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from *The Image of the City* (1960)

Kevin Lynch

Editors’ Introduction

Kevin Lynch (1918–1984), a professor of urban design at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is the towering figure of twentieth-century urban design. *The Image of the City*, from which this selection is taken, is the most widely read urban design book of all time.

Drawing widely on material from psychology and the humanities, Lynch sought to understand how people perceive urban environments and how design professionals can respond to the deepest human needs. Lynch’s rambling, profoundly humane writings weave together a unique blend of theory and practical design suggestions drawn from his voluminous reading in history, anthropology, architecture, art, psychology, literature, and a host of other areas.

This influential chapter on “The City Image and its Elements” presents Lynch’s best known concepts on how people perceive cities. Lynch argues that people perceive cities as consisting of underlying city form elements such as “paths” (along which people and goods flow), “edges” (which differentiate one part of the urban fabric from another), “landmarks” (which stand out and help orient people), “districts” (perceived as physically or culturally distinct even if their boundaries are fuzzy), and “nodes” where activities, and often paths, meet. Lynch believes that humans have an innate desire to understand their surroundings and do this best if a clear city image is discernible from these elements. If urban designers understand how people perceive these elements and design to make cities more imageable, Lynch argues, urban designers can create more psychologically satisfying urban environments.

Lynch’s research is a good example of creative qualitative research. Rather than starting from a theory and reasoning from it about how people perceive cities (deductive logic), Lynch started by gathering empirical information from people themselves and then constructing theory that explained the broad patterns he found (inductive logic). This is a common research strategy. Planners, for example, often conduct surveys to get people’s opinions on a particular planning issue. What distinguishes Lynch’s work from a run-of-the-mill survey report is his skill at generalizing what he found into high order conceptual categories rather than just reporting survey results. Lynch pioneered the technique of having people draw “mental maps” and analyzing them to understand how people perceived their surroundings. Lynch came to his conclusions about the basic elements of city form that shape perception largely by observing recurring patterns in the maps. Almost everyone drew streets and other geographical features along which people and goods moved. Lynch generalized these features into a category he named “paths”. He also noticed that boundaries between parts of the city were often clear in the maps – and named this urban form element an “edge”. Similarly Lynch created categories he called landmarks, nodes, and districts by generalizing repeating patterns he discovered in the maps ordinary citizens drew.

Influenced by Lynch’s work, urban designers in cities as diverse as San Francisco, Cairo, Havana, and Ciudad Guyana, Venezuela have sketched out the elements of cities or parts of cities they are designing as paths, edges,
Kevin Lynch studied architecture at Yale University and apprenticed himself to Frank Lloyd Wright, the brilliant and opinionated architect who envisioned Broadacre City (p. 345) and was eventually recognized as one of the United States’ greatest architects. Lynch received a bachelor’s degree in urban planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 1947 and joined its faculty a year later. At MIT Lynch taught courses in urban design and site planning. He maintained an active urban design practice and, after publication of The Image of the City, cemented his reputation, lectured and consulted worldwide.

An American urban designer and writer, Kevin Lynch is recognized as one of the pioneers of the fields of environmental psychology and urban design. His work has significantly influenced the way urban designers and planners think about the relationship between people and their built environment. Lynch is best known for his book The Image of the City, which introduced the concept of environmental psychology and described the cognitive maps that people create of their surroundings. His ideas have been influential in the design of urban spaces, parks, and other public areas around the world.

Lynch’s approach to urban design emphasizes the importance of considering how people perceive and use space. He argues that urban design should not only be aesthetically pleasing but also functional and psychologically satisfying. Lynch’s ideas about the psychological impact of urban form have been influential in fields such as environmental psychology and urban planning, and his work continues to inform the work of urban designers and planners today.
There seems to be a public image of any given city which is the overlap of many individual images. Or perhaps there is a series of public images, each held by some significant number of citizens. Such group images are necessary if an individual is to operate successfully within his environment and to cooperate with his fellows. Each individual picture is unique, with some content that is rarely or never communicated, yet it approximates the public image, which, in different environments, is more or less compelling, more or less embracing.

