

## COMMUNITY DESIGN IN ITS PRAGMATIST AGE: INCREASING POPULARITY AND CHANGING OUTCOMES

Zeynep TOKER and Umut TOKER

**Received:** 17.10.2006

**Keywords:** community design; participation; genuine participation; pseudo participation; pragmatism.

1. During the design processes of both Sandhills Community Center and Laguna Child and Family Education Center, the authors were supervised by Henry Sanoff, whose experience in the area was invaluable in the authors' learning process. The authors are also grateful to Joan Sanoff for her contributions in the Laguna Child and Family Education Center Project.

The origins of "community design", a term originally coined for the involvement of local people in planning and design decision-making processes, dates back to 1960s, a period of awakening and acknowledging human rights in the world (1). Community participation in planning and design, in this respect, appears to contemporary planners, designers and scholars as an extension of the ideals and systems of thought that were in the mainstream four decades ago (Sanoff, 2000). Since the start of the movement, however, the understanding of the practice of community design and the meaning behind fundamental terms such as "community design" and "participation" have shifted. While such a shift has multiple implications for practitioners of community design, the shift itself can be characterized as one from an ideological base to a pragmatic base. Landmark studies such as Arnstein's (1969) and Wulz's (1986) exemplify this shift from late 60s to 80s, and more recent studies confirm a continuation of this trend (Toker, in press). Since 1990s, however, the shift towards a pragmatic understanding has also led the way to surprising mutations of the idea of people's involvement in planning and design decision-making. The very use of the term "participation" by popular planners / designers in the mainstream to provide leverage to the creation and promotion of new styles exemplifies this trend (i.e. Duany and Plater-Zyberk, 1992).

The shift from an ideological base to a pragmatic one has contributed to the increasing popularity of community design in several ways. First, broad preference of the mild character of the pragmatic approach with its collaborative decision-making focus over the antagonistic attitudes of the 1960s (i.e. Alinsky, 1972) has made community design movement more accessible in its pragmatic era. Second, the eventual realization by many practitioners, of the significantly positive outcomes of public participation in design and planning decision-making processes has become more probable with the increasing focus on the pragmatic aspects of community design. Increasing popularity in this context - for either reason - however,

left the practice of community design open to be used as a tool in creating leverage to mutated lines of thought in planning and design. Such approaches (e.g. new urbanism) conceptualize community design in a way that turns communities into physical entities (Harvey, 1997) and focuses on design as it relates to the building facades and layouts (Sorkin, 1998). This kind of overemphasis on spatial aspects in especially new urbanism echoes spatial determinism, which overestimates the power of architecture in shaping social dynamics (Sorkin, 1998; Talen, 1999; Hayden, 2003; Torre, 1999). Idealist or pragmatist, community design has always been about building communities and designing for communities (Sanoff, 2000), and always at odds with the proponents of spatial determinism. Therefore, community design in the context of new urbanism can only be construed as an example of pseudo-participation, which seems to be the outcome of increasing popularity of community design. As Sanoff (2000) distinguishes genuine participation from pseudo participation he claims that as long as the decision-making power is not in the hands of the participants, and they are to be presented what is planned for them, it cannot be genuine participation. For it to be genuine, the participatory process has to place participants in control of the decisions and actions taken. Today, the picture of community design reveals two main areas of practice, a picture characterized by the terms genuine participation and pseudo participation (Sanoff, 2000).

The purpose of this paper is to identify the characteristics of genuine participation in its pragmatist phase and provide two examples after tracing the community design movement in its transition from idealist phase to pragmatist phase with the argument that even in its pragmatist phase, community design still requires genuine participation despite the popular and contrary use of it within approaches such as new urbanism.

To that end, the paper is structured in four main sections. The first section traces the developments in the background, understanding and practice of community design in its first three decades: from late 1960s to 1990s. The second section focuses on the interpretations of community design in the last decade and identifies the characteristics of its use when pseudo participation dominates. In the third section we exemplify genuine participation with two projects we were involved in and identify the characteristics that we believe distinguishes them from pseudo participation. In the last section, we discuss the significance of community design in its pragmatist phase with its increasing popularity and draw attention to potential misuses.

