A CASE STUDY METHOD FOR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Mark Francis, FASLA

Landscape Architecture Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Landscape Architecture Foundation

636 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20001-3736

The graphic design and electronic publishing of the Land and Community Case Study series was supported by a grant from the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts.

The CLASS Fund, through the Ralph Hudson Environmental Fellowship, provided support for the printing and distribution of the report.

A CASE STUDY METHOD FOR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Final Report to the Landscape Architecture Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Revised, July 16, 1999

Mark Francis, FASLA
Landscape Architecture Program
University of California, Davis
Davis, CA 95616
(916) 752-6031; (916) 752-1392 (Fax)
mofrancis@ucdavis.edu
lda.ucdavis.edu/dept/lda/faculty/francis.html

Contents

A CASE STUDY METHOD FOR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Executive Summary/Abstract

Case studies are widely used in most professions, including medicine, law, engineering, business, planning and architecture. This practice is also becoming increasingly common in landscape architecture. The primary body of knowledge in landscape architecture is built up through written and visual documentation—stories—of projects, be it well known ones such as New York's Central Park or more modest projects such as a small neighborhood park. Together, these cases provide the primary form of education, innovation and testing for the profession. They also serve as the collective record of the advancement and development of knowledge in landscape architecture.

This report summarizes a research project commissioned by the Landscape Architecture Foundation (LAF) in 1997 and completed in 1998 for development of a case study method for landscape architecture. The report concludes that a case study method is a highly appropriate and valuable approach in landscape architecture. The body of research and practice in landscape architecture is already based to some degree on a case study method. Many past designed projects, research studies and educational curricula have utilized a case study approach. The profession lends itself especially well to this type of critical analysis. With increased rigor and funding, the case study method promises to be an increasingly common and effective form of analysis and dissemination for landscape architects.

The Landscape Architecture Foundation is well positioned to take a leadership role in advancing the quality of practice and knowledge of case studies in landscape architecture. The report suggests several parallel actions the Foundation can take alone and with others to advance utilization of the case study method in environmental design in general and landscape architecture in particular. It specifically calls on LAF to begin a three year "Case Studies Initiative" to fund the preparation and publication of ten or more new case studies a year, organized around geographic region and project type. These cases, to be selected by a review panel appointed by LAF, would be made available in several forms including publications, online, and in a Case Study Institute to be administered by LAF in cooperation with ASLA and other related organizations. A large audience exists for such a service, including professionals, academics, public officials, and the general public.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to the Landscape Architecture Foundation and its Board for their foresight in commissioning this study. I would especially like to thank Frederick Steiner, ASLA, LAF Vice President for Education and Research, and Professor at Arizona State University, and Susan Everett, FASLA, the Foundation's executive

director, for their valuable assistance and encouragement during this project. The CLASS Fund provided valuable support through its Ralph Hudson Environmental Fellowship. I want to thank my graduate research assistant Mary Bedard for her help with this project and Susan Palo for editing suggestions. I would also like to thank the many people who gave of their time to inform this project. While I have purposely kept their input confidential, their voices are heard throughout this report.

A CASE STUDY METHOD FOR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

"Outstanding new projects can result from putting a new twist on ideas from the past."

Urban Land Institute, 1998

Introduction

Case studies have a long and well-established history in landscape architecture. They are how landscape architects tell stories about and inform their colleagues and the public about their work. In doing so, they establish and communicate the profession's unique place in history. Case studies have been frequently used in landscape architecture education and research. Practitioners have also utilized them to a more limited extent. As the profession develops more of its own theory and knowledge base and communicates this more broadly, the case study method promises to be an effective way to advance the profession.

The purpose of this present study, commissioned by the Landscape Architecture Foundation in 1997 and completed in 1998, is to explore ways that case study analysis can be more effectively used in landscape architecture. Recommendations include launching a "Case Study Initiative" to support development of new case studies and to disseminate them through publications, professional and continuing education, and the World Wide Web.

Project Objectives

As defined by LAF and the author, this project has several related goals:

- Advance and improve the level of practice and scholarship in landscape architecture through the development of a case study method that can be used to critically document and evaluate projects and issues;

- Develop a case study method that can be used in undergraduate and graduate education and could be easily adopted by teachers, students, researchers, and practitioners;

- Create a way to provide accessible knowledge of designed and natural landscapes so that future practice can be better informed by past experience;

- Expand the depth of critical analysis in landscape architecture so that the value of landscape architecture can be more effectively communicated to the public and allied professions; and

- Advance the state of the art of landscape architecture research and practice.

Study Approach and Methods

The research approach used to develop a case study method for landscape architecture involved several steps:

- A review of past approaches to case study analysis in other professions and the social and ecological sciences, including a summary of the benefits and limitations of this approach.

- A review how environmental design professionals and researchers have utilized case study analysis for designed and natural places. This review included an examination of research reports, journal articles, books, and project descriptions in professional magazines. In addition, existing sources of case study analysis that exist on the Web (such as the University of Toronto's Web archive) and at other organizations (such as the Urban Land Institute, Lincoln Land Institute, Urban Parks Institute, etc.) were identified and evaluated.

- Interviews with several leading researchers and practitioners (see Appendix A) to assess how they would see a case study method being useful in future research and practice. Questions asked in the interviews conducted in early 1998 included: What is the value/limitations of case study analysis in landscape architecture (design, teaching, research)? Seminal projects/examples/literature? Critical dimensions to include in case study analysis? Would you use a case study archive in your practice, teaching? If so, how? What recommendations would you make to LAF to advance this kind of work? Interviewees were asked to suggest additional key people to talk with, although not all were contacted due to time limitations.

- In addition, the same questions were posed as an electronic survey via some key listservers, including the Landscape Architecture Electronic Forum, Child-Youth Environments, Environmental Design Research Association and Urban Parks Institute listserve (addresses are listed at the end of the Bibliography). Responses received are summarized in this report.

- Development of a set of critical dimensions important to document with case study analysis. These include items such as baseline data, key actors, site context, funding, major design principles, perceptions of success, use, meaning, maintenance and management, evaluation, etc. How to collect and present this type of data is discussed.

- After completion of a draft report in April 1998, it was submitted for review to LAF and its board. In addition, I conducted a critical review by sending the draft for comment to those who were interviewed as part of my research as well as other leading landscape architecture practitioners and academics and selected people from other fields (e.g., planning, urban development, land conservation, etc.). Those that provided input are listed in Appendix A).

In addition to this final report summarizing the results of the study to LAF, the results will be more widely disseminated on LAF's Web site and in a manuscript to be submitted to *Landscape Journal* and a more popular article for *LAND* or *Landscape Architecture*.

The Case Study Method and a Definition

The case study method has long been utilized in various professions and fields as an established method of education and research[1]. Law, business, medicine, engineering, and public policy (Yin, 1976, 1993, 1994; Stake, 1995) all have used the case study. Fields such as sociology, economics and psychology also use case studies as a research method. Case studies often serve to make concrete what are often generalizations or purely anecdotal information about projects and processes. They also bring to light exemplary projects and concepts worthy of replication or broader dissemination.

While case study definitions have taken different forms, I offer the following definition of a case study as one well suited for landscape architecture:

> *A case study is a well-documented and systematic examination of the process, decision-making and outcomes of a project that is undertaken for the purpose of informing future practice, policy, theory and/or education.*

Case studies can be valuable for a profession in a number of ways. For practitioners, they can be a source of practical information on potential solutions to difficult problems. For professional education, case studies are an effective way to teach by example, to learn problem solving skills and to develop useful evaluation strategies. For the profession as a whole, case studies are a way to build a body of criticism and critical theory and to disseminate the effectiveness of landscape architecture outside the profession.

There are several ways case studies can be used. In the design professions such as landscape architecture, they typically are used to *describe* and/or *evaluate* a project or

---

[1] For an excellent overview of case study methods and applications as utilized in a variety of fields see Robert Yin's *Applications of Case Study Research* (1994), and *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 1993 both published by Sage.

process. In other fields, case studies are sometimes used to *explain* or even *predict* theory related to practice or phenomenon. Here multiple case studies are looked at with an eye for generalizable lessons or principles that can advance knowledge[2]. Case studies can be of exemplary projects that are stellar or exceptional projects. They can be conducted of more typical projects, which may be easier to replicate. They can be done of contemporary projects as well as more historic types. Successful cases typically include both aspects.

The literature on case study method is clear on the potential benefits and limitations (Sommer & Sommer, 1986; Sommer, 1997, Web et. al., 1966; Zeisel, 1990). While there are many benefits of a case study approach, there are some important limitations as well. One typical problem is the inability to compare across cases, especially where different types of data have been collected. In landscape architecture, some designers consider taking pictures of built projects as a form of case study analysis. Empirical and critical analysis is often missing. So, too, is the use of systematic methods. There is an opportunity through the leadership of LAF in cooperation with organizations such as the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA) and others to increase the level of rigor and application of case study analysis in landscape architecture. They can show how case studies can both better inform practice and advance the state of the art of landscape architectural research.

Case study analysis is one of several well-established research methods in landscape architecture[3]. Case studies typically utilize a variety of research methods. These include experimental (Ulrich, 1984), quasi-experimental (Zube, 1984), historical (Walker and Simo, 1994), story telling/anecdotal documentation (McHarg, 1996) as well as multi-method approaches[4].

Use of Case Studies in other Professions/Fields

---

2 I am grateful to Robert Sommer of the University of California, Davis for pointing out to me that it is often in the looking across multiple case studies with an eye toward synthesis and patterns rather than the individual case study that common themes and principles can be identified. An excellent example of this are the Kaplan books *The Experience of Nature* (1989) and *With People in Mind* (1998) which summarize many case studies of people-plant relations and presents them as patterns and principles useful for design and management.

3 My purpose here is not to review the full array of landscape architecture research methods. Each method has its place depending on the research approach, hypothesis and issues to be addressed.

4 Much of my own case study research has utilized a multimethod approach combining observational, attitudinal, archival, historical and quantitative methods.

The professions of law, medicine, business and engineering have relied on case studies for education, research and practice. The body of case studies in these fields is well developed. For example, the case method is a core part of the curriculum in medicine, law and engineering. The Harvard Business School and Law School routinely use case studies to train their students, in continuing education and for advanced research. The case method is now the educational standard in most professional education. There is a well-developed case study methodology in the social and natural sciences, much of which is useful for landscape architecture.

While similar to case studies in landscape architecture, the social and natural sciences employ a well developed case study methodology which differ in some key ways. Business and law often invent hypothetical case studies for use in education and practice. These are presented to demonstrate how difficult management or clinical situations could be handled in real practice. They challenge students and practitioners to be effective problem solvers and devise solutions to common situations encountered in practice.

Most similar to uses in landscape architecture are the ways case studies have been used historically in urban planning, architecture, urban design, and urban land development. Design education today relies heavily on case studies. Research in architecture, planning and urban design often rely on a case study approach be it a historical, social- or policy-oriented examination.

Similar Efforts

In the course of my research, I examined a number of existing case study programs and archives both in landscape architecture and related fields, including planning, urban land development and urban parks. They include:

Urban Land Institute. The Urban Land Institute has developed a strong record of using case studies as a focus of their organization dedicated to advancing urban land development practice. ULI's Project Reference Files contain development details on over 250 innovative and successful projects from 1985. They develop up to twenty new case studies a year. These are available by mail or on line. Abstracts are free. Subscribers get access to the full case studies. Cost is $75 for ULI members and $95 for nonmembers. ULI also uses their cases as the curriculum in their workshops and institutes held in various parts of the country. More information on ULI and their Project Files is included in Appendix C.

