

Abstract

This paper distinguishes between "subarea planning" in which central planning agencies deconcentrate facilities or functions to subareas, and "neighborhood planning" in which community residents and organizations develop plans and programs for themselves. This distinction is overdue and not trivial, for little of the growing discussion of neighborhoods carefully discriminates among alternative meanings. Yet each type of planning has different ends, and much of what passes today as neighborhood planning is actually subarea planning in disguise. This paper draws on a review of research and practice on planning in neighborhoods concerned with housing rehabilitation, economic development, physical improvement, and social services. It analyzes each type of planning, its objectives and methods, major participants and obstacles, and impacts and factors influencing practice. It concludes that these are distinct movements important to separate, each motivated by distinct ends and values, each implying distinct roles for planners, planning, and planning education and research.

Introduction

This paper distinguishes between two types of planning in neighborhoods: "subarea planning" in which central planning agencies deconcentrate facilities or functions to subareas, and "neighborhood planning" in which community residents develop plans and programs for themselves. This distinction is overdue and not trivial. Little of the growing discussion of neighborhoods draws this distinction or carefully discriminates among alternative meanings and objectives. Yet each type of planning has its own ends, and much of what passes today as neighborhood planning is subarea planning in disguise.

This exercise also has implications for planning research and education. Although many American planners trace their historical roots to the neighborhoods, planning in neighborhoods remains a relatively undeveloped area of professional specialization. As a result, there is a tendency to accept either widely varying or singular

notions of planning in neighborhoods which embrace all forms of practice. This can be a source of confusion to those who study or teach about planning in neighborhoods. My aim here is to contribute to a greater measure of clarity in conceptualizing domains of practice in the field. I believe that such clarification could help reduce confusion, sharpen the research and action agenda, and make the whole enterprise more purposeful.

Subarea Planning

Subarea planning is an episode in the history of municipal government reform. This history is not new, although the current episode can be traced to citizen participation movements in the 1960s. This demand originated with the organized actions and protests of minorities and then spread throughout the society. The once-held image of Americans as apathetic gave way under a stampede of civil rights movements, consumer coalitions, neighborhood associations, and other citizen organizations.

Government agencies were frequently the target of these actions. Public confidence in government declined drastically. One study found more than half of those Americans surveyed were "alienated and disenchanting, feeling profoundly impotent to influence the actions of their leaders" (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations 1974, p. 17). Most of these people expressed potential to become active in government if the means were available and they could have impact. Without such assurances, however, the growing belief was that independent citizen organizations and local units were more effective than government in solving problems and getting things done. Government itself was perceived as "vast, remote, inaccessible" (Dahl 1970, p. 98).

Several advisory commissions recommended reforms to narrow the gap between officials and citizens. Some turned toward the neighborhoods. One commission advocated neighborhood subunits with elected councils, another little city halls with decentralized services, and another metropolitan government with neighborhood districts (Advisory Commis-

sion on Intergovernmental Relations 1972; National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 1968; Committee for Economic Development 1966, 1970). One President advocated "creative federalism" involving neighborhood groups in social planning, another "new partnership" with neighborhoods, government, and business as partners in development.

Government agencies responded with official programs to expand participation in local subareas. Between 1968 and 1976 there were over 25 hearings in Congress focusing on the need for greater participation, and participation became part of most federal domestic programs. For example, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 promised to provide residents with "adequate opportunity to participate in the planning, implementation, and assessment of the program," and was interpreted to include subarea programs in addition to traditional public hearings and citizen advisory boards. American city governments developed a wide range of participation structures and methods. Nearly one in three cities adopted some method of decentralization, two in three some type of citizen committee to advise city hall (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations 1972, 1979).

City planning agencies shared in this movement for reform. Traditional planning had come under attack from citizens frustrated by unsolved social problems and organized to oppose planning programs perceived as intrusive or unresponsive to local needs (Hartman 1975; Fellman 1973; Katznelson 1981; Mollenkopf 1975). Planning agencies responded with programs to involve subarea residents in developing plans. For example, San Diego assigned planners to prepare subarea plans for land use, circulation, open space and community facilities. Fort Worth assigned planners to organize subarea councils and propose plans to citywide bodies for approval and use in developing overall programs. Pittsburgh assigned planners to represent districts in community development block grant programs. They operated out of the agency's downtown office, but attended evening meetings in their districts (Hallman 1976). Needleman and Needleman (1974, p. 25) studied several cities and documented "the opening of

city planning to citizen participation on a decentralized basis. Planning departments in a number of major cities have undertaken programs in this innovative type of planning, for the first time encouraging citizens to take a direct and active role in shaping the planned development of their own neighborhoods."

