Solutions in Search of a Problem
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Two things influence the comments that follow. First, I was a member of the committee that developed the program as well as a member of the jury. Second, on both I represented a different view of design, predicated on research-based knowledge derived from environment-behavior studies (EBS) and a variety of related disciplines. These comments, therefore, address some general and very important issues that I raised during the program committee meetings but could not address during the jury process. In fact, they are based on notes I made while on the jury knowing that I would not be able to use them there and then.

The program asked competitors to select a future involving assumptions about a variety of economic, occupational, educational, demographic and similar variables. Proposals were to be derived from these assumptions. To me that meant an acknowledgment that design, particularly of cities, cannot be arbitrary and subjective, but is a serious problem-solving activity. I therefore, expected an explicit chain of reasoning and inferences leading from the setting of explicit objectives based on the assumptions, and the use of research-based knowledge, to proposals satisfying these objectives. After all, one can hardly judge whether a thing is done well unless one knows what it is supposed to do—and why.

From that perspective the entries were generally disappointing. Lacking were clear objectives—notions of what things should be like and why—and any link between assumptions and proposals.

Competitions checked the assumptions but seemingly ignored them, proceeding in the usual non-explicit, arbitrary way to manipulate shapes and spaces, buildings and vegetation. The few who did engage in serious analysis also ignored the assumptions and either neglected proposals or made proposals that neither derived from nor emerged from the analysis. As a result there was no clear rationale for decisions, no clear or explicit goals, nor any possibility of justification of any goals—even if one could infer them. The lack of chains of reasoning, of explicit linkages among assumptions, data, relevant research and proposals made it difficult, if not impossible, to analyze, discuss and, hence, evaluate the proposals rationally.

Even the problems were never identified—and unknown problems cannot be solved. Yet problems could be derived from the assumptions. For example, the assumptions selected by each competition team would lead to a certain distribution of population groups. These population groups could be expected to have certain lifestyles leading to the need for cer-
Two distinct areas are proposed for the park:
- The "lake," a very open area with long vistas and a bridge for the railroad.
- The "forest," a heavily wooded area with more intimate spaces and a network of paths that link different areas of use.
In form or more picturesque open spaces would be defined by tree masses that link these two areas and specific sites for sports fields.
The edge of the park would be defined by some of the existing residential areas as well as by new housing units, which are defined as "urban villas" and provide a visible edge to the park while preserving a "permeable" quality for the residential area.
An integral component of planning for the Older Neighborhood District is re-evaluating the street system:
- The existing street grid would be extended to the edge of the new park.
- New residential blocks would be half the size of existing blocks to allow better public access to the park from the residential areas.
- Two curvilinear streets would mark the edge of the park.
- An existing street would be continued through the park and under the railroad.
- A network of pedestrian paths would be provided in order to link the lake area with places for sports activities, small squares at the end of streets and the proposed transit station.

Lincoln Creek passing through the Older Neighborhood District competition site.
been generalized to water edges; their treatment and linkages derived from assumptions and related to the lifestyles of the likely users in the downtown, older neighborhood and growing edge contexts. Only in that way could proposals influence policy relevant to this particular class of cities.

Finally, in these very brief comments, I find it significant that there was general agreement that the proposals for the growing edge were the weakest; in my view these were followed by the older neighborhood with the downtown proposals being the strongest. I think this is because the latter is most constrained by local and specific conditions, whereas the first is the least constrained and hence the most generic. Yet constraints are essential—the essence of design is a choice among alternatives using research-based criteria gradually to reduce the decision-space. The results show the inadequacy of arbitrary, subjective, idiosyncratic criteria mainstream designers typically used to make decisions. It also bears on the unwillingness (or possibly the inability) of designers to derive constraints from the program, from the research literature and from the knowledge of other disciplines.

I thus conclude where I began. The competition revealed the typical and traditional weaknesses and problems of designer and the design professions. It confirmed my position that fundamental changes are essential; the state of the art in city design (as of design in general) is pretty woeful.
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