Contemporary Landscape Inquiry Project (CLIP). The Contemporary Landscape Inquiry Project at the University of Toronto's Virtual Landscape Architecture Library web site includes over 160 project case studies in landscape architecture, maintained by landscape architecture faculty and students. The site includes case studies of varying lengths and qualities, a case study search engine and a way to input new case studies

online. According to the project's own description on their web site, "case studies of existing landscape projects are very rough and unedited and are posted as examples and need more work and better image support, particularly sections and details." This project represents a good first effort in making notable landscape architecture projects available to a large audience and provides lessons for what LAF could do to improve the quality and content of case studies in landscape architecture. More information on CLIP is included in Appendix D.

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. The Lincoln Institute's goals are to integrate the theory and practice of land use and taxation and to understand the multidisciplinary forces that influence them. The Institute explores these issues through three focused program areas: 1) Program in the Taxation of Land and Buildings, 2) Program in Land Use and Regulation Program in Land Values, Property Rights and Ownership and 3) Program in the Taxation of Land and Buildings Actual Value. Much of this research utilizes a case study approach. Lincoln Land Institute studies are well regarded and their seminars and conferences have influenced land policy. A few examples of projects they have sponsored include: "Government and Vacant Land: Creating Cityscapes," "Public Policy and Sprawl: Implications of Existing Development Patterns," "State-Level Growth Management," "Urban Transformations and Land Use Regulation," and, "Changing Character of Public Spaces in Contemporary Metropolitan Areas". A unique part of their mission is to examine international as well as national projects. More information on the Lincoln Land Institute and projects they support is included in Appendix E.

Trust for Public Land. TPL is a national land conservation organization with a strong record of advancing urban and rural land preservation and design. They offer several case study oriented services and publications such as "The Power of Parks," "Green Cities Initiative," and "GreenSense: Financing Parks and Conservation". They recently collaborated with the Urban Land Institute (ULI) with funding from the Graham Foundation to produce and publish an excellent book of case studies on urban parks (Garvin and Berens, 1997).

Urban Parks Institute. Based in New York City, this institute, established with a $1.6 million grant from the Lila Wallace Readers Digest Fund in 1995, provides training and advancement of best practices in urban park and open space development. They hold annual Urban Parks Institutes to bring city officials, academics and practitioners together to examine advancements in the field. They maintain an excellent web site "Urban Parks Online," which provides case studies of successful urban park projects. They sell for $30 a set or for $3 each "Park Places" case studies include a photo of the project, project background, funding, impacts, lessons learned and a key project contact.

American Planning Association (APA). APA's Planning Advisory Service (PAS) has developed a large number of planning case studies available to APA and subscribers on line. About 1,600 planning agencies, consultants, and educational institutions subscribe to PAS. Since 1949, the service has produced 475 PAS Reports—research monographs

that provide practical solutions to the problems planners face every day. Subscribers receive PAS Reports immediately upon release—eight reports a year. They also receive the PAS Memo each month. The PAS inquiry service allows subscribers to tap into APA's vast collection of planning reports, ordinances, regulations, and vertical files on 375 planning subjects. PAS gets about 5,000 calls a year.

Case studies are developed and published by other organizations such as the **American Institute of Architects** (AIA), **Environmental Design Research Association** (EDRA), and **Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture** (CELA), although mostly through their conference proceedings, journals or newsletters. This is also true of the **American Society of Landscape Architects** (ASLA). ASLA's ***Landscape Architecture*** publishes landscape architecture case studies and is closely followed by the profession. ASLA's Landscape Architecture Technical Information Series (LATIS) is also a potential source of publishing case studies.

The Value of Case Studies

Robert Yin suggests that the value of case studies is their ability to "retain holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life situations" (1994, p. 3). Case study analysis is a particularly useful research method in professions such as landscape architecture, architecture, and planning where real world context tends to make more controlled empirical study difficult.

Case studies can often answer big questions at the intersection of policy and design. They are useful in participatory planning, for culturally sensitive design, and for studies trying to refine or test emerging concepts and ideas. Questions posed in case studies by Ian McHarg, Kevin Lynch, Herbert Gans, and Jane Jacobs 30-40 years ago still form the basis for much contemporary thinking in environmental design in general and landscape architecture in particular. From these cases, new normative theory was developed.

In my review of the literature and in interviews, several valuable benefits of case studies were identified, especially for landscape architects. These are summarized in six general areas: teaching, research, practice, theory building, criticism, and communication and outreach:

Teaching. Landscape architecture today is predominately taught by example. Case studies are an effective and established way to use examples in the classroom or studio. Most schools utilize some form of case study method in their curriculum. Case studies are a useful way for students to gain insight into past projects in order to successfully design new ones. They are particularly instructive in teaching history and useful for students in community outreach projects. Case studies are an excellent way to get students involved in landscape architectural research because the method is easily used by students, including those early in their training. Examples of past case study

approaches to landscape architectural education include McHarg's early case study studios at the University of Pennsylvania focused on the Delaware River Basin, the work of Carl Steinitz at Harvard where his studios have developed useful information for specific communities or regions including Monroe County, Pennsylvania (1994) and Camp Pendelton, California (1996). Clare Cooper Marcus, through the work of her students in her social factors seminar course at Berkeley, has developed a large body of case studies of the use and redesign of urban open spaces (Cooper Marcus and Francis, 1997), particularly in the Bay Area[5].

More recent examples include Ann Spirn's studios at the University of Pennsylvania developing and evaluating community garden case studies in West Philadelphia, Rob Thayer's studios at UC-Davis developing case study projects in the Putah/Cache Creek watershed of central California, and John Lyle's studios at Cal Poly Pomona on regional design problems within the Los Angeles Basin. Several courses have utilized case studies to teach theory in landscape architecture, particularly at Arizona State, Harvard, UC-Davis and Virginia.

Research. There is a large and well-developed literature on the case study method and its many applications (see Bibliography). Landscape architectural researchers have utilized the case methods in post occupancy evaluations, landscape ecology, site technology and historical analysis[6]. Many MLA and Ph.D. theses and dissertations are excellent examples of case study analysis[7]. Organizations such as the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture, the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Environmental Design Research Association all report on advances in case study research to some degree at their annual meetings[8]. Increased use of case studies helps to expand the research base in landscape architecture as well as to communicate these research advances to the profession.

Practice. Case studies are a structured way of recording and record keeping for landscape architectural projects. They are useful in case law and have a value for defensible practice. Case studies are also a useful way for practitioners to evaluate the success and failure of projects, although few practitioners do this. Future practice can build on existing cases by understanding aspects of a project unique to a given context while gleaning principles useful in similar projects. Case studies can help practitioners

---

5 My own interest in the use and meaning of public space began as a student in Clare's course in 1970 where we conducted case studies of Union Square in San Francisco and several neighborhood parks in Berkeley.

6 See past ASLA Research Awards in *Landscape Architecture* for some more notable examples.

7 There continues to be a problem of accessing and disseminating these theses. This is a useful role for LAF especially in developing their web site and publications.

8 Many of these case studies are published in the *Proceedings* of these organizations yet they are still largely unknown and inaccessible to practitioners.

replicate successes and avoid failures. Case studies can be helpful in demystifying what landscape architects do and how projects come together. They can be particularly useful in the design process as a way of engaging a variety of people in a complex process, moving from problem identification to creating a solution. Case studies can also serve as "how-to" guides which, if well designed and clearly expressed, can lead someone step-by-step through any process.

Theory Building. While not always used this way, case studies can be instrumental in developing new theory related to landscape architecture. They can not only describe but also explain and predict future action. Case studies can be used to develop what Kristina Hill calls a "strategic approach" or rules of thumb regarding landscape architectural projects from the scale of the site to the region (1995). For example, case by case data on amounts of impervious surface can test the larger community or regional impacts of a project. Findings from case studies on pedestrian or park behavior can be used to predict how activity may take place in similar projects[9]. They can help to develop models and theory of what makes a particular type of project or development work (Steinitz, 1995, 1996).

Criticism. A body of criticism is essential for any profession to develop and progress. Case studies are a useful way to develop criticism in landscape architecture. They can illuminate both the positive as well as the more negative aspects of projects. Case studies can also inform the ongoing intellectual debate and critical discussion within landscape architecture.

Communication and Outreach. Case studies are an effective way to communicate the results of landscape architectural projects. They are particularly well suited for reporting in the media and are easily understandable by the public. They can give visibility to the uniqueness of the profession and its many important contributions.

Some Limitations

While case studies are still one of the best means for communicating lessons in many fields, they are plagued with difficulties. Some of the most common limitations for landscape architecture include:

- They are often costly to do, especially if they are done well with time spent on site.

---

[9] For example, William Whyte's (1980) case studies of public spaces in Manhattan in the 1970s first alerted designers and city officials to the importance of use in making successful outdoor spaces and led to development of policies in many cities for the design of plazas and public space.

- Project designers, owners and managers may be unwilling to provide frank information about problems with their projects, information necessary to prepare a full and critical case study.

- They are not as effective on new projects. The Urban Land Institute, for example, typically waits one or two years after a project is complete before they begin a case study. Some projects are best evaluated after a decade or more.

- Professionals in landscape architecture often lack the scientific background and training in research methods essential for good case study research.

- Comparison across individual cases may be difficult because of a lack of comparable methods.

- Limited information is available on existing case studies. For example, cases done as graduate theses are rarely published or easily accessible.

- A limited number of case studies are available beyond the well-known projects that tend to be studied over and over again (e.g.: Bryant Park, Central Park, etc.)

- Practitioners often do not have the time to find and read case studies.

- One risk with case studies is that they may portray only one solution to a problem and as a result may limit broader creative thinking.

- Case studies can sometimes point out failures as well as successes of projects. While we often learn as much or more from failure than success, professionals are often not eager to have this aspect of their project highlighted.

- Funding is limited for supporting case studies in landscape architecture.

- There is often a lack of peer review of case studies unless submitted for publication in refereed journals such as *Landscape Journal,* which very few are. As a result, publications that contain case study projects are not as rewarded in tenure and promotion cases as much as "scientific" research[10].

Case Studies in Landscape Architecture

---

[10] An exception is when a case study results in a stand-alone monograph or book, it is rewarded in the tenure system. Examples include Herbert Gans' *The Urban Villagers* (1966) and Clare Cooper Marcus' *Easter Hill Village* (1975).

Case study analysis has a long history in landscape architecture. While not always called case studies, documentation and dissemination of projects have been done since the days of Olmsted. Many of these are simply documentation and publication of projects lacking more in-depth and critical review. Professional design awards are a useful source of exemplary case studies[11]. Some contemporary landscape architects have used case studies to develop and test their theories and design ideas. They include some of the most important landscape architects working today, including Rich Haag, Randy Hester, Ann Spirn, Ian McHarg, Carl Steinitz, Rob Thayer, John Lyle and Peter Walker, to name just a few. There is also a sizable literature of landscape architecture projects based all or in part on case studies (see seminal case study project list below). There has been recent expansion in the number of case studies, particularly those published by Process Architecture and Spacemaker Press in the United States.

Some Key Issues in Case Study Analysis

There are several critical issues when doing case studies. It is important to address these when designing a case study method and carrying out the study. Questions include: Who does the case study? What is the role of participants in carrying out the case study (designer, client, and users)? What constitutes success or failure of a project? How will failures be reported? How can objectivity be insured in carrying out a case study?

Seminal Case Study Projects

There are several seminal projects that make up a large part of the knowledge base as well as the popular culture of landscape architecture. These single projects as well as comparative studies of project types have had enormous influence on development of the profession. They illustrate the impact that well documented case studies have on past and future practice.

In my interviews, the following single or comparative case studies were cited as seminal to the theory and practice in landscape architecture. While not a comprehensive survey, it demonstrates the large number of well recognized case studies that exist that have had a significant impact on landscape architectural thought and action.