#### **ORIGINS AND TRANSITION OF COMMUNITY DESIGN: THE FIRST THREE DECADES**

Many scholars and practitioners have defined the term community design over time. For example, Sanoff (2000) and Wates (1999) define community design as an interdisciplinary movement with a focus on the involvement of local people in the design and management of their built environments. Hester (1990) identifies seven main tasks that community designers tackle: creating everyday environments in which people spend the majority of their lives (i.e. homes, schools, offices, neighborhoods), meeting the unique needs of people who will use a particular piece of the built environment in the design and planning process, empowering disenfranchised communities and people, addressing environmental inequities, creating environmental justice, and participation in design and planning decision-making.

Hester's (1990) description of community design tasks, not surprisingly, reveal the building blocks of the movement from sixties, mainly concerned with providing people with a voice, civil rights, and advocacy. A look at the origins of the movement clearly yields the advocacy planning approach, where the practitioner is a community organizer and advocate for empowerment and progress (Arnstein, 1969; Alinsky, 1972; Davidoff, 1965). Citizen power for self-decision forms a foundation for community design, from the 1960s. While the advocacy approach that has led the way to the development of community design is no more on the forefront, the main ideal of involving local people in design and planning decision-making processes prevails.

A brief review of literature in the area easily reveals a shift in the understanding of community design, from an ideological standpoint to a pragmatic one. In a landmark study, Wulz (1986) displays the shift from an advocacy approach to a continuum of approaches. In this continuum, citizen power / voice in planning and design decision-making is assumed to take the following forms from a position of "maximum say" to a minimum: self-decision, co-decision, alternative, dialogue, regionalism, questionnaire and representation. In this study, Wulz (1986) reveals that the following modes of involvement, which were unacceptable in the 1960s as a mode of participation, have become acceptable in the field since the mid-1980s: representation, questionnaire, regionalism and dialogue. One ironic indicator in this picture is the presence of "regionalism", the iconic standpoint of "post-modern" architects, in the continuum as a mode of participation, pinpointing the foundations of pseudo-participation.

This shift from idealist phase to pragmatist phase began in the late 1970s, when more conservative political climate became reluctant in funding community design projects in the United States (Comerio, 1984). The economic pressure of the 1980s only increased the pace of this transition (Sachner, 1983; Curry, 2000; Comerio, 1984). However, evidence showing that the pragmatist phase of community design still accommodated genuine participation has been available. For example, when practitioners in the community design field were asked in a survey in 1984, over half of the respondents stated that they believed in the necessity of people participating in making decisions which would affect them (Hester, 1990). By mid 1990s, however, collaborative decision-making has become the focal point, dominating the scene and shadowing advocacy approaches (e.g. Creighton, 1994; Suskind et al.; 1999; Wates 1999). Therefore, the transition has been in the area of focus rather than the nature of the field. Community design remained to be about people being in control of decision-making processes related to their communities, although loss of focus on advocacy has marked the pragmatist phase.

#### **COMMUNITY DESIGN IN ITS PRAGMATIST PHASE: THE LAST DECADE**

A look at the literature starting at the mid 1990s to today reveals an even more interesting picture. This period shows that community design has moved further into the mainstream in parallel with the rise of a pragmatist understanding in the field. In this period, while community designers who commit to genuine participation in planning and design decision-making are still on the forefront, a new group emerges along with the new uses for the terms "community design" and "participation".

