

Toward Postmodern Urbanism? Evolution of Planning in Cleveland, Ohio

Sonia A. Hirt

The term *postmodernism* has attracted relatively little debate in planning, despite the commanding attention it has received in other related fields from geography (e.g., Soja 1989, 2000; Dear 2000; Dear and Flusty 2002) to architecture (e.g., Jencks 1984, 1986, 1987, 1992; Klotz 1988). This article claims that although the term may continue to be met by “apathy” by planning theorists (Dear 2000, 299), some of the changes that have occurred in planning in recent decades are interpretable as being part of a shift in sensibilities that the social sciences and the humanities commonly refer to as *postmodern*. Postmodernism thus has the potential of acting as a conceptual bridge that links changes in planning to changes in other fields. Furthermore, it has the potential of placing changes in planning in the context of a broad cultural shift that includes vast realms of human experience.

There have recently been several comprehensive attempts to uncover some of the implications of postmodernism for urban forms and urban planning, most notably by Ellin (1999) in her analysis of “postmodern urbanism” and Allmendinger (2001) in his study of “planning in postmodern times.” Yet although these works have laid the groundwork for understanding the term in the urban planning context, postmodern urbanism still remains in the literature an “anonymous metaprocess” (Loukiaitou-Sideris and Banarjee 1998, xxvi) that is yet to be elaborated in terms of rich, concrete, place-based context.

This article seeks to flesh out the theoretical debate on postmodernism and planning in terms of such rich, place-based context through the in-depth study of planning in the City of Cleveland, Ohio. Cleveland was selected because of its highly visible planning tradition, which has weaved through the main historic stages of American planning, and because Cleveland has served as a planning laboratory nationwide. It is because of this rich planning tradition that the story of Cleveland, albeit being only one of many possible stories of planning’s “postmodernization,” resonates to broader planning audiences and warrants investigation as a case study through which to highlight the complex ways in which postmodern philosophical undercurrents have played out in the planning context.

The article’s central questions are whether one may detect a postmodern planning shift in Cleveland, what its key elements are, and what the story of Cleveland tells us about the nature of this shift. To that end, the article analyzes the two primary types of

Abstract

This article analyzes the meaning of postmodernism in planning through the in-depth study of the evolution of planning and zoning in Cleveland, Ohio. Cleveland was selected because of its innovative and highly visible planning tradition, which has weaved through the main historic stages of American planning, and has served as a planning laboratory nationwide. The article investigates whether a postmodern planning transition in Cleveland is detectable and what its key aspects and contradictions are. It concludes that the postmodern shift in Cleveland is notably stronger in planning discourses than in planning policies. In so doing, the article demonstrates a key characteristic of the postmodern shift generally and in terms of planning, more specifically, that postmodernism is still more about a shift in attitudes than in actions.

Keywords: *Cleveland; postmodernism; planning history*

Sonia A. Hirt is an assistant professor at the Department of Geography and Planning at the University of Toledo, Ohio. She has accepted an offer as an assistant professor at the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning at Virginia Tech University in Blacksburg starting in 2005. She holds a doctoral and master’s degrees in urban and regional planning from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. Her interests include urban planning theory and history, land-use policy, and comparative and international planning.

documents produced by city planners—the master plans and the zoning codes—in their historic sequence; additional planning-related sources; and twenty-six interviews with planners, planning and design review commissioners, planning critics, and academicians.

The article accepts a definition of postmodernism as a broad post-1960s–1970s shift in sensibilities with specific manifestations for planning thought. It uses it as an “umbrella” term covering a number of related ideological transitions in planning and their policy manifestations, such as a shift from expert-driven toward participatory processes; from a planning view assuming the supremacy of new, “modern” forms toward a view appreciative of the historic structure; and from a planning focus on functionalism and efficiency toward a focus on human-scale, urbane, and unique forms. Although each shift may warrant a separate study, bringing them together under one umbrella allows a more holistic view of the evolution of planning. Furthermore, postmodern theory provides useful guidance in exploring changes in planning processes versus planning forms, or across the procedural versus substantive division in planning theory. It suggests that seemingly separate transitions, such as those from expert-led to participatory planning, and from planning in favor of technologically efficient, functionally separated forms to planning in favor of more urbane, mixed-use forms, may share ideological roots.

The article first offers a theoretical review of some aspects of postmodern urbanism derived from the broader principles of postmodern thought. It then provides a walk through the watersheds of Cleveland’s planning history, followed by a reading of this history (particularly along the five themes of the postmodern transition from the theoretical section) and a brief history of zoning. Finally, it summarizes the key aspects in which a postmodern planning shift has occurred in Cleveland and the aspects in which it has not. More specifically, it concludes that the postmodern shift is notably more radical in planning discourse (i.e., in the language of the plans) than in planning policy (i.e., in the specifics of land-use regulation). In this, the article demonstrates a key characteristic of the postmodern shift generally and in planning, more specifically: that postmodernism is about a powerful shift in attitudes that is yet to translate into a similar shift in actions.

► The Modern-Postmodern Transition: Implications for Urban Planning

The term *postmodern* is notoriously controversial. Postmodernism may be deemed an epoch, a cultural shift overlapping with postindustrialism or post-Fordism as socioeco-

nomie shifts, a type of social theory, an intellectual fad, a style in the arts, or just an architectural style (see Dear 2000, 32-39; Allmendinger 2001, 25-90).¹

In the urban planning literature, postmodernism remains understudied. Despite some comprehensive works discussing the meaning of postmodernism in planning (Ellin 1999; Allmendinger 2001) and additional literature by well-known authors such as Beauregard (1989), Milroy (1991, 1993), and Dear (1986), postmodernism continues to be met by planning theorists mostly with “apathy” (Dear 2000, 299) or with hostility (e.g., Harper and Stein 1995). Furthermore, for planning practitioners, the term *postmodernism* and its implications for the profession remain largely unrecognized (Milroy 1993).

Postmodernism is understood here as a post-1960–1970s “sensibilities” shift (Allmendinger 2001, 9); a new “state of mind,” in Vaclav Havel’s words (1994); or the rise of a set of interlinked ideas, coming as a reaction against the Enlightenment-born modernist philosophy linked with positivism, scientism, and the assumed supremacy of rational order. The modernist philosophy came to dominate the Western world by the mid-twentieth century (Healey 1997, 38-43) and has traditionally guided planning (Beauregard 1989), among other professions. Here, five related aspects of postmodern urbanism are reviewed in the context of the broader postmodern shift (also Ellin 1999):

- A growing interest in participatory planning (in lieu of the former dominance of rational planning performed by value-free experts)
- A search for urbanity, urban identity, and cultural uniqueness (in lieu of the former focus on functionalism, efficiency, and rational organization of urban forms)
- An appreciation of historic spaces; a return to traditional urban forms (in lieu of the modernist belief in the supremacy of new forms)
- A mixing of land uses and flexible zoning (rather than strict land-use segregation)
- The pursuit of human-scale, pedestrian-friendly, higher density, urbane, and compact forms (in contrast to spread-out, low-density, and auto-oriented forms)

Through the postmodern interpretation of planning’s evolution, the article aims to contribute to a broader debate on whether postmodernism signifies a break with modernism or its continuation. The literature is here sharply divided. Although influential authors like Havel (1994) argue that the modern era has ended, others like Harvey (1990) maintain that change has been superficial or that postmodernism represents, in fact, a state of intensified modernity (Auge 1995). Although this debate cannot be put to rest, the argument made here is that one may talk of a postmodern revolution in sensibilities, at least in planning, but this revolution is yet to trans-

late into a policy change, an argument close to the interpretation of the current state of planning advanced by Filion (1999).

Planning Process and the Common Public Good: From Value-Free to Value-Laden Planning

The key aspect of the postmodern transition is the epistemological. The postmodern, as a method of inquiry, comes largely as a reaction against some of the failures of Enlightenment-born positivism and scientism. It involves a revision of Enlightenment-modern notions for a reality whose laws can be objectively uncovered through scientific reason and mastered for the pursuit of the common welfare (Beauregard 1989). The Enlightenment-modern ideas came under strong attack from a number of influential philosophers in the late twentieth century for being illusory and producing a reductionist view of reality (e.g., Horkheimer and Adorno 1972; Habermas 1971; Lyotard [1979] 1984; Havel 1994; Scott 1998).

Urban planning, as a profession, has been rooted in the Enlightenment-modern tradition (Irving 1993; Beauregard 1989). It historically subscribed to the modernist idea that the laws of reality (i.e., the laws of city building) objectively exist, that a common public good could be objectively defined, and that planners and other experts are uniquely positioned to understand both how a city works and what is best for its citizens (Beauregard 1989). The modernist principles crystallized in comprehensive rationalism (Hemmens 1992), the model that dominated the profession from the Progressive era to at least the 1970s.