This analysis limits itself to the effects of physical, perceptible objects. There are other influences on imageability, such as the social meaning of an area, its function, its history, or even its name. These will be glossed over, since the objective here is to uncover the role of form itself. It is taken for granted that in actual design form should be used to reinforce meaning, and not to negate it.

The contents of the city images so far studied, which are referable to physical forms, can conveniently be classified into five types of elements: paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks.

Indeed, these elements may be of more general application, since they seem to reappear in many types of environmental images. . . . These elements may be defined as follows:

1 Paths. Paths are the channels along which the observer customarily, occasionally, or potentially moves. They may be streets, walkways, transit lines, canals, railroads. For many people, these are the predominant elements in their image. People observe the city while moving through it, and along these paths the other environmental elements are arranged and related.

2 Edges. Edges are the linear elements not used or considered as paths by the observer. They are the boundaries between two phases, linear breaks in continuity: shores, railroad cuts, edges of development, walls. They are lateral references rather than coordinate axes. Such edges may be barriers, more or less penetrable, which close one region off from another; or they may be seams, lines along which two regions are related and joined together. These edge elements, although probably not as dominant as paths, are for many people important organizing features, particularly in the role of holding together generalized areas, as in the outline of a city by water or wall.

3 Districts. Districts are the medium-to-large sections of the city, conceived of as having two-dimensional extent, which the observer mentally enters "inside of," and which are recognizable as having some common, identifying character. Always identifiable from the inside, they are also used for exterior reference if visible from the outside. Most people structure their city to some extent in this way, with individual differences as to whether paths or districts are the dominant
elements. It seems to depend not only upon the individual but also upon the given city.

4 Nodes. Nodes are points, the strategic spots in a city into which an observer can enter, and which are the intensive foci to and from which he is traveling. They may be primarily junctions, places of a break in transportation, a crossing or convergence of paths, moments of shift from one structure to another. Or the nodes may be simply concentrations, which gain their importance from being the condensation of some use or physical character, as a street-corner hangout or an enclosed square. Some of these concentration nodes are the focus and epitome of a district, over which their influence radiates and of which they stand as a symbol. They may be called cores. Many nodes, of course, partake of the nature of both junctions and concentrations. The concept of node is related to the concept of path, since junctions are typically the convergence of paths, events on the journey. It is similarly related to the concept of district, since cores are typically the intensive foci of districts, their polarizing center. In any event, some nodal points are to be found in almost every image, and in certain cases they may be the dominant feature.

5 Landmarks. Landmarks are another type of point-reference, but in this case the observer does not enter within them, they are external. They are usually a rather simply defined physical object: building, sign, store, or mountain. Their use involves the singling out of one element from a host of possibilities. Some landmarks are distant ones, typically seen from many angles and distances, over the tops of smaller elements, and used as radial references. They may be within the city or at such a distance that for all practical purposes they symbolize a constant direction. Such are isolated towers, golden domes, great hills. Even a mobile point, like the sun, whose motion is sufficiently slow and regular, may be employed. Other landmarks are primarily local, being visible only in restricted localities and from certain approaches. These are the innumerable signs, storefronts, trees, doorknobs, and other urban detail, which fill in the image of most observers. They are frequently used clues of identity and even of structure, and seem to be increasingly relied upon as a journey becomes more and more familiar.

The image of a given physical reality may occasionally shift its type with different circumstances of viewing. Thus an expressway may be a path for the driver, and edge for the pedestrian. Or a central area may be a district when a city is organized on a medium scale, and a node when the entire metropolitan area is considered. But the categories seem to have stability for a given observer when he is operating at a given level.

None of the element types isolated above exist in isolation in the real case. Districts are structured with nodes, defined by edges, penetrated by paths, and sprinkled with landmarks. Elements regularly overlap and pierce one another. If this analysis begins with the differentiation of the data into categories, it must end with their reintegration into the whole image...

