowledge about the economic analysis and fiscal management aspects of city planning. And we were never very good at traffic engineering.

I have always felt somewhat lacking as a professional for not having learned better the “nuts and bolts” of my art and craft. I wished I knew more about analytic techniques, land and market economics, utilities engineering, housing analysis, fiscal management—that I had worked enough with those areas so that they were more a part of me. A city planning director does not get to do very much city planning personally and directly, although that is where the fun is. Still, the planning director ought to know in detail, in regard to a number of substantive areas, what is required. He or she ought to be able to show the way.

These misgivings notwithstanding, we did well in any area involving land-use law and in city planning matters that were related to housing, urban design, recreation and open space, neighborhood planning, information collection and analysis, and graphic communication. In time, our professional expertise was noticed and respected, even if our advice was not always followed. I have no way of knowing for certain, but I suspect that Mayor Alioto's continued tolerance of a city planning staff that often disagreed with him came out of his recognition of its professional quality.

I learned many times how important the dissemination of understandable, untampered with, factual information can be. I am sure, for example, that a major reason for our continuing role in housing was the information that we continually collected and published on that subject. During this same period, the Redevelopment Agency was putting out materials that people often found suspect. People tend to assign

more responsibilities to an agency that gives them reliable information.

So many of the issues that city planners are involved in are like battles. Sometimes we won because of our professional skills, and sometimes we won because of our political acumen. We might not have been in favor of street widenings or turning a two-way street into a one-way street, but in a given situation we ought to have had the analytical skills to determine whether or not such proposals were necessary to move traffic or desirable in terms of their impacts on the lives of people and on activities that bordered the street. Traffic engineering is not so difficult, and analysts like Donald Appleyard have shown how to assess people's responses to traffic.<sup>6</sup> With or without those professional skills, we might also call upon friendly residents to help support our positions.

You never win all the contests and it is unpleasant to lose for whatever reason. But when you win because of your professional skills alone or even in combination with your political abilities, the victory is sweeter. When the *only* thing that stops the street from getting widened is your ability to "call out the troops," that is, your political skills, that is not a very good victory. It is a little bit shameful. The planning commission, the mayor, or the city council could as well hire anyone else; they don't need a city planner.

Certainly I was involved in the politics of city planning. Every city planner is. Overall, however, the best "politics" is top professional work, forcefully presented and defended.

It will come as no surprise that I believe city planners ought to have points of view and that they should be prepared to go to bat for them. They ought to have something to say about the quality of the urban environments they are involved in shaping. Being top-notch technicians is important, but it is not enough.

City planners should not be neutral, and I do not believe their clients, at the level of local government, expect them to be without values or opinions. After they have arrived at some position, some point of view, some desired direction, one would hope to see it reflected in both public plans and day-to-day recommendations. Why hide it? Further, city planners should be willing to stand up for their points of view if they want to be effective. They should be prepared to "mix it up." They must do more than recommend. Within a democratic process they should advocate and search for ways to carry out their plans. I believe, too, that they should value and nurture their utopian predilections. They are nothing to be ashamed of. I do not believe we have done these things enough. We have tended to be meek.

I am not suggesting for one minute that city planners do battle with every person with whom they disagree or with

every interest that is different than theirs. Nor am I suggesting that every matter that comes up has a right and wrong side for the planners. Some matters have reasonable alternatives, not just one answer. Some will come out all right no matter what point of view prevails. In any event, the planners must do an honest job of evaluating various courses of action, and they must make their evaluations public. However, I am suggesting that there are many matters that do have right and wrong sides for planners and that when this is the case they should be prepared for conflicts even with those interests they might wish most to serve. My experience with city planning in San Francisco indicates that everyone—elected and appointed officials, interest groups, and residents—appreciates, respects, and responds positively to strong advocacy, even if there is not always agreement with what is being proposed. I doubt that people in other places are that much different from San Franciscans in this respect.

The client, that is whoever literally or figuratively signs the city planner's paycheck, should have the right to fire the planner. The city planner would do well to have his or her bags packed. The worst losses are in battles that were never fought. We have points of view related to the way cities should be built and about the ways they should function. We might as well state them.

Planning cities can be a frustrating business. I do not think that Americans like cities very much. Planning them may be alien to our predispositions and to our habits. In the past, we could always move away from what we didn't like. Since we were a land of plenty, we did not have to plan. We have been more concerned with quantity than with quality. My observation is that when "how much" is in conflict with "what kind," the quantity bag men usually win. We see a continuous rush to bigness, but it may be a losing bargain. Private property rights and a growth-for-its-own-sake mentality have, for so many major American cities, produced a development cycle that results in ever increasing intensities of land use—from rural to urban, urban to more urban—until we leave these cities or tear down large sections and start over.

Our patience for solving urban problems is short, and we get new problems before we have a chance to solve the old ones. Nothing, it seems, will stand still long enough for us to get a handle on it or to find a lasting solution. Victory today, over the wrong thing in the wrong place, does not ensure that the same battle will not have to be fought tomorrow or the next day.