Postmodern thought challenges the premises of comprehensive rationalism. In Milroy's terms (1991, 183), postmodernism is "antifoundationalist" in terms of questioning universal laws and unitary definitions of what "truth" or "good" is, "nondualistic" in the sense of refusing to separate facts from values, and "encouraging plurality and difference." Any claims for the discovery of a conflict-free public good, and those for planners-experts as being uniquely positioned to define it, are rendered illusory or oppressive under postmodern auspices. Planning theory has been recently dominated by debates on how to foster citizen-driven instead of expert-driven planning. Various postrationalist models have been proposed (Davidoff 1965; Forester 1999; Innes 1996; Healey 1997, 2003), and there are data that practitioners value communicative over technical skills and spend more time in gathering citizens' views than technical analysis (e.g., Guzzetta and Bollens 2003). This rise of participation signifies the adaptation of "the planning process to the postmodern relativity of views" (Filion 1999, 424; Hirt 2002).

Planning Priorities: From Efficiency to Sense of Place

The ideology of "high modernism" had a lot to do with imposing homogenous, machine-like order and efficiency on sociospatial systems in the relentless pursuit of economic gain with blatant disregard of local cultural specifics and often with disastrous results (Scott 1998). Tied to the epistemological movement away from rationality and totalizing claims on the truth, and toward the celebration of "plurality and difference" (Milroy 1991, 183; Hemmens 1992) and "differentiation and distinction" (Filion 1999, 422), comes the postmodern rebellion against massification, standardization, and sameness.

In planning, the modernist search for rational order ("rational" understood in terms of maximum technological efficiency and the "love of the machine") had particularly clear manifestations (Pitkin 2001; Irving 1993). High modernist ideologues embraced machine-like efficiency: Corbusier defined a house as a "machine for living in," praised an aesthetics in which "repetition dominates everything," and claimed that a "city made for speed is made for success" ([1929] 1987, 220, 179); Frank Lloyd Wright (1932) welcomed a new planning measurement scale—not the walking man but the man driving a car. These ideas, according to which planning's central aim was the most technologically friendly and efficient urban form, came to dominate the profession with the rise of the *city efficient* and well into the postwar years (Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee 1998, 47-67).

As a reaction to the homogeneity produced by the "Fordist" approach in planning (Filion 1999)—from mass suburbia to "international-style" towers in central cities and urban neighborhoods pierced by highways—came a string of influential antimodernist planning theorists. These advocated urban complexity and diversity (Jacobs 1961); "good city form" (Lynch 1981); the search for a "city of collective memory" (Boyer 1983); the importance of the city "image," its patterns, its legibility, and its sense of place (e.g., Lynch 1960; Alexander 1977); and human (not machine-based) planning scales (e.g., Calthorpe 1993). These views are shared by the most influential current planning movements from neighborhood revitalization to new urbanism (e.g., Congress for the New Urbanism 2001). This reflects a general shift in planning focus from efficiency-related, quantitatively measurable goals to more intangible, qualitative, "soft" priorities, such as "community renewal" (Milroy 1993) or "sense of place," and parallels what has been coined as a key element of global cultural postmodernization: a shift from materialist-centered toward quality-of-life-centered values (Inglehart 1997). Thus, the rise of a postmodern urbanist sensibility may be defined as away from "totalizing rationality, functionalism, Taylorism, the machine metaphor" toward "pluralism, a search for 'character,' urban

identity, unique features, visual references, creation of landmarks” (Ellin 1999, 111).

Planning and the Past: From Antitradition to Tradition

Linked to the cult of technology is another key tenet of modernism—a rejection of historic structures as regressive and holding humanity back from the progress promised by scientific reason. Modernism thus “entails a ruthless break with any or all preceding historical conditions” (Harvey 1990, 12). Modernist thinkers believed in the inherent backwardness of historic social systems and the profound need to disassemble them as to start it all anew (Scott 1998). In reaction to the failure of many grand modernist projects (from socialist states to great dams) to fulfill their promises, postmodern thought brings about a search for origins and a nostalgia for the past (Ellin 1999); postmodernism may be defined as the selective “revalorization of tradition” (Inglehart 1997, 25).

Once again, this aspect of modernist philosophy found a clear planning manifestation. Planning emerged as a profession in reaction to the chaos of the nineteenth-century industrial city (Hall 1996) with the promise of radical urban reform. The historic city was often seen as dilapidated beyond repair, whereas the future was thought to belong to rationally planned, newly built forms. The premise for the supremacy of new over old forms may be traced to Ebenezer Howard’s advocacy for building on a “clean sheet” ([1898] 1946) and Wright’s enthusiasm (1932) for the “disappearance” of the old city. The strong spirit of antitradition culminated after World War II (Filion 1999) and translated into the massive “urban renewal” of central cities and the building of rings of suburbs around them.

Postmodern urbanism represents a revival of traditionalism. In lieu of a clean break, it “seeks a reconciliation with the past” (Audriac and Shermyen 1994, 161) in terms of a renewed interest in historic urban forms and the local cultural heritage. This is evident in the growing power of historic preservation and in the fact that some of the most celebrated new forms are built under “neo-traditionalist” principles (see Krier 1988).

Planning and Land-Use Arrangement: From Separation to Integration

As Stevens (1990, 271-72) has argued, the modernist era coincided with the rise of a remarkable number of very specialized sciences, each targeting one fragment of reality neatly classified in its own “box” while ignoring the rest (in a way,

“dividing to conquer”). This segregation of knowledge into different fields represented a drastic revision of the pre-modern, more holistic epistemological approach. Post-modern critics have targeted this aspect of modernist epistemology on the grounds that it reduces complex systems to their simple subparts by producing false discontinuities between them (e.g., Spretnak 1997; Scott 1998), thus failing “to connect with the most intrinsic nature of reality and with natural human experience” (Havel 1994).

Modernist planning also has a lot to do with categorizing and then dividing—by land use and by function. Although the historic city was an amalgam of different uses and people in chaotic coexistence, modernist planners aimed at their orderly arrangement in separate corners. The segregationist philosophy penetrated classic modernist visions from Garnier’s 1917 *Cité Industrielle* to the 1933 Athens declaration of the International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM; [1933] 1973), and it ultimately came to dominate generations of strict and segregationist zoning codes.

Jacobs (1961), whose critique of planning marks the modern-postmodern divide (Irving 1993), notoriously listed mixed uses as a key prerequisite of urban vitality. Ever since, the mechanistic separation of urban space into its composite parts via strict zoning has been blamed for a number of ills from social isolation to ecological pollution and class domination (e.g., Calthorpe 1993; Krier 1988; Boyer 1983). That land uses should be mixed—a key postmodern theme (Ellin 1999)—has become a consensus point in current planning theory (Talen and Knaap 2003) shared by new urbanists (Congress for the New Urbanism 2001) and smart-growth proponents (American Planning Association [APA] 1998), among others.

Planning Forms and Densities: From Garden Cities to Compact Cities

A key element of modernist ideology is the idea of the human “domination of nature in order to produce a wealth of commodities” (Angus 1989, quoted by Ellin 1998, 226). Modernists viewed nature as a sea of endless resources, with human satisfaction being its sole purpose of being (Spretnak 1997; Scott 1998). Ecological disasters through the twentieth century led to the gradual realization of the limits of nature, including land, and the rise of ecological awareness as a sign of cultural postmodernization (Inglehart 1997).

Once again, this aspect of the modern-postmodern shift has clear planning implications. Early planning prophets proposed deurbanization—the reduction of urban density and the low-density spread of populations over free land—as a solution to the urban problems of the time. The deurbanization

visions, from Howard's ([1898] 1946) to Wright's (1932), favored the "marriage" of city and nature. Yet they were based on the modernist idea that free land is unlimited and destined for human use. When postwar planning fulfilled these visions in rings of new towns, the process had little to do with "marriage" (which implies consensus) and more with the aggressive takeover of nature.

Current planning theory, however, is dominated by debates on how to minimize land consumption, that is, limit sprawl, preserve open space, and restore urban life. As it is with mixed uses, there appears to be a "remarkable convergence" of views that planning should promote compact, urbane, higher density forms (Talen and Knaap 2003) to achieve central city rebirth and metropolitan sustainability (Wheeler 2000). Although sprawl is attacked from multiple viewpoints, the changed view of the role of humankind in nature and the growing interest in historic forms—both postmodern signs—play a crucial part.

The above discussion reviewed five interrelated aspects of the postmodern shift with clear manifestations for urban planning. Although the list is far from exhaustive, it provides a useful conceptual framework for exploring some shifts in Cleveland's planning.

