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JANE JACOBS REVISITED: DO SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS HAVE A PLACE IN REDEVELOPING COMMUNITIES?

Ian Hitchcock

INTRODUCTION

Despite its small town feel, Frederick is the second largest city in Maryland, trailing Baltimore. Its position as a crossroad for several major highways has made it prime real estate for those looking to escape the high prices of the suburbs around our nation's capital. Located just 50 miles from the center of Washington, D.C., Frederick has seen an explosion of growth in the past 10 years, not just in its suburbs, but in its "Old Town" area as well.

Frederick has seen an undeniable redevelopment in Old Town, most noticeably through several high-end residential projects at its "South End." Yet at the heart of the South End lies the Frederick Community Action Agency (FCAA), a hub for much of the social service activity in Frederick City and County. The FCAA has felt the pressure of the redeveloping "neighborhood" and is at a crossroads.

3. U.S. Census Bureau, supra note 1 (showing from 2000-10, Frederick's population grew by 23.6 percent).
6. Jane Jacobs refers to neighborhoods as "mundane organs of self-government." JANE JACOBS, THE DEATH AND LIFE OF GREAT AMERICAN CITIES 149 (1993). In this article, neighborhood appears in quotes when it is being referred to as an organ with the capacity to self-govern.
itself: does the FCAA have a place amid the redevelopment in Frederick or should it fold under the pressure and relocate?7

There has been considerable research conducted on urban redevelopment.8 One pioneer on the subject is Jane Jacobs, author of “The Death and Life of Great American Cities.”9 Jacobs’ groundbreaking book thoroughly discusses how a city should aim to redevelop itself.10 However, there is little, if any, research that has examined social service organizations (SSOs) caught in the middle of redevelopment, such as a community trying to strengthen its tax base.11

I am of the position that social service organizations are needed in many communities. With that position in mind, this paper seeks to explore, through the lens of Jacobs’ original theories expressed in her book “The Death and Life of Great American Cities,” whether social service organizations have a place in urban redevelopment. In the first Section, I briefly explore SSOs in general and perceptions people have about them. In Section two, I explore Jacobs’ thoughts on urban redevelopment, particularly mixed-use districts, and their self-destruction. In Section three I discuss Frederick’s experience with redevelopment and the FCAA’s experience throughout. In Section four, I explain the place of SSOs from a mixed-use perspective, why SSOs are generally unwelcome in communities, and how to protect them amid redevelopment.

I. SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Broadly speaking, SSO and community organizations play an important role in American society and have operated in the United States for more than 200 years.12 These organizations can have an isolated purpose or can serve a variety of needs for the community, featuring services like medical clinics, soup kitchens, food banks, cold weather day shelters, and overnight homeless shelters.13 In addition, SSOs include various charitable organizations, though their presence may be more discrete because the scale of their services is smaller than larger SSOs.14

---

7. *Infra Section III and IV.*
13. *FCAA, supra* note 5.
Despite all the positive attributes of SSOs, their presence frequently elicits feelings of indifference from the community.\textsuperscript{15} In one study, although only 9 percent of respondents reported that they had a negative impression of a home for the mentally disabled,\textsuperscript{16} 46 percent felt that the home had no effect on their community.\textsuperscript{17} The "no effect" responses are especially interesting because the same respondents gave overwhelmingly positive responses to such neighborhood features such as parks, restaurants, and grocery stores.\textsuperscript{18} Some of the negative responses to the homes were focused almost entirely on behavioral issues that neighbors witnessed in public spaces and primarily on neighborhood streets, for example: "They harass you for money when you go to the store;"\textsuperscript{19} "I had a problem with someone yelling across the street;"\textsuperscript{20} "Because of the fact that there are people with behavioral difficulties;"\textsuperscript{21} "They just roam the streets."\textsuperscript{22} A few respondents also noted that they believed the residential sites negatively affected the value of their home, partly due to residences not being "well managed."\textsuperscript{23} The study found a majority of the negative responses were due to anecdotal reactions, while many of the positive responses focused on the greater good the services provided.\textsuperscript{24}

Another survey found that negative reactions to the psychiatric homes were based on a perceived lack of support for social services policies, and the respondents felt psychiatric homes should be located anywhere but in their back yard because "the residents could not successfully be integrated into the community."\textsuperscript{25} Thus, the respondents recommended locating the homes in lower income areas, other areas of the city, or areas zoned for institutions.\textsuperscript{26} However, neither the respondent’s awareness of a psychiatric home nor the proximity of their house to a site was associated with a level of satisfaction to a statistically

\textsuperscript{15.} Allison Zippay & Sung Kyong Kee, Neighbors’ Perceptions of Community-Based Psychiatric Housing (No. 3), 82 SOC. SERVICE REV. 395, 404 (Sept. 2008).

\textsuperscript{16.} Id. Although SSOs are broader in scope than just homes for psychiatric patients, many SSOs have clients that have mental health issues and the research can be generalized for the purposes of this article.

\textsuperscript{17.} Id.

\textsuperscript{18.} Id. at 402.

\textsuperscript{19.} Id. at 410-11.

\textsuperscript{20.} Id.

\textsuperscript{21.} Zippay, \textit{supra} note 15, at 410-11.

\textsuperscript{22.} Id.

\textsuperscript{23.} Id. Respondents stated that the homes could better supervise residents or could upkeep the property better. \textit{Id.} at 411.

\textsuperscript{24.} Zippay, \textit{supra} note 15, at 409.


\textsuperscript{26.} Id.
significant degree. But, similar to the study above, the survey con-
cluded that although the negative reactions were present and needed to be
reconciled, they were based on the person’s individual consider-
ations as they pertain to the community, rather than the community as a whole.

