



Source: Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee (1988), courtesy of the University of California Press

Figure 5.11 A behavioural map of Pershing Square, Los Angeles in 1988.

by inhabitants of single-room occupancy units (SROs). The two groups inhabited two different worlds and the park was no seam. The former inhabited private spaces and the latter public. What then to do with the square? The Pershing Square Management Association commissioned the Jerde Partnership to conduct an evaluation of the park in 1984. This study initiated the process that led to the park we see today.

The redevelopment of the square in 1994 cost \$US14.5 million. The Center City Management Association representing property owners and the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) of Los Angeles financed it. The goal was to have an open public space of broad appeal. It was to be a place of meeting,

have a positive image and be an oasis for casual leisure activities. Special events and temporary facilities (e.g. an ice rink in winter, a bandstand in the summer) were to be able to be accommodated. The park level, because of the parking garage below, was unfortunately a metre above that of the surrounding streets but the park did have a promising set of enclosing buildings that give the square some character. Most of these buildings date back to the 1920s with the building of the Subway Terminal Building, the Title Guarantee and Trust Building, the Biltmore Hotel and the Philharmonic Auditorium. The Public Library is only a block away. They provided the basis for making a fine square but it has not happened.

The Center City Management Association, other civic associations, the CRA of Los Angeles, the City's Department of Parks and Recreation and the Cultural Affairs Commission organized an international competition for the redesign of the square in 1986. It attracted 242 entries from 17 countries with the winning entry being produced by Sculpture In The Environment (SITE), a New York based architectural firm headed by James Wines and Michelle Stone. It was designed in collaboration with landscape architects EDAA, Inc. with architects Charles Kober Associates and engineers Delton Hampton and Associates. The predicted cost of building their design, a 'metaphorical carpet', was \$12.5 million but \$20 million was thought to be more realistic by many observers. That price plus the expectation of cost overruns was simply too high to be considered feasible.

The SITE scheme (see Figure 5.12a) was based on a 13'6" grid (the column spacing of the garage below). The surface of the park was designed to be undulating and