► Cleveland as a Case Study in Planning History

In terms of planning history, Cleveland is both typical and unique. It is typical in the sense that the sequence of its plans broadly follows the main watersheds of American planning. It is unique in the sense that although never being a megacity of Chicago's caliber, it provides highly visible examples of the various historic planning paradigms, sometimes the first or second of a kind, sometimes the most ambitious, sometimes the best known. The importance of its planning tradition, one may say, outweighs its importance as a city.

Different periodizations have been suggested for the history of American planning (e.g., Krueckeberg 1983; Hall 1996). Loukiaitou-Sideris and Banarjee (1998, 40-70) define several broad periods: the City Beautiful, the City Practical (or Efficient or Functional) as a prelude to modernism, modernist (postwar urban renewal), and after-modernist.² For each of these, Cleveland offers a well-known, influential, sometimes pioneering example, often with contributions from some of the most renowned names in planning history. The city has one of the oldest planning commissions in the country, founded in 1913; a landmark case of the City Beautiful—the downtown mall planned by Daniel Burnham in 1903; a strong example of the City Efficient—the 1949 *General Plan* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949); one of the most daunt-

ing urban renewal programs nationwide (Krumholz and Keating 2001; Jenkins 2001); and a very ambitious downtown urban renewal plan, the *Erieview Plan*, by world-renowned architect I. M. Pei in the early 1960s (Pei and Associates 1961). These were followed by a pioneering experiment with equity planning under the leadership of one of the few "living legends" in planning, Norman Krumholz, and an award-winning latest plan from the late 1980 and early 1990s, *Civic Vision 2000* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 1991). The city is currently putting together its latest citywide plan, *Connecting Cleveland: 2020 Citywide Plan* (Cleveland City Planning Commission n.d.).

► Data Collection and Analysis

The article uses three main sources to examine the potential presence and the nature of the postmodern transition in Cleveland's planning: Cleveland's historic and current plans (downtown and citywide), its zoning codes, and twenty-six interviews. Additional sources include historic and current planning-related media reports, archival documents, and scholarly articles (e.g., articles by the planning directors at the time). Because the newest plan, *Connecting Cleveland*, was still a work in progress when these data were collected, the interviews, the media, and the city Web site were used as main data sources indicating the direction of the new plan.

The language of plans—the first main source—was analyzed along the five themes of the modern-postmodern shift from the theory section. Language related to the themes was coded (Miles and Huberman 1984) with the aim of tracing the signs of a postmodern shift.

The interviews were conducted by phone or in person. They were semistructured, varied in length of up to one hour, and were tape-recorded and transcribed. Subjects were current and former city planners (including the current and two former planning directors), planning and design review commissioners, and planning academicians and critics. The questions were related to the five main themes (e.g., "Do you think that Cleveland needs less or more mixed land uses, and why?"), and the transcripts were coded accordingly.

The analysis also includes a review of zoning and subdivision regulation. The idea behind this was to compare the evolution of planning texts to that of zoning texts while trying to assess which of the two—plans or codes, discourse or policy—has moved further, if at all, in the postmodern direction. In other words, if the new plan and the current planners embrace the language of postmodern urbanism, does the current code also promote this type of urbanism? Admittedly, zoning regulation is an imperfect "proxy" of planning policy, which is a

broader category. It is theoretically possible that even if the code has remained unchanged, planning policies have notably shifted, because planners grant an increasing number of variances, for example. Alternatively, it is possible to study the history of capital investments to see what type of urban forms are being promoted. The textual analysis, however, of master plans versus zoning codes—the two main documents produced by planners—allows a straightforward juxtaposition, and it is reasonable to expect that major policy shifts would have entered the texts of both.³

As a reference on what type of local land-use regulatory mechanisms promote postmodern (i.e., mixed-use, compact, high-density, pedestrian friendly, and historically sensitive urban forms), the article relied on the American Planning Association (APA) guide on “smart development” (1998), the Congress for the New Urbanism (2001), and a list compiled by Talen and Knaap (2003), who use the former two sources as well, among others. Such mechanisms, which may either mandate or encourage compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly, and historically and environmentally sensitive forms, include the establishment of design review boards and/or historic, environmental, infill, planned unit development or other overlay zones; the adoption of mixed-use zoning (whether named as such, or simply zoning that allows a greater crossover of uses between the zoning districts), performance zoning, or cluster zoning; and the setting of minimum density/maximum lot size limits and/or reduced setbacks, floor-to-area, and parking and street size requirements.

The question was, then, to what extent have such mechanisms become part of Cleveland’s regulation? If plans have moved in the postmodern direction, has regulation moved as well? Some recent literature suggests that local zoning continues to present an obstacle to the development of “alternative” (compact, mixed-use) or new urbanist forms (Inam and Levine 2001; Congress for the New Urbanism 2001), and that a clear disjuncture exists between postmodern planning discourse and modernist policies (Filion 1999) and between plans favoring “smart growth” goals and codes that hardly support them (Talen and Knaap 2003). Does the case of Cleveland support or challenge such conclusions?

► Planning Cleveland

The story of Cleveland’s planning dates back to the city’s foundation in the late eighteenth century. At that time, a team of surveyors laid a simple grid pattern around a town square.

Through the next century, Cleveland entered an era of phenomenal growth. By the year 1900, it had become one of the wealthiest cities in the United States, a leading center of

industry and commerce—no less than a “city upon a hill,” as its mayor named it (Jenkins 2001, 472). Yet the city also carried all the scars that fast industrialization and urbanization could inflict—dirt, chaos, and slums (Chapman 1953). Inspired by Chicago’s 1893 Exposition, Cleveland’s elite searched for ways to bring some order and dignity to the polluted city. A committee was formed in 1899 to study the possibility of erecting a group of public buildings to serve as the city’s civic heart. In 1900, the committee delivered a proposal for a civic center near the lake, which was endorsed by the majority of Cleveland’s leaders, from its Progressive mayor to its conservative businessmen. A Group Plan Commission was founded, comprising Daniel Burnham, John Carrere, and Arnold Brunner. The commission published its plan in 1903 (Krumholz and Keating 2001). It was only the second City Beautiful plan in the country after Washington’s and the only Burnham’s plan realized with some extent of completeness (Johannesen 1987).

The plan represented Cleveland’s attempt to dress its rising prosperity in proper form and put itself on the map of the American continent, “where Vienna and Paris are in the old world” (in the words of a participant in the 1899 planning debates; Leedy 1991, 84). Inspired by European design, the plan’s authors proposed a symmetric composition of a grand open mall with a main axis perpendicular to the lakefront. The mall was to be framed by various civic buildings unified by a neo-Renaissance style (Kolson 2001)—an “example of order, system and reserve” (Burnham, Carrere, and Brunner 1903).

Implementation, however, was slow mostly due to the great difficulties of imposing the grand design without the backing of a strong central power. Ultimately, the plan’s legacy included several civic buildings erected on more than forty acres of land cleared from the mix of existing homes and shops, but excluded the plan’s centerpiece—the railroad depot as a city gateway (Krumholz and Keating 2001). Still, the plan became one of the most acclaimed cases of the City Beautiful and an exemplar to other cities (Leedy 1991).

Through the early to mid-twentieth century, Cleveland’s star continued to rise. By 1950, with a population of almost a million, the city was one of the leading industrial centers of the world—perhaps the “best location in the nation,” as the Electric Illuminating Co. named it in 1946 (Jenkins 2001, 471). Yet early signs of trouble appeared in 1916 with the foundation of the first upper-class suburb (Madison 1960). By the 1930s, the elites had largely made their suburban choice; by the 1940s, they were joined by the middle class.

At that time, Cleveland produced its first master plan, the 1949 *General Plan* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949); there were, however, attempts at citywide planning dating back to the 1920s (see Jenkins 2001). The plan was the result of several years of technical studies on population, land

use, and transportation, many conducted at the regional level, under the leadership of E. Bohn and John Howard. Unlike Burnham's plan, which focused on downtown's physical form and was to affect the rest of the city through inspiration, the 1949 plan was an example of citywide, analytical planning: a "triumph of the 'city efficient' over the 'city beautiful,' 'occupied with function [rather] than form'" (Krumholz and Keating 2001, 8). As such, it was a nationally acclaimed effort, "the top in the nation at that time" (McCahill 1973).

The plan was ultimately a reaction to the realities of the day. Although Cleveland was still at its peak, poverty persisted in its "slums," and suburban exodus was a known threat. The plan's famous opening words, "Plan or Perish!" (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 4), reflected the optimistic confidence in the potential of planning to save the city, so typical of the City Efficient and the postwar eras. Planning was to save the city from "slums and blight" and "loss of people and business and industry to the suburbs"; "nothing can cure them but community planning" (4). The plan proposed a wide range of reforms: expanded parks, a regional freeway system, and a comprehensive neighborhood clearance and rebuilding program.