Because of these impressions, one study found that up to 50 per-
cent of newly established SSOs experience opposition from neigh-
bors. Opposition is most often expressed through complaints to
local public officials and agency housing sponsors, vocal protests at
community meetings, and efforts to use local building codes and ordi-
nances to block approval for the site. The protests typically focus on
the potential negative effects of the SSOs on the “neighborhood’s”
quality of life, such as perceived threats to personal safety and a de-
cline in property values.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, neighborhood demographics are typically
cited as the most significant predictors of opposition to SSOs. The
“neighborhoods” least likely to oppose an SSO are those characterized
as low-income, socially liberal or tolerant of diversity, ethnically di-
verse, and having low rates of home ownership. In fact, many SSOs
tend to be located in more dense, mixed use neighborhoods that are
close to commercial districts. Further, the residents of neighbor-
hoods that have a variety of uses are more likely to report that a SSO is
positive addition to the community.

The next section explores a SSO caught in the middle of redevelop-
ment. The community’s perception to the SSO is remarkably similar
to the perceptions described in the studies above.

II. FREDERICK, MARYLAND

Founded in 1745, Frederick, Maryland has historically been the cap-
ital city of a farming county. Well into the twentieth century, Freder-
ick remained relatively untouched by the sprawl happening in suburbs
outside of Washington, D.C. But as cities along Interstate 270 grew
more congested and expensive, residents started to drift northwest

30. Piat, supra note 25, at 127.
31. Piat, supra note 25, at 128.
32. See Zippay, supra note 15.
34. Zippay, supra note 15, at 397.
36. See Francis A. Randall, History of the City of Frederick, THE CITY OF FREDERICK
37. Compare Living in Western Maryland, LONG AND FOSTER REAL ESTATE, INC.,
http://maryland-homes.longandfoster.com/Western_MD_Real_Estate/
from Rockville, Gaithersburg, and Germantown searching for more room or for something different.\textsuperscript{38} Because of the large area Frederick encompassed, it was able to accommodate more residents and its population soon grew so much that it was second largest city in Maryland.\textsuperscript{39} However, Frederick's Old Town area had issues with crime, drugs, and violence well into the 1980s.\textsuperscript{40} Part of the trouble stemmed from several housing projects in the Old Town area and general community disarray.\textsuperscript{41}

Near the center of Frederick is the Frederick Community Action Agency (FCAA), a SSO located in an old train station.\textsuperscript{42} It runs along the center of the north/south street of Frederick (Market Street) and two blocks south of the east/west dividing street (Patrick Street).\textsuperscript{43} The FCAA, which has been in existence since 1968, chose its location in the South End of Old Town (the South End) because it was home to a number of low-income residents.\textsuperscript{44} The FCAA worked with the community and several other SSOs that were concentrated in the South End\textsuperscript{45} to help develop a community center and programs to make the South End a better place to be.\textsuperscript{46}

Though the FCAA and the South End had had their share of troubles with crime in the area, Frederick became a safer place to live.\textsuperscript{47} As Frederick transitioned out of its troubled past, a then-recent explosion of houses in nearby Urbana\textsuperscript{48} caught the attention of Old Town residents. In particular, a group of residents formed "The South End Coalition" ("SEC").\textsuperscript{49} The SEC formed to promote economic devel-

\begin{enumerate}
\item See U.S. Census Bureau, supra note 1.
\item Interview with Todd Johnson, Assistant Dir., Frederick Cmty. Action Agency (Apr. 27, 2011).
\item Id.
\item FCAA, supra note 5.
\item Interview with Todd Johnson, Assistant Dir., Frederick Cmty. Action Agency (Apr. 27, 2011).
\item Id.
\item Id.
\item Id.
\item South End Coalition Inc., NCCS, http://nccsweb.urban.org/orgs/profile.php?311529677?popup=1 (last visited Dec. 3, 2011). Though I attempted to interview the SEC, the president turned down my request out of anxiety that their words would be used against them. My inferences about the SEC come from newspaper articles and Todd Johnson (in an informal capacity).
opment in the South End; specifically, they wanted to promote home-ownership.\textsuperscript{50}

The South End starts immediately south of the man-made Carroll Creek, which serves as a dividing line in Old Town.\textsuperscript{51} Just north of Carroll Creek, there are a number of boutique shops and restaurants. In comparison, the blocks immediately south of Carroll Creek and next to the FCAA had no thriving businesses or especially aesthetically attractive properties.\textsuperscript{52} It was apparent that \textit{something} was keeping residents and businesses at bay. That \textit{something} may have been the reputation of the area itself.\textsuperscript{53} It is also possible that that \textit{something}, based on Frederick’s (rumored) racist past,\textsuperscript{54} may have been the poor, minority population, often seen loitering outside the FCAA. Based on the studies in section one \textit{supra}, that \textit{something} could have just been an unfounded perception that the FCAA was a magnet for troublesome activity.\textsuperscript{55}

The first stirring of emotions between the SEC and the FCAA centered around a property that the FCAA wanted to acquire.\textsuperscript{56} Located just across the street from it, the FCAA was interested in acquiring a store-front that had been vacant for two years in order to expand its weatherization services.\textsuperscript{57} At a Board of Aldermen meeting in March of 2000, the SEC brought roughly 45 supporters to block the acquisition of the building.\textsuperscript{58} The group complained that Frederick had “persistently concentrated welfare agencies in their neighborhood, attracting a bad element, and crippling economic development” and that the office would create “a greater public welfare presence in

\textsuperscript{50} Interview with Todd Johnson, Assistant Dir., Frederick Cmty. Action Agency (Apr. 27, 2011).


\textsuperscript{52}See Steve Miller, \textit{South End Office Plan Stirs Heated Debate}, \textit{Frederick News Post}, Mar. 9, 2000, at A1, available at http://www.fredericknewspost.com/sections/archives/display_detail.htm?StoryID=6084 (stating that people living in the South End were concerned that welfare agencies in the area were creating a bad reputation for the area); See Katherine Heerbrandt, \textit{Plans Afoot to Rejuvenate South End}, \textit{Frederick News Post}, Aug. 22, 2004, at A1, available at http://www.fredericknewspost.com/sections/archives/display_detail.htm?StoryID=46064 (demonstrating hope for development for the South End, which has been known as “less-than-desirable” and a “once popular hangout of drug dealers and prostitutes.”).