PATHS

For most people interviewed, paths were the predominant city elements, although their importance varied according to the degree of familiarity with the city. People with least knowledge of Boston tended to think of the city in terms of topography, large regions, generalized characteristics, and broad directional relationships. Subjects who knew the city better had usually mastered part of the path structure; these people thought more in terms of specific paths and their interrelationships. A tendency also appeared for the people who knew the city best of all to rely more upon small landmarks and less upon either regions or paths. The potential drama and identification in the highway system should not be underestimated. One Jersey City subject, who can find little worth describing in her surroundings, suddenly lit up when she described the Holland Tunnel. Another recounted her pleasure:

You cross Baldwin Avenue, you see all of New York in front of you, you see the terrific drop of land [the Palisades] ... and here’s this open panorama of lower Jersey City in front of you and you’re going down hill, and there you know: there’s the tunnel, there’s the Hudson River and everything ... I always look to the right to see if I can see the ... Statue of Liberty ... Then I always look up to see the Empire State Building, see how the weather is . . . I have a real feeling of happiness because I’m going someplace, and I love to go places.

Particular paths may become important features in a number of ways. Customary travel will of course be one of the strong lines, such as Boylston Street in Boston or the freeway features ...

Concentration a street may give observers. Washi...
be one of the strongest influences, so that major access lines, such as Boylston Street, Storrow Drive, or Tremont Street in Boston, Hudson Boulevard in Jersey City, or the freeways in Los Angeles, are all key image features. . . .

Concentration of special use or activity along a street may give it prominence in the minds of observers. Washington Street is the outstanding Boston example: subjects consistently associated it with shopping and theatres. . . . People seemed to be sensitive to variations in the amount of activity they encountered, and sometimes guided themselves largely by following the main stream of traffic. Los Angeles' Broadway was recognized by its crowds and its street cars; Washington Street in Boston was marked by a torrent of pedestrians. . . .

Characteristic spatial qualities were able to strengthen the image of particular paths. In the simplest sense, streets that suggest extremes of either width or narrowness attracted attention. Cambridge Street, Commonwealth Avenue, and Atlantic Avenue are all well known in Boston, and all were singled out for their great width. . . . Spatial qualities of width and narrowness derived part of their importance from the common association of main streets with width and side streets with narrowness. Looking for, and trusting to the "main" (i.e., wide) street becomes automatic, and in Boston the real pattern usually supports this assumption. . . . Some of the orientation difficulties in Boston's financial district, or the anonymity of the Los Angeles grid, may be due to this lack of spatial dominance.

Special façade characteristics were also important for path identity. Beacon Street and Commonwealth Avenue were distinctive partly because of the building façades that line them. . . .

Proximity to special features of the city could also endow a path with increased importance. In this case the path would be acting secondarily as an edge. Atlantic Avenue derived much importance from its relation to the wharves and the harbor, Storrow Drive from its location along the Charles River.

. . .

Where major paths lacked identity, or were easily confused one for the other, the entire city image was in difficulty. . . . Many of the paths in Jersey City were difficult to find, both in reality and in memory.

That the paths, once identifiable, have continuity as well, is an obvious functional necessity. People regularly depended upon this quality. . . .

People tended to think of path destinations and origin points: they liked to know where paths came from and where they led. Paths with clear and well-known origins and destinations had stronger identities, helped tie the city together, and gave the observer a sense of his bearings whenever he crossed them. . . .

A few important paths may be imaged together as a simple structure, despite any minor irregularities, as long as they have a consistent general relationship to one another. The Boston street system is not conducive to this kind of image, except perhaps for the basic parallelism of Washington and Tremont Streets. But the Boston subway system, whatever its involutions in true scale, seemed fairly easy to visualize as two parallel lines cut at the center by the Cambridge–Dorchester line, although the parallel lines might be confused one with the other, particularly since both go to North Station. The freeway system in Los Angeles seemed to be imaged as a complete structure. . . .

A large number of paths may be seen as a total network, when repeating relationships are sufficiently regular and predictable.

The Los Angeles grid is a good example. Almost every subject could easily put down some twenty major paths in correct relation to each other. At the same time, this very regularity made it difficult for them to distinguish one path from another.