Single Case Studies:

Amelia Island, FL
Boston Commons, MA
Bryant Park, New York, NY
Camp Pendelton Study, CA
Central Park, New York, NY
Easter Hill Village, Richmond, CA
Gas Works Park, Seattle, WA
Ghiradelli Square, San Francisco, CA
Greenacre Park, New York, NY

[11] Publications of the professional awards programs of the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Rudy Bruner Award, and the EDRA/*Places* Exemplary Place Awards are rich sources of very good case study projects.

Lovejoy & Forecourt Fountains, Portland, OR
Manteo, NC
National Center for Atmospheric Studies, Boulder, CO
Reston New Town, VA
Plan for the Valleys, MD
Paley Park, New York, NY
People's Park, Berkeley, CA
Raleigh Greenway, NC
Seaside, FL
Seattle Freeway Park, Seattle, WA
Stanford Campus Plan, Palo Alto, CA
Tanner Fountain, Harvard, Cambridge, MA
Vietnam Memorial, Washington, DC
Village Homes, Davis, CA
Washington Environmental Yard, Berkeley, CA
The Woodlands New Town, TX

Comparative Case Studies:

Cities Reborn, 1987
City Form and Natural Process, Hough, 1984
Community Open Spaces, Francis et. al., 1984
Contemporary Landscapes of the World, 1990
Design for Human Ecosystems, Lyle, 1996
Design with Nature, McHarg, 1995
Ecological Design, Thompson and Steiner, 1997
Gardens in Health Care Facilities, Cooper-Marcus & Barnes, 1995
Great Streets, Jacobs, 1996
Grey World, Green Heart, Thayer, 1994
Image of the City, Lynch, 1961
Modern Landscape Architecture, Johnson, 1991
The Death and Life of Great American Cities, Jacobs, 1961
People Places, Cooper Marcus and Francis, 1997
Politics of Park Design, Cranz, 1982
The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces, Whyte, 1980
Public Space, Carr et. al., 1992
Urban Parks and Open Spaces, Garvin and Berens, 1997
Yard, Street and Park, Girling and Helphand, 1994

Critical Dimensions

Case studies can be utilized to bring out several kinds of information. While some of this information may be unique to the given project and its context, it may also be useful to advancing knowledge in the profession in general. Elements that a full case study should include are:

- Baseline information/context – location, size, client, designer(s), consultant(s), density, land use type, etc.

- Role of key participants – Landscape architect? Other professionals? Client? Users? What is the nature of the team? Who leads the team? Their role in beginning of project? How has this changed during course of project?

- Financial – Initial budget? Final costs? Reasons for any difference?

- Process – Political process? Decision making process? Design process? Implementation Process? Who influences a project's decisions and outcomes? Why? How does project come together?

- Problem definition and response – What problem(s) is the project trying to solve? Was it solved? If so, how? If not, why not? Were other problems solved?

- Goals – What are key goals (social, ecological, aesthetic)? How set? Who defined them? Did goals change during course of project? If so, how?

- Program – How was program developed? Who developed it? Was it modified during course of project?

- Design – Key design concepts? Inspiration for form? How did designer translate goals into form?

- Site visit(s) – What does the project look like? How does it work? How does it feel?

- Use – How is the place used? Who uses? Does not use? How? Scale relationship to similar projects?

- Maintenance and management – problems of management and maintenance? Maintenance costs? Perception of project by space managers?

- Perception and meaning – How place is perceived and valued?

- Scale – Size of Project? Dimensions of key elements? Amount of site coverage and impervious surface?

- Time – How well does the place fare over time? How does project age incrementally?

- Unique constraints – How were they addressed in process?

- How is the community served by this project? Social impact? Meaning?

- Environmental sensitivity and impact - How is the environment served by this project? Contribution to sustainability?

- Impact on profession – How is the profession served by this project? What does it contribute to the professional knowledge base?

- Infrastructure – Underlying challenges of site? Technology constraints?

- Lessons learned - Place specific versus more generalizable lessons learned?

- Theoretical underpinning – Why project was done? Question(s) it is trying to answer? Problem(s) it is trying to solve?

- Outside critiques – By awards jury? Experts? Users? Review committees? Design critics? Journalistic reporting? Has there been any controversy associated with the project? Has this been resolved? If so, how?

A Suggested Format for Case Studies

From this range of knowledge that can make up a case study, at least three levels of information are possible in a case study analysis. The first, and simplest, is a project abstract (2-3 pages). The second is a full project case study. The third is more in-depth case study material with information included of a more contextual or specialized nature. While each may have a different audience, the need, especially in teaching, is most critical for the more detailed case study at the second and third level.

Abstract/Fact Sheet

- Photo(s)
- Project Background
- Project Significance and Impact
- Lessons Learned
- Contact
- Keywords

Full Case Study

- Project Name
- Location
- Date Designed/Planned
- Construction Completed
- Cost
- Size
- Landscape Architect(s)
- Client
- Consultants
- Managed by
- Context
- Site Analysis
- Project Background and History
- Genesis of Project
- Design, Development and Decision Making Process
- Role of Landscape Architect(s)
- Program Elements
- Maintenance and Management
- Photograph(s)
- Site Plan(s)

- User/Use Analysis
- Peer Reviews
- Criticism
- Significance & Uniqueness of Project
- Limitations
- Generalizable Features & Lessons
- Future Issues/Plans
- Bibliography of Project Citations/References
- Web Sites/Links
- Contacts for Further Information

In-depth Analysis

There are often more in-depth and case specific considerations unique to the type of case study. They may include:

- Archival research (e.g., project records, newspaper articles, etc.)
- Awards or special recognition for project
- Copies of articles or reports on project
- Interviews with client
- Interviews with managers and maintenance people
- Interviews with users
- Interviews with nonusers
- Longitudinal studies of the place over time

Methods/Process

Case study analysis typically involves the following steps: 1) designing the case study, 2) conducting the case study, 3) analyzing the results, and 4) disseminating the results. Case studies can be done alone or together to compare across projects (Yin, 1994). Case studies in landscape architecture can be organized around 1) type of project (see typology), 2) type of problem, 3) geographical region, or 4) designer. Each has its own unique purpose and benefits.

One methodological issue is who actually should do the case study. It is important that objectivity be insured in the design and carrying out of the case study. Subjectivity can be avoided if other people (such as academics, journalists, and users) are involved in preparing the case study. The person or team that prepares the case study needs to be free of bias and skilled in asking questions, listening, and comprehending the type of place and issues involved.

Information for case studies can be gathered in a variety of ways. It is important to be systematic and consistent in using the methods. Most successful case studies utilize a variety of methods such as the following:

- Site visits
- Site analysis
- Historical analysis
- Design process analysis
- Behavioral analysis
- Interviews with designer(s), developer(s), manager(s), public officials, etc.
- Interviews with users and non-users
- Archival material searches including project files, newspaper articles, public records, etc.
- Bibliographic searches
- Web searches

A Landscape Typology

Case studies can be organized in several ways. One is geographically-based to document projects within a region or part of the country or world. Another is by type of funding, decision-making, or role of the landscape architect. A third is by project type, which is particularly helpful to compare and learn across projects. Case studies of projects can follow a typology for landscape architecture that may include the following types (partial listing)[12]:

- Campuses
- Cemeteries
- City Plans
- Community Open Spaces
- Gardens (Private)
- Gardens (Public)
- Greenways/Parkways
- Historic Landscapes
- Housing Environments
- Institutional and Corporate Landscapes
- Landscape Planning
- Metropolitan Open Spaces
- National Forests
- National Parks
- New Community Design
- Plazas

---

12 This typology is adapted from W. Tishler (Ed.) *American Landscape Architecture*. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation,1989 and Carr et. al. *Public Space*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Recreational Areas
- Regional Plans
- Restored Natural Landscapes/Reclamation
- State Parks
- Streets
- Urban Parks
- Waterfronts

An Issue Typology

Case studies could also be conducted and organized around issues that face landscape architects. While any types of issues are possible, they could address, for example[13]:

- Approaches to community participation
- Design decision making
- Development costs
- Low cost urban parks
- Use and users
- Meaning
- Park management and maintenance
- Permanency in community gardens

Two Case Study Examples - Bryant Park and The Sea Ranch

To illustrate how case study analysis could be structured, two seminal landscape architecture projects are developed as example case studies: The Sea Ranch in Northern California (New Community Design/Landscape Planning) and Bryant Park in midtown Manhattan (Urban Parks). I know both projects well, having lived in one for several summers and worked across the street from the other for three years. I have also been involved in research on both places. They are not presented here as full or complete cases but abbreviated illustrations of the type of information that should be included in case studies of landscape architecture projects. I refer readers to the case studies and publications cited on these two projects.

I have chosen these two projects because there is a significant and accessible body of case study material already published on each, including reports from the designers and critical writing by others including designers and journalists. While these are larger

---

13 I am indebted to Anne Vernez Moudon of the University of Washington- Seattle for pointing out that case studies are especially needed that address processes and issues as well as specific types of projects.

scale and complex projects, they both represent the breadth and depth of issues found in landscape architectural projects.

Case Study Example: Bryant Park, New York City[14]

PROJECT NAME	**Bryant Park**
LOCATION	Avenue of the Americas between 41st and 42nd Streets, behind New York Public Library, Manhattan
DATE DESIGNED/PLANNED	Original design completed in 1934; Redesigned early 1990s
CONSTRUCTION COMPLETED	Built in phases from 1991 to 1995
CONSTRUCTION COST	Park Rehabilitation = $5.9 million
SIZE	4.6 acres
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT(S)	Hanna/Olin, Landscape Architects
CLIENT/DEVELOPER	New York City Parks Department & Bryant Park Restoration Corporation (BPRC)
CONSULTANTS/ARCHITECTS	Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer, New York City
MANAGED BY	New York City Parks Department & Bryant Park Restoration Corporation (BPRC)

Context. Bryant Park, located one block from Times Square and behind the main branch of the New York Public Library, is a major public open space in Manhattan's bustling midtown. It is located in a busy office and educational district of Manhattan and serves as an outdoor retreat for office workers, tourists, and students. In the 1970s it was populated by drug dealers and the homeless. Today it is heralded as a revitalized and democratic urban public space that can serve as a model for other cities.

The history of the park graphically demonstrates some of the conflicts inherent in managing public spaces in dense urban centers. Considering its location, the notion of Bryant Park as a place for relaxation can be viewed as appropriate on one hand and unrealistic on the other. Clearly many urbanites seek a place of retreat from the activity of the city, and Bryant Park is one of the few places in central Manhattan that could conceivably offers this respite. Indeed, in their 1976 study of the park, Nager and

---

[14] Material for this case is drawn from Biederman, D.A. and Nager, A.R. 1981. Up from smoke: A new improved Bryant Park? *New York Affairs*, 6: 97-105; Carr, S., M. Francis, L. Rivlin and A. Stone. *Public Space.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 1994; Garvin, A. and G. Berens. 1997. *Urban Parks and Open Space*. Washington: The Urban Land Institute; Longo, G. 1996. *Great American Public Places*. New York: Urban Initiatives; Nager, A. R. & W.R. Wentworth. 1976. Bryant Park: A comprehensive evaluation of its image and use with implications for urban open space design. New York: CUNY Center for Human Environments; and Thompson, W. *The Rebirth of New York City's Bryant Park*. Washington: Spacemaker Press. 1997.

Wentworth found that relaxing or resting was the most frequent activity engaged in by the park users they interviewed.

However, as these same researchers suggest, some of the very factors that made the park a place for retreat and relaxation, such as its ample vegetation and the stone fences separating it from the street, also encouraged its intensive use by drug dealers, who operated easily in the semi-seclusion of the park during the 1970s until its redevelopment in 1990s. During the 1970s it became clear that some design or management changes were necessary in order to counteract the appropriation of the park by dealers and their clients and to increase its use by a wider range of people, including local office workers and shoppers. This concern gave rise to current redesign and development of the park, completed in phases from 1991 to 1995.