\textsuperscript{53}See Miller, \textit{supra} note 52.

\textsuperscript{54}It has been rumored that Frederick County has connections with the Ku Klux Klan. See 20th CENTURY-KU KLUX KLAN, http://www.kklux.com/vari-ous.htm (last visited Dec. 14, 2011).

\textsuperscript{55}See Miller, \textit{supra} note 52.

\textsuperscript{56}See Miller, \textit{supra} note 52.

\textsuperscript{57}See Miller, \textit{supra} note 52.

\textsuperscript{58}See Miller, \textit{supra} note 52.
Despite the SEC's continued insistence that the new building would draw vagrants and drug dealers into the area, cause further deterioration to the South End, and reduce property values, the FCAA received the property. Though the new office did not have any of the effects the SEC foretold, one alderman could sense the weight of the decision and stated that it could tear the South End community apart.

Undeterred by their unsuccessful attempt to block the FCAA, the SEC continued its mission of injecting economic life into the South End. In 2004, the local newspaper announced that the South End was about to get "fashionable." The article touted plans for high-end townhomes and condos, an upscale restaurant, and development along the man-made, Carroll Creek promenade, while deploring the South End "for its proliferation of social service establishments, including the FCAA. . ." The article goes on to state that developers were "grasping the potential of the once-popular hangout of drug dealers and prostitutes," with plans to renovate a block of historic homes into condos. The article mentions additional plans to replace a thrift store and homeless shelter with a restaurant and luxury condos and that investors were not offended or dissuaded by the presence of SSOs, such as the FCAA, in the immediate area. Further, the article credited the SEC, not only for their role in increasing home-ownership, but also for their "instrumental" role in reducing crime in the area.

While the South End grew, the FCAA had plans to grow as well. In 2005, it attempted to acquire the property next door to expand its food bank services, while at the same time expanding its healthcare clinic. However, when the plan was disclosed to the City, the City held up the expansion by requiring it to be submitted for open review at a public hearing. Neighborhood residents once again com-

59. See Miller, supra note 52.
61. Id.
62. Id.
64. Id.
65. Id.
66. Id.
67. Id.
68. Id.
70. Id.
plained that SSOs were “taking over the community.”71 Comparing the expansion to the acquisition in 2000, the director of the FCAA stated, “At that time [the FCAA was] criticized as holding the South End back from economic revitalization. Now we don’t fit in.”72 He went on to state, “There can be good gentrification. There can be gentrification without displacement. In my opinion that’s not happening in Frederick.”73

The SEC countered the FCAA’s proposed expansion by bringing their complaints to Mayor Jennifer Dougherty.74 A news conference was held outside the FCAA to condemn the proposed expansion and the FCAA’s continued blight upon the neighborhood.75 The solution? Move the FCAA—not just out of the South End—but out of the Frederick City limits entirely.76 The proposed move would relocate the FCAA and other SSOs to a “community park,” a sort of “one-stop-shop” for a patron’s service needs.77 A feasibility study was proposed to see if the FCAA should be moved.78 Once again, the SEC spoke at a meeting.79 A spokesperson stated, “The changing demographics in the South End of the city will inevitably move the [FCAA]. The political will of City Hall was absent [in the past] and it was easy to ignore [residents].”80 The feasibility study was approved, conducted, and showed that it was not worth the cost to the City to move the FCAA.81

As investors poured money into the city, the property values and taxes increased, forcing some residents to leave because they could no longer afford their homes.82 Developments in the South End created luxury condos and homes that ranged in value from $170,000 to $250,000 on the low end and $500,000 to $750,000 on the high-end.83 Just a few years before, these spaces had been a Greyhound Bus Sta-
tion, a parking lot for the FCAA, and a family owned tire center.84 Frederick’s then-Deputy Director for Planning, Chuck Boyd, stated that the development was an “organic” and “natural gentrification” rather than some “planned, governmental scheme.”85 When asked about displacement, Mr. Boyd was not sure if it was happening, but if it was, it was merely because of the law of “supply and demand.”86 As “supply and demand” displaced people from conversions, the local government made no effort to develop programs to preserve low-income or affordable housing.87

Then the mortgage crisis hit and, while the projects in the South End continued forward, the other residents of Frederick sought housing assistance and counseling from the FCAA.88 Frederick’s homeless population increased as well. From 2007 to 2008, the homeless population increased 12.7 percent (268 to 302) and from 2008 to 2009, it increased by another 9 percent (302 to 324).89 The number of people staying in one of Frederick’s shelters reached 67, compared to 22 in 2008.90 The major men’s shelter in Frederick was often filled to its maximum capacity of 80 beds, with 274 individuals regularly visiting the shelter.91

Despite all the contention, the FCAA remains standing today in the same location it has been for the past 43 years.92 However, it still struggles to serve its population as discretely as possible because of the concerns from the SEC and the community.93 The following are some examples of the FCAA’s attempts to assuage the SEC’s and the community’s sensitivities in the changing South End:

- In response to complaints of patrons “loitering” on the sidewalk outside the FCAA while waiting for the soup kitchen to open, the FCAA first asked the patrons to not queue up until the doors opened.94 However, because of the rush of people trying to get food at service time, the FCAA now queues the patrons inside the building, snaking a line of up to 150 people through the building’s nar-

84. Id.
85. Id.
86. Id.
87. Id.
90. Id.
91. Id.
92. Interview with Todd Johnson, Assistant Dir., Frederick Cmty. Action Agency (Feb. 18, 2011).
93. Id.
94. Id.
row halls, while presenting the facade of a friendly, historic train station. 95

- In response to complaints of vagrants along the Carroll Creek Promenade and in the main county library two blocks away, the SEC petitioned the city to set up a police sub-station inside the FCAA. 96 The city turned down the request for two reasons. First, the vagrants were doing nothing wrong and were using the Promenade and library appropriately, more than the residents themselves were using them. 97 Second, the police already had a substation located nearby—just two blocks away. 98

What started out as an “organic” community response by the SEC to increase the “livability” of the South End, evolved into a purging, with the FCAA labeled as public enemy number one. 99 The experiences of the SEC and FCAA lend credence to the studies which are cited in Section 1 supra: that although the SSO may have a positive net effect on the community, individuals’ negative perceptions of the SSOs could block their ability to continue their mission in the community. Should the FCAA have to move amid redevelopment? I now turn to Jane Jacobs research to see, if in her original thoughts on redevelopment, she contemplated such a situation.