Boston's Back Bay is an interesting path network. Its regularity is remarkable in contrast to the rest of the central city, an effect that would not occur in most American cities. But this is not a featureless regularity. The longitudinal streets were sharply differentiated from the cross streets in everyone's mind, much as they are in Manhattan. The long streets all have individual character—Beacon Street, Marlboro Street, Commonwealth Avenue, Newbury Street, each one is different—while the cross streets act as measuring devices. The relative width of the streets, the block lengths, the building frontages, the naming system, the relative length and number of the two kinds of streets, their functional importance, all tend to reinforce this differentiation. Thus a regular pattern is given form and character. The alphabet formula for naming the cross streets was frequently used as a location device, much as the numbers are used in Los Angeles. . . .
The frequent reduction of the South End to a geometrical system was typical of the constant tendency of the subjects to impose regularity on their surroundings. Unless obvious evidence refuted it, they tried to organize paths into geometrical networks, disregarding curves and non-perpendicular intersections. The lower area of Jersey City was frequently drawn as a grid, even though it is one only in part. Subjects absorbed all of central Los Angeles into a repeating network, without being disturbed by the distortion at the eastern edge. Several subjects even insisted on reducing the street maze of Boston’s financial district to a checkerboard!

**EDGES**

Edges are the linear elements not considered as paths: they are usually, but not quite always, the boundaries between two kinds of areas. They act as lateral references. They are strong in Boston and Jersey City but weaker in Los Angeles. Those edges seem strongest, which are not only visually prominent, but also continuous in form and impenetrable to cross movement. The Charles River in Boston is the best example and has all of these qualities.

The importance of the peninsular definition of Boston has already been mentioned. It must have been much more important in the 18th century, when the city was a true and very striking peninsula. Since then the shore lines have been erased or changed, but the picture persists. One change, at least, has strengthened the image: the Charles River edge, once a swampy backwater, is now well defined and developed. It was frequently described, and sometimes drawn in great detail. Everyone remembered the wide open space, the curving line, the bordering highways, the boats, the Esplanade, the Shell.

The water edge on the other side, the harborfront, was also generally known, and remembered for its special activity. But the sense of water was less clear, since it was obscured by many structures, and since the life has gone out of the old harbor activities. . . .

In Jersey City, the waterfront was also a strong edge, but a rather forbidding one. It was a no-man’s land, a region beyond the barbed wire. Edges, whether of railroads, topography, throughways, or district boundaries, are a very typical feature of this environment and tend to fragment it. Some of the most unpleasant edges, such as the bank of the Hackensack River with its burning dump areas, seemed to be mentally erased.

While continuity and visibility are crucial, strong edges are not necessarily impenetrable. Many edges are uniting seams, rather than isolating barriers, and it is interesting to see the differences in effect. Boston’s Central Artery seems to divide absolutely, to isolate. Wide Cambridge Street divides two regions sharply but keeps them in some visual relation. Beacon Street, the visible boundary of Beacon Hill along the Common, acts not as a barrier but as a seam along which the two major areas are clearly joined together. Charles Street at the foot of Beacon Hill both divides and unites, leaving the lower area in uncertain relation to the hill above. Charles Street carries heavy traffic but also contains the local service stores and special activities associated with the Hill. It pulls the residents together by attracting them to itself. It acts ambiguously either as linear node, edge, or path for various people at various times.

Edges are often paths as well. Where this was so, and where the ordinary observer was not shut off from moving on the path . . . then the circulation image seemed to be the dominant one. The element was usually pictured as a path, reinforced by boundary characteristics.