Today, subarea planning operates in agencies across the nation. There has been no systematic study of the scope of the field, but there is an obvious proliferation of programs. For example, Raleigh, North Carolina planners have formed 18 neighborhood groups to discuss local problems, react to city proposals, and design self-help projects. Baltimore planners have drafted neighborhood social development plans to examine problems, define goals, set priorities, and initiate actions. Portland, Oregon planners have worked with 63 associations formed to represent 71 neighborhoods through seven district boards. Seattle planners have circulated ballots to neighborhood residents who vote on alternative improvement for their communities.

Subarea planning is usually initiated by municipal officials. The mayor, planning director, or another official proposes the idea; planning commissioners consider and endorse the proposal; city councilors adopt an ordinance and direct the planning agency to implement the program. For example, Atlanta city councilors adopted an ordinance to create 24 subarea planning units. Planners work with citizens to prepare subarea plans for approval and incorporation into the comprehensive plan and city budget. They also assist a city-wide advisory board to educate subarea representatives, disseminate information about municipal concerns, and increase communications among residents and officials (Atlanta Department of Planning 1973; Hallman 1976; Hutcheson 1981; Rohe and Gates 1981).

Subarea planning may follow steps of rational planning. One guide instructs planners to establish a subarea committee, assess community conditions, set goals, and propose plans to higher bodies for implementation (St. Paul Department of Planning and Economic Development 1981). Another instructs planners to define boundaries, select block representatives, prepare social surveys and land use maps,

formulate goals and submit alternative plans for review and implementation as part of the general plan (Boulder Department of Community Development n.d.). Yet another instructs them to inventory local conditions, set goals and priorities, and submit plans to municipal agencies to assure compatibility with city policies (Baltimore City Planning Commission n.d.).

Subarea planning may produce written plans. Some plans are comprehensive, as in Seattle and Denver where they include descriptions of history and population; analyses of community assets and problems; elements including population, housing, historic preservation, land use, and transportation; and recommendations for development (Werth and Bryant 1979). Other plans are problem focused, as in Portland, Oregon where they focus on housing rehabilitation and controlled growth (Portland Bureau of Planning 1975a), or on redevelopment of a single avenue (Portland Bureau of Planning 1975c), or on land use and zoning in a mixed residential district near the center of the city (Portland Bureau of Planning 1975b). These are not Master Plans, but are in that tradition.

Subarea plans can help fulfill minimal requirements for citizen participation in federal funding programs, provide information for incorporation into comprehensive plans, or enable review of proposed local changes. In Atlanta they "help blend changes in the neighborhood in the comprehensive planning process" (Atlanta Department of Planning 1973, n.p.); in St. Paul they "help citizens become involved in the unified capital improvement program and budgeting process" (St. Paul Department of Planning and Economic Development 1981, p. 1); and in Boulder they "become leverage in requesting neighborhood improvement projects for inclusion in the city's annual program" (Boulder Department of Community Development n.d., p. 2). Another use is to show municipal concern and provide public relations for city government: "Baltimore is committed to providing necessary

improvements, facilities, and services to sustain and strengthen neighborhoods" (Baltimore City Planning Commission n.d., n.p.). Yet another use is to boost the image of a city as a place of good neighborhoods: "Boston is its neighborhoods" (Boston Office of Program Development 1978, p. 8).

Subarea planners are municipal employees assigned to local areas. The American Planning Association describes this role in *A Guide to Neighborhood Planning* (hereafter *APA Guide*), which "takes the planner from the point of entry through the completion of the plan" (Werth and Bryant 1979, p. 1). It describes the planner as "a resource for both the neighborhood and the city planning agency," who can provide "the directions and skills of a professional planner with specialized training . . . (and) relevant data from the city department files, maps and surveys, and explanations of the city's policies and procedures," and who can "know the personalities of the neighborhood's leaders, how various segments of the neighborhood interact, and the condition or character of the neighborhood. This knowledge can be invaluable to the central planning office in its day-to-day work of reviewing zoning changes and budget proposals, putting together citywide plans, and dealing with citizen complaints" (p. 2). It anticipates conflict between neighborhood and city allegiances, warns against showing partisanship or getting caught between competing interests, and reaffirms responsibility of the planner to city government: "Obviously, as a city employee, the neighborhood planner is accountable to the planning agency in the same way any other employee is" (p. 2).