A new piece of research into the identification of key issue leaders and priorities of practitioners in community design provides a good indicator of what has changed (Toker, in press). This study has asked fifteen practitioners in the community design area to identify key issue leaders and high priority issues in community design. Results indicate that community design has not only been pulled more towards the mainstream, but also new, mutated lines of thought have emerged using popular terms. The study indicates that while founders of the movement, such as Henry Sanoff, Rex Curry and Michael Pyatok still are perceived as key issue leaders, there are others who have arrived in the scene: Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Peter Caltorphe, all of whom have been referred to as key issue leaders in the community design field. Ironically they are also the founders of the new urbanist approach, which has been criticized for its favoritism of spatial determinism (e.g. Sorkin, 1998; Talen, 1999; Hayden, 2003; Torre, 1999). However, in the same study, community design practitioners placed participation as the most important aspect of community design followed by the needs and involvement of local communities (Toker, in press), similar to the results of the survey of 1984. Therefore, the pragmatist phase supports the idea of genuine participation, yet due to focus on building consensus and lack of advocacy, it allows new approaches such as new urbanism to borrow the terminology.

At this point, we begin to see what Sanoff (2000) refers to as pseudo-participation, and the emergence of a problem with the terminology. New urbanism, capitalizing on the disappearance of pedestrian-friendly, high-density urban environments and the alienation fueled by them, proposes that historic-looking neighborhoods designed according to a series of design guidelines can bring back "a sense of community" and walkable neighborhoods (Talen, 1999). New urbanism is associated with arguments of Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk (1994), who claim to provide an alternative to the suburban development with the principles of new urbanism. As one of the proponents, Calthorpe (1994, xvi) boldly argues that new urbanism "is about the way we conceive community". It is explained in a following chapter by Bressi (1994, xxv) that new urbanism is "to revive principles about building communities that have been virtually ignored for half a century". However, the communities new urbanists are enthusiastic about are physical entities (Harvey, 1997) with a rigid context and controlled social organization (Torre, 1999). The main assumption of new urbanism, which cannot be accommodated in the genuine participatory understanding of community design, is that once the physical design of a neighborhood is completed after the residents move in, they will become a community just because the design of the physical environment suggests a resemblance to a small town. The fact that new urbanist developments are in essence for-profit developments based on single-family houses standing on private lots as their predominant residential type (Torre, 1999; Harvey, 1997) cannot be changed with the hopes of a community emerging there merely due to the physical characteristics of a neighborhood.

Consequently, the very use of the term "community design" seems to acquire another meaning in the context of new urbanism, which does not include genuine participation of the local communities or efforts of actual community building. Similarly, increasing numbers of publications (and scholars as well as students) seem to refer to the design of a physical environment as "community design", as opposed to a process (e.g. Hall and Porterfield, 2001). In this respect, the very act of designing a settlement

or an apartment complex is frequently referred to as “community design”, instead of a design process which insures systematic involvement of eventual or potential users in all phases of decision-making. In a similar vein, the “charettes”, mostly designed as showpieces, and composed of informing sessions, seem to be referred to as “participatory meetings”, as opposed to community workshops in which a series of custom-designed instruments are administered by community designers acting as facilitators, not informers. Most interestingly, these approaches seem to get more and more popular, despite a significant lack of empirical studies that confirm the proposed comeback of “a sense of community” (Talen, 1999). This popularity even seems to attract mainstream star architects, who refer to more and more “public charettes” or “design charrettes”. We perceive these as good examples of pseudo-participation.

### GENUINE PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNITY DESIGN TODAY

Despite the popular pseudo versions of participation, community design is still practiced in its pragmatic phase with genuine participation, as exemplified in recent literature (Sanoff, 2000; Wates, 1999; Faga, 2006; Sanoff, Toker and Toker, 2005; Hamdi, 2004). In concurrence with Sanoff (2000) we believe that genuine participation is based on local communities having control of decision-making about the issues that will affect them. More particularly, in such a process, all stakeholder groups in communities including the minorities are presented; generation of goals and strategies is done with maximum participation possible and consensus is achieved, and an action plan is prepared at the end of it for implementation. With these principles, we were involved in two community design projects, where we believe to have ensured genuine participation through adhering to the following guidelines.

1. **Participation.** Generate utmost participation of the local community members by utilizing local news media and communication networks of key leaders.
2. **Collaboration.** Start with a collaborative idea generation session with a focus on the identification of key issues, existing assets and problems.
3. **Consensus.** Organize community workshops where members of the community work in small groups to achieve consensus on shared goals and on strategies to attain those goals.
4. **Action.** Conclude the process with an action plan, which includes first steps and potential action initiators for each strategy.