III. REDEVELOPING COMMUNITIES

In 1961, Jane Jacobs wrote her critically acclaimed book, “The Death and Life of Great American Cities.” 100 Jacobs brought a commonsense approach to urban city planning and heavily criticized the traditional “pseudoscience’s” “familiar superstitions, over simplifications, and symbols.” 101

A. The Parts of the City

Jacobs seemed especially interested in analyzing the city as a whole and recognizing each piece’s importance. 102 She found that each individual piece, or “neighborhood,” could not work at cross-purposes

95. Id.
96. Id.
97. Id.
98. Interview with Todd Johnson, Assistant Dir., Frederick Cmty. Action Agency (Feb. 18, 2011).
99. See Henk, supra note 82.
102. See generally id.
to each other without economically weakening the city of which they are a part.103 Further, Jacobs found that the lack of economic or social self-containment was natural and necessary to city neighborhoods.104

Jacobs separated the city into three kinds of neighborhoods: city wide, street neighborhoods, and city districts.105 She felt it impossible to say that one unit is more important than the others.106 According to Jacobs, successful street neighborhoods are not discrete units: “they are physical, social, and economic continuities—small scale to be sure, but small scale in the sense that the lengths of the fibers making up a rope are small scale.”107

Jacobs focused much of her economic discussions on the district level.108 According to Jacobs, a district should be big enough to fight city hall, but not so big that street neighborhoods are unable to draw distinct attention and “to count.”109 She found that their chief function was to mediate between the street neighborhood and the city as a whole.110 In addition, Jacobs found that districts help bring the resources of a city down to where they are needed by street neighborhoods and help translate the experiences of real life into policies and purposes of the city as a whole.111

However, one difficulty that she found with districts was that few people could identify with the “abstraction” of a district or care much about them.112 Further, most residents personally identify with a place in the city because they use it, and districts are too large to have that personal connection.113 Nevertheless, Jacobs cautioned putting too much stock into street neighborhoods: “What do [street] neighborhoods do, if anything, that may be socially and economically useful in cities themselves?”114 Jacobs felt that believing street neighborhoods to be self-contained or introverted units was dangerous and hindered the progression of a city’s economic development.115

103. Id. at 198-200.
104. Id.
105. Id. at 153.
106. Id.
108. Id. at 158-68.
109. Id. at 170.
110. Id. at 158.
111. Id. at 159.
112. Id. at 169.
114. Id. at 148.
115. Id. at 148-150.
B. *City Diversity and Mixed Use*

Jacobs felt that in order for a city to be successful, its districts should be diverse. She laid out four primary conditions that are required for generating diversity in city streets and districts. By inducing these conditions, the city's vitality would be enhanced. The four conditions are:

1. The district must serve mixed, primary uses;
2. Most blocks must be short; the streets and opportunities to turn corners must be frequent;
3. The district must mingle buildings that vary in age and condition, thus varying the economic yield they must produce; the mingling should be close grained; and
4. There should be a sufficiently dense population of people.

Contrary to zoning practices at the time, Jacobs saw exclusionary zoning as detrimental to the city and mixed-use as a key to a district's success. Thus, she proposed the following:

The district, and indeed as many of its internal parts as possible, must serve more than one primary function; preferably, more than two. These must insure the presence of people who go outdoors on different schedules and are in place for different purposes, but who are able to use many facilities in common.

There are several aspects to Jacobs' idea of mixed-use districts. The main aspect is that each district should be composed of more than one primary use, function, or purpose. Jacobs defined primary uses as "those which, in themselves, bring people to a specific place because they are anchorages." Two such primary purposes are "business" and "residential" districts. However, as Jacobs explained in a commonsense way, although these two primary uses are fine in their own right, they create problems when they are the only use of an area. This is because business districts are mainly frequented during the weekday, and residential neighborhoods are frequented in the evening and weekends.

116. *Id.* at 198.
117. *Id.* at 196-97.
118. *Id.* at 197.
120. *Id.* at 188.
121. *Id.*
122. *Id.* at 198.
123. *Id.*
124. *Id.* at 209.
126. *Id.* at 211.
127. *Id.* at 199-200.
This brings up a key point in Jacobs’ theory: districts can only achieve (economic success) by having people there to use them.\textsuperscript{128} Having people on the streets not only allows a greater opportunity for people to be economically active, but it also allows for a sense of safety.\textsuperscript{129} Therefore, residential and business districts are inverses of each other regarding the way people use them and the two districts need some balance by having people frequent the area consistently throughout the work day and into the evening.\textsuperscript{130} A primary use cannot achieve this on its own; a district needs more than one primary use to have people on the street while it is awake.\textsuperscript{131}

In addition to multiple primary uses, secondary uses/secondary diversity can achieve a similar result. Secondary diversity is the name for enterprises that grow in response to the presence of primary uses, in effect serving the people the primary uses draw.\textsuperscript{132} Such secondary diversity can consist of a variety of consumer needs, from restaurants down to specialized services.\textsuperscript{133} However, having one group of secondary uses strictly in response to primary uses, such as luncheonettes, results in the same lack of diversity that a single primary use has.\textsuperscript{134} The more intricately mixed the pools of primary and secondary uses are, the more people will come to use the uses, which in turn will produce more people on the streets at varying times.\textsuperscript{135}