Subarea planners recognize the importance of citizen participation. But the measure of effectiveness is not that citizens exercise power in planning, but rather that public input is solicited and contributes to a decision that is supported by residents. "After the planner has gathered background information about the neighborhood in the office, the next step is developing citizen interest and participation in the planning process," continues the *APA Guide* (p. 10). It advises the planner to prepare an agenda for a public meeting to introduce the city's program, present an overview of the subarea,

and lead discussion of goals for an official plan. It provides practical advice to run meetings: "Make sure all of your department's guidelines or rules are right up front from the beginning;" "use examples that are personal to them;" "do not come on too strong;" "don't hide behind jargon of what you do at the office;" "don't try to razzle-dazzle them;" and "be careful that your style is not inadvertently insulting or inappropriate for residents" (p. 15). It advises planners to bring citizens "back to the point if they stray blindly from the subject at hand," deflect complaints until they "take care of the planning business first;" and listen carefully to all concerns: "Even the most seemingly irrelevant complaint may sometimes point to a fundamental need in the neighborhood. It might take a while to convince people that the plan is *their* plan. As many neighborhood planners reported, although people may be uneducated, it does not mean that they don't know what they want" (p. 15).

Subarea planners also recognize the importance of community organization. In some cities, they work with established groups that meet agency criteria. For example, St. Paul planners recognize groups which demonstrate "that a broadly representative community organization has been developed through an open process" (St. Paul Department of Planning and Economic Development 1981, p. 4). Salem, Oregon planners recognize groups which are "firmly established," have "broad based support" and "a regular method of communication with neighborhood residents, businesses, and absentee property owners," and show "basic understanding of key functions in city government, including the structure, role, responsibilities of city council, city departments, citizens advisory bodies, and city policies relating to planning including the area comprehensive plan, growth and transportation study plans, and urban renewal plans" (Salem Department of Community Development 1975, p. 6f).

In other cities, planners from subarea planning councils that represent citizens "to assure the smooth development of the plan as well as to provide a fair basis for its implementation" (Werth and Bryant 1979, p. 16). The *APA Guide* advises planners to involve representatives in committees "to assume a leading role in resolving

conflicts between the neighborhood and the city's plans, putting pressure on city agencies to fund the plan proposals, and serving as a general lobbying group for the neighborhood" (p. 21). It warns against "members who tend to dominate meetings and seek to channel discussion toward a favorite pet issue or area of expertise. Such problems can best be handled by keeping personal feelings out of the picture and reminding the committee of the broader scope of the planning process" (p. 21).

Subarea councils serve several functions. Hutcheson (1981) finds that they make city councilors more aware of community organizations. Pederson (1974, 1976) finds that they improve communications among citizens and officials. Rohe and Gates (1981) find that they educate citizens about planning issues, develop community cohesion and leadership, and improve neighborhood conditions and services. Elsewhere, Checkoway (1981) analyzes councils that implement plans through project review, education, and advocacy; recruit volunteers and develop leadership skills; and maintain subarea offices which enhance discussion of local concerns.

Subarea councils also can engender community controversy. Some councils are unrepresentative of the area population, frustrate citizens rather than activate them, or antagonize those they are supposed to serve. In New York City, for example, councils and boards were established to increase participation and improve service delivery. But some residents protested elite representation on councils, drafted alternative plans to oppose corporate construction and institutional expansion, and sought guarantees for low income housing and community control. Planners responded by involving residents in technical planning procedures. Today these councils operate as resource centers and intermediaries between subareas and city hall. They tend to serve administrative ends and residents are largely unaware of them (Baldwin 1982; Barton *et al.* 1977; Weber 1976; Zimmerman 1979).

Some subarea councils provide an organizing vehicle for community residents. For example, consumers in Illinois organized around a lack of effective participation in a subarea health planning council. They recruited a large number of new members, enlisted candidates to run for the council, and won a majority of seats. Local providers organized in response to these initiatives, elected their own slate by a wide margin, and caused consumers to reconsider their participation. Subarea planning gave consumers an organizational start, although this was an unanticipated consequence and providers recaptured control nonetheless (Checkoway 1982; Checkoway and Doyle 1980).

In working with subarea councils, however, planners are not community organizers concerned with political action. On the contrary, the *APA Guide* warns that "this kind of community organization is seldom undertaken by government employees and is frequently viewed with hostility by city agencies. Planners would be unwise to adopt the Alinsky approach. Not only do they jeopardize their jobs by involving their programs and agencies in controversy, but, more important, they jeopardize their nonpartisan role as link between the neighborhood and city agencies" (Werth and Bryant, p. 16). Planners thus involve citizens to facilitate plan development and implementation, not to build strong local organizations or to transfer power to neighborhood residents.