These guidelines insure starting with a wide range of ideas, and systematically narrowing them down to specific planning and design decisions without excluding anyone in the community. Two community design processes we have completed in the last several years exemplify the real-life applications of these guidelines described above.

*SANDHILLS COMMUNITY CENTER, Spring Lake, NC, USA*

Sandhills Family Heritage Association is a community-created, community-run organization committed to the preservation and conservation of rural African American land stewardship and cultural heritage in the Sandhills region of North Carolina. Sandhills Community Center is a concern for this organization because of the mostly emotional



**Figure 1.** Community members working on the space planning exercise.

**Figure 2.** The proposed Sandhills Community Center.



but also practical interest of the surrounding communities in re-opening the Sandhills Community Center. It was built by the older relatives of the current community members during the civil rights movement and accommodated important meetings of the time. With this claim in the history of the surrounding predominantly African-American communities, until recently the Sandhills Community Center had also established a reputation of being the only proper place for significant events in the area, such as the weddings, anniversaries and birthdays in addition to regular community gatherings. The historical connotation and the recent association of the Sandhills Community Center building required that the new community center is an expansion of the existing building.

When this purpose was communicated to the design team, as an initial step we decided to conduct a meeting with key informants to capture the historical anecdotes regarding the existing building with an intention to revitalize the habitual uses in the community center as well as to identify the new uses and activities that the community center can now accommodate. Utilizing the informal network of the Sandhills family Heritage Association, **participation** of several key members of the surrounding communities was ensured. This initial **collaboration** for idea generation in the form of a group meeting provided the information needed to prepare the initial list of possible activities to be used in the space planning exercise prepared by the design team.

The same informal network helped us reach most of the local community members and inform them about the project. In the first community workshop, over 60 members of the community gathered in Spring Lake, close to the site of the Sandhills Community Center building, which was now out of code and shut down. In the workshop the members of the community were asked to form groups of 5 to 8 to participate in a space planning exercise that was prepared for this project. The space planning exercise technique, which was introduced, gradually improved and modified according to the specific needs of individual projects by Henry Sanoff for decades (Sanoff, 2000; Sanoff and Toker, 2003), was

once again effectively utilized for local community's participation in the Sandhills Community Center project. As the design team, based on the list of activities - old and new - we compiled in the focus group meeting, we prepared a set of symbols matching with the set of activities. Each symbol was to represent an activity space. In groups, community members discussed and agreed on the activities they preferred to accommodate in the new community center, and placed the symbols of those activities on the grid-base that was prepared with the actual restrictions of the site. In each group the members had to reach a **consensus** before the end of the exercise, when one member from each group presented their proposal to the rest of the workshop participants. At this point, each proposal was discussed openly regarding the potential advantages and disadvantages (**Figure 1**).

Within two weeks following the workshop the community members received an integrated version of the layout proposal prepared by the design team using the same set of symbols and grid-base but combining the advantages of different proposals presented by the participants at the end of the workshop. This way, we were able to communicate with the community through a tool that they were familiar with. In order to receive feedback regarding this integrated version of the proposal, we attached a mail-in form asking about for reaction regarding different aspects of the proposal. Upon receiving the feedback from the community members, the modifications were made and the next phase, which was to transform this conceptual diagram into a design proposal, began.

After the design proposal was prepared, computer-based three-dimensional modeling was completed. The final community workshop included the presentation of the design proposal, which accommodated the needs, preferences and values of the community members. The design proposal, which achieved partial preservation of the existing building in addition to a considerable expansion, was welcomed enthusiastically by the community (**Figure 2**).

The **action** to follow this community design process was for the community to look for more funding in order to implement the project. Therefore, a fund raising document elaborating on the process or participation, the need for a new community center in Spring Lake, and the design proposal was prepared and submitted to the Sandhills Family Heritage Association. The organization is currently working with the community in search of funding for implementation.