It is difficult to think of Chicago without picturing Lake Michigan. It would be interesting to see how many Chicagoleans would begin to draw a map of their city by putting down something other than the line of the lake shore. Here is a magnificent example of a visible edge, gigantic in scale, that exposes an entire metropolis to view. Great buildings, parks, and tiny private beaches all come down to the water’s edge, which throughout most of its length is accessible and visible to all. The contrast, the differentiation of events along the line, and the lateral breadth are all very strong. The effect is reinforced by the concentration of paths and activities along its extent. The scale is perhaps unrelievedly large and coarse, and too much open space is at times interposed between city and water, as at the Loop. Yet the façade of Chicago on the Lake is an unforgettable sight.
Districts

Districts are the relatively large city areas which the observer can mentally go inside of, and which have some common character. They can be recognized internally, and occasionally can be used as external reference as a person goes by or toward them. Many persons interviewed took care to point out that Boston, while confusing in its path pattern even to the experienced inhabitant, has, in the number and vividness of its differentiated districts, a quality that quite makes up for it. As one person put it: Each part of Boston is different from the other. You can tell pretty much what area you’re in.

Jersey City has its districts too, but they are primarily ethnic or class districts with little physical distinction. Los Angeles is markedly lacking in strong regions, except for the Civic Center area. The best that can be found are the linear, street-front districts of Skid Row or the financial area.

Subjects, when asked which city they felt to be a well-oriented one, mentioned several, but New York (meaning Manhattan) was unanimously cited. And this city was cited not so much for its grid, which Los Angeles has as well, but because it has a number of well-defined characteristic districts, set in an ordered frame of rivers and streets. Two Los Angeles subjects even referred to Manhattan as being “small” in comparison to their central area! Concepts of size may depend in part on how well a structure can be grasped.

In some Boston interviews, the districts were the basic elements of the city image. One subject, for example, when asked to go from Faneuil Hall to Symphony Hall, replied at once by labeling the trip as going from North End to Back Bay. But even where they were not actively used for orientation, districts were still an important and satisfying part of the experience of living in the city. Recognition of distinct districts in Boston seemed to vary somewhat as acquaintance with the city increased. People most familiar with Boston tended to recognize regions but to rely more heavily for organization and orientation on smaller elements. A few people extremely familiar with Boston were unable to generalize detailed perceptions into districts: conscious of minor differences in all parts of the city, they did not form regional groups of elements.

The physical characteristics that determine districts are thematic continuities which may consist of an endless variety of components: texture, space, form, detail, symbol, building type, use, activity, inhabitants, degree of maintenance, topography. In a closely built city such as Boston, homogeneities of façade – material, modeling, ornament, color, skyline, especially fenestration – were all basic clues in identifying major districts. Beacon Hill and Commonwealth Avenue are both examples. The clues were not only visual ones: noise was important as well. At times, indeed, confusion itself might be a clue, as it was for the woman who remarked that she knows she is in the North End as soon as she feels she is getting lost.

Usually, the typical features were imaged and recognized in a characteristic cluster, the thematic unit. The Beacon Hill image, for example, included steep narrow streets; old brick row houses of intimate scale; inset, highly maintained, white doorways; black trim; cobblestones and brick walks; quiet; and upper-class pedestrians. The resulting thematic unit was distinctive by contrast to the rest of the city and could be recognized immediately.

A certain reinforcement of clues is needed to produce a strong image. All too often, there are a few distinctive signs, but not enough for a full thematic unit. Then the region may be recognizable to someone familiar with the city, but it lacks any visual strength or impact. Such, for example, is Little Tokyo in Los Angeles, recognizable by its population and the lettering on its signs but otherwise indistinguishable from the general matrix. Although it is a strong ethnic concentration, probably known to many people, it appeared as only a subsidiary portion of the city image.

Yet social connotations are quite significant in building regions. A series of street interviews indicated the class overtones that many people associate with different districts. Most of the Jersey City regions were class or ethnic areas, discernible only with difficulty for the outsider. Both Jersey City and Boston have shown the exaggerated attention paid to upper-class districts, and the resulting magnification of the importance of elements in those areas. District names also help to give identity to districts even when the thematic unit does not establish a striking contrast with other parts of the city, and traditional associations can play a similar role.

When the main requirement has been satisfied, and a thematic unit that contrasts with the rest of the city has been constituted, the degree of internal homogeneity is less significant, especially if discordant elements occur in a predictable pattern. Small stores on
street corners establish a rhythm on Beacon Hill that one subject perceived as part of her image. These stores in no way weakened her non-commercial image of Beacon Hill but merely added to it. Subjects could pass over a surprising amount of local disagreement with the characteristic features of a region.