It is no surprise that this is the case. Planners emphasize administrative values of economy, efficiency, and control, and these may be the antithesis of participation and planning in subareas (Aleshire 1972; Baum 1980; Friedmann 1973; Steckler and Herzog 1979). They favor reforms that are not disruptive of program management, and oppose measures which would transfer power to local territorial or functional units. They perceive citizen participation to cause delays in action, to expand the number and intensity of conflicts, and to increase the costs of operations (Checkoway and Van Til 1978). Planners who advocate subarea priorities may experience administrative controls and professional tensions which prove fatal to them in the agency (Baum 1983; Forester 1982; Lipsky 1973; Needleman and Needleman 1974).

Subarea planning is not neighborhood planning in which community residents plan for themselves, but an approach in which central planning agencies deconcentrate facilities or functions to subareas. It is not decentralization, but a new form of centralization.

Neighborhood Planning

Neighborhood planning is an episode in the history of community self-determination in large cities. In the 1960s this took the form of citizen protest, often by low income blacks in urban ghetto areas in reaction to federal programs. Some organized around the bulldozers of urban renewal, others the routes of proposed expressways, yet others the intrusion of large institutions into nearby areas. These actions helped individuals to recognize common problems, join together, and build organizations (Hartman 1975; Fellman 1973; Lamb 1975; Lancourt 1979; Mollenkopf 1975; Piven and Cloward 1977).

In the 1970s working class whites in older urban neighborhoods took lessons from their black counterparts and organized around private and public institutions whose practices contributed to decline. Their issues included housing rehabilitation, community revitalization, physical improvement, social services, health and safety, and community empowerment. Some applied high visibility tactics and caused changes in established institutional practices. For example, neighborhood groups pressured Illinois legislators to enact an anti-redlining law to prohibit institutions from denying property loans because of geographic location, and stimulated similar actions in other states (Boyte 1981; Cassidy 1980; Goering 1979; Naparstek and Cincotta 1976; National Commission on Neighborhoods 1979; Perlman 1978; Rosenbloom 1979).

Neighborhood groups have increased in number and capacity. By 1980, the National Commission of Neighborhoods had identified more than 8,000 neighborhood organizations in the United States; the federal Office of Neighborhoods, Voluntary Associations, and Consumers Affairs had identified nearly 15,000 citizen groups concerned with neighborhood problems; and

the U.S. Office of Consumer Affairs had presented case accounts of almost 100 leading local groups working to activate citizens and meet local needs. These groups have diverse origins and encompass a wide range of activities.

These groups also have built coalitions and support networks which help formulate strategies, train leaders, and provide assistance. For example, the Center for Community Change assists poor and minority groups involved in housing rehabilitation and neighborhood reinvestment; the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs helps urban ethnic groups involved in community development and commercial revitalization; the National Training and Information Center trains neighborhood workers in enforcing compliance with federal housing programs; and the National Association of Neighborhoods lobbies for legislation and promotes decentralization.

Today, some groups have grown to a stage where they develop plans and programs for themselves. In Chicago, for example, residents formed a temporary organization to protest university expansion, slum landlords and merchants, and segregated schools. They convened a congress of more than 1200 people representing 97 community groups to form The Woodlawn Organization (TWO). They formulated plans in reaction to official city plans for the area; proposed an educational park of four schools on a common campus; worked to eliminate a skid row on a main local thoroughfare; and developed an experimental school project using the neighborhood as an educational research center. Since then TWO has produced low-income housing developments, a comprehensive mental health care facility, a supermarket, security patrols, a theater, a management corporation, and a community development corporation to coordinate overall strategy for the neighborhood (Brazier 1969; Fish 1973; Lancourt 1979).

In St. Louis, residents reacted to a federal antipoverty program which misrepresented the community and to a proposed urban renewal project which threatened massive neighborhood demolition. They formed Jeff-Vander-Lou (JVL), an independent organization emphasizing housing, community development, education, social services, and other objectives. They adopted bylaws that provided for community representation, drafted proposals, enlisted support, and began their first project. Since then JVL has built and rehabilitated housing, generated capital development, operated social services, attracted new industry and jobs, and formulated plans to boost the local economy. They have increased awareness of neighborhood issues, developed leadership, and produced results (Checkoway forthcoming).

TWO and JVL are exceptional neighborhood planning organizations, but they are not alone in the field. For example, Inquilinos Boricuas en Action in Boston has rehabilitated houses formerly slated for demolition, developed housing for the elderly, and completed a community cultural plaza. Tri City Citizens Union for Progress in Newark has rehabilitated housing, operated adult employment training services, established day care and community health programs, and provided outreach counseling and referral services. Voice of the People in Chicago has bought apartments from absentee landlords, renovated and rented them to low income residents, and helped tenants organize and manage buildings. Communities Organized for Public Services in San Antonio has won a bond issue to fund storm drainage improvements, received federal funds for community projects, and established block clubs which have installed stoplights, removed trash, built pedestrian bridges over railroad tracks, and discouraged junk dealers from locating in poor neighborhoods. Chinatown Neighborhood Improvement in San Francisco has converted a YMCA residence to senior housing, established a nonprofit housing corporation, and made improvements in the business district.