#### *LAGUNA CHILD AND FAMILY EDUCATION CENTER, NM, USA*

Laguna Department of Education, operating under the auspices of the Pueblo of Laguna Tribal Council, serves to pursue the tribe's own education goals by meeting the educational needs of the community from birth through adulthood. When the Laguna Department of Education identified their need for a new child and family education center facility, they searched for consultancy to make sure that this process included input of the local community. As the design team, we agreed to work with the tribal community in preparing the program and the design of the new Laguna Child and Family Education Center (Sanoff, Toker and Toker, 2005). We utilized the formal and informal networks of the Laguna Department of Education to achieve **participation** of the tribal community members in addition to the department heads and teachers.



**Figure 3.** Participants working on the space planning exercise.

**Figure 4.** The proposed Laguna Child and Family Education Center. Left: Overview, Right: View towards the preschool playrooms and outdoor play areas.



The existing facilities, which partially provided similar services were problematic in more than one sense. First, they were scattered in different areas of Laguna, which was an impediment for providing the required proximity between certain uses and activities. Second, they were accommodated mostly in temporary structures such as trailers, which were limiting in size and shape too. These inadequacies of the existing facilities were identified in the first two site visits of the design team, where **collaboration** for idea generation was organized. In the first site visit we held several meetings and walk-through of the existing facilities. In the second site visit, we conducted interviews with the employees of the Laguna Department of Education, which included teachers and department heads, utilizing the preliminary list of activity spaces prepared after the first visit. At the end of the interviews during the second visit, we were ready to prepare an extensive list of potential uses and activity spaces to be accommodated in the new Laguna Child and Family Education Center (Sanoff, Toker and Toker, 2005).

Using the list of potential uses and activity spaces, a space planning exercise was prepared for the community workshop. A symbol for each activity space was created as well as a grid-base with actual dimensional limitations of the potential site of the new building. The third site visit was dedicated to the first community workshop which was attended by the teachers, department heads and community members. Gathered in groups of 5 to 8, the participants discussed and achieved **consensus** on the uses and activity spaces they want to accommodate in the new building. At the end of the workshop, one member from each team presented their proposal to the rest of the participants of the workshop (**Figure 3**).

The fourth site visit was for another workshop, which included department heads only to evaluate the layout proposals and the program. We prepared these layout proposals and the program based on the first community workshop results. At the end of this process of participation and feedback, a series of building design objectives, such as creating a child-friendly environment, avoiding long and unfriendly corridors, and creating a community plaza were clarified. Based on these design objectives, a preliminary plan layout was prepared. The following site visit was to receive feedback on the preliminary plan layout from the department heads in another workshop. The design, which accommodated the community's needs and wishes, was finalized and presented to the community in a final meeting. The final design proposal was received with enthusiasm by the community members including the teachers and the department heads (**Figure 4**).

Laguna Department of Education received a fund-raising document, which helps them in their funding search, in addition to the final design proposal and programming document. These documents provide the necessary means to follow this community design process with **action** towards implementation. This project also received a 2004 Reviewer's Recognition Award from DesignShare Inc., an international organization evaluating innovative schools around the world (DesignShare, Inc., n.d.).

## CONCLUSION

The benefits of community design in its pragmatist phase with genuine participation is undeniable in the sense that involving users in the planning and design processes are advantageous not only for the users since it generates customized outcomes, but also for the planners and designers, since it maximizes user satisfaction with the product. However, as mentioned before, increasing popularity of community design in its pragmatist phase also comes with pseudo applications.

We believe that community design is a straightforward design and planning understanding, which is concerned with employing all means possible to give the eventual or potential users of a particular piece of built environment a voice in the planning and design process. Inevitably, with this understanding of community design, two lines of design thinking and their proponents are excluded:

(i) The line of thought that assumes that the professional (i.e. architect, planner) is *the* expert. S/he makes decisions, leading the way in all phases of the design / planning process ignoring the presence, preference and needs of local community members. The mainstream architectural design processes with "star" architects in the center of gravity form examples of this line of thought.