If secondary diversity flourishes sufficiently and contains enough uses that it is unusual or unique, it seemingly can become, in the accumulation of its unique uses, a primary use by itself.\textsuperscript{136} People can come specifically for that “shopping district.”\textsuperscript{137} However, secondary diversity seldom becomes a primary use in its own right because the district still needs people spread throughout the day because of fixed reasons.\textsuperscript{138} Ultimately, a secondary-turned-primary uses can engender the same lack of diversity issues that primary uses have, yet the results can be much worse.\textsuperscript{139}

Jacobs has three suggestions for the effective mixture of primary uses. First, the people using the streets at different times must actually

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{128. \textit{Id.} at 203-04.}
\footnote{129. \textit{Id.} at 199.}
\footnote{130. \textit{Id.} at 209.}
\footnote{131. \textit{JANE JACOBS, THE DEATH AND LIFE OF GREAT AMERICAN CITIES} 211 (1993).}
\footnote{132. \textit{Id.}}
\footnote{133. \textit{Id.} at 212.}
\footnote{134. \textit{Id.} at 211.}
\footnote{135. \textit{Id.} at 213-14.}
\footnote{136. \textit{Id.} at 212.}
\footnote{137. \textit{JANE JACOBS, THE DEATH AND LIFE OF GREAT AMERICAN CITIES} 212 (1993).}
\footnote{138. \textit{Id.}}
\footnote{139. \textit{See infra} Section III.C. An example would be small businesses closing, meaning less people, which means more businesses closing, which means no people coming, which turns a lively area into blocks of vacant store fronts.}
\end{footnotes}
use the same streets. If their paths are separated or buffered from one another, there is no mixture. Second, people using the same streets must include people who will use some of the same facilities. Thus, the people must not be sorted in some totally incompatible fashion, such as an opera house and low-income housing project. Third, there must be a reasonable proportion of people using the streets throughout the day and night.

Jacobs had special concerns for primarily residential areas. She felt that in districts that are primarily residential, the more complexity and variety that can be cultivated, the better. When residential uses were mixed with places of work, the districts would liven up in the evenings when the workers left for the day.

C. Self Destruction of Mixed-Uses

As aware as Jacobs was about the need for mixed-uses, she was just as cognizant about the effects of districts that became too successful. She explained the “self-destruction” process and effect as such:

1. A district containing a diversified mixture of uses becomes outstandingly popular and successful as a whole.
2. Because of the location’s success, competition develops because the area is a “fad.” Prices are driven higher.
3. Because unique or less profitable businesses will no longer be able to afford the area, more popular uses will trump those unique or less profitable uses. The winners in the competition for space will represent a narrow segment of the uses.
4. These winners will grow to be those that are most profitable in the locality. These businesses will be repeated, crowding out, overwhelming, and then overtaking the less profitable forms of use.
5. The triumph is hollow because the locality will start to be deserted by people not using it for purposes that have emerged triumphant.

141. Id.
142. Id.
143. Id. at 213.
144. Id.
145. Id. at 228.
147. Id. at 316.
148. Id. at 317.
149. Id.
150. Id.
151. Id. at 318.
6. The lack of diversity equates to less people. The area will then have to start the diversity cycle all over again.\textsuperscript{153}

The self-destruction of diversity often results from the need or desire for urban residences.\textsuperscript{154} Jacobs heavily criticized the redevelopment of a neighborhood or district into a primarily residential area.\textsuperscript{155} She found that most city residential districts had never possessed the four fundamental conditions for generating exuberant diversity in the first place, so building more residences only enhanced the lack of diversity.\textsuperscript{156} In addition, she found that when many people want to live in a locality, it becomes "profitable to build (residences), in excessive and devastating quantity, for those who can pay the most."\textsuperscript{157} The effect is that families are crowded out, variety is crowded out, and enterprises unable to support the increased costs are crowded out.\textsuperscript{158} Even though other areas of the city or localities could use the residences to strengthen their diversity, and the redeveloped area could use the diversity it is forcing out, the hunger for profit is insatiable and the redeveloped residential area will eventually falter because of a lack of diversity.\textsuperscript{159}

As one can see from above, the self-destruction of diversity is caused by the success of a district, not by its failure. During periods of economic growth, some unique uses may be crowded out because they give low economic return for the land they occupy.\textsuperscript{160} If the use is truly low value, then it should be crowded out.\textsuperscript{161} However, when the opportunity for redevelopment occurs, the use being replaced should optimally enhance diversity, not promote sameness.\textsuperscript{162} A district can and should maximize its value, but failing to modify the self-destruction process at a critical point will cause a malfunction and will cost more money trying to salvage the district than if diversity had been implemented in the first place.\textsuperscript{163}

IV. ANALYSIS

Frederick could be creeping closer to its critical point of self-destruction. For the overall success of the district, Jane Jacobs found that diversity is critical if a district wants to succeed. But are SSOs, like the FCAA, included within Jane Jacobs' original idea of diversity and
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mixed-use?\textsuperscript{164} If so, why are they still not wanted in redeveloping neighborhoods? The following analysis answers these difficult questions.

A. Social Service Organizations and Diversity

Does Jacobs provide any guidance on the place of SSOs in mixed-use neighborhoods and districts? Despite a thorough examination of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," there is no explicit mention of any organization resembling an SSO.\textsuperscript{165} What we do know is that Jacobs focused on the economic benefits that mixed-uses provide.\textsuperscript{166} Based on economic production alone, a SSO serves no purpose in a community.\textsuperscript{167} However, an SSO has other purposes that may overcome its own lack of economic productivity.\textsuperscript{168}

To begin, we should look at how SSOs generally function as an organization in the community. Essentially, SSOs function in multiple roles. First, they may deliver services to the community.\textsuperscript{169} These services can range from a food bank, health clinic, social work services, and a soup kitchen.\textsuperscript{170} In this manner, SSOs function as shops or small businesses. Second, SSOs have their own employees and bring people to their location.\textsuperscript{171} Thus, the additional people in the district increase the number of patrons who use the district's secondary uses, such as shops or restaurants. Third, if the SSO has an overnight shelter in whatever capacity, either homeless, family, or half-way house, then the SSO functions as a residential use and supports the area's secondary uses.\textsuperscript{172} As one can see, though an SSO has no economic production on its own, it can potentially lend a large amount to the surrounding secondary uses.

