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A City is an ecosystem that is alive and constantly evolving. Humankind’s first cities had been collective settlements that protected its inhabitants from both natural and manmade harm and provided them with the necessary resources for survival. The necessity for protection from external aggression is evidenced by the fortress-like structures common to the ancient cities of Ur, Jericho, Athens, and Luoyang.
BACKGROUND

However, as time passed, the growing population pushed the city perimeter outward. The emergence of mass industry, explosive population growth, and rapid urbanization gave birth to what is today known as metropolises, and the original notion of the *city-as-fortification* has weakened in favor of a gigantic economic machine.
The Traditional city: Grids, centers, peripheries

Certain structural commonalities are shared by these metropolises: *grids, centers, and peripheries.*
The Traditional city: Grids, centers, peripheries

These elements are readily seen in the following metropolises of the world

- Los Angeles
- Paris
- New York
- Tokyo
The Problem

Today’s city represents all these different notions that characterized the city and more. As a synthesis of its past, the modern city exudes both the pre-modern and the modern.
The Problem

However, while this fascinating fact may be an interest to the historian or the archaeologist, it is often **out of tune with the demands of our age**.

Because our contemporary city is born out of the ancient and modern city, it has also inherited their fundamentals limitations.
The Problem

1. Unnecessary Redundancies
   ➔ Distant, inaccessible, and congested center gives rise to unnecessary satellite cities.
   ➔ Requires multiple major highways and railway systems to serve outlying communities.
   ➔ Urban and