The most significant legacy of the 1949 plan was that it laid the foundation of the largest urban renewal program in the country, covering more than 6,000 acres of land—12 percent of the total city area (Krumholz and Keating 2001, 9). Two competing downtown renewal plans were put together in the following decade. The first was *Downtown Cleveland 1975*, published by the Cleveland City Planning Commission in 1959. The second was the Erieview Plan I and II (*The Urban Renewal Plan for Downtown Cleveland*; Pei and Associates 1961), prepared by the Urban Renewal and Housing Department and authored by the world-renowned architect I. M. Pei (which was "as good as, if not better than, any [such plan] in the country"; McCahill 1973). The two plans embodied intragovernmental rivalry and disagreed on key points (e.g., whether to strengthen the old retail core along Euclid Avenue). Yet they held deep philosophical similarities—both espoused ambitious agendas for social progress through "blight" clearance, and both were bold visions of the high modernist type. Pei's plan, for example, was a Corbusian composition of towers in the park (named "clean vertical accents"; Pei and Associates 1961, 2), an "ivory city-within-a city of office towers and apartment megablocks," as one critic depicts it (Morton 2002, 16), "everything orderly, clean, lasting and pure."

But although initiating an "orgy of demolition" (Litt 2000) and enabling the development of a mass of large new buildings, urban renewal efforts to reinvigorate Cleveland, as elsewhere, failed to materialize. Most were stymied by a weak market and racial and political conflicts (Krumholz and Keating 2001; Jenkins 2001). Most importantly, they had no means to

counter trends in the national economy and its passage from manufacturing to service (see Kasarda 1988) that set the city on the path of decline. From 1950 to 1980, manufacturing jobs declined in Cleveland by 60 percent, population fell by more than a third, incomes fell to 70 percent of those of the county, and poverty reached a quarter of the residents (Krumholz 1986, 328). In 1966, the poorest urban areas were ravished by riots (Campbell 1990). In 1969, the polluted Cuyahoga River burned. In 1978, Cleveland became the first American city since the Depression to default on its debt. What was once "a city upon a hill" had become known as the "mistake on the lake" (Knack 1999, 12).

The acute urban crisis of the 1960s and 1970s and the failure of urban renewal to solve it contributed to the birth of Cleveland's most innovative planning tradition—equity planning, a relative of advocacy planning (see Davidoff 1965). With Norman Krumholz as planning director from 1969 to 1979, planning shifted gears from being comprehensive and land-use driven to being focused on the needs of disadvantaged groups and social-policy driven—a novel approach that Cleveland's planners maintained through three very different political administrations. The product of this planning model was the 1974 *Cleveland Policy Planning Report* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1974). Its authors named it "not a plan, at least not in the traditional sense," not a "series of colored maps," but a "catalog of objectives, policies and action programs," and defined its goal as "promoting a wider range of choices for those individuals and groups who have few, if any, choices" (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1974, 2). Planning initiatives at the time included attempts to reduce housing segregation and provide more choices for transit-dependent residents (Krumholz and Forester 1990; Krumholz 1986). Although the success of equity planning is debatable (Suskind 1982), it opened a key debate within the profession as to whether a planner's neutral standing is at all possible or desirable.

With Norman Krumholz's departure in 1979, however, planning returned to its land-use focus. The new planning director, Hunter Morrison, was a believer in physical planning as an instigator of the city rebirth (see Morrison and Fleischman 1982; Morrison 1983).

Civic Vision 2000 (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 1991), undertaken under the leadership of conservative Mayor George Voinovich, was the first comprehensive land-use plan that the city had prepared since 1949. It consisted of two parts, a 1988 *Downtown Plan* and a 1991 *Citywide Plan*. The main goals were to strengthen downtown, revitalize the neighborhoods through encouraging new housing and neighborhood retail centers, and promote new industrial and office parks. As it is in line with Cleveland's planning tradition, the plans were

seen as an exemplary enterprise and won the American Planning Association award (Gallagher 1992).

The plans gave a clear priority to downtown and encouraged its conversion to a center of finance and tourism, thus welcoming the arrival of the postindustrial economy. Parallel to the plans, the city launched an ambitious downtown renaissance program that came to be symbolized by “gorilla” projects such as the Public Square retail center, new sports stadiums, a few glitzy banks and hotels, the Science Museum, the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame (designed by none other but I. M. Pei), and the largest theater renovation effort nationwide, Playhouse Square (Barnett 1988; Litt 1995; Knack 1999; Hollis 2003). These efforts, however, have been criticized for failing to pursue a social equity agenda (Keating and Krumholz 1991) and abandoning “the social idealism that drove so many modernist plans in the middle of this century” (Davidson-Powers 1988, 34).

Cleveland’s downtown has yet to find its match in terms of successful neighborhood rebirth. Yet even in some of the most depressed areas, one can find some hopeful signs. Thus, several large, new, urbanist-looking developments have been built near the Hough area, where the riots once took place, as well as in Fairfax and Broadway. And citywide, new housing starts are clearly on the rise—from 50 in 1990 to 200–400 per year today.

With a new mayor and a new planning director, Cleveland is now working on an update of its 1991 *Citywide Plan* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1991), named *Connecting Cleveland: 2020 Citywide Plan*. The plan proceeds in the context of the city’s tentative “comeback” in terms of a stabilized population and a diversifying economy through the 1990s (Hollis 2003; Hill 1999). Because of this stabilization, as the interviewees indicated, the planning focus will be less on massive physical initiatives of the 1990s type and more on pursuing “livability” and “quality of life” issues—issues of preserving open space, having lakefront access, enhancing pedestrian connectivity, and diversifying services—in addition to improving economic viability.

► Plans, Planners, and the Postmodern Shift

Cleveland’s planning history will be here examined specifically in terms of the five themes of the modern-postmodern transition. Does Cleveland provide testimony for the presence of a postmodern planning shift, and, if so, when and how has this shift occurred?

Planning Processes

The implications of postmodernism for planning processes amount to discarding the notion that through technical analysis, planners can uncover a unitary public good. May one detect such a shift in Cleveland’s planning? One may say a cautionary “Yes.”

The notion of impartial consideration of all alternatives by distinguished experts played a chief role in the rhetorical power of Burnham’s plan (Leedy 1991). The plan’s authors presented themselves as observers who had become “perfectly familiar with the local conditions,” had considered “every suggestion which has come to them” and “every other possible solution of the problem,” and had only then arrived at what was most beneficial for their unitary subject—the city as a whole. The 1949 plan (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949) had a similar unitary subject in mind. In its introductory pages, it sought support precisely by arguing that its authors were able to study land-use locations for “the good of everyone in the community” (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 7) so that by their proposal, the “whole community would benefit” (6). “The best use of land,” the plan asserted, “benefits everybody” (14). Yet the planners’ expert abilities did not preclude seeking some citizen input. In fact, Cleveland’s planners were among the first in the nation to make “special efforts to enlist the participation of neighborhoods, community groups and citizens in the planning process” (Krumholz and Keating 2001, 8). This is how one of them presented the balance between technical analysis and civic input, using a strikingly contemporary language (Weinberg 1944, 23):

Our “technique,” then, is, strictly speaking not technical but political. Our effort is to discover what the community wants and to help it make its own plans and work for their realization, with the Commission acting as technical advisor and liaison between the community and local government.

The idea of a unitary public good and planners’ neutrality in finding it was crushed with the ascent of Norman Krumholz. The 1974 *Report* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1974) asserts that in a world of inequitably distributed resources, planners must choose whom to serve, and it clearly admits its bias and its sympathies. In Krumholz’s own words (1982, 166), the plan abandoned the “planner’s traditional posture as an apolitical technician serving a unitary public interest.”

Yet the Krumholz years amount to a temporary aberration. No hint exists in the plans after Krumholz’s departure that planning is about advocacy. The mayoral introduction of the 1991 *Citywide Plan* refers to planning as means “to join together and travel the road to a better future of all Clevelanders” (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1991, vi), although the

confident rhetoric that the plan is good for “everyone in the community” that prevailed in 1949 had subsided by the 1980s.

A continuous evolution, however, seems to have occurred regarding the balance between expert analysis and civic input, with each consecutive plan placing a higher weight on the latter. The 1949 plan briefly mentioned civic input at the end (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 46), whereas in *Civic Vision* the subject was awarded prime, front position (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 1991). Still, *Civic Vision* placed an equal weight on public input versus expert analysis: the planning process was a “synthesis of citizen preferences and technical projections,” through which “recommendations from citizens were balanced against findings from a series of technical studies” (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1991, 4-5).