(ii) The line of thought that refers to participation as a means of justifying a particular design agenda. Users are at best invited to pseudo-participatory sessions in which they are presented with the final decisions. The mainstream design and planning approaches that capitalize on nostalgia and notions of “community”, “sense of place” (e.g. new urbanism) form examples of this line of thought.

The four guidelines listed above, which are participation, collaboration, consensus, and action, are essential in any community design process in its pragmatist phase. Acknowledging that pragmatism has shifted the focus in the field from advocacy to consensus building is also an important step towards preventing pseudo participation and misuse of the term community design. We believe that the main contribution of pragmatism to community design is its integration to the dominating institutional structures rather than resisting them. However, we also believe that the control over decision making has to remain in the hands of the communities even when the institutional structures are utilized.

This argument is parallel to what we have experienced in Sandhills Community Center and Laguna Child and Family Education Center. In both projects, local communities were genuinely involved in the decision making processes, and consequently an ownership towards the project emerged which is an important step towards successful implementation. However, in both projects, interaction with some form of institutional structure was utilized as an advantage in the beginning for increasing the number of participants and in the end when it came to the action and implementation.

We believe that it is among the responsibilities of scholars to bring the background, knowledge base, and hands-on techniques of genuine participatory planning and design to their communities and students as a contribution to the community design field in its pragmatist phase.

## REFERENCES

- ALINSKY, S. (1972) *Rules for Radicals*, Vantage Books, New York.
- ARNSTEIN, S. R. (1969) A Ladder of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* (35) 215-224.
- BRESSI, T. W. (1994) Planning the American Dream., in P. Katz (ed.) *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community*, McGraw-Hill Inc., New York; xxv-xiii.
- CALTHORPE, P. (1994) The Region, in P. Katz (ed.) *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community*, McGraw-Hill Inc., New York; xi-xvi.
- COMERIO, M. C. (1984) Community Design: Idealism and Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Architecture and Planning Research* (1) 227-243.
- CREIGHTON, L. (1994) *Involving Citizens in Community Decision Making: A Guidebook* (Program for Community Problem Solving), Washington, DC.
- CURRY, R. (2000) History of Community Design, in J. M. Cary Jr. (ed.) *The ACSA Sourcebook of Community Design programs at Schools of Architecture in North America*; 38-43.

- DAVIDOFF, P. (1965) Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning, *Journal of American Institute of Planners*, (31) 331-38.
- DesignShare (n.d.) Retrieved October 2006, from "Designshare, Designing for the Future of Learning" website: <http://www.designshare.com/index.php/projects/laguna-center>.
- DUANY, A. and PLATER-ZYBERK, E. (1994) The Neighborhood, the District and the Corridor, in P. Katz (ed.) *The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York; xvii-xx.
- DUANY, A. and PLATER-ZYBERK, E. (1992) *Towns and Town-Making Principles*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Graduate School of Design, Rizzoli, New York.
- FAGA, B. (2006) *Designing Public Consensus: The Civic Theater of Community Participation for Architects, Landscape Architects, Planners, and Urban Designers*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ.
- HALL, K. B. Jr. and PORTERFIELD, G. A. (2001) *Community by Design: New Urbanism for Suburbs and Small Communities*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- HAMDI, N. (2004) *Small Change: About the Art of Practice and the Limits of Planning in Cities*, Sterling, VA: Earthscan, London.
- HAMDI, N. (1991) *Housing without Houses: Participation, Flexibility, Enablement*, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, Cincinnati, Atlanta, Dallas, San Francisco.
- HARVEY, D. (1997) The New Urbanism and the Communitarian Trap, *Harvard Design Magazine*, Winter / Spring 1997; 68-71.
- HAYDEN, D. (2003) *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1820-2000*, Pantheon Books, New York.
- HESTER, R. (1990) *Community Design Primer*, Ridge Times Press, Mendocino, CA.
- SACHNER, P. M. (1983) Still Planning with the Poor: Community Design Centers Keep up the good Works, *Architectural Record*, June; 126-131.
- SANOFF, H., TOKER, U., TOKER, Z. (2005) "Research Based Design of a Child and Family Education Center" in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA 36)*.
- SANOFF, H., TOKER, Z. (2003) *Three Decades of Design and Community*, Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University Office of the Vice Chancellor for Extension and Engagement and the College of Design.
- SANOFF, H. (2000) *Community Participation Methods in Design and Planning*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- SORKIN, M. (1998) Can New Urbanism Learn from Modernism's Mistakes? *Metropolis*, August/September.
- SUSSKIND, L., MCKEARNAN, S. and THOMAS-LARMER, J. (eds) (1999) *The Consensus Building Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- TALLEN, E. (1999) Sense of Community and Neighborhood Form: An Assessment of the Social Doctrine of New Urbanism. *Urban Studies*, 36(8), 1361-1379.