Many of the problems that cities and their planners are asked to deal with require larger than local solutions. They have to be resolved at a metropolitan, regional, or larger scale, we think. Alfred Heller, longtime president of the conservationist and planning-oriented California Tomorrow, has said

that for big cities like San Francisco, “all the major development decisions were made decades ago; and that all that is left today is to tinker with the remains by making ‘urban design’ rules.”<sup>7</sup> But if he is right, then what are so many local people concerned about, and wouldn’t the same thing be true at the state and regional level? In any case, the governmental structure to do effective city planning at a larger than city scale rarely exists. Besides, are the city planners (like the local people they represent) really sure they want to give planning powers to some super government? Can those fellows really be trusted? At the same time, people at the neighborhood or district scale think that theirs is the level at which to do city planning and to guide and control urban development. The city planner may have a hard time meshing neighborhood concerns with citywide plans and regional interests.

There is seldom enough time, or people, or information, or tools at the city planners’ disposal to prepare the kinds of plans and implementing programs they would like. Often the tools and programs they do devise, such as zoning or urban redevelopment, get misused. There is never enough money (and the city planners rarely control its use in any case). City planners don’t usually build things or run programs by themselves. They are always trying to get others to do what they want, and people are reluctant, if not ornery. More and more, it seems that someone from the federal or state government knows your business better than you and is telling you how to do it. (And will they cop out on you when the going gets tough? Better not to depend on them.) Just when you think you know your craft, your art, and what it will take to solve a problem and to plan for the future, there is yet another hurdle.

City planners may have a hard time knowing when they have been successful. It is hard to know what constitutes a good batting average. Very seldom does all of a plan get carried out. In many cities, success is measured by what happens, by what gets done, by what is accomplished. We are accustomed to thinking that way, but sometimes it is better to measure success by what does not happen. Any number of variations are possible and city planners, as well as their clients, may have a hard time identifying success when they see it. Success depends upon many variables—timing, people, laws, economics, you name it—and few of them are controlled by the city planner.

Nevertheless, the city is where the action is. It is the first line of government for most people. They feel their problems and frustrations where they live and work, and it is in their communities where people state their expectations and lodge their complaints. It is possible to do planning in cities within a context of specific faces and names as well as of places and things. It is possible to relate abstract policies

and plans and programs to tangible experiences. The city planner can feel and experience what he is dealing with.

Even if city planners rarely design or build anything directly or operate a program, they can, working at the city level, have an impact on the environment. They can help a community decide what it wants to be and then help to achieve that future. They can see their successes and their failures, even those successes that are represented by something that did not happen.

The impact of local city planning may be more than local. When the solutions that are developed are truly innovative, they may be adopted and used elsewhere. But perhaps the most satisfying plans are the ones that respond purely to local needs and circumstances, those not required or mandated by any other level of government. Similarly, the best programs are the ones that are developed locally and carried out with local resources—because the community wants and endorses them for their own sake—not because of the availability of funds or aid programs, often illusory anyway, from some other level of government.

Certainly, there are frustrations. But if after many years you end up with one small park that might not have existed otherwise, one major piece of legislation, or one program that allows people to fix up their homes or live in sound and fairly priced housing in neighborhoods they enjoy, then the satisfactions can be very great. Such achievements will always be small in relation to the need. But there is always the chance of ending up with many parks and open spaces, a full transit system, a whole city of neighborhoods of well-maintained housing at prices that people can afford, and a host of facilities and services that together make a city what it can be. Those are very high stakes indeed.

## Notes

---

1. T.J. Kent, Jr., *The Urban General Plan*, Chandler Publishing Co., San Francisco, CA, 1964 (reprinted by the American Planning Association, APA Planners Press, Chicago, IL, 1990).

2. Paul Sedway and Thomas Cooke, *Land and the Environment: Planning in California Today*, William Kaufmann, Inc., Los Altos, CA, p. 139: 1975.

3. For an example of where city planning has gone and is going, see “National Policies for Planning,” American Institute of Planners, revised draft, June 15, 1977, part I, pp. 1-3, on “The Role of Planning.” This document, in its definition of planning, leaves considerable doubt as to whether planning has any roots at all in the physical environment or any particular relationship to urban areas. It is more concerned with government and “the planning process” than with the substance or focus of planning. Its only reference to the planning commission is in a historical sense,

not as a desirable place to do city planning. A skeptic, observing the direction city planning has taken in the late 1970s, might say that since the definition of the field has become so broad that it includes all planning, for everyone, and that since everyone plans in one way or another, then everyone is a planner. That skeptic might well ask why a special planning organization or society should exist at all. (The final version of this document was adopted in October 1977 and released in 1978 under the title *AIP Planning Policies*.)

4. Robert A. Walker, *The Planning Function in Urban Government*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1941.

5. Alan A. Altshuler, *The City Planning Process; A Political Analysis*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, pp. 390-91: 1965.

6. For example, see Donald Appleyard and Mark Lintell, "The Environmental Quality of City Streets: The Residents' Viewpoint," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, March 1972. Also see San Francisco Department of City Planning (Donald Appleyard, consultant), *Street Livability Study*, June 1970.

7. Alfred Heller, "To Plan or Not to Plan," *San Francisco Bay Guardian*, April 14, 1977.