Based on the interviews, the current emphasis has tilted further. The city Web site lists “input from residents” as the number one input in the planning process; and with no exception, planners preferred the label of “facilitators” instead of “analysts” or “experts.” A turnaround thus seems to have occurred in a century, from Burnham’s posture as a neutral judge to current planners claiming that the expert-judges are, in fact, the citizens.

I think actually public process is the chief factor to any planning process. Having the public engaged, that’s what it’s all about, it’s not about us, about experts coming in and making recommendations and planning in committees. . . . It should be a bottom-up process. They’re the experts, they are the judges!

Planning Priorities

Like other City Beautiful plans, Burnham’s 1903 plan of Cleveland was one in which “beauty clearly stood supreme” (Hall 1996, 183); beauty was the vehicle through which it was to achieve its more implicit goals from civic unity to economic growth. By the 1940s, beauty had nearly vanished from the planning language and, as the 1949 plan demonstrates, concerns had shifted in a more practical direction—the plan is above all a “practical guide” (p. 4) that would oversee that all the “right” things end up in all the “right” places (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 5). In lieu of Burnham’s inspirational but vague language, enter land-use studies, population projections, and discussions on how zoning would ensure stable property values and how an efficient “thorofare system” would allow faster traffic. A machine metaphor is used to describe this new “thorofare system”: the freeways will flow “from all parts of the region to the heart of the city, like the

spokes of a wheel,” as the “rim of the wheel, tying with the spokes,” will handle the peripheral traffic (31).

Beauty and efficiency mingle in the urban renewal plans, more prominently in Pei’s *Erieview*, which was to be “beautiful as well as useful” (Pei and Associates 1961, 2). Yet, in both, the urban assets were viewed primarily in efficiency terms; for example, downtown was the “highest and most efficient focus for the operation of its [the region’s] business and government functions,” producing the “highest concentration of local tax revenues” (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1959, 1). Through the Krumholz’s years, another theme triumphed—this of equity over efficiency—but was soon forgotten after Krumholz’s departure.

In comparison to the preceding decades, it seems as if Cleveland planners today speak a different language. Machine metaphors and functionalist descriptions have given way to the new vogue in planning discourse: uniqueness, identity, culture, and quality of life—the things that “cause a collection of buildings to become a neighborhood,” as the city Web site coins it. The focus is on promoting Cleveland as a city “known nationally for our arts and culture” with neighborhoods among the most “unique in the nation,” according to a presentation by the planning director, in which he described the plan as an example of “identity-based” planning. The new plan will even include a chapter on the role of the arts and culture in urban growth. This is how one commissioner explained the shift:

It seems that in the past cities were so obsessed with becoming what they were not—becoming clean, new, orderly, efficient, just like the suburbs. . . . We just have to get rid of the entire idea that to “compete with the suburbs” we need to make ourselves like them. It is totally pointless to pretend what you are not. We have different types of assets here, un-suburban assets, unique assets, like our cultural amenities, and this is what we need to strengthen to attract people.

Planning and the Past

If the postmodern shift is understood as growing interest in historic preservation, then its signs are easily detectable in Cleveland’s planning history. Interest in the historic local heritage was barely present before the 1970s but seems to have been growing since.

Like other City Beautiful plans, Cleveland’s was inspired by history (although, of course, *not* local but European history). In their quest to remake Cleveland into the European image, Burnham and his colleagues advocated a Roman-inspired aesthetics, and their drawings were followed by renderings of the

great cities of Europe (e.g., Paris and Berlin). Yet the plan made no reference to the existing fabric of the site or its surroundings (i.e., the “slums”), thus advocating total demolition and rebuilding under new principles.

Interest in history—local or foreign—had been put on the back burner by the 1940s. The 1949 plan characterized the new neighborhoods in town as the “good” areas (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 18) and the old ones as the generally “not-so-good” areas (14), and spoke enthusiastically about their pending clearance, “modernization,” and “redevelopment” (18-19).

The case of the urban renewal downtown plans was similar. In the modernist tradition, they envisioned massive demolitions. Pei’s plan described the city core as a “derelict neighborhood in the middle of the city,” 71 percent of whose buildings were “sub-standard” (Pei and Associates 1961, 1, 16), and called for the total overhaul of old urban forms. Dense streets were to make way for superblocks (“simplified street network”; Pei and Associates 1961, 4), each taking several former city blocks (Kolson 2001). The built-to-open-space ratio was reversed in favor of the latter, and “International Style” towers were to replace the old, small-scale buildings.

Interest in history visibly returned with the founding of a Landmarks Commission in 1972 (a Mall Land Protective District was established, however, much earlier, in 1959). Preservation explicitly enters the language of master plans in the 1980s in *Civic Vision*. The *Citywide Plan* pointed to preservation as the eighth of nine top policies (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1991, 9) and provided a detailed description of the current and potential landmark districts (73-75). The *Downtown Plan* listed it as the sixth of ten top goals (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 2) and included a separate chapter on preservation planning (62-67). Earlier enthusiasm for urban clearance was gone, and the terms “rehabilitation,” “restoration,” and “re-use” (e.g., Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 66; 1991, 32) seem to replace the earlier “redevelopment” or “renewal.”

Based on the interviews with current planners and the preliminary planning materials, it seems that preserving the historic heritage plays a key part within the framework of the new planning focus—promoting Cleveland’s unique urban identity. As one of the interviewees put it, “What but our history makes us what we are and how we are distinct.”

Planning and Land-Use Arrangement

Burnham’s plan was a proposal for a group of public buildings; it did not explicitly address the question of how the various land uses should relate to each other. Yet the planning

vision sought the creation of a self-contained, single-land-use district (Kolson 2001), comprising civic buildings and spaces that were to replace the existing mixture of small shops, businesses, and homes. By the 1940s, the question of land-use arrangement had clearly moved to a central position. At that time, the isolation of the various uses—residential, business, and industrial—from each other was not only deemed to be in the city’s best interest but was also, in fact, understood as the very purpose of planning.

This jumble of homes, stores and factories, a common sight in many parts of the city, is the result of no planning. By contrast, planning separates the different uses of land, residential, business, industrial, etc., and arranges them in areas where each can develop to best advantage. (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 6)

The central goal of the 1949 plan was thus pronounced to be “to set aside enough of the right kind of space for each of the things our community needs, and to sort out and rearrange land uses that produce conflict when they are mixed up” (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 7).

Attitudes toward land-use mixing appear to barely soften in the urban renewal plans (yet this may be because they targeted downtown—the most multifunctional district to begin with). Both plans claimed to promote a multiuse renewed city core. Pei proposed a single “complex” (Pei and Associates 1961, 1) of office, civic, and apartment towers. At the same time, in both plans, the different uses were consolidated in different corners. Pei’s plan spurned the existing pattern as a “hodge-podge of unrelated uses” (18) and placed the housing, civic, and office uses into large distinctive blocks of the “complex.” *Downtown Cleveland 1975* proclaimed the “separation or removal of conflicting land uses” as one of its top goals (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1959, 57) and similarly sought their consolidation into large, separate areas (59).

It is *Civic Vision 2000* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 1991) that serves a welcome to mixed land uses. The *Downtown Plan* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988) proposes a mixed-use category as “new to the downtown” and recommends it for parts of the Flats Oxbrow and Warehouse areas, inviting a “development pattern quite unlike what might result from typical, single-use zoning” (134). This mixed-uses welcome is, however, very cautious. The citywide plan favors mixed-use neighborhood centers, yet it bemoans the presence of “scattered” retail and proposes no more than 0.3 percent of the city’s area (including downtown) under a mixed-use category for the year 2000 (77).

The interviews with current planners indicate a sea change in attitude. With only one exception, planners agreed that the city should promote more mixed uses; two favored the abandonment of the entire “land use zoning idea” as “inherently

segregationist” and advocated its replacement with performance zoning, as these interview excerpts illustrate.

Basic goal of city is to re-build neighborhoods, I don't mean neighborhoods of houses but of people so that people can do all the things they want to do in the neighborhood. A neighborhood should be self sustaining, so people must be able to do all kinds of things close to where they live.

There is definitely the potential and interest in more mixed-use. Of course, in the pre-automobile, streetcar era, Cleveland was built to have a lot of mixed use. Whole streets made of storefronts and apartments above. Now there is a growing interest in returning to this type of development. . . . And we, as planners, should allow and encourage this to happen.