Jacobs anticipates this result with regards to organizations that do not produce their own economic output.\textsuperscript{173} She stated that "public and quasi-public" bodies help to make up a district's diversity.\textsuperscript{174} These bodies include "parks, museums, schools, most auditoriums, hospitals, some offices, and some dwellings."\textsuperscript{175} Jacobs found these bodies produce the same effects that are described above.\textsuperscript{176} In addition, an SSO can have its own unique effect on the economy of a city.
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For example, SSOs get people off the streets and into programs they may need. This will reduce the amount of money spent on public programs. Also, SSOs help people find jobs which helps the district’s tax base. Finally, SSOs help get people into houses which helps a city’s statistics. Therefore, one can see that if SSOs were not in a district, the district and its citizens may actually be worse off economically than if a repetitive use were in its place.

Jacobs suggests the following for the effectively mixing primary uses. First, the people must actually use the same streets; there is no reason that the population using the SSO would use different streets that the average citizen. Second, the people must use the same facilities; some, though not all, of the facilities would be shared. Third, the people must not be sorted in some incompatible fashion. Recall Jacobs’ comment that placing an opera house next to a low-income housing project is incompatible. Are luxury condos so incompatible with an SSO that they make no sense being next to each other? As both examples deal with residential uses, the competing uses should be analyzed for compatibility. An opera house is only open in the evenings and on weekends and its patrons come solely for the event and do not otherwise contribute to the immediate tax base. Many SSOs are used all day and into the evening, offering some services on the weekend, and its patrons do utilize the local businesses to increase the tax base. Therefore, the situation in Frederick is not so incompatible that the uses should not be next to each other. Thus, it is clear that although Jacobs did not explicitly state SSOs are included in diverse districts, an inference can be drawn that they do fit in and would be beneficial to the district.

B. Ruinous Uses

The discussion does not end at whether SSOs generally fit in with the idea of mixed-use and diversity. One argument against diversity is that it invites “ruinous uses.” Jacobs posed the question as, “Is permissiveness for all (or almost all) kinds of uses in an area destructive?” To answer this question, Jacobs identified additional uses,
which, though diverse, may or may not harm a street neighborhood or district.\textsuperscript{182}

The first are "destructive uses," identified as those uses which contribute nothing to the general convenience, attraction, or concentration of people.\textsuperscript{183} These uses are destructive because they make demands upon the land that non-destructive uses do not make.\textsuperscript{184} Jacobs identifies junkyards, used-car lots, and abandoned or underused buildings as destructive uses.\textsuperscript{185} Jacobs found that successful districts are not successful because they lack these uses, but rather the districts lack these destructive uses because the city district is successful.\textsuperscript{186} Further, if a city wants to avoid these uses, it should cultivate an environment of diversity.\textsuperscript{187}

The next category of ruinous uses is "harmful uses," defined as those "conventionally" considered harmful by planners and zoners.\textsuperscript{188} Such uses consist of bars, theaters, clinics, businesses, and manufacturing facilities because these uses "do not belong" in residential districts and because they flounder in dull, gray areas of the city.\textsuperscript{189} Jacobs found that these uses are not inherently harmful to a neighborhood, and that in lively districts, they cause no harm and can be quite successful in achieving diversity.\textsuperscript{190}

She identifies two uses "conventionally" considered harmful: the glue factory and the mortuary.\textsuperscript{191} The two are considered harmful because of the images they produce, not because they are inherently harmful.\textsuperscript{192} In addition, mortuaries are identified as harmful because they provide no extra retail advantage.\textsuperscript{193} That said, she criticizes the critics because "like so much of orthodox planning, the presumed harm done has been somehow accepted without anyone asking the questions, 'Why is it harmful? Just how does it harm and what is the harm?'"\textsuperscript{194} She concludes that it is doubtful that there are any legal economic uses that can harm a city district "as much as a lack of abundant diversity harms it."\textsuperscript{195}

Jacobs identifies a final category of "distracting" uses that, unless their location is controlled, are harmful to diverse city districts.\textsuperscript{196}
These include “parking lots, large or heavy truck depots, gas stations, outdoor advertising, and enterprises which are harmful not because of their nature, exactly, but because in certain streets their scale is wrong.”\(^{197}\) Jacobs admits that these uses can and will be profitable enough, but because of their nature, they act as street “disorganizers.”\(^{198}\)

With regard to uses of the “wrong scale,” a large street frontage can be a street “disintegrator and desolator,” though the same kind of uses in a smaller scale are assets.\(^{199}\) Examples include supermarkets, large cafeterias, and large factories.\(^{200}\) Jacobs suggests controls on street frontage, not zoning for uses, to solve such problems.\(^{201}\) Thus Jacobs finds that “harmful” uses are not ruinous, but “destructive” and “distracting” uses should be controlled.\(^{202}\)

Where do SSOs fit in with these categories of uses? As defined by Jacobs, SSOs are not inherently “destructive” because by their nature, they contribute something “to the general convenience, attraction, or concentration of people.”\(^{203}\) However, whether SSOs are “harmful” or “distracting” is another matter.\(^{204}\)

\(i.\) **Perceptions of SSOs**

SSOs are probably perceived as a “harmful” use. As mentioned above, there are certain uses, while not inherently harmful, which nevertheless invoke negative images that cause residents to not want the use in their neighborhood.\(^{205}\) Jacobs found mortuaries invoked negative images of death.\(^{206}\) SSOs can invoke a similar negative image.