Some neighborhood planning organizations originate in reaction to crises and confrontations. Protest is often a neighborhood's first weapon and source of victories. Over time, however, residents may decide that it is a strategic mistake to react

to crises without an independent agenda of their own. This decision can help them to broaden their issues and formulate new plans (Checkoway forthcoming; Lancourt 1979). Other organizations originate when residents decide to redevelop their community. Initial goals may aim "to develop an active, integrated, desirable neighborhood where residents live in harmony and with pride," or "to assure that the community has a capacity to initiate development on as independent a basis as possible," or "to strive for justice and accountability in all areas pertaining to a healthy wholesome environment" (National Commission on Neighborhoods 1979).

Neighborhood planning operates in an imbalanced political arena (Ahlbrandt and Brophy 1975; Boyer 1973; Cassidy 1980; Clay 1979; Downie 1974; Gans 1962; Hartman 1975; Marciniak 1977; National Commission on Neighborhoods 1979; National Training and Information Center 1976; Stone 1976). Outside economic interests—including some landlords, real estate agents, financial institutions, and commercial establishments are more likely to mobilize resources around development and planning than are unorganized neighborhood residents. Individual residents tend to face the neighborhood alone, know little about it as a planning unit, or hesitate to "intrude" in areas that involve concentrated power. In the absence of special circumstances, the key decisions which affect local communities are often made outside them.

Neighborhood planning thus can be viewed as a process of political development. Cohen (1979) describes a five stage model in which neighborhood planning develops countervailing power. First, the neighborhood is unorganized and fragmented; then primary institutions bring individuals together to share common concerns and accomplish limited objectives; then citizens organize to deal with housing and other issues; then the organization recruits members, builds support, and becomes a political entity of substance and power; and finally the organization represents the entire neighborhood, widens the range of issues, and delivers programs and services affecting all aspects of social and political life. Organization serves to mobilize individuals, develop a program, and generate power. It is often

only after individuals organize that they develop programs to meet neighborhood needs (Schoenburg and Rosenbaum 1980).

Neighborhood planning can also be viewed as a process of community development. It may involve steps to identify neighborhood problems and issues; formulate goals and objectives; collect and analyze data; and develop and implement plans. But it may also involve efforts to sweep the streets, knock on doors, pack a public hearing, and confront the power-holders. It is not a one-time process to produce a singular plan, but a continuous and multifaceted process to develop capacity. It is not a form of mandated participation in which citizens provide input to plans developed elsewhere, or of advocacy planning in which advocates develop plans to serve local interests, but of community development in which people strengthen themselves as well as their communities.

Neighborhood planning organizations may produce written plans. These plans generally are not comprehensive but sectoral, not long-range but immediate, not a series of colored designs describing an ideal future but a statement of practical problems and community-based strategy searching for resources. They may be the first such statement of strategy, in the words of those who live there and know it best. They may proclaim that residents have taken account of themselves and know where they want to go, even if they have little idea of how to get there and how long it might take.

Neighborhood planning organizations can benefit from preparing a plan. The process can help residents articulate goals in systematic fashion, describe problems and causes, analyze alternatives for revitalization, and build a foundation for implementation. The plan can also help legitimate an organization. One Chicago organization was already well-known and respected outside the neighborhood when they decided to draft a plan. The availability of an attractive, technically proficient product helped confirm its image among constituents and provide legitimacy among funding sources (Checkoway and Cahill 1981).

But the process of preparing a neighborhood plan can also have disadvantages. It can divert residents from direct action, focus them on narrow issues rather than the whole social picture, and absorb them in written drafts when other actions might be more powerful (Piven 1970; Piven and Cloward 1977). Mayer and Blake (1980) find that the preparation of plans is among the least useful activities undertaken by neighborhood organizations, because such plans can relate poorly to daily concerns, create delays, and frustrate supporters. They find that more useful is a process involving ongoing discussions among key participants, resourcefulness in moving forward from broad strategy to action, and ability to recognize opportunities and generate one project from another. Neighborhood planning is not plan preparation alone.