Site Analysis. Bryant Park is bounded on three sides by streets and on the fourth by the back of the New York Public Library. Two of the three streets, 42nd and Avenue of the Americas, are heavily trafficked. Historic elements include a stand of heritage Sycamore trees on the site framing a central lawn area and a plaza at the western end. There are stunning views of the skyline of midtown Manhattan from most parts of the park, and the New York Public Library building forms a strong visual edge at the east end of the Park. Wally Wentworth and Anita Nager (1976) conducted a behavioral analysis of Bryant Park in the early 1970s followed by filming and observation of use of the park by the sociologist William Whyte. Landscape architect Laurie Olin conducted detailed sketches, site analysis and redesign studies of the park in 1980s[15]. Several economic studies were done on the importance and redevelopment of the park during that same period.

Project Background and History. While Bryant Park has served as a public open space since the mid-1850s, its main configuration was established in 1934 and then modified in the early 1990s. Bryant Park was originally a potter's field in 1823. It was developed as a park in 1847 and named Reservoir Park—"after the city reservoir that was constructed on the site now occupied by the public library" (Berens, 1998, p. 45). In 1884, it was renamed Bryant Park after the poet William Cullen Bryant, who was a strong advocate for parks. When Robert Moses became head of the New York City Parks Department in 1923, he mounted a major redevelopment of the park. Moses intended the park to be a place of "restful beauty," with ample trees and hedges, rather than a space for active recreation (Biederman & Nager, 1981). Moses held a design competition, and the winning design converted the park into a classically influenced formal space, surrounded by a stone fence and laid out in a symmetrical fashion.

Until then the park was on grade with the surrounding sidewalk, but fill was used from nearby subway construction to raise the park above the surrounding streets. Gayle

---

[15] See Olin's engaging sketches pp. 9 –17 in W. Thompson, *The Rebirth of New York City's Bryant Park*. 1997.

Berens of the Urban Land Institute, who has written an excellent and detailed case study of the park, attributes the decline of the park to the late 1960s when it was "ignored by leisure-time" users (1998, p. 46). The recent redevelopment effort was made largely to address the perception of Bryant Park as a "needle park" for drug dealing (Longo, 1997). Years of neglect, deterioration and problems of use led the Rockefeller Brothers Fund to fund a reexamination of the park. The fund brought in noted public space expert William Whyte, who used past research on the park to create a formula for redesign (see Program).

After Whyte's report, the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation, a public-private partnership, was formed to redevelop the park and a team of designers was hired. Construction of the park took place in the early 1990s and the park has enjoyed a rebirth and transformation as a result. Today it is a well-used and popular open space in midtown Manhattan.

Genesis of Project. The recent redevelopment of Bryant Park grew out of significant social and crime problems with the park, especially during the 1970s. To redevelop the park, the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation, a private nonprofit group funded primarily by corporations located near the park and the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund, was founded in 1980. While the Corporation dealt extensively with maintenance and security issues in cooperation with the City's Parks and Police Departments, its major goal was "to fill Bryant Park with activity, to attract to the park as many legitimate users as possible" (Bryant Park Restoration Corporation, 1981). In the years it has operated, the restoration group in conjunction with the Parks Council, the Public Art Fund, and other organizations has been responsible for an array of events and new activities in the park. These include several concert series, an artists-in-residence program, arts-and-crafts shows, a booth selling half-price tickets to musical and dance events, and book and flower stalls (Carr et. al, 1992). It is generally agreed that these activities, along with improvements in policing and maintenance, significantly increased park use and reduced crime (Fowler, 1982). However, it was clear that more had to be done to restore and refresh the park. Landscape architects Hanna Olin were hired in the early 1990s to redesign the park. Their design goal was to make the park a multiuse and user-friendly urban open space.

Design, Development and Decision-Making Process. Six million dollars worth of physical changes were made to the park in several phases in the early 1990s. These included adding more seating, increasing access points, refurbishing hedges, lawns and flower beds, restoring the fountains and Bryant statue, and expanding the library's central book stacks underneath the Great Lawn (Program on Public Space Partnerships, 1987). The office of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, a firm known for being sensitive to historical landmarks, was hired as architects for the restaurant addition at the rear of the New York Public Library facing the park. This proposal to encroach into the public park with a private development received considerable opposition, including objections from the influential private advocacy group, the Parks Council. After three years of public debate and review, a scaled-down proposal called for two smaller

buildings on the upper terrace, one housing an upscale restaurant, the other concessions for lower cost food. Design coupled with an aggressive programming of events, increased maintenance (including an annual maintenance budget of $2 million and 35 full time staff) and new elements such as food, music and movable seating provided the ultimate formula for success for the park (Thompson, 1997; Berens, 1998).

Role of Landscape Architect(s). Landscape architect Laurie Olin and his firm Hanna Olin played a major role in the design and redevelopment process[16]. Their concern was "design, rather than sociology" since the existing park had many physical problems ranging from years of neglect to numerous dead ends, hidden places and general lack of amenities. In the end, many of the changes were subtle, building on the classical principles of Moses's 1930s design.

Program Elements. The park redesign program was essentially identified in the original behavioral research done by Anita Nager and Wally Wentworth, two doctoral students in environmental psychology at the City University Graduate Center, directly facing the park (Nager & Wentworth, 1976.). William Whyte summed up the problems with the park as "Access is the nub of the matter. Psychologically, as well as physically, Bryant Park is a hidden place. The best way to meet the problem is to promote the widest possible use and enjoyment by people." (quoted in Berens, 1998, p. 46). Whyte translated this observation into a number of specific recommendations in 1979[17]:

- Remove the iron fences;
- Remove the shrubbery;
- Cut openings in the balustrades for easier pedestrian circulation in and out of the park;
- Improve visual access up the steps on the Avenue of the Americas;
- Provide a third set of steps midway between the existing stairs and 42nd Street;
- Provide ramps for the handicapped;
- Open up access to the terrace at the back of the library with new steps;
- Restore the fountain; and
- Rehabilitate Carrere and Hastings' historic restroom structures.

While not all these ideas were adopted in the final design program, they became the essential redesign agenda for Bryant Park. A number of additional elements were included in the park including 2,000 movable folding chairs, extensive new planting (to make the edge of the park more like a public garden). The restrooms were also restored (complete with fresh flowers and a baby changing table).

---

16 The redesign process and role of the landscape architect for Bryant Park is discussed in great detail in Thompson, W. *The Rebirth of New York City's Central Park*. Washington: Spacemaker Press. 1997.

17 William H. Whyte, "Revitalization of Bryant Park." Report to the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. 1979.

Maintenance and Management. One of the keys to the park's rebirth as described in recent case studies of Bryant Park was its extensive management and maintenance program (Berens 1998; Thompson 1997). Aggressive activity programming has clearly played a key in the park's success. For example, numerous free concerts, fashion shows, and fairs have been held in the Park on a regular basis. A staff of over thirty people maintain and manage the park including "a full time horticulturist, a maintenance and sanitation crew, and a security team that operates twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week" (Thompson, 1997, p. 33). This unusual level of maintenance is made possible by a unique public-private partnership between the City of New York (who in many ways gave up its claim to maintaining the park), corporate and institutional tenants of surrounding buildings, and the private foundations. A Business Improvement District (BID) assesses fees that are used to fund management and staff maintenance for the park[18].

User/Use Analysis. Significant behavioral problems identified in several detailed studies of the park led to the current redevelopment. In the early 1970s, the detailed study conducted by environment psychology doctoral students Anita Nager and Wally Wentworth (1976) identified many of the core physical problems with the park. Many of these were perceived safety concerns that kept people out of the park except during peak periods. My faculty office at the City University Graduate Center was directly across the street from Bryant Park from 1977-80. and I frequently used the park during lunch hours and on nice days. I also had my students use the park as a way to evaluate the use and meaning of urban parks. The park was run down but a pleasant retreat from the busy world of Midtown Manhattan. One would see drug dealing occurring on the edge of the park, but the Central Lawn was often a safe haven especially during periods of heavy use[19]. It was this perceived sense of danger that led planners and land owners to want to change the park.

Since redesign, amount of use and diversity of users have clearly increased in the park. Park use has reportedly more than doubled since the redesign and female use of the park is up considerably based on records kept by the managers (Thompson, 1997, p. 33). A postoccupancy evaluation was conducted after some construction was completed in 1993 by a student in the same CUNY environmental psychology program that

---

18 For a detailed discussion of how the Business Improvement District was used to rebuild and maintain Bryant Park see Gayle Berens, *Bryant Park*, p. 48, 1998.

19 It was interesting to me that the drug buyers I observed were typically well dressed, office workers from surrounding offices. This has been found to be the case in studies of drug selling behavior in public space (Carr et. al, 1992). One wonders if this activity has only shifted to less supervised and policed public spaces. The problem in Bryant Park was that during periods of low use of the park, drug dealing was the predominate activity in the park.

conducted the original 1976 study of the park[20]. Using behavioral observation and interview methods, the author found that increased visual and physical access resulted in people feeling safer using the park. The CUNY study found much of the success was due more to increased maintenance and policing than physical design. It is clear however that the redesign is a magnet for users and contributes to the park's overall success. Continued observation, evaluation, programming, and redesign will be needed to keep the park functioning as a successful urban park.

Peer Reviews. Bryant Park has enjoyed a very favorable acceptance by the larger landscape architecture and urban design community. It has received many awards from organizations such as the American Society of Landscape Architects, the American Institute of Architects and the Regional Plan Association (Thompson, 1997, p. 34). It has been widely publicized in professional magazines and books. Bryant Park was selected by a distinguished jury assembled by Urban Initiatives in 1996 as one of the 60 most flourishing and successful public spaces in America (Longo, 1996). In 1998 it won one of the first Exemplary Place Awards by the Environmental Design Research Association and the journal *Places* (Places, 1998) awarded by a jury that included the landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, architect Donlyn Lyndon and social researcher Clare Cooper Marcus. As far as peer review, Bryant Park has become one of the most publicized and heralded urban parks since Olmsted's Central Park.

Criticism. Bryant Park has also enjoyed quite favorable reviews in the popular press. According to Bill Thompson (1997, p. 34), *Time* magazine named Bryant Park the "Best Design of 1992", *New York Magazine* called it a "touch of the Tuileries…the perfect endorsement for restoring public space with private funds," and a *New York Times* article by Paul Goldberger called the restored park "a monument of pure joy."

Yet the redesigned park has not been without critics. Some have expressed fear that the park has become privatized. With its redesign and upgrading and addition of expensive restaurant, the park has attracted more of an upscale clientele and discouraged use by more undesirable users.

Urban designer Stephen Carr, landscape architect Mark Francis, environmental psychologist Leanne Rivlin and planner Andrew Stone raised a number of concerns before redevelopment of the park took place (Carr et. al., 1992). First we worried if Bryant Park could accommodate all of these new activities and still serve as a place of retreat and relaxation for some of its users. Another issue was who has ultimate control over public parks. In spring 1983, the Restoration Corporation, in cooperation with the New York Public Library, entered into a 35-year agreement with the City Parks Department whereby the Corporation would be responsible for all aspects of the park's maintenance, management, and renovation, under the overall supervision of the City's

---

[20] Park, S. "Post-occupancy evaluation of Bryant Park". New York: Environmental Psychology Program, City University Graduate Center, 1993.

Parks Commissioner. Responding to the original cafe proposal and the overall management plan, Peter Berle, then president of the Parks Council said, "I'm concerned about taking public land, removing it from the protections of public park status and turning it over to a private entity....If you have a private entity running a public park, who is to say that you and I may not be the undesirables next year?" (Carmody, 1983, p. B3).