Planning Forms and Densities

How to deal with declining urban density, how to balance open and built-out space, and what kind of development to promote—high-density urban-type or lower density suburban-type—have been key questions in Cleveland's planning throughout time. John Howard, the 1940s planning director, favored strict urban density limits. “Higher densities will not provide acceptable living conditions,” he argued; suburban densities must be “approached in order to compete in attracting residents” (Howard 1944, 19). The 1949 plan took a similar line. It pointed to “small lots and no yard spaces” as a typical feature of the slum areas, which were destined for clearance (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949, 19), and argued that “generous yard space makes modern apartments inviting place[s] to live,” whereas “old apartments are built too close together, thus cutting air, sunlight and livability to a minimum” (15).

The downtown urban renewal plans had little to do with “approaching suburban densities.” Pei's *Erievue*, for example, was a high-density proposal of the Corbusian type: slender vertical structures amid “airy open spaces” (Pei and Associates 1961, 12) and plenty of parking. More than half of the total land area of *Erievue* was, in fact, left for open space (4). This represented a substantial revision of the ratio between open and built spaces in historic urban areas, a revision that is typical of modernist urban design (see Holston 1989).

The *Civic Vision* plans suggest a subtle shift in thinking. Instead of suburban densities or the radical restructuring of urban space, these plans talked about promoting “medium-to-high density” housing (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1991, 32), in “identifiable urban neighborhoods” (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 19). They still, however, labeled existing urban patterns as “obsolete” and listed large subdivisions “competitive with suburban alternatives” as a pri-

ority (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1991, 31-32). The large majority of the proposed increase of residential acreage was thus reserved for “relatively low-density development” (77).

Current thinking appears to have shifted further. Related to the growing emphasis on reinforcing Cleveland's historic heritage, urbanity, and identity, most planners agreed that it is denser, urbane housing that should be encouraged. Higher density, linked to higher pedestrian mobility as compared to the suburbs, and to open-space preservation, was generally perceived crucial to be “what Cleveland is really all about.” As one said,

I think that there are certain things that an inner city, a truly urban center, whether downtown or the individual urban neighborhoods with people living close to each other, can offer that can't be found anywhere else, especially in the suburbs or beyond. It's also something that can't be duplicated . . . like our single-family neighborhoods mixed in with high quality retail and restaurants. . . . And all within walking distance, and that ties in with my sprawl comment. When you live in a suburb, you can't walk to different places; you have to get in your car and drive to get what you need. If you live in one of these neighborhoods or downtown, you don't necessarily have to drive to get the things you need. Walk next door, go to a nice restaurant, walk across the street to the grocery store; you don't have to drive in your car. This is what only we have, and they don't and this is what we need to work on.

► Land-Use Regulation

In comparison to many other large cities in the United States and its own suburbs, Cleveland was late in adopting its first zoning code (Conley 1929). It took a decade to debate the virtues and pitfalls of zoning, prepare the regulations, and overcome opposition headed by real estate interests (Campbell 1987; Washburn 2000). The first zoning code was finally passed by the city council in May 1929 and approved by the voters in November 1929.

The code divided the city into five height, five area, and seven land-use districts, superimposed over each other. The use districts, arranged in a hierarchical fashion with residential zones on top of the pyramid, included the Dwelling House District of one and two family homes, the Apartment House District, Retail, Commercial and three Industrial zones (Cleveland City Plan Commission 1929).

Between the adoption of the first zoning code in 1929 and the 1940s, the large majority of zoning activity consisted of piecemeal amendments (e.g., granting variances). It was not until the mid-1940s that planners initiated a substantial “modernization” of the code, an effort that aimed to provide a legal

tool for the implementation of the goals of the 1949 *General Plan* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1949). The revisions included a substantial reorganization of the code format and a streamlining of its language, and the introduction of “floor-to-area” ratios and increases in minimum lot sizes, setbacks, and off-street parking requirements, all in concordance with one of the key goals of planners since the turn of the twentieth century: the reduction of “crowding” (see Campbell 1987; Howard 2000). Thus, for example, whereas in 1929, the original code required 4,800 square feet as the minimum residential lot area in the largest area district (Cleveland City Plan Commission 1929), by the 1940s, the minimum area had grown to 7,200 square feet (Cleveland City Plan Commission 1944). Through the revisions, the code retained its strictly hierarchical nature. Residential zones, being on top of the pyramid, allowed only additional uses such as schools and libraries, whereas each consecutive district further down the pyramid permitted almost all uses from the district above it. The shielding of single-family homes from almost all else, through the hierarchical principle, remained a central aim of the code. “Zoning means protection,” as a zoning ad by the planning commission proclaimed at the time: “It means protection of your home so that an apartment house or a gas station or a store or a junk yard or a factory will not be built next to it.”

During the postwar years, the code has certainly become much more intricate. The current text is many times the size of the original; land-use districts and lists of allowed uses in each have proliferated (e.g., the residential districts have branched into eight subtypes, as compared to the original two); and administrative procedures have become more complex. The 1940s rewrite remains, however, the most comprehensive overhaul of the code throughout the years, although *Civic Vision 2000* (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1988, 1991) was also accompanied by a set of revisions. Notable during the postwar decades is the introduction of overlay districts with historic preservation purposes and design review procedures. Thus, a Mall Public Land Protective District was established as far back as 1959 with the aim of protecting the historic integrity of the mall. By now, this district has expanded to most of downtown as well as the Euclid Avenue–Cleveland State University area. Several other aesthetic-related provisions have since then been adopted as well, particularly around the time of the *Civic Vision* plans: the Business Revitalization District Ordinance permitting design controls near downtown was passed in 1988, a sign regulation chapter was added in 1990, and a landscaping chapter in 1991. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay District was adopted in 1993 with the stated aim of a “more flexible approach to land use control” (Cleveland City Planning Commission 1997, 334.01).

Despite these chapter additions, however, many of the requirements of the current code, *Codified Ordinances, Part Three: Zoning Code* (City of Cleveland 1997), are not grossly dissimilar from those in the 1940s. The hierarchical principle remains central to the code, as it was in the 1940s or, as a matter of fact, in 1929 (there are some exceptions to it: residences are now prohibited in most industrial zones, but this only makes the segregation of uses stricter). And although this principle allows for some mixture of uses to occur (one may clearly build residences in the retail areas), it still creates exclusively residential zones. In the most restrictive residential zone (Limited Single-Family; City of Cleveland 1997, 337.01), permitted by-right uses are basically single-family houses (and only *detached* ones; 357.09), whereas schools, libraries, and museums are listed as conditional uses. The least restrictive residential zone permits, naturally, a much greater number of uses, including apartments, schools, hospitals, and kindergartens but still no retail (Residence-Office; 337.10). Accessory uses in all residential zones allow not much more than home occupation (337.23). Thus, operating a coffee shop on the first floor of an apartment building in a multifamily district, for instance, is still not an option.

With the exception of the historic preservation and the planned unit development overlay districts, the code in its current 1997 edition has few traces of the new urbanist or “smart development” techniques that one may find listed in the Congress for the New Urbanism (2001) or the APA report (1998). For example, in terms of permitted lot sizes and densities, the minimum lot areas for a single-family house remain between 4,800 and 7,200 square feet (355.03), the same as they were in the 1940s codes, compared to the optimal 3,000 to 5,000 square feet recommended by the APA (1998); setback requirements for both residential and local retail zones remain large—15 percent of the average depth of the lots having their front lines along the street frontage, also language unchanged since the 1940s (357.04). There are no in-built incentives in the code (e.g., density bonuses or fee waivers) to developers for either mixing land uses or building in ways to preserve more common open space (e.g., in clusters).

One would perhaps expect more encouragement for the development of urbane, compact, and mixed-use forms in the PUD chapter. Yet this is hardly the case. The chapter language, in fact, explicitly puts the burden on developers to show evidence for a level of “integrated planning and amenity exceeding the level that may be achieved under otherwise applicable regulations,” including the demonstration of “architectural design meeting exceptionally high standards of quality and character” (City of Cleveland 1977, 334.15)—something that is not required for standard residential subdivisions. Thus,

instead of encouraging PUD, the chapter language seems to discourage it. Not surprisingly, there are only a dozen small PUDs in the city, and as one planner said, “Well, it’s a new thing for Cleveland.” In terms of opportunities for high-density, pedestrian-friendly forms, the PUD does indeed allow zero lot lines yet prohibits increases in density exceeding 10 percent of this in the underlying zone (334.16). Opportunities for mixing uses also remain limited. Mixed uses are listed as an incentive for developers, but the incentive is weak: 30 percent of the gross area of all residential uses in the PUD project may be devoted to residential uses that are not otherwise permitted, whereas a maximum of 10 percent of the project’s gross floor area may be devoted to nonresidential uses (334.14). In a non-residential PUD, a maximum of 20 percent of the PUD may be for uses otherwise not permitted (334.14).