Neighborhood planners combine diverse roles and skills. Some operate as technical experts to conduct research on community problems and complete steps in project planning and implementation. Others operate as organizers to bring citizens together and generate support for programs. Yet others operate as publicists to expand awareness of community issues, or as educators to develop leaders who stand up for the neighborhood. Neighborhood planners often have roving agendas (Henderson and Thomas 1980; Mayer and Blake 1980).

Neighborhood planners face problems unfamiliar to traditional planners. When should an organization move from protest to program? Where are the leaders to command a following? What will convince outsiders of local capacity to complete projects? What tactics activate residents without alienating allies and funding sources? How can planners give individuals a sense of the power to participate? These problems are different from those faced by most planners.

There are many obstacles to planning in neighborhoods. It is difficult to plan around neighborhood issues when individuals operate in isolation, or accept the notion of outside control over local development, or show little support for neighborhood public intervention. Several studies document the pattern in which private institutions disinvest from neighbor-

hoods in favor of other locations, and in which public institutions disinvest from an area by reducing service levels. The result is typically a downgrading cycle of inadequate services, deteriorated infrastructure, and withdrawal of people and institutions (Clay 1979; Cohen 1979; Naparstek and Cincotta 1976). Those who remain are often left with poor housing, health care, education, and declining quality of life. It is no surprise that many residents suffer a crisis of confidence and symptoms of alienation from a situation in which they have been displaced.

Despite obstacles, there are neighborhood planning organizations which show exceptional success. Mayer and Blake (1980) analyze such organizations and find common "stages of development" among them. Each has formally incorporated itself, developed competence in specific projects and expanded competence into other areas. Each also has developed effective leadership and staff, attracted involvement and support from community groups and outside actors, and dealt with the economic, social, and political environment.

Yet even exceptional neighborhood planning organizations have difficulties influencing the larger context in which they operate. Such organizations show that citizens can take hold of their surroundings without outside officials telling them what they need; handle local problems without harmful effects of federal intervention; and improve their communities when they determine plans and programs for themselves. But even the most accomplished organizations are unable to reverse citywide decline. Neighborhood problems result from decisions and institutions that operate largely outside the neighborhood, and the consequences flow from that process. To alter the consequences, it would be necessary to alter the process.

Toward a Synthesis? Implications for Research and Education

Some may think it useful to attempt a synthesis of these two types of planning in neighborhoods, but I believe it more useful to distinguish between them and develop the agenda of each. There is no single notion of planning in neighborhoods which embraces all forms of practice. Subarea planning and neighborhood planning are separate movements, each motivated by its own ends and values, each in its own early stage of development. In the formation of fields such as these, it is more important to develop what is unique to each rather than to attempt a grand embracing conception. Subarea planners are not neighborhood planners, and their roles will likely remain distinct in the future. The two approaches could possibly be used together in mutually reinforcing ways, but at present such an effort is probably not worth the investment.

More research is needed on each type of planning. What do we know about subarea planning? There is need to sort through the fragmented accounts of practice, draw from them general propositions that represent areas of agreement among researchers and practitioners, and indicate unanswered or remaining questions. What is the scope and quality of subarea planning? There is need for a comprehensive, systematic survey of planning agencies on a national scale to inventory the objectives and methods in use, identify major participants and obstacles, and analyze impacts and factors influencing practice. What are the innovative or exemplary methods in use? This study would analyze agencies that employ such methods, and draw lessons for adoption from one area to another.

What do we know about neighborhood planning? There is need for in-depth empirical case studies of neighborhood planning in practice. Recent studies provide brief accounts of individual initiatives, but stop short of systematic analysis (Boyte 1980; Goering 1979; National Commission on Neighborhoods, 1979; Perlman 1978; U.S. Office of Consumer Affairs 1980). There is also need to use empirical materials to build a conceptual base for further analysis. How do neighborhood planning

organizations diagnose local conditions, set goals and priorities, find and make leaders, form and build organizations, formulate strategies and action plans, and mobilize resources or implementation? There also is need to develop an action theory based on neighborhood practice, although recent work takes steps toward such theory (Henderson and Thomas 1980). Other work, comprised largely of mimeographed papers by community practitioners, is considerable but restricted in circulation (Booth 1977; Miller n.d.; Trapp 1976). Neighborhood planning has reached a point where practitioners require firmer guidance and clarity to extend understanding.

Planning curricula have not emphasized planning in neighborhoods. It is ironic that this is the case, for neighborhoods are important in the history of American planning. But curricula tend to focus on comprehensive urban systems, not community subareas or neighborhoods. Curricula that do include neighborhoods tend to focus on subarea planning, not neighborhood planning. Other professions have a tradition of planning in neighborhoods, but planning educators have largely ignored their work (Cox, *et al.* 1974; Kramer and Specht 1969; Lauffer and Newman 1981). Yet this is a vital area for planning education, surely as vital as urban design, land use, regional development, and transportation planning. No matter how much planners increase knowledge and skills in serving those who dominate downtown skylines and city hall, if there is no parallel concern with planning in neighborhoods, then it is at risk to the people who live there.