Districts have various kinds of boundaries. Some are hard, definite, precise. Such is the boundary of the Back Bay at the Charles River or at the Public Garden. All agree on this exact location. Other boundaries may be soft or uncertain, such as the limit between downtown shopping and the office district, to whose existence and approximate location most people would testify. Still other regions have no boundaries at all, as did the South End for many of our subjects. . .

These edges seem to play a secondary role: they may set limits to a district, and may reinforce its identity, but they apparently have less to do with constituting it. Edges may augment the tendency of districts to fragment the city in a disorganizing way. A few people sensed disorganization as one result of the large number of identifiable districts in Boston: strong edges, by hindering transitions from one district to another, may add to the impression of disorganization.

That type of district which has a strong core, surrounded by a thematic gradient which gradually dwindles away, is not uncommon. Sometimes, indeed, a strong node may create a sort of district in a broader homogeneous zone, simply by "radiation," that is, by the sense of proximity to the nodal point. These are primarily reference areas, with little perceptual content, but they are useful organizing concepts, nevertheless.

Some well-known Boston districts were unstructured in the public image. The West End and North End were internally undifferentiated for many people who recognized these regions. Even more often, thematically vivid districts such as the market area seemed confusingly shapeless, both externally and internally. The physical sensations of the market activity are unforgettable. Faneuil Hall and its associations reinforce them. Yet the area is shapeless and sprawling, divided by the Central Artery, and hampered by the two activity centers which vie for dominance: Faneuil Hall and Haymarket Square. Dock Square is spatially chaotic. The connections to other areas are either obscure or disrupted by the Artery. Thus the market district simply floated in most images. Instead of fulfilling its potential role as a mosaic link at the head of the Boston peninsula, as does the Common farther down, the district, while distinctive, acted only as a chaotic barrier zone. Beacon Hill, on the other hand, was very highly structured, with internal subregions, a node at Louisburg Square, various landmarks, and a configuration of paths.

Again, some regions are introvert, turned upon themselves with little reference to the city outside them, such as Boston's North End or Chinatown. Others may be extrovert, turned outward and connected to surrounding elements. The Common visibly touches neighboring regions, despite its inner path confusions. Bunker Hill in Los Angeles is an interesting example of a district of fairly strong character and historical association, on a very sharp topographical feature lying even closer to the city's heart than does Beacon Hill. Yet the city flows around this element, buries its topographic edges in office buildings, breaks off its path connections, and effectively causes it to fade or even disappear from the city image. Here is a striking opportunity for change in the urban landscape.

Some districts are single ones, standing alone in their zone. The Jersey City and Los Angeles regions are practically all of this kind, and the South End is a Boston example. Others may be linked together, such as Little Tokyo and the Civic Center in Los Angeles, or West End–Beacon Hill in Boston. In one part of central Boston, inclusive of the Back Bay, the Common, Beacon Hill, the downtown shopping district, and the financial and market areas, the regions are close enough together and sufficiently well joined to make a continuous mosaic of distinctive districts. Wherever one proceeds within these limits, one is in a recognizable area. The contrast and proximity of each area, moreover, heightens the thematic strength of each. The quality of Beacon Hill, for example, is sharpened by its nearness to Scollay Square, and to the downtown shopping district.

**NODES**

Nodes are the strategic foci into which the observer can enter, typically either junctions of paths, or concentrations of some characteristic. But although conceptually they are small points in the city image, they may in reality be large squares, or somewhat extended linear shapes, or even entire central districts when the city is being considered at a large enough level. Indeed, when conceiving the environment at a national or international level, it is possible to identify highly recognized "nodes," and to make what are essentially "radiances" of them, extending outward to all the "radii" of the city image.
a national or international level, then the whole city itself may become a node.