In the interviews, planners readily admitted that the code needs updating and does little to encourage urbane-type forms. As one said, “Not to worry! We know we are 50 years behind Portland.” Thus, although a total overhaul of the code is not in the making, interviewees suggested that several incremental changes are under consideration.

Two new chapters, in fact, have been just added to the code, both in the direction of encouraging a more urbane-type environment. The first is an ordinance for a Live-Work Overlay District, allowing small residential-studio spaces in some industrial districts where they were previously prohibited. And the second is a Pedestrian Retail Overlay District, which instead of designating minimum setbacks, as is standard, designates maximum front setbacks of five feet and reduces standard parking requirements by 33 percent.

► Limitations and Conclusions

This article provided a reading of planning as culture. Through the analysis of planning texts and interviews, it focused on planners’ values and prescriptions of how to plan or how to change the city rather than on evaluating the extent to which changes in ideas brought changes on the ground. This is clearly a limitation. A future line of research may compare prominent developments in Cleveland from the 1960s high modernist period to those built recently, evaluate differences, and examine the role of planning.

The main argument was that changes in the culture of planning are *interpretable* as being part of a larger whole—as part of changes in the broader ideological climate of our times, or as part of the tentative rise of a postmodern zeitgeist. Because the manifestations of this zeitgeist are discipline-specific, although key commonalities remain, the task was to study how the rise of

this zeitgeist manifested itself in planning. Five manifestations were identified: from technocratic toward participatory processes; from planning’s focus on technological efficiency toward focus on cultural identity; from neglect toward appreciation of historic forms; from pursuing segregated toward pursuing mixed uses; and from promoting low density, spread-out forms toward promoting more urbane-type forms.

The article then reviewed the planning history of Cleveland and used it to study the specifics of the postmodern change and contribute to the debate about whether postmodernism amounts to a true shift. The analysis of the interviews and the plans demonstrated that in terms of planning discourse, a gradual postmodern shift in Cleveland is detectable. Thus, the importance of technical expertise as a source of planning legitimacy has decreased throughout time, and current planners see themselves as facilitators of public choice rather than experts. In contrast to mid-twentieth-century plans, which spoke the language of efficiency, the new plan and current planners focus on issues of urban cultural identity. Unlike earlier plans from the City Beautiful to urban renewal, which favored urban clearance, recent planning advocates preservation. Although midcentury plans vowed to segregate the land uses, newer plans since the 1980s and current planners are more open to land-use mixing. Lastly, unlike midcentury plans, which aimed at reducing density or radically changing the urban fabric, current planning seems more interested in creating urbane forms.

To compare the evolution of planning discourses to the evolution of policies, the article studied the evolution of zoning. The analysis showed that some postmodern themes that dominate current discourse, such as these related to promoting compact, mixed-use forms, have barely entered regulation. Many aspects of the code have remained unchanged throughout time; many key strategies presumed to encourage compact, mixed-use, and urbane (i.e., postmodern) forms are missing. Thus, whereas in discourses the evidence points to a shift, in policies it points to continuity. The study then suggests that although postmodern changes in planning are present, it is doubtful that they amount to a new paradigm. This seems in accord with the literature suggesting that postmodernism in planning is still more about changes in discourses than practices (Filion 1999). If so, does the rise of postmodern thinking have any relevance? Yes, because no planner today would suggest writing a plan and “educating” the public in the aftermath, and no planner would suggest running highways through neighborhoods. And no, because codes still prescribe car-oriented, segregated development, and the greatest difference between Cleveland’s new towers and those dreamed by Pei in 1960 may be in the sporadic postmodern arches rather than in

how they fit in the historic context. Still, the change in values is there and cannot be ignored—it is only the beginning of a journey, not its end.

Ultimately, interpreting changes in planning in a broad philosophical context remains exactly that—an interpretation. The article is an exercise in interpretivist research; it aims to explore meanings and uncover hidden currents that underlie changes in planning—changes that are too closely related to changes in our broader sensibilities to be coincidental. But unlike positivist research, interpretivist research does not seek to eliminate alternative explanations. It is clear that excellent papers may be (and have been) written on the political, racial, or economic battles that undermined urban renewal, for instance, and served a death sentence to the idea of clearing the urban fabric without mentioning postmodernism. In this sense, changes in planning may be just as well explainable as a reaction to “real-life” contexts as they are as part of a broad ideological change. Yet the rise of postmodern zeitgeist outside of planning is also easily explainable as a reaction to reality; had we not seen Hiroshima or Chernobyl, would we have wavered in our faith in modern reason? The fact that particular “real-life” circumstances, whether in planning or elsewhere, brought about ideological changes does not eliminate the need to analyze the elements of ideological change. Thus, bringing the postmodern debate into the picture may not rule out alternative explanations; it only serves to enrich them.

Author's Note: *The article covers events in Cleveland's planning history until the spring of 2003. The author thanks the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and the University of Michigan Rackham School for their financial support. She also thanks Dr. Jonathan Levine, Dr. Scott Campbell, Dr. Robert Fishman, Dr. Ronald Inglehart, Dr. Walter Leedy, Dr. Norman Krumholz, Dr. W. Dennis Keating, the anonymous reviewers, and the staff of the Cleveland Planning Department (particularly Robert Brown) for their help and comments.*

► Notes

1. In architecture and the arts, postmodernism is linked with the abandonment of elite-driven, avant-garde styles and a bow to consumerism and popular culture (e.g., Venturi 1972; Huyssen 1986); the decline of notions of artistic objectivity and machine-based efficiency of the type of William Carlos Williams's idea of a poem as a “machine made of words” and Corbusier's idea of a house as a “machine for living in,” as demonstrated by the fall of “less-is-more,” “form-follows-function” architecture; and the rise of the collage arts, which celebrate heterogeneity and the playful or ironic revival of elements from the past (Jencks 1986). Most of those elements in the arts bear similarity with postmodern elements in planning: the decline of technocratic planning may be interpreted as the demise of planning's own avant-garde (the

expert-planners), the growing critique of functionalist planning is related to the decline of artistic functionalism, and the rise of historic preservation parallels the growing interest in architectural historicism.

2. The authors also include a colonial period and use this periodization in the context of downtown planning.

3. Furthermore, the review of zoning regulation does not allow any discourse versus policy analysis regarding one of the five themes of the postmodern transition that were identified here—the planning process.

► References

- Alexander, Christopher. 1977. *A pattern language: Towns, buildings, construction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Allmendinger, Philip. 2001. *Planning in postmodern times*. London: Routledge.
- American Planning Association (APA). 1998. Planning advisory service report no. 479: *The principles of smart development*. Chicago: American Planning Association.
- Audriac, Ivonne, and Anne Shermeyen. 1994. An evaluation of neo-traditional design's social prescription: Postmodern placebo or remedy for suburban malaise. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 13:161-73.
- Auge, Marc. 1995. *Non-places: Introduction to the anthropology of supermodernity*. London: Verso.
- Barnett, Jonathan. 1988. In Cleveland, of all places: Urban rebirth, complete with stararchitecture. *Architecture* (December): 88-89.
- Beauregard, Robert. 1989. Between modernity and postmodernity: The ambiguous position of U.S. planning. *Environment and Planning: Society and Space* 7:381-95.
- Boyer, M. Christine. 1983. *Dreaming the rational city*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Burnham, Daniel, John Carrere, and Arnold Brunner. 1903. *The group plan of the public buildings of the City of Cleveland: Report made to the Honorable Tom L. Johnson, mayor, and to the Honorable Board of Public Service*. Cleveland, OH: City of Cleveland.
- Calthorpe, Peter. 1993. *The next American metropolis*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Campbell, Ben. 1987. *The history of zoning in Cleveland*. Unpublished manuscript, City of Cleveland Public Administration Library, subject file: zoning.
- Campbell, Thomas. 1990. Cleveland: The struggle for stability. In *Snowbelt Cities*, edited by Richard Bernard. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Chapman, Edmund. 1953. City planning under industrialization: The case of Cleveland. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 12 (2): 21-24.
- City of Cleveland. 1997. *Codified ordinances, part three: Zoning code*. Cleveland, OH: City of Cleveland.
- Cleveland City Plan Commission. 1929. *Summary of permanent zoning as proposed by the City Plan Commission*. Cleveland, OH: City Plan Commission.
- Cleveland City Planning Commission. 1944. *Building zone ordinance*. Cleveland, OH: City Planning Commission.
- . 1949. *General plan of Cleveland*. Cleveland, OH: City Planning Commission.
- . 1959. *Downtown Cleveland 1975*. Cleveland, OH: City Planning Commission.