References

- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. 1979. *Citizen Participation in the American Federal System*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- _____. 1972. *The New Grass Roots Government?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ahlbrandt, R.S. and Brophy, P.C. 1975. *Neighborhood Revitalization*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Aleshire, R.A. 1972. Power to the People: An Assessment of the Community Action Model Cities Experience. *Public Administration Review*. 32:428-44.
- Atlanta Department of Planning. 1973. Atlanta's Comprehensive Plan—The Value of Neighborhood Planning. Atlanta: Department of Planning.
- Baldwin, S. 1982. Community Boards in the Buffer Zone. *City Limits*. 12:13-16.
- Baltimore City Planning Commission. n.d. The Neighborhood Social Development Plan. Baltimore: Baltimore City Planning Commission.
- Barton, A.H., et al. 1977. *Decentralizing City Government: An Evaluation of the New York City District Manager Experiment*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Baum, H.S. 1983. *Planners and Public Expectations*. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Booth, H. 1977. *Direct Action Organizing*. Chicago: The Midwest Academy.
- Boston Office of Program Development. 1978. Living in Boston: A Guide to Boston and Its Neighborhoods for People Interested in City Living. Boston: Office of Program Development.
- Boulder Department of Community Development. n.d. Guide to Neighborhood Planning. Boulder: Department of Community Development.
- Boyer, B.C. 1973. *Cities Destroyed for Cash: The FHA Scandal at HUD*. Chicago: Follet Publishing Company.
- Boyte, H. 1980. *The Backyard Revolution: Understanding the New Citizen Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Brazier, A.M. 1969. *Black Self-Determination: The Story of the Woodlawn Organization*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Herdman Publishing Co.
- Cassidy, R. 1980. *Livable Cities: A Grass-Roots Guide to Rebuilding Urban America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Checkoway, B. 1982. The Empire Strikes Back: More Community Organizing Lessons for Health Care Consumers. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*. 7:111-124.
- _____. 1981. Innovative Citizen Participation in Health Planning Agencies. In *Citizens and Health Participation and Planning for Social Change*, ed. B. Checkoway. New York: Pergamon Press.
- _____. Forthcoming. Revitalizing an Urban Neighborhood: A St. Louis Case Study. In *The Metropolitan Midwest: Policy Problems and Prospects for Change*, eds., B. Checkoway and C.V. Patton. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Checkoway, B. and Cahill, W.D. 1981. Student Workshops and Neighborhood Revitalization. *Alternative Higher Education*. 6:96-110.
- Checkoway, B. and Doyle, M. 1980. Community Organizing Lessons for Health Care Consumers. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*. 5:213-226.
- Checkoway, B. and Van Til, J. 1978. What Do We Know About Citizen participation? A Selective Review of Research. In *Citizen Participation in America*, ed., S. Langton. Lexington: D.C. Heath.
- Clay, P. 1979. *Neighborhood Renewal*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Cohen, R. 1979. Neighborhood Planning and Political Capacity. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*. 14:337-362.
- Committee for Economic Development. 1966. *Modernizing Local Government*. New York: Committee for Economic Development.
- _____. 1970. *Reshaping Government in Metropolitan Areas*. New York: Committee for Economic Development.
- Cox, F.M. et al., eds. 1974. *Strategies of Community Organization: A Book of Readings*. Itasca: F.E. Peacock.
- Dahl, R.A. 1970. *After the Revolution?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Downie, L. 1974. *Mortgage on America*. New York: Praeger.
- Fellman, G. with Brandt, B. 1973 *The Deceived Majority: Politics and Protest in Middle America*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Fish, J.H. 1973. *Black Power/White Control*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Forester, J. 1982. Planning in the Face of Power. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 48:67-80.
- Friedmann, J. 1973. *Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor.
- Gans, H.J. 1962. *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*. New York: Free Press.
- Goering, J.M. 1979. The National Neighborhood Movement: A Preliminary Analysis and Critique. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 45:506-514.
- Hallman, H.W. 1976. Neighborhood Planning with Residents: Approaches of Six Local Planning Departments. *Neighborhood Decentralization*. March-April:1-7.
- Hartman, C. 1975. *Yerba Buena: Land Grab and Community Resistance in San Francisco*. San Francisco: Glide Publications.
- Henderson, P. and Thomas, D.N. 1980. *Skills in Neighborhood Work*. Boston: George Allen and Unwin.
- Hutcheson, J.D. 1981. The Neighborhood Planning Ordinance in Atlanta: Implemen-

tation and Structural Constraints. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York.