Significance & Uniqueness of Project. Bryant Park has become a model for how to transform rundown historic urban parks into lively and successful public spaces. The private-public partnership used to redevelop Bryant Park has been widely heralded as one of the best ways to renew older urban open spaces in periods of declining public funding of parks and open spaces (Berens, 1998).

Limitations. It is unclear if the early success enjoyed at Bryant Park can be sustained over the long term. Recent declines in funding for maintenance and management for Bryant Park have caused some to worry whether current levels of use can be maintained without impacting on the park's overall image and safety.

Generalizable Features and Lessons. The key ingredients of Bryant Park's rebirth—programming, movable seating, food, high quality maintenance, strong design and detailing—are ingredients for any successful public open space. Yet the scale of funding used to transform Bryant Park is not typically possible even in major parks in other downtown areas. Yet there is evidence that funding is increasing for park rehabilitation[21].

Bryant Park process and design offer several lessons for the design of similar park projects. The process used in Bryant Park's transformation is a model for similar projects. Bryant Park is an exemplar of how behavioral analysis can be combined with thoughtful design to create successful public spaces. Yet not every urban park can command a multimillion-dollar budget raised from private sources. Most projects are more modest in budget and scope. However the principles are the same—get people involved, do careful social and economic analysis, realize that design alone is often not enough (programming and management are critical as well) and that good parks must be continuously evaluated and redesigned to ensure success.

Future Issues/Plans. The Bryant Park Restoration Corporation is continually seeking additional funding for the park. They would like to extend the park hours and institute

---

[21] A number of private foundations have become funding partners for rehabilitating urban parks in larger and medium sized cities. Especially noteworthy is the "Urban Parks Initiative" of the Lila Wallace Reader's Digest Fund that is supporting up to $100 million in park renovations in various cities. Other foundations are following Wallace's lead, which include the Goldman Foundation, which are funding waterfront park projects for the Trust for Public Land in San Francisco.

a sculpture program (Berens, 1998). In addition they would like to renovate the Pavilion at the corner of West 40th Street and Sixth Avenue. Landscape architect Laurie Olin offers the following assessment of the future of the park: "The Park now has a constituency of tens of thousands of people. It's going to endure." (Thompson, 1997, p. 34).

Bibliography and Project Citations or References. See Footnotes or References at end of report.

Web Sites/Links. See list at end of report.

Contact for Further Information

Laurie Olin
Olin Partnership
421 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 440-0030
(215) 440-0041 (Fax)

Case Study Example: The Sea Ranch, California[22]

PROJECT NAME	The Sea Ranch
LOCATION	Mendocino Coast, northern California (about 100 miles north of San Francisco)
DATE DESIGNED/PLANNED	1963-1968; plan refined and modified since
CONSTRUCTION COMPLETED	Being built in phases, currently about 63% built-out
SIZE	5200 acres along 11 miles of coastline with 3500 acres developed as home sites and common areas with the remainder in permanent open space and forest preserve; 2310 house sites with 1461 houses (or 63 %) developed by 1997
COST	N/A
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT(S)	Lawrence Halprin, Lawrence Halprin and Associates, San Francisco
CLIENT/DEVELOPER	Oceanic Properties (until 1988)
CONSULTANT/ARCHITECTS[23]	Charles Moore, Donlyn Lyndon, William Turnbull and Richard Whitaker (MLTW); Joseph Esherick; Richard Reynolds, Ecologist; Robert Muir Graves (Golf Course Architect)
MANAGED BY	The Sea Ranch Homeowners Association

Context. The Sea Ranch is a planned community located along 11 miles of the Northern California Coast about a two and one half-hour drive north of San Francisco. Located just north of Stewart's Point and south of the community of Gualala, The Sea Ranch is a

---

22 There is an extensive literature on The Sea Ranch, including document of the design process in Lawrence Halprin's books such as *RSVP Cycles*. For this case, I drew primarily from Lawrence Halprin, *The Sea Ranch: Diary of an Idea*. Sea Ranch, CA: Comet Studios, 1995 and R. Sexton, *Parallel Utopias: The Sea Ranch and Seaside*, San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1995. In addition, I employed site visits, interviews and archival documents including newsletters from The Sea Ranch Association, sales brochures and other reports.

23 A number of architects have designed houses in Sea Ranch. Listed here are the architects for the most noteworthy public buildings in Sea Ranch. These architects also collaborated with Lawrence Halprin in developing the original design principles of Sea Ranch. Donlyn Lyndon is currently collaborating with Halprin on the commercial expansion of the Village Center.

former Sheep Ranch now transformed into one of the most fashionable yet environmentally friendly communities in California.

The Sea Ranch is an early and largely successful example of sustainable development. Along with the Woodlands in Texas, Amelia Island in Florida and Village Homes in California, Sea Ranch is an example of a large scale residential development planned to fit the environment. It has become one of the most celebrated and recognized examples of environmental planning and architecture.

Site Analysis. The Sea Ranch property is one of the most beautiful found along the California coast. It has a rich ecology ranging from tidal pools to meadows and coastal forests, all with extensive biological diversity. Visually it is a striking landscape and one that has been well preserved, especially given the large amount of development that has taken place over the past three decades. Environmentally, the Sea Ranch has a number of problems, including strong coastal winds, harsh storms and high risk for forest fires that occasionally occur along the coast[24].

Aided by Richard Reynolds, an ecologist, landscape architect Lawrence Halprin conducted ecological studies of the site including analysis of climate, wind, and views. He writes in his own thoughtful and frank autobiography of the project, *The Sea Ranch: Diary of an Idea* (1995): "We began by camping on the Del Mar Ranch and continued in that mode for several years, living on the land with the weather, the seasonal changes, the native inhabitants and the culture of the area. In those days this North Coast was wild, unfriendly, mostly uninhabited, austere and sometimes belligerent" (Halprin, 1995, pp. 4-5). He goes on to say that "our most difficult task was to find a way for people to inhabit this magnificent and natural system without destroying the very reason for people to come here" (Halprin, 1995, p. 26). What Halprin and the other designers did not realize at the time was that the environmental ideals would become embraced by the future generations of the environmental movement. Sea Ranch became a perfect place for some people to express their own environmental concerns.

Halprin decided "that the narrow linear form of the parcel and its complex typography were not conducive to a town like plan" (Sexton, 1995, p. 34). His studies led to the concept of clustering and tucking structures into hedgerows to leave broad natural areas of open commons and meadows. Overgrazed land was to be rested and allowed to return to its natural state. The development would become a wildlife preserve.

---

[24] We experienced first hand a wildfire when we were staying at Sea Ranch in the summer of 1997. In the course of a few minutes, strong north winds spread a small brush fire through the southern end of Sea Ranch threatening many of the homes there including Lawrence Halprin's own house and that of the Nobel laureate Milton Friedman. In talking with Halprin a year after the fire, he commented that he thought that the fire was in fact ecologically healthy and the landscape had healed itself quickly.

Residential design would allow houses to blend in and become part of the natural environment.

Project Background and History[25]**.** In 1964, Oceanic Properties, Inc. (later called Oceanic California, Inc. and now Castle and Cook Development) purchased the ten-mile Del Mar Ranch. In 1964, Sonoma County approved a "Precise Development Plan" for the southern one third of the Ranch. A similar plan for the northern two-thirds was approved in 1968. At this time, the developer gave to the county the 124-acre Gualala Point Regional Park at the Gualala River estuary. By 1988, all remaining building sites had been sold.

Genesis of Project. The Sea Ranch began essentially as a developer's desire to create a large housing project on a beautiful undeveloped site. To their credit, the developers had the foresight to hire landscape architect Lawrence Halprin and a group of environmentally minded architects in planning their development. According to author Richard Sexton, who has done a comparative analysis of The Sea Ranch and the new urbanist community Seaside, Florida, the goals of Sea Ranch planners were to protect the environment and "enrich the lives of its residents" (Sexton, 1995, p.27). The goal he states was "to provide an opportunity for people to get back to the land."

It is important to note that planning for The Sea Ranch began before the environmental movement had become such an integral part of the development review process. It is clear that The Sea Ranch, even with its environmental sensitivity, would never be allowed to be developed today given the strict development controls imposed by the California Coastal Commission and its environmental review process.

Design, Development Process. Sea Ranch was developed with a number of site planning principles intended to protect the natural and open space quality of this picturesque part of the California coast. These included keeping houses nestled against hedgerows, preserving open spaces, and developing an extensive system of trails and access to the bluffs and beaches. A major planning idea was the development of "Open Space Commons" intended to protect nature while providing for public access and enjoyment. These commons are "open spaces preserved or created for their view values across meadows to oceans, bluffs, special structures, land configurations, etc. These open spaces would contain hiking, bicycling, and equestrian trails as well as natural land features such as rock outcroppings, drainage swales, sand dunes, etc.[26]. About half of the land in Sea Ranch is kept in commons or permanent open space protection.

---

[25] Project history is drawn primarily from *The Sea Ranch Association Owner's Manual*, The Sea Ranch Association, 975 Annapolis Road, P. O. Box 16, The Sea Ranch, California 95497-0016, 1996, and interviews with home owners and realtors.

[26] Lewis Owen, "Trail research reviewed," p. 3, *The Sea Ranch Surroundings*, Spring 1991.

Even with such a clear vision for development of Sea Ranch by Halprin, the plan required continued refinement and clarification. As early as 1969, the developers hired landscape architect Yosh Kuromiya to carry forward Halprin's original planning in areas of equestrian and hiking facilities and the impact of expansion of Highway 1 (which runs the length of Sea Ranch).

Role of Landscape Architect(s). Landscape architect Lawrence Halprin and his office played a critical leadership role in this project. In fact, The Sea Ranch project allowed Halprin to develop and test many of his early design principles of integrating people and nature through design. He writes, "For me, The Sea Ranch became the place where I tested many of the basic ideas on the importance of place as a generator of community design" (Halprin, 1995, p. 11-12). Halprin and his colleagues not only established the overall plan of conservation and development of the site but also contributed design guidelines that would ensure that future development would be kept to these principles. With changes in developers and the involvement of residents, it is a tribute to Halprin's original vision that these principles have largely held up over time.

Program Elements. The Sea Ranch is primarily a second home residential community planned on 3500 acres. There are 2310 private house sites, of which about two-thirds have been developed as of 1998. About 80 new homes are being built each year. The project also includes many miles of hiking, biking and equestrian trails that run along its entire length, two community swimming pools; golf course; community garden; village center with mailboxes, small gift shop, restaurant, lodge and rental agency. Home sales prices in 1998 ranged from the mid $200,000 to well over a $1 million.

Maintenance and Management. The Sea Ranch functions with a large number of rules ranging from those governing trail use and dogs to architectural guidelines. Design review is an extensive and sometimes contentious process that is strongly linked to the planning and environmental goals of the community. *The Sea Ranch Homeowners Manual* presents a complicated design review process with over 35 steps. Site specific design and design quality is emphasized. Its "Declaration of Restrictions, Covenants and Conditions" states:

> It must be assumed that all owners of property within The Sea Ranch, by virtue of their purchase of such property, are motivated by the character of the natural environment in which their property is located, and accept, for and among themselves, the principle that the development and use of The Sea Ranch must preserve that character for its present and future enjoyment by other owners. It is also assumed that those who are entrusted with the administration of The Sea Ranch will discharge their trust in full recognition of that principle and, to the extent consistent therewith, will foster maximum individual flexibility and freedom of individual expression.

The Sea Ranch Owner's Manual (1996) goes on to state: "The Sea Ranch Concept embraces the idea that we can 'live lightly on the land,' and achieve a harmonious

relationship with nature by introducing only structures that seem to exist *within* the landscape instead of intruding *upon* it."