- . 1974. *Cleveland policy planning report*. Cleveland, OH: City Planning Commission.
- . 1988. *Civic Vision 2000: Downtown plan*. Cleveland, OH: City Planning Commission.
- . 1991. *Civic Vision 2000: Citywide plan*. Cleveland, OH: City Planning Commission.
- . n.d. *Connecting Cleveland: 2020 citywide plan*. <http://planning.city.cleveland.oh.us/cwp>.
- Congress for the New Urbanism. 2001. *New urbanism: Comprehensive report and best practices guide*. Ithaca, NY: New Urban Publications.
- Conley, Chas. 1929. Zoning in Cleveland and its suburbs. *Cleveland Engineering* (April 11): 3-7.
- Davidoff, Paul. 1965. Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31 (4): 331-38.
- Davidson-Powers, Cynthia. 1988. Cleveland. *Inland Architect* 32 (4): 30-37.
- Dear, Michael. 1986. Postmodernism and planning. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 4:367-84.
- . 2000. *The Postmodern urban condition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dear, Michael, and Steven Flusty, eds. 2002. *The spaces of postmodernity: Readings in human geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellin, Nan. 1999. *Postmodern urbanism*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Filion, Pierre. 1999. Rupture or continuity? Modern and post-modern planning in Toronto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 23 (3): 421-44.
- Forester, John. 1999. *The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gallagher, Mary Lou. 1992. Cleveland citywide plan and downtown plan. *Planning* 58 (3): 8-10.
- Guzzetta, Jacqueline, and Scott Bollens. 2003. Urban planners' skills and competencies. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23 (1): 96-106.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1971. *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon.
- Hall, Peter. 1996. *Cities of tomorrow: An intellectual history of planning and design in the twentieth century*. New York: Blackwell.
- Harper, Thomas, and Stanley Stein. 1995. Out of the postmodern abyss: Preserving the rationale for liberal planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14:233-44.
- Harvey, David. 1990. *The condition of post-modernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1994. Searching for something of value: Man as observer increasingly alienated from himself as being (speech excerpts). *Buffalo News*, 10 July.
- Healey, Patsy. 1997. *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- . 2003. The communicative turn in planning theory and its implications for spatial strategy formation. In *Readings in planning theory*, edited by Scott Campbell and Susan Fainsten. Malden: Blackwell.
- Hemmens, George. 1992. The post-modernists are coming, the post-modernists are coming. *Planning* 58 (7): 20-22.
- Hill, Edward. 1999. Comeback Cleveland by the numbers. In *The new American city faces its regional future: A Cleveland's perspective*, edited by David Sweet, Kathryn Hexter, and David Beach. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Hirt, Sonia. 2002. Postmodernism and planning models. *Critical Planning* 9 (Summer): 116-27.
- Hollis, Linda. 2003. Spreading the wealth. *Planning* 69 (9): 10-15.
- Holston, James. 1989. *The modernist city: An anthropological critique of Brazilia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. 1972. *The dialectic of the enlightenment*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Howard, Ebenezer. [1898] 1946. *Garden cities of to-morrow*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Howard, John. 1944. An urban rehabilitation program for Cleveland. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 10 (1): 18-23.
- . 2000. City planning in Cleveland 1937-1949: A personal account. In *Cleveland: City planning in the 20th century*, edited by Layton Washburn, 47-55. Cleveland, OH: City of Cleveland Printing and Reproduction Division.
- Huyssen, Andreas. 1986. *After the great divide: Modernism, mass culture, postmodernism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Inam, Aseem, and Jonathan Levine. 2001. *Who is responsible for alternative development?* Paper presented at the ACSP conference, Cleveland, OH, October.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and post-modernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Innes, Judith. 1996. Planning through consensus-building. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62 (4): 460-72.
- International Congress of Modern Architecture. [1933] 1973. *Athens charter* (translated from French). New York: Grossman.
- Irving, Allan. 1993. The modern/postmodern divide in planning. *University of Toronto Quarterly* 62 (4): 474-87.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random.
- Jencks, Charles. 1984. *The language of postmodern architecture*. New York: Rizzoli.
- . 1986. *What is postmodernism?* London: Academy Editions.
- . 1987. *Postmodernism: The new classicism in art and architecture*. New York: Rizzoli.
- , ed. 1992. *The post-modern reader*. London: Academy Editions.
- Jenkins, William. 2001. Before downtown: Cleveland, Ohio, and urban renewal, 1949-1958. *Journal of Urban History* 27 (4): 471-96.
- Johannesen, Eric. 1987. Making and sustaining a legacy: Cleveland's group plan. *Inland Architect* (November-December): 30-35.
- Kasarda, John. 1988. Economic restructuring and America's urban dilemma. In *The metropolis era*, edited by Mattei Dogan and John Kasarda. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Keating, W. Dennis, and Norman Krumholz. 1991. Downtown plans of the 1980s: The case for more equity. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 57 (2): 136-52.
- Klotz, Heinrich. 1988. *The history of postmodern architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Knack, Ruth. 1999. Cleveland: The morning after. *Planning* 65 (1): 12-15.
- Kolson, Kenneth. 2001. *Big plans: The allure and folly of urban design*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Krier, Leon. 1988. Traditional ideas for today's towns. *City Magazine* 10 (2): 20-23.
- Krueckeberg, Donald, ed. 1983. *Introduction to planning history in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- Krumholz, Norman. 1982. A retrospective view of equity planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48 (2): 163-74.
- . 1986. City planning for greater equity. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 3 (4): 327-37.

- Krumholz, Norman, and John Forester. 1990. *Making equity planning work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Krumholz, Norman, and W. Dennis Keating. 2001. *A century of planning in Cleveland: Exhibit catalogue*. Cleveland, OH: T. Campbell Exhibition Gallery and Cleveland State University.
- Le Corbusier. [1929] 1987. *The city of to-morrow and its planning*. New York: Dover.
- Leedy, Walter. 1991. Cleveland's struggle for self-identity. In *Modern architecture in America*, edited by Richard Wilson and Sidney Robinson. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Litt, Stephen. 1995. Brave new Cleveland. *Landscape Architecture* 85:38-39.
- . 2000. Examining the fate of Cleveland's best-laid plans. *Plain Dealer*, December 17.
- Loukaitou-Sideris, Anastasia, and Tridib Banerjee. 1998. *Urban design downtown: Poetics and politics of form*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lynch, Kevin. 1960. *The image of the city*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 1981. *A theory of good city form*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lytard, Jean-François. [1979] 1984. *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Madison, Robert. 1960. Cleveland's third downtown reawakening. *American Institute of Architects Journal* (September): 50-56.
- McCahill, Ed. 1973. People planning in Cleveland. *Planning* 39 (1): 8-11.
- Miles, Matthew, and A. Michael Huberman. 1984. *Qualitative data analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Milroy, Beth. 1991. Into postmodern weightlessness. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 10 (3): 181-87.
- . 1993. Planning, the humanities and the circulation of ideas. *University of Toronto Quarterly* 62 (4): 488-503.
- Morrison, Hunter. 1983. Revitalizing the lakefront. *Urban Design International* 4 (4): 31.
- Morrison, Hunter, and Richard Fleischman. 1982. Cleveland bounces back. *Urban Design International* 3 (5): 13-18.
- Morton, David. 2002. Project Cleveland: The city that never was. *Cleveland Free Times* (January 23-29): 14-18.
- Pei, I. M., and Associates. 1961. *An urban renewal plan for downtown Cleveland (Erieview plan)*. New York: I. M. Pei and Associates.
- Pitkin, Bill. 2001. A historical perspective of technology and planning. *Berkeley Planning Journal* 15:34-59.
- Scott, James. 1998. *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Soja, Edward. 1989. *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. New York: Verso.
- . 2000. *Postmetropolis: Critical studies of cities and regions*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Spretnak, Charlene. 1997. *The resurgence of the real: Body, nature and place in a hypermodern world*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Stevens, Garry. 1990. *The reasoning architect: Mathematics and science in design*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Susskind, Lawrence. 1982. Comment. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48 (2): 181-83.
- Talen, Emily, and Gerrit Knaap. 2003. Legalizing smart growth: An empirical study of land use regulation in Illinois. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22 (4): 345-59.
- Venturi, Robert. 1972. *Learning from Las Vegas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Washburn, Layton, ed. 2000. *Cleveland: City planning in the 20th century*. Cleveland, OH: City Planning Commission.
- Weinberg, Robert. 1944. A technique for urban rehabilitation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 10 (1): 23-28.
- Wheeler, Stephen. 2000. Planning for metropolitan sustainability. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20 (2): 133-45.
- Wright, Frank Lloyd. 1932. *The disappearing city*. New York: Payson.