Katznelson, I. 1981. *City Trenches: Urban Politics and the Patterning of Class in America*. New York: Pantheon.

Kramer, R.M. and Specht, H., eds. 1969. *Readings in Community Organization Practice*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Lamb, C. 1975. *Political Power in Poor Neighborhoods*. Cambridge: Schenkman.

Lancourt, J.E. 1979. *Confront or Concede: The Alinsky Citizen Action Organizations*. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Lauffer, A. and Newman, E. 1981. Community Organization for the 1980's *Social Development Issues*. 5, Summer/Fall.

Lipsky, M. 1973. Street Corner Bureaucracy and the Analysis of Urban Reform. In *Neighborhood Control in the 1970s: Politics, Administration, and Citizen Participation*, ed., G. Frederickson. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Marciniak, E. 1977. *Reviving an Inner City Neighborhood*. Chicago: Loyola University.

Mayer, N. and Blake, J. 1980. *Keys to the Growth of Neighborhood Development Organization*. Washington: Urban Institute.

Miller, N. n.d. *Reader in Mass Organization*. San Francisco: Organize, Inc.

Mollenkopf, J.H. 1975. The Post-War Politics of Urban Development. *Politics and Society*. 5:247-495.

Naparstek, A.J. and Cincotta, G. 1976. Urban Disinvestment: New Implications for Community Organization, Research and Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. 1968. Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Commission on Neighborhoods.

1979. *People, Rebuilding Neighborhoods*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

National Training and Information Center, 1976. *The American Nightmare*. Chicago: National Training and Information Center.

Needleman, M.L. and Needleman, C.E. 1974. *Guerillas in the Bureaucracy: The Community Planning Experiment in the United States*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Office of Neighborhood Association. 1930. Neighborhood Accomplishments in Portland, Oregon 1976-1980. Portland: Office of Neighborhood Associations.

Pederson, N.C. 1976. Citizen Participation in Portland, Oregon. Paper delivered at the National Conference for Neighborhood Coordinators.

_____. 1974. Neighborhood Organization in Portland, Oregon. Portland: Office of Neighborhood Associations.

Perlman, J. 1978. Grassroots Participation from Neighborhood to Nation. In *Citizen Participation in America*, ed., S. Langton. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Piven, F.F. 1970. Whom Does the Advocacy Planner Serve? *Social Policy*. May/June:32-37.

Piven, F.F. and Cloward, R. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage Books.

Portland Bureau of Planning. 1975a. Corbett, Terwilliger, and Lair Hill. Portland: Portland Bureau of Planning.

_____. 1975b. Northwest District Policy Plan. Portland: Portland Bureau of Planning.

_____. 1975c. Union Avenue Redevelopment Plan. Portland: Portland Bureau of Planning.

Rohe, W.M., and Gates, L.B. 1981. Neighborhood Planning: Promise and Product. *The Urban and Social Change Review*. 14:26-32.

Rosenbloom, R. 1979. The Politics of the Neighborhood Movement. *South Atlantic Urban Studies*. 4:102-120.

St. Paul Department of Planning and Economic Development. 1981. St. Paul Citizen's Guide and Glossary to the Unified Capital Improvement Program and Budgeting Process. St. Paul: Department of Planning and Economic Development.

Salem Department of Community Development. 1975. Development of a Neighborhood Plan. Salem, Oregon: Department of Community Development.

Schoenburg, S.P. and Rosenbaum, P.L. 1980. *Neighborhoods That Work: Sources for the Viability of the Inner City*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Steckler, A.B. and Herzog, W.D. 1979. How to Keep Your Mandated Citizen Board Out of Your Hair and Off Your Back: A Guide for Executive Directors. *American Journal of Public Health*. 69:809-812.

Stone, C.N. 1976. *Economic Growth and Neighborhood Discontent: System Bias on the Urban Renewal Program of Atlanta*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Trapp, S. 1976. *Dynamics of Organizing*. Chicago: National Training and Information Center.

U.S. Office of Consumer Affairs. 1980. *People Power: What Communities are Doing to Counter Inflation*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. 1974. *Confidence and Concern: Citizens View American Government*. Cleveland: Regal Books.

Weber, N. 1976. Urban Planning and Community Resistance. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Goddard College.

Werth, J.T. and Bryant, D. 1979. *A Guide to Neighborhood Planning*. Washington: American Planning Association.

Zimmerman, J.P. 1979. Community Boards: Neighborhood Planning and Service Delivery in New York City. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.