Clearly, design review is intended to reinforce the importance of the landscape and conspicuous non-consumption while allowing some freedom of expression. Interpretation of these principles is governed by a Design Committee, an autonomous body made up of design professionals, who must approve all construction and landscape changes through an established design review process. They utilize design criteria, including height, bulk, setbacks and siting standards. Minimum overhangs are used to maximize solar heating. Roof forms must reflect the slopes of the hills. Only native plants are allowed and property lines are kept invisible. As stated by the homeowners association, these restrictions are intended to "maintain architectural quality, protect property values and uphold the philosophy of the early designers and architects."

The Sea Ranch Trails Code is an example of the strong environmental ethics of the development. It states:[27]

- Respect the people, the land and the sea
- Protect wildlife, plants and trees.
- Safeguard streams, tide pools, beaches and ponds
- Honor the property of others
- Go gently and stay on the trails
- Keep horses under control, dogs on leash
- No bicycle riding on the bluff trail
- Respect the environment
- Be responsible for your own safety

Use/User Analysis. The Sea Ranch is comprised of three primary user groups: homeowners (some of whom live permanently in Sea Ranch), renters and tourists/passersby. The Sea Ranch with its beautiful natural surroundings, open space and amenities, enjoys considerable use, both by residents as well as the general public. Recreational activities include golfing, tennis, swimming, biking and fishing. Visiting The Sea Ranch during peak seasons, one is struck by the few people ones sees. This is due to the fact that the development is so spread out and the fact that many people use it as a retreat from their hectic lives in the city. Many of the old timers know each other and can be found talking together at their mailboxes, at the recreation centers or when they pass on trails.

Permanent residents have developed a number of informal groups, clubs and interest groups to create more of a sense of community. *The Sea Ranch Homeowners Manual* lists over 50 cultural, card, exercise and special interest groups ranging from quilting groups

---

27 "The Sea Ranch Trails Guide," The Special Trails Committee, August 1993.

to music groups. There is much to do here if one wants to, although as a visitor it is difficult to get a strong sense of community. It is interesting that with all its publicity and interest, I could not find a systematic evaluation, such as a post occupancy evaluation, of The Sea Ranch.

Peer Reviews. Sea Ranch has received substantial recognition from the press and from the professional design community. It has also received numerous planning and design awards. The Sea Ranch stands with developments such as McHarg's Woodlands in Texas and Mike and Judy Corbett's Village Homes in Davis, California as one of the most notable and celebrated ecological developments of this century.

Criticism. The Sea Ranch with all its success and recognition, has attracted criticism[28]. Much of it relates to the ephemeral nature of The Sea Ranch as a second home and rental community. With its strong open space and trail system, it is still primarily an auto-oriented development (Sexton, 1995). Social diversity is limited. Halprin states that one of their original goals was to have "a great diversity of people in their interests, backgrounds and hopefully, incomes." (Sexton, 1995, p. 46). This clearly is a goal that was never realized.

Larry Halprin himself is one of the sharpest critics of how The Sea Ranch has evolved differently than intended. He writes, "In my mind, The Sea Ranch started out to be a new kind of utopia. It was a vision of how a like-minded group of people could live together under a set of environmental and aesthetic premises and constraints and govern themselves to maintain an agreed upon value system. The entry of the new settlers was encouraging and ecologically synergistic. But as time went on, the succeeding waves of people flawed the experience for me" (Halprin, 1995, p. 54). This shift is also true of most other planned utopian communities from Greenbelt, Maryland to Seaside, Florida. Halprin is also critical of the way houses have grown in size and their distraction from the open space quality of the development[29].

Significance & Uniqueness of Project. This project is significant in a number of ways. It broke new ground in environmental planning, showing developers that environmental sensitivity can be economically successful. It provided a model for other designers and planners to follow for site planning and community design. It also marked a historic collaboration between some of the most important modern architects and landscape architects. It was also a unique project in that it was done before environmental restrictions would have made the project almost impossible to implement.

---

28 This criticism is based on published reports as well as many visits to The Sea Ranch, including staying for several weeks in 1997 and 1998, talking with residents and observing activity.

29 Personal correspondence with Lawrence Halprin, 1997.

Limitations. Perhaps the greatest limitation of The Sea Ranch is its lack of social diversity. While this was a concern of its original planners, their vision of a modest development with diverse residents was undone by the project's popularity and economic success. Like any community, the Sea Ranch has experienced growing and management pains. Yet the active engagement of its residents in the overall management of the community has served to address many of these problems.

Generalizable Features and Lessons. The Sea Ranch provides many lessons and models for other development. It serves as a workable environmental planning model that has been well documented and disseminated for others to follow[30]. The great economic success of The Sea Ranch demonstrates the value of producing a strong environmentally based plan at the beginning and sticking to its principle.

Comparison to other Projects/Cases. There are a number of similar case studies of planned residential communities. There is also a well-developed comparative case study of The Sea Ranch and Seaside Florida[31]. Other similar cases include Village Homes in Davis and Laguna West in Sacramento, both in California.

Future Issues/Plans. Halprin himself poses the most critical question for Sea Ranch's future: "Perhaps most importantly, The Sea Ranch still needs a heart. Most communities come by that organically because they are based physically on a contained mandala form. Our community, however, is 11 miles long. It is narrow and linear. This may be the greatest challenge which lies ahead for The Sea Ranch – to create a community center with a heart." (Halprin, 1995, p. 57).

Like most planned communities, The Sea Ranch continues evolve. Larry Halprin has recently completed a plan to expand The Sea Ranch's commercial center. New recreational facilities continue to be developed as the community grows. New hiking and bicycle trails continue to be developed along the forest ridges. Design review standards are being refined to address community concerns[32]. The Sea Ranch will change and evolve over time, yet its essential qualities will remain over time.

Bibliography of Project Citations/References. See Footnotes or References at end of report.

---

30 One of the best sources of this process is Lawrence Halprin's early *RSVP Cycles*. (1970) which like McHarg's *Design with Nature* (1995) had an enormous impact on young landscapes architects of that period, including myself.

31 See Sexton, R. *Parallel Utopias: The Sea Ranch and Seaside*, San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1995.

32 A case in point is the recent addition of small television satellite dishes as acceptable additions to homes.

Web Sites/Links. See list of Web sites at end of report.

Contact for Further Information:
The Sea Ranch Association
Box 16
The Sea Ranch, CA 95497-0016
(707) 785-2444
(707) 785-3555 (Fax)
www.tsra.org

Implications/Recommendations to the Landscape Architecture Foundation

There are several ways LAF could become involved in the development and dissemination of case studies in landscape architecture. These could range from developing an in-house staff responsible for preparing and publishing case studies (much like the Urban Land Institute) to simply publishing and promoting existing case studies. The former could involve a commitment of several hundred thousand dollars of staffing and publishing costs to be successful. It is doubtful that revenue would cover this cost, even over the long term. Major outside funding may be needed to fund such an effort. The latter approach could be accomplished within existing LAF/ASLA venues at a cost of a few thousand dollars annually.

Based on my research, I recommend that the Foundation take more of a middle approach. Rather than devoting sizable resources to develop an in-house staff, they can use the considerable expertise that exists within the professional and research community to develop a number of high quality and comparable case studies in landscape architecture. I propose that the foundation develop, alone or in partnership with other organizations, a major three year ***Case Studies in Landscape Architecture Initiative*** to build up a critical mass of high quality case studies in landscape architecture. The case studies would be organized around selected types of landscapes (see above) as well as geographic regions and perhaps be expanded to include international projects in later years.

The development by LAF of a ***Case Studies in Landscape Architecture Initiative*** could involve the following activities. The recommendations are organized by more immediate actions LAF could take followed by longer term proposals.

Development and Funding of Case Studies:

- To create a critical mass of case studies, LAF would **commission**: 1) ten or more new case studies of projects, 2) several issue-based analyses of existing cases, and 3)

several hypothetical cases useful for education. Emphasis would be placed in the initiative on inviting new cases with written and visual narratives of landscapes. In addition, a number of issue-oriented cases would be commissioned that look across existing cases and synthesize knowledge useful for landscape architectural practice and research. LAF would also support development of hypothetical case studies to challenge new thinking and invent new ways of practice for the profession. This is often done in schools of business and law and could be valuable for landscape architectural education and practice as well.

- LAF would provide funding, a suggested methodology and a dissemination mechanism for the case studies

- LAF would establish a **clear statement of the criteria** for selection of cases. Emphasis should be placed on cases that can advance theory, improve practice and reach supportable conclusions and recommendations.

- To develop a substantial number of case studies, LAF would issue a **call for proposals** (by mail, newsletter and its Web site) to professionals and the general public to nominate potential projects to be developed as a LAF case study. Proposals would need to address the significance of the project and its potential contribution to the profession. The incentive for the nominator is that selection could bring national attention to a local project or professional. A review panel appointed by LAF would develop a list of potential cases and issue a Request for Proposal to do case study projects.

- LAF would **award grants** on a competitive basis to researchers to do the in-depth case studies, following a common format provided by LAF. Landscape Architecture Programs would be invited to prepare the case studies in their own region. For example, schools such as Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio State, etc. could be asked to submit proposals for Midwest case studies. Washington, Washington State, UBC and Oregon could be asked to prepare cases in the Northwest. Schools would need to demonstrate how the effort would fit into their curriculum and what unique abilities and resources such as matching funding they would bring to bear to each project. Funding provided by LAF would be $2,000 to $10,000 per case depending on the complexity of the case.

- LAF would establish a **National Advisory Council** to oversee the Initiative and to ensure that a high standard of quality and consistency is maintained as case studies are developed. This oversight would also add the referee function required for academic advancement. At least one LAF Board member would sit on this panel.

- LAF with input from CELA and ASLA would ensure that an adequate **peer review process** of experts is maintained before the case studies are selected, completed and published.

Dissemination of Case Studies:

- LAF would **disseminate the case studies through an online archive** of case studies at their website with specific cases, baseline data, and images. These would be searchable by topic, problem, location, use, goal, etc. Abstract information could be available free with more detailed case studies available for a charge (e.g.: annual fee or by case). Reduced fees could be provided for ASLA members. On line access makes it easy for authors to update information and for professionals and students to have quick access to the very latest information.

- LAF would also **develop and sell case study publications** or CD-ROMs on selected case study topics such as sustainable development projects, urban waterfronts, etc. For firms and practitioners, the cases will need to be organized in a way that they would find useful. LAF could also publish a yearly or bi-yearly publication *Case Studies in Landscape Architecture* to ensure that the cases are more widely distributed.

- Starting in the second year of the Initiative and utilizing existing and new case studies, LAF could develop a series of Landscape Architecture **"*Case Study Institutes*"** or study courses. Institutes could be organized around project type or by geographic region. These would be particularly well suited for continuing education credit when and if this becomes part of professional licensure.

- LAF could join with CELA and/or ASLA to **sponsor sessions at annual meetings on case studies** and invite people doing this kind of work to present and discuss their work. The focus of these meetings could be on case study methodology, comparative analysis, and theory building.

- After it has developed its own track record with case studies, LAF could **partner with other organizations** (such as Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture, American Society of Landscape Architects, Environmental Design Research Association, American Institute of Architects, American Planning Association, Trust for Public Land, Urban Land Institute, Urban Parks Institute, etc.) to **develop a national archive of case study projects** related to the built and natural environment. Partnership would allow LAF to reduce costs and reach a broader audience. In my conversations with representatives from some of these organizations, I have found an openness to working with LAF on joint case study projects.

- LAF could also explore co-sponsoring, with organizations like ASLA, AIA, APA, National Trust for Historic Preservation, CELA and EDRA, a **National Conference on Case Studies** in Environmental Design with other national organizations.

- LAF could **explore providing support** to *Landscape Journal* and/or *Landscape Architecture* to devote part of their issues to present case studies in landscape architecture developed as part of the Initiative.

- At the end of the third year, the Foundation would conduct an **evaluation** of the Initiative to explore ways it could, if desired, institutionalize the program.