The junction, or place of a break in transportation, has compelling importance for the city observer. Because decisions must be made at junctions, people heighten their attention at such places and perceive nearby elements with more than normal clarity. This tendency was confirmed so repeatedly that elements located at junctions may automatically be assumed to derive special prominence from their location. The perceptual importance of such locations shows in another way as well. When subjects were asked where on a habitual trip they first felt a sense of arrival in downtown Boston, a large number of people singled out break-points of transportation as the key places. In a number of cases, the point was at the transition from a highway (Storrow Drive or the Central Artery) to a city street; in another case, the point was at the first railroad stop in Boston (Back Bay Station) even though the subject did not get off there. Inhabitants of Jersey City felt they had left their city when they had passed through the Tonnelle Avenue Circle. The transition from one transportation channel to another seems to mark the transition between major structural units.

The subway stations, strung along their invisible path systems, are strategic junction nodes. Some, like Park Street, Charles Street, Copley, and South Station, were quite important in the Boston map, and a few subjects would organize the rest of the city around them. . . .

Major railroad stations are almost always important city nodes, although their importance may be declining. Boston's South Station was one of the strongest in the city, since it is functionally vital for commuter, subway rider, and intercity traveler, and is visually impressive for its bulk fronting on the open space of Dewey Square. The same might have been said for airports, had our study areas included them. . . .

The other type of node, the thematic concentration, also appeared frequently. Pershing Square in Los Angeles was a strong example, being perhaps the sharpest point of the city image, characterized by highly typical space, planting, and activity. . . .

Louisburg Square is another thematic concentration, a well-known quiet residential open space, redolent of the upper-class themes of the Hill, with a highly recognizable fenced park. It is a purer example of a concentration than is the Jordan–Filene corner, since it is no transfer point at all, and was only remembered as being "somewhere inside" Beacon Hill. Its importance as a node was out of all proportion to its function.

Nodes may be both junctions and concentrations, as is Jersey City's Journal Square, which is an important bus and automobile transfer and is also a concentration of shopping. Thematic concentrations may be the focus of a region, as is the Jordan–Filene corner, and perhaps Louisburg Square. Others are not foci but are isolated special concentrations, such as Olvera Street in Los Angeles.

A strong physical form is not absolutely essential to the recognition of a node: witness Journal Square and Scollay Square. But where the space has some form, the impact is much stronger. The node becomes memorable.

[
[

Nodes, like districts, may be introvert or extrovert. Scollay Square is introverted, it gives little directional sense when one is in it or its environs. The principal direction in its surroundings is toward or away from it; the principal locational sensation on arrival is simply "here I am." Boston's Dewey Square, on the other hand, is extroverted. General directions are explained, and connections are clear to the office district, the shopping district, and the waterfront. . . .

Many of these qualities may be summed up by the example of a famous Italian node: the Piazza San Marco in Venice. Highly differentiated, rich and intricate, it stands in sharp contrast to the general character of the city and to the narrow, twisting spaces of its immediate approaches. Yet it ties firmly to the major feature of the city, the Grand Canal, and has an oriented shape that clarifies the direction from which one enters. It is within itself highly differentiated and structured: into two spaces (Piazza and Piazzetta) and with many distinctive landmarks (Duomo, Palazzo Ducale, Campanile, Libreria). Inside, one feels always in clear relation to it, precisely micro-located, as it were. So distinctive is this space that many people who have never been to Venice will recognize its photograph immediately.

**LANDMARKS**

Landmarks, the point references considered to be external to the observer, are simple physical elements which may vary widely in scale. There seemed to be
a tendency for those more familiar with a city to rely increasingly on systems of landmarks for their guides — to enjoy uniqueness and specialization, in place of the continuities used earlier.

Since the use of landmarks involves the singling out of one element from a host of possibilities, the key physical characteristic of this class is singularity, some aspect that is unique or memorable in the context.

Landmarks become more easily identifiable, more likely to be chosen as significant, if they have a clear form; if they contrast with their background; and if there is some prominence of spatial location. Figure-ground contrast seems to be the principal factor. The background against which an element stands out need not be limited to immediate surroundings: the grasshopper weathervane of Faneuil Hall, the gold dome of the State House, or the peak of the Los Angeles City Hall are landmarks that are unique against the background of the entire city.