TOKER, Z. (in press) "Recent Trends in Community Design", in *Design Studies*.

TORRE, S. (1999) Expanding the Urban Design Agenda: A Critique of the New Urbanism, in J. Rothschild (ed.), *Design and Feminism: Re-Visioning Spaces, Places, and Everyday Things*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London; 35-43.

WATES, Nick. (1999) *The Community Planning Handbook: How People Can Shape Their Cities, Towns and Villages in any Part of the World*, Earthscan, London.

WULZ, F. (1986) The Concept of Participation, *Design Studies* (7)3; 153-162.

Alındı: 17.10.2006

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** "topluluk için tasarım"; katılım; hakiki katılım(cılık); sahte katılım(cılık); faydacılık.

### ARTAN POPÜLERLİĞİ VE DEĞİŞEN SONUÇLARI IŞIĞINDA FAYDACILIK DÖNEMİNDE "TOPLULUK İÇİN TASARIM"

"Topluluk için tasarım" çıkış noktasında, yani 1980 yılına kadar, ekonomik mücadelenin uygulamacıları daha faydacı zeminler aramaya sürüklediği bir süreçte, insan hakları hareketinin idealist yaklaşımlarından ve insan haklarını savunan planlamacılıktan etkilendi. Son yirmi yıl "topluluk için tasarım" uzmanları için daha da zorlu oldu; çünkü terim popülerleştirse de "hakiki katılım(cılık)"ın pratiği ve dolayısıyla "topluluk için tasarım"ın doğru kullanımı gerçekleşmedi. Alandaki bu faydacı dönemde, "topluluk için tasarım" kisvesi altında yapılan pek çok "sahte katılım(cılık)" örneği, "topluluk için tasarım" teriminin yanlış kullanımını gözden kaçırarak yeni bir bağlamın ortaya çıkmasına yol açtı. Bu türden yanlış kullanımlardan birisi 'Yeni Kentçilik' (*New Urbanism*) yaklaşımının benimsediği tarzda "topluluk için tasarım" da ortaya çıkar. Bu yazıdaki tutumumuzla, bir faydacılık döneminde bile "hakiki katılım(cılık)"ın "topluluk için tasarım"ın temelini oluşturması gerektiğini savunmaktayız. "Topluluk için tasarım" da "hakiki katılım"ı garantilemek için dört asal eleman tanımlıyor ve tasarımına katıldığımız iki projeye bunların uygulamalarını örneklendiriyoruz.

### ABSTRACT

Community design has originally been influenced by the idealist approaches of human rights movements and advocacy planning until 1980s, during which economic challenges pushed practitioners in the area towards exploring more pragmatist grounds. The last two decades have been even more challenging for community designers, since the term has become popular even though the practice of genuine participation, hence the correct use of the term "community design" has not. In a pragmatist age in the area, many examples of pseudo-participation under the disguise of community design have generated a new context where misuse of the term "community design" is overlooked. The way new urbanism has adopted the term "community design" is an example of such misuse. We argue that even in a pragmatist age, genuine participation should form the foundation of community design. We identify four essential elements to insure genuine participation in community design, and we exemplify the application of these with two projects we have been involved in.