Conclusions/Future Work

It is clear that case study analysis should occupy a central role in landscape architectural practice, education and research. As in other professions, such as medicine, law, engineering, etc., case study analysis is an effective way for landscape architecture to advance and mature as a profession. Case studies are an effective way for the profession to go about training students, developing a research base and advancing and improving practice. They are also a way for the profession to avoid "re-inventing the wheel" and remain honest about its successes and failures. Yet additional support and funding are needed to improve the quality and expand the quantity and accessibility of case studies. Beyond what LAF can specifically do to advance work in this area, there are several more general findings of this study.

Further research on case studies in landscape architecture is needed in several areas. Existing methods need to be made more systematic and rigorous and tested in a wider variety of settings. There is a need to develop better comparative methodologies for case study analysis. More case studies are needed on topics such as effective design practices, aesthetics, landscape meaning, the components of successful projects, and design theory. There also needs to be more post occupancy evaluations of landscape architecture projects, where evaluation becomes part of every built project. With increased support, case study analysis promises to greatly advance understanding of the profession for both practitioners and the larger public.

Bibliography

Agranoff, R. and B. A. Radin. 1991. The comparative case study approach in public administration. Research in Public Administration. 1, 203-231.

Berens, G. 1998. Bryant Park. pp. 44 – 57 in Garvin, A. and G. Berens. 1997. Urban Parks and Open Space. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Land Institute.

Biederman, D.A. and Nager, A.R. 1981. Up from smoke: A new improved Bryant Park? New York Affairs, 6: 97-105

Boyer E. L. and L. D. Mitgang. 1996. Building Community: A New Future for Architecture Education and Practice. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bryant Park Restoration Corporation, 1981. Annual Report. New York.

Carmody, D. 1983. Proposal for restaurant in Bryant Park disputed. The New York Times, May 16, p. B3.

Carr, S., M. Francis, L. Rivlin and A. Stone. 1992. Public Space. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, C. 1975. Easter Hill Village. New York: Free Press.

Cooper Marcus, C and M. Barnes. 1995. Gardens in Healthcare Facilities. Martinez, CA: Center for Health Design.

Cooper-Marcus, C. & C. Francis (Eds.). 1997. People Places: Design Guidelines for Urban Open Space. New York: Wiley. (2nd edition).

Corner, J. and A. S. MacLean. 1996. Taking Measures Across the American Landscape. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cranz, G. 1982. The Politics of Park Design. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Feagin, J. R., A. M. Orum, and G. Sjoberg. 1991. A Case for the Case Study. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Francis, M. 1975. Urban impact assessment and community involvement: The Case of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library. Environment & Behavior. 7, 3: 373-404.

Francis, M. 1998. Proactive practice: Visionary thought and participatory action in environmental design. Places. 12, 1.

Francis, M., L. Cashdan and L. Paxson. 1984. Community Open Spaces. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Francis, M. and R. Hester (Eds.) The Meaning of Gardens. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Gans, H. 1966. The Urban Villagers. New York: Free Press.

Garvin, A. and G. Berens. 1997. Urban Parks and Open Space. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Land Institute.

Girling, C. L. and K. Helphand. 1994. Yard, Street, Park: The Design of Suburban Open Space. New York: Wiley.

Halprin, L. 1970. RSVP Cycles. New York: George Braziller.

Halprin, L. 1995. The Sea Ranch: Diary of an Idea. Sea Ranch, California: Comet Studios.

Halprin, L. 1997. The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.

Hill, K. 1995. Emphasizing strategic thinking in Landscape Architecture: Implications for the form and content of the curriculum," pp. 141-146 in Renewing the American City. Proceedings of the 1995 Annual Meeting, ASLA, Cleveland, Ohio. Washington, D.C: ASLA.

Hough, M. 1984. City Form and Natural Process. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Jacobs, A. 1996. Great Streets. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Jacobs, J. 1961. The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Random House.

Johnson, J. 1991. Modern Landscape Architecture. New York: Abbeville Press.

Kaplan, R. and S. Kaplan. 1989. The Experience of Nature. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, R., S. Kaplan and R. Ryan. 1998. With People in Mind: Design and Management of Everyday Nature. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Kobayashi, H. et. al. 1990. Contemporary Landscapes of the World. Tokyo: Process Architecture.

Leavitt, R. 1987. Cities Reborn. Washington, DC: Urban Land Institute.

Longo, G. 1996. Great American Public Places. New York: Urban Initiatives.

Louisiana State University. Critiques of Built Landscapes. Annual Series.

Lyle, J. 1996. Design for Human Ecosystems. New York: Wiley.

Lynch, K. 1961. Life and Death of Great American Cities. New York:

McHarg, I. 1995. Design with Nature. New York: Wiley.

McHarg, I. 1996. A Quest for Life: An Autobiography. New York: Wiley.

Nager, A. R. & W.R. Wentworth. 1976. Bryant Park: A comprehensive evaluation of its image and use with implications for urban open space design. New York: CUNY Center for Human Environments.

Owen, L. 1991. Trail research reviewed. P. 3. *The Sea Ranch Surroundings*. Spring.

Park, S. 1993. Post-occupancy evaluation of Bryant Park. New York: Environmental Psychology Program, City University Graduate Center.

Platt, J. 1992. Case Study in American Methodological Thought. Current Sociology. 40, 17-48.

Potteiger, J, and J. Purinton. Landscape Narratives: Design Practices for Telling Story. New York: Wiley. 1998.

Riley, M. W. 1963. Sociological Research: A Case Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Rosenthal, R. & R. L. Rosnow. 1975. Primer of Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Wiley.

The Sea Ranch Association. 1993. *The Sea Ranch Trails Guide*. August.

The Sea Ranch Association. 1996. *The Sea Ranch Association Owner's Manual*.

The Sea Ranch Association. 1996. *Surroundings*. Quarterly homeowners association newsletter.

Sexton, R. 1995. Parallel Utopias: The Sea Ranch and Seaside. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.

Stake, R. E. 1995. The Art of Case Study Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sommer, R. 1997. Utilization issues in environment and behavior research. pp. 347-368. In G. T. Moore and R. W. Marans (Eds.), Advances in Environment, Behavior and

Design. Vol. 4. Toward the Integration of Theory, Methods, Research and Utilization. New York: Plenum.
Sommer, R. and B. Sommer. 1986. A Practical Guide to Behavioral Research. New York: Oxford University Press.
Steinitz, C. et. al. (ed.), 1994. "Alternative Futures for Monroe County, Pennsylvania." Graduate School of Design, Harvard University.
Steinitz, C. et al. (ed.) 1996. "Landscape Planning for Biodiversity; Alternative Futures for the Region of Camp Pendleton, CA." Graduate School of Design, Harvard University.
Thayer, R. 1994. Gray World, Green Heart. New York: Wiley
Thompson, G. and F. Steiner, 1997. Ecological Design and Planning. New York: Wiley.
Thompson, W. 1997. The Rebirth of New York City's Bryant Park. Washington, D.C.: Spacemaker Press.
Tishler, W. (Ed.) 1989. American Landscape Architecture. Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation.
Treib, M. (Ed.). Modern Landscape Architecture: A Critical Review. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press. 1993.
Ulrich, R.S. 1984. View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. Science. 224: 420-421.
Yin, R. F. Rand Corporation. 1976. A Review of Case Studies of Technological Innovations in State and Local Services. Santa Monica, California: Rand.
Yin, R. F. 1993. Applications of Case Study Research. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
Yin, R. F. 1994. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
Walker, P. and M. Simo. 1994. Invisible Gardens. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
Webb, E. J., D. T. Campbell, R. D. Schwartz & L. Sechrest. 1966. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Rand McNally.
Whyte, W. H. 1979. Revitalization of Bryant Park. Report to the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.
Whyte, W. 1980. The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces. Washington, D.C.: Conservation Foundation.
Zeisel, J. 1990. Inquiry by Design. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Zube, E. 1984. Environmental Evaluation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Some Useful Web Sites

American Community Gardening Association: www.communitygarden.com
American Institute of Architects: www.aia.org
American Planning Association: www.planning.org
American Planning Association Planning Advisory Service (PAS): www.planning.org/PAS/pas.html
Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture: www.idaho.edu/cela
Decision Case Education: www.decisioncase.edu
Design Net Journal: www.scc.msu.edu/~laej

Environmental Design Research Association: www.acs.ohio-state.edu/edra26/leadin.html
Harvard GSD GIS site: www.gsd.harvard.edu/educ_res/crg/gis/
Initiative for Architectural Research: www.architectureresearch.org
Lincoln Institute of Land Policy: www.lincolninst.edu
Trust for Public Land: www.tpl.org
University of Toronto CLIP site: www.clr.utoronto.ca/VIRTUALLIB/CLIP/
Urban Land Institute: www.uli.org
Urban Land Institute Project Reference Files: www.uli.org/prf/test/index.htm
Urban Parks Institute: www.pps.org/urbanparks
Urban Parks Institute Park Places Case Studies: www.pps.org/urbanparks/gpp_home.html

Web Sites for Bryant Park and The Sea Ranch Cases

Bryant Park, Activities scheduled in: newyork.citysearch.com/E/V/NYCNY/0004/51/96/cs1.html
Bryant Park, Live camera shot: www.otec.com/cgi-bin/parse-file?TEMPLATE=/htdocs/park-cam.html
The Sea Ranch Association: www.tsra.org
The Sea Ranch History: www.tsra.org/History.htm
The Sea Ranch Environment (including lists of birds, endangered species, environmental restrictions): www.tsra.org/OtherInfo.htm#Environs
The Sea Ranch Activity Groups: http: www.tsra.org/Contacts2.htm#Activity%20Groups
The Sea Ranch Design Manual (including design review guidelines): www.tsra.org/DesignMan.htm
The Sea Ranch Maps: www.tsra.org/Maps.htm
The Sea Ranch Properties: www.thesearanch.com

Some Useful Listserves

Child-Youth Environments: cye-l@cunyvms1.gc.cuny.edu
Environmental Design Research Association: envbeh-l@duke.poly.edu
Landscape Architecture: LARCH-L@LISTSERV.SYR.EDU
Urban Parks Institute: urbparks@pps.org

Appendix A
Individuals and Organizations Contacted

Nigel Allan, Professor of Landscape Architecture and Geography, University of California-Davis
Anne Beer, Professor Emeritus of Landscape Architecture, Sheffield University
Gayle Berens, Urban Land Institute, Washington, D.C.
Kathleen A Blaha, Vice President, Trust for Public Land, Washington, D.C.
Herb Childress, Jay Farbstein & Associates, San Luis Obispo, California
Clare Cooper Marcus, Professor of Landscape Architecture and Architecture Emeritus, University of California-Berkeley
Galen Cranz, Professor of Architecture, University of California-Berkeley
Kerry Dawson, ASLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Georgia
Susan Everett, FASLA, Executive Director, Landscape Architecture Foundation, Washington, D.C.
Jane Goodman, Education & Outreach Director, Clean-Land, Cleveland, Ohio
Randy Hester, FASLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of California-Berkeley
Kristina Hill, Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Washington-Seattle
Margarita Hill, Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Maryland
Mina Hilsenrath, ASLA, Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Maryland
Stan Jones, Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Oregon
Skip Mezger, ASLA, Principal, CoDesign, Inc., Landscape Architects, Davis, California
Patrick Mooney, ASLA, Professor and Chair, Landscape Architecture, University of British Columbia
Jack Nasar, Chair, Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA), Professor of City Planning, Ohio State University
Cynthia Orcutt, ASLA, Landscape Architect, Yarmouth, Maine
Michelle A. Rinehart, Coordinator, Initiative for Architectural Research (IAR), American Institute of Architects, Washington, D.C.
Jan Schach, FASLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Kentucky
Robert Sommer, Professor of Psychology, University of California-Davis
Frederick Steiner, ASLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture and Planning, Arizona State University
Robert Thayer, Jr., FASLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of California-Davis
Bill Thompson, FASLA, Managing Editor, *Landscape Architecture*
Tom Turner, Professor of Landscape History, University of Greenwich-London
Anne Vernez Moudon, Professor of Urban Design and Planning, University of Washington
Dennis Winters, Graduate Student in Landscape Architecture, University of Toronto

Appendix B
Questions Asked in Interviews

- How have you used case studies in your own work?
- What do you see as the value and/or limitations of case study analysis in landscape architecture (design, teaching, research)?
- What do you consider to be some of the most seminal case study projects, examples, and/or literature in landscape architecture?
- What critical dimensions are essential to include in any case study analysis?
- Would you use a case study archive in your practice, teaching? If so, how?
- What recommendations would you make to Landscape Architecture Foundation to advance case study analysis in landscape architecture?
- Are they any additional people you think it would be useful to talk with?
- Additional comments?