A larger SSO like the FCAA has its presence felt beyond its bricks and mortar. As patrons wait for services or chat with friends afterward, they loiter around the area, discard used cigarettes on sidewalks or other property, and have loud conversations.\(^{207}\) In addition, some patrons are intoxicated, mentally unstable, or unsanitary.\(^{208}\) In situa-
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tions where the public is exposed to individuals with some problems, the public has been found to feel uncomfortable around the individuals. Thus, when there are a large number of these individuals in one area, people will want to stay away from the area—resulting in lost revenue for businesses. Based on Frederick's past history with criminal activity, common sense would suggest that even if the FCAA is not currently presenting a negative impression, since it was at one time associated with negativity, the negative perception may continue until its presence is removed. A similar feeling has been experienced when a community has been forced to help those in need. These perceptions can lead to a kind of "not-in-my-neighborhood" mentality that is bad for district diversity and may be present in Frederick. In fact, patrons of the FCAA and the FCAA's existence have not been connected or correlated with any incidents of crime in their long history.

Though these perceptions exist, they were part of the problem to begin with. Jacobs found a common criticism about diversity was that mixed-uses "look ugly" and invite "ruinous uses." However, these "myths" helped to "rationalize city building into the sterile, regimented, empty thing it is." She found that the images people had were based on images of unsuccessful districts that had too little, not too much diversity. And because they were recalling those images, they recalled the worst of those images in unsuccessful districts: the low-value land uses such as junkyards or used-car lots. People often resort to this "end of the world" thinking, and are more willing to
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hold on to safe notions than to risk a “disaster.” However, as Jacobs stated, “cities can aim for areas of great diversity and, because real differences are thereby expressed, can get results which, at worst, are merely interesting, and at best can be delightful.” Therefore, I assert, and Jacobs agrees, ill-perceivers need to accept that SSOs are not “harmful” uses of city space: poverty and SSOs are an aspect of city living.

ii. The Placement of SSOs in the District

Even if the negative perceptions disappear, a problem remains with the placement of SSOs in the district. The patrons of SSOs often need several different types of services that an SSO could provide. Using the FCAA as an example, a certain patron could come to the FCAA for the food bank, health clinic, soup kitchen, social work programs, or any number of other programs. Thus, for several reasons, if there is a greater concentration of services in one area, the ability to serve needy patrons will be positively affected. First, if the patrons do not have a car or easy mode of transportation, having the services in one area allows for a “one-stop-shop.” Second, by having the services concentrated, it allows easier outreach because if patrons need a service, they can be referred to a nearby program.

This concentration can be accomplished in two ways: either having all the services in one building or having several services in close proximity of each other. However, both ways of concentrating the services in one area conflicts with diversity in two ways. The first, having all the services in one area, may be a “distracting” use of the space. This is because the scale of the facility is “wrong,” even though if the different services were broken up, the individual providers would promote diversity. It is easy to conceptualize this problem if one thinks of the large SSO as a Wal-Mart of social services. As great as Wal-Mart can be in concentrating many things in one area for ease of access, it does not belong in the middle of a city district. Though the FCAA is nowhere near the size of Wal-Mart, it currently takes up about 1/3 of each small block it fronts. Its sheer size can be distracting to the “neighborhood,” which only adds to the “harmful” perception it currently has.
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The second way to increase the concentration of social services in an area is to cluster multiple buildings with different services in a district or neighborhood. If the services are too far apart, the patrons will have a difficult time accessing each one. However, if the services are clustered too close to each other, the area may become a "social services district," possibly resulting in two negative effects. First, the area's primary use may convert to "social services" and secondary uses would sprout to "support" the social services. Less desirable fronts may open (liquor stores, bail bonds places) and the fronts that might otherwise attract money and attention (upscale restaurants and boutiques) may stay away. Second, and more generally, clustering the services together endangers diversity. Jacobs identified such an occurrence in San Francisco. When several upstanding public buildings were placed in close conjunction with each other, these buildings repelled vitality and gathered blight around them.

Thus, there is an inherent tension between providing services and the location of the services themselves. If the services are large and centrally located, the facility and its patrons will be distracting or create less diversity in the district. However, if the services are spread out, the district or neighborhood will be more diverse, but the ability of the SSOs in the area to provide services will probably be impacted. Although there is not a clear solution to the tension created, there is merit in keeping SSOs, especially major community hubs like the FCAA, in central locations so that their services are more readily available or deliverable.

C. Protecting the SSO in Redevelopment

SSOs can be just as important to the city as any business. Though the bricks and mortar of a city may impress, and its businesses may bring people in, SSOs help in ways those entities cannot. Therefore, to protect these SSOs amid redevelopment, two different zoning techniques could be used.

The first is inclusionary zoning. Through inclusionary zoning, governments require or encourage developers—both residential and commercial—to create affordable residential units as part of any new development. Inclusionary zoning seeks to counter the ills of exclusionary zoning; many communities disguise their exclusionary zoning practices as a way to "preserve the community character."
However, the motivation behind exclusionary zoning is a financial concern for the impact on property values, but can involve prejudice against those of lower income. SSOs could use mandatory or voluntary inclusionary zoning, not in a residential sense, but could expand the zoning to include community centers to serve the community. Specifically, Frederick has a number of residential units going up around the FCAA and inclusionary zoning could ensure both that there is mixed income housing and a place to come for help.

A more compelling protection is mixed-use zoning. As the name suggests, mixed-use zoning attempts to facilitate mixed-use projects in the same community or building. Therefore, mixed-use projects require flexible zoning that will allow integrated uses that cannot be combined in other areas, and that will allow planning and design concepts that are restricted or prohibited in other zoning areas. Flexible, mixed-use zoning can address some of the difficult issues of a mixed-use project or area while protecting SSOs in at least two ways. First, mixed-use zoning can integrate mixed-use developments with facilities that serve the larger community or vice-versa. Second, it can foster a sense of community among those of mixed-incomes. For example, the Old Town has had a number of mixed-uses and mixed incomes that have worked well over the years and some protection should be given to protect its diversity.