In another sense, subjects might single out landmarks for their cleanliness in a dirty city (the Christian Science buildings in Boston) or for their newness in an old city (the chapel on Arch Street). The Jersey City Medical Center was as well known for its little lawn and flowers as for its great size. The old Hall of Records in the Los Angeles Civic Center is a narrow, dirty structure, set at an angle to the orientation of all the other civic buildings, and with an entirely different scale of fenestration and detail. Despite its minor functional or symbolic importance, this contrast of siting, age, and scale makes it a relatively well-identified image, sometimes pleasant, sometimes irritating. It was several times reported to be "pie-shaped," although it is perfectly rectangular. This is evidently an illusion of the angled siting.

Spatial prominence can establish elements as landmarks in either of two ways: by making the element visible from many locations (the John Hancock Building in Boston, the Richfield Oil Building in Los Angeles), or by setting up a local contrast with nearby elements, i.e., a variation in setback and height. In Los Angeles, on 7th Street at the corner of Flower Street, is an old, two-story gray wooden building, set back some ten feet from the building line, containing a few minor shops. This took the attention and fancy of a surprising number of people. One even anthropomorphized it as the "little gray lady." The spatial setback and the intimate scale is a very noticeable and delightful event, in contrast to the great masses that occupy the rest of the frontage.

Distant landmarks, prominent points visible from many positions, were often well known, but only people unfamiliar with Boston seemed to use them to any great extent in organizing the city and selecting routes for trips. It is the novice who guides himself by reference to the John Hancock Building and the Custom House.

Few people had an accurate sense of where these distant landmarks were and how to make one’s way to the base of either building. Most of Boston’s distant landmarks, in fact, were "bottomless"; they had a peculiar floating quality. The John Hancock Building, the Custom House, and the Court House are all dominant on the general skyline, but the location and identity of their base is by no means as significant as that of their top.

The gold dome of Boston’s State House seems to be one of the few exceptions to this elusiveness. Its unique shape and function, its location at the hill crest and its exposure to the Common, the visibility from long distances of its bright gold dome, all make it a key sign for central Boston. It has the satisfying qualities of recognizability at many levels of reference, and of coincidence of symbolic with visual importance.

People who used distant landmarks did so only for very general directional orientation, or, more frequently, in symbolic ways. For one person, the Custom House lent unity to Atlantic Avenue because it can be seen from almost any place on that street. For another, the Custom House set up a rhythm in the financial district, for it can be seen intermittently at many places in that area.

The Duomo of Florence is a prime example of a distant landmark: visible from near and far, by day or night; unmistakable; dominant by size and contour; closely related to the city’s traditions; coincident with the religious and transit center; paired with its campanile in such a way that the direction of view can be gauged from a distance. It is difficult to conceive of the city without having this great edifice come to mind.

But local landmarks, visible only in restricted localities, were much more frequently employed in the three cities studied. They ran the full range of objects available. The number of local elements that become landmarks appears to depend as much upon how familiar the observer is with his surroundings as upon the elements themselves. Unfamiliar subjects usually mentioned only a few landmarks in office
interviews, although they managed to find many more when they went on field trips. Sounds and smells sometimes reinforced visual landmarks, although they did not seem to constitute landmarks by themselves.

 Element interrelations

These elements are simply the raw material of the environmental image at the city scale. They must be patterned together to provide a satisfying form. The preceding discussions have gone so far as groups of similar elements (nets of paths, clusters of landmarks, mosaics of regions). The next logical step is to consider the interaction of pairs of unlike elements.

Such pairs may reinforce one another, resonate so that they enhance each other's power; or they may conflict and destroy themselves. A great landmark may dwarf and throw out of scale a small region at its base.

Properly located, another landmark may fix and strengthen a core; placed off center, it may only mislead, as does the John Hancock Building in relation to Boston’s Copley Square. . . .

We are continuously engaged in the attempt to organize our surroundings, to structure and identify them. Various environments are more or less amenable to such treatment. When reshaping cities it should be possible to give them a form which facilitates these organizing efforts rather than frustrates them.