Appendix C:
Urban Land Institute Project Reference Files
www.uli.org/prf/test/index.htm

The Urban Land Institute's Project Reference Files (PRFs) contain development details on more than 250 innovative and successful projects from 1985 to present. All users can use the database to receive summary reports or subscribe to receive full text reports on-line. Abstracts are free. Subscribe for 1 year and get access to 250+ profiles from 1985 to 1998 + 20 new projects a year. Cost is $75 for ULI members and $95 for nonmembers. Subscribe on-line and receive your password in minutes! Or call 1-800-321-5011.

Published in hardcopy since 1971, PRFs feature project reports (four to six pages on average) of innovative residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects. Each profile report includes a complete description of the project; the challenges faced and the lessons learned; distinctive features that set it apart from the ordinary, sales, rent, and cost data; and illustrations of the site and building plan. The PRF Online Database contains more than 250 records from 1985 to 1998. Five new projects are added to the database quarterly.

ULI Project Reference File reports are written by the ULI research staff in cooperation with the developer. Project selection is based on the following criteria—the project is: financially successful at the time of the report; innovative in its market; sufficiently completed and operating long enough to evaluate success; and geographically diverse. The easy-to-use search and index allows subscribers to get to the projects quicker than the former hardcopy product. ULI designed the PRF database to let users search the full-text of projects using key words or phases, or choose among a variety of key terms indexed by ULI. The simple design of on-line PRF allows the users to download the document quickly. Each image for each file is not attached to each file but is a separate link. The image is downloaded only if requested by the user. Most project reference files are less than 50k in file size, and most images are less than 100k, which allows for a relatively quick download.

Sample Project Reference File Abstract:

Abstract/Description (source: *www.uli.org/prf/test/index.htm*)
Reston Town Center Project
Name: Reston Town Center
Location: Reston, Virginia
Project Type: Mixed-Use/Multi-Use
Volume: 21
Number: 11
Year: 1991
Abstract: The Reston Town Center Urban Core is an 85-acre mixed-use urban center located within a 460-acre Town Center District that was identified in Reston's original 1962 master plan. The first phase of the Urban Core, completed in 1990, includes 530,000

square feet of office space, 240,000 square feet of retail, restaurant, and entertainment space, and a 514-room hotel.
Features: Gridded street system; unanchored upscale retail, restaurants, and entertainment at street level; open-air, pedestrian orientation; single developer and manager.

Examples of ULI Case Study Project Files Available On Line for 1995-97

Project Name	Location	Category	Sub-Category	Year
Albina Corner	Portland, Oregon	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1997
Crescent 8	Greenwood Village, CO	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Suburban	1997
Hawthorne Park	Kansas City, Missouri	Special Use	Parks- Recreation	1997
Lakeview Corporate Park	Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin	Commercial/Industrial	Industrial/Office Parks	1997
Maple Court	New York City, New York	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1997
New Neigh. Shop. Center	Newark, New Jersey	Commercial/Industrial	Shopping Centers/Neigh./Com.	1997
Norm Thompson Headquar.	Hillsboro, Oregon	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Suburban	1997
Nyland Cohousing Com.	LaFayette, Colorado	Residential	Single Family Attached	1997
Old Orchard Center	Skokie, Illinois	Commercial/Industrial	Shopping Centers- Regional	1997
Peakview Apartments	Lafayette, Colorado	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1997
Poplar Project	Boulder, Colorado	Residential	Single Family Detatched	1997
Portland Int. Airport	Portland, Oregon	Commercial/Industrial	Shopping Centers- Specialty	1997
SunTec Center	Marina Centre, Singapore	Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Downtown	1997
Sycamore Plaza	Cincinnati, Ohio	Commercial/Industrial	Power Center	1997
Tchoupitoulas Self-Storage	New Orleans, Louisiana	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1997
Kensington Business Centre	Tulsa, Oklahoma	Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Suburban	1997
Marketplace at Cascades Ct.	Loudoun County, Virginia	Commercial/Industrial	Shopping Centers- Regional	1997
Washington's Landing	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Downtown	1997
Westminster Place	St, Louis, Missouri	Residential	Large-Scale Urban Redevelopment	1997
Wyndham	Henrico County, Virginia	Residential	Large-Scale Planned Communities	1997
101 Hudson	Jersey City, New Jersey	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1996
640 Memorial Drive	Cambridge, Massachusetts	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1996
Circle Centre	Indianapolis, Indiana	Commercial/Industrial	Urban Entertainment Centers	1996
Entertainment Ct. at Irvine	Irvine, California	Commercial/Industrial	Urban Entertainment Centers	1996
Highland Vil./Providence Pt.	Issaquah, Washington	Residential	Single Family Attached	1996
Homan Square	Chicago, Illinois	Residential	Large-Scale Urban Redevelopment	1996
McConnell at Davidson	Davidson, North Carolina	Residential	Single Family Detatched	1996
Pearl Lofts	Portland, Oregon	Residential	Multifamily-For Sale	1996
Preservation Park	Oakland, California	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1996
Riverbank State Park	New York City, NY	Special Use	Parks- Recreation	1996
The Arizona Biltmore	Phoenix, Arizona	Commercial/Industrial	Hotels	1996
The Carriage Works	Atlanta, Georgia	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1996
The Forum Shops at Caesars	Las Vegas, Nevada	Commercial/Industrial	Urban Entertainment Centers	1996
The Greenwood	Englewood, Colorado	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1996
The Heritage on The Garden	Boston, Massachusetts	Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Downtown	1996
The Waterside Shops	Pelican Bay, Florida	Commercial/Industrial	Shopping Centers- Specialty	1996
The Westchester	White Plains, New York	Commercial/Industrial	Shopping Centers- Regional	1996

Trovare	Newport Coast, California	Residential	Multifamily-For Sale	1996
Truman Annex	Key West, Florida	Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Suburban	1996
Union Seventy Center	St. Louis, Missouri	Commercial/Industrial	Industrial/Office Parks	1996
Alliance	Fort Worth, TX	Commercial/Industrial	Industrial/Office Parks	1995
Beaver Creek Resort	Avon, Colorado	Commercial/Industrial	Resorts/Conference Centers	1995
Cascade Court Apartments	Seattle, Washington	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1995
Castlestone	Baltimore, MD	Residential	Single Family Attached	1995
Chateau Sonsta Hotel	New Orleans, LA	Commercial/Industrial	Hotels	1995
Country Club of the South	Atlanta, GA	Residential	Resort/Golf Course Communities	1995
Del Norte Place	El Cerrito, CA	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1995
Dewees Island	Dewees Isalnd, SC	Residential	Resort/Golf Course Communities	1995
Kapalua	Maui, Hawaii	Commercial/Industrial	Resorts/Conference Centers	1995
Maho Bay	St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands	Commercial/Industrial	Resorts/Conference Centers	1995
Meyerland Plaza	Houston, Texas	Commercial/Industrial	Power Centers/Outlet Centers	1995
Perimeter Expo	Atlanta, GA	Commercial/Industrial	Power Centers/Outlet Centers	1995
Pine Square	Long Beach, California	Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Downtown	1995
Pioneer Place	Portland, Oregon	Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Downtown	1995
State Street Bank Building	Boston, Massachusetts	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1995
The Farm	Soquel, California	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1995
The Rookery	Chicago, Illinois	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1995
Washington Mutual Tower	Seattle, Washington	Commercial/Industrial	Office/Industrial Building- Urban	1995
Wimbledon Apartments	Spring, TX	Residential	Multifamily-Rental	1995
Woodfield Village Green	Schaumburg, Illinois	Commercial/Industrial	Power Centers/Outlet Centers	1995

Appendix D:
Contemporary Landscape Inquiry Project

Appendix E:
Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
(Source: *www.lincolninst.edu*)

The Lincoln Institute's goals are to integrate the theory and practice of land use and taxation and to understand the multidisciplinary forces that influence them. The Institute explores these issues through three focused program areas:

1) Program in the Taxation of Land and Buildings
2) Program in Land Use and Regulation Program in Land Values, Property Rights and Ownership
3) Program in the Taxation of Land and Buildings Actual Value

Projects they have supported include:

Assessment in the Greater Toronto Area: Impacts and Policy Implications
Measuring the Tax Subsidy Produced by Use-Value Assessment of Open Space on the Urban Fringe
Land Taxation in South Africa
Redistribution of Fiscal Stress
Valuation of Open Space
School Finance Reform and Property Tax Revolts
Efficiency and Equity of a Forest Site Value Tax
Land Taxation and Land Use in Asia
Land Taxation and Value Capture Initiatives in Britain
Property Tax Appraisals and the Reuse of Inner-City Properties
Property Taxation in Transitional Economies: Case Studies
Land Tax Systems: Comparative Issues, Strengths and Problems
The Two-Rate Tax: The Amsterdam, New York, Experience
The Latin American Experience with Value Capture
Infrequent Assessments Distort Property Taxes: Theory and Evidence
Program in Land Use and Regulation Politics of Megaprojects
Growth and Spread of Vacant/Underutilized Land and Land Value Depression in Buffalo: 1946-1996
Use of Growth Management Tools to Achieve Sustainable Development
Developing Model Solutions to Recycling Brownfield Areas
Government and Vacant Land: Creating Cityscapes
Public Policy and Sprawl: Implications of Existing Development Patterns
Vacant Land In Latin American Cities
State-Level Growth Management
Urban Transformations and Land Use Regulation
Changing Character of Public Spaces in Contemporary Metropolitan Areas
Changing Organization of Work
Land Use Patterns, Social Justice and Environmental Improvement

Non-Profit Developers and Vacant Land
Boston as a Global City Region

Author

Mark Francis, FASLA, is professor and past chair of landscape architecture at the University of California (UC), Davis and principal of CoDesign Landscape Architects. Trained in landscape architecture and urban design at UC-Berkeley and Harvard University, he is co-author or editor of several books, including *Community Open Spaces* (Island, 1984), *The Meaning of Gardens* (MIT, 1990), *Public Space* (Cambridge, 1992), and *The California Landscape Garden: Ecology, Culture and Design* (California, 1999), and over sixty articles and book chapters. His work has focused on the use and meaning of the built and natural landscape. Much of this research has utilized a case study approach to study parks, gardens, public spaces, streets, nearby nature, and urban public life.

He has received five national ASLA Honor and Merit Awards for his work in planning, research and communication, as well as awards from the American Planning Association, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Graham Foundation, and the University of California Humanities Council. He is associate editor of the *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* and a member of the editorial boards for *Environment and Behavior and Children's Environments*. He is an appointed member of the National Urban and Community Advisory Council (NUCFAC), past Chair of the Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA), and a member of the advisory boards of the Urban Land Institute, Trust for Public Land, the American Community Gardening Association, and Nearby Nature (Eugene, Oregon).

He is currently working on a book on the theory and design of urban places.