Jacobs had suggested such defenses to protect diversity. She uses the terms “zoning for diversity” and “mixed-use zoning.” These zoning techniques would ensure that changes or replacements, if they occur, will not be overwhelmingly of one kind. Jacobs found that through protecting diversity, the long-term potential of the tax base would be protected.
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Jacobs offered another suggestion specific to public buildings; she suggested that they should be “staunch.” During planning, cities should establish public buildings or facilities at points where they will effectively add to diversity in the first place. Then amid redevelopment, they should stand staunch no matter how valuable the property becomes of surrounding success. Though Jacobs only suggested “staunchness” for public buildings such as libraries or community centers, SSOs could fall into this category, especially if they are community hubs, like the FCAA. Jacobs did warn that these protections serve only as “windbreaks”—they can stand against the “gusts” of economic pressures. Zoning and staunchness are defensive actions, but they will give under too much pressure from other sources.

CONCLUSION

Jacobs’ literature about city diversity has forever changed the way planners think about developing a city for optimum economic output. There is no doubt that diverse neighborhoods and districts can achieve the results she witnessed and foresaw. Yet a diverse district can mean different things to those living in neighborhoods with the more diverse uses such as SSOs. As stated before, Jacobs found people related more to street neighborhoods than “abstract” districts.

A “neighborhood” may want different things than what the city wants. In Frederick, the SEC is acting out of its own best interest because it perceives its neighborhood being negatively affected. However, in other neighborhoods residents may be more interested in making the whole district better without maximizing their individual assets.
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Yet the SEC should not be criticized for its actions. It joined as a neighborhood group and succeeded in turning its neighborhood into an aesthetically attractive area that is ripe for redevelopment. However, as Jacobs states, "As a sentimental concept, 'neighborhood' is harmful to city planning. It leads to attempts at warping city life into imitations of town or suburban life." A perfect example of this warping is the SEC's demand that the FCAA wind the queue for its soup kitchen patrons through the building rather than on the street. By presenting the front of an appealing historic railroad station, the "neighborhood" is comforted by the perception that nothing disruptive to their ideals exists, but in reality, having more people on the street would present more advantages.

It can be pointed out to the SEC that their thinking is flawed in two respects. First, a strong assumption can be made that the SEC does not want the FCAA or other SSOs in the South End because of the negative perception attached to the SSOs. This negative perception can turn, and possibly already has turned, into a situation of "them" versus "us" and can evolve into something discriminatory. Though the "neighborhood" joined together to fight for the betterment of the South End, according to Jacobs, togetherness destroys cities and drives people apart. Togetherness, in effect, pushes "others" out. As the South End moves toward a wealthier tax base, each entity that cannot afford to be in conformity gets pushed out.

Similarly related, another reason why the SEC may have a negative impression of SSOs is because of privacy. As Jacobs states:

To understand why drinking pop on the stoop differs from drinking pop in the game room, and why getting advice from the grocer or bartender differs from getting advice from either your next-door neighbor or someone who you can trust, has to do with city privacy. Privacy is precious in cities.

With an increased presence of individuals on the street, especially individuals which have been shown to cause uneasiness, the desire to hold on to privacy may intensify. Therefore, the desire to remove the SSO could be less discriminatory in nature and more about preservation of privacy. Regardless of why the "neighborhood" has a negative perception of the SSO, the perception is just that—a perception.
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A perception, by its very nature, can be perceived differently. How this can be accomplished is beyond the scope of this article, but if the "neighborhood" is not ready to have their perception dispelled, it will not occur.

The second reason why the SEC's thinking is flawed is that they are not thinking about the "greater good"; that is, what is better for the district, Old Town, is ultimately better for them. Through enhancing the district's overall diversity, the individual street neighborhood will have more staying power. Jacobs found that the best way to raise a city's tax base was not to exploit the short-term tax potential of every site because it undermines the long-term potential of whole neighborhoods or districts. The South End's current plan of concentrating development into one area may be great for investors, but it is not the best plan for the entire district. Further, Jacobs found that the way to raise the district's tax base was to expand the range of successful uses—not to cut out those uses that are not directly increasing the tax base. Instead of making the South End primarily residential, Jacobs would recommend halting the excess duplications at one place, and divert them to other places where they will be healthy additions. Also, the diverted projects should go to areas of the district where the additions will have an opportunity for sustained success. The residential projects and shops can be sprinkled strategically through Frederick's downtown area, not just the Old Town area, to increase the district's diversity and all the benefits that come with it.

Ultimately, the district is more important than the "neighborhood." As Jacobs stated, "The main responsibility of city planning and design should be to develop, insofar as public policy and action can do so—cities that are congenial places for the great range of unofficial plans, ideas, and opportunities to flourish, along with the flourishing of public enterprises." Yet as important as the district is, a single organization, such as the FCAA, may be the center of a neighborhood, district, or city. If it is removed, a domino effect may occur. As Jacobs stated, "It is futile to plan a city's appearance, or speculate on how to endow it with a pleasing appearance of order, without knowing what sort of innate functioning order it has." The FCAA may be critical to Frederick's order and it, like other SSOs, should be protected amid rede-
velopment until it is no longer in Old Town’s (the district’s) best interest to do so.

Thus it comes down to the community, which is the bridge between the street neighborhood and the district. In the U.S., we can define a community as “a group of people united by the common objects of their love” or “a group of people working together actively to achieve a common goal.” 267 Both definitions apply to the situation in the South End, but they are competing against each other. Based on Jacobs’ thoughts, the FCAA fits in with a diverse district, but not with the SEC’s ideal South End. Only time will tell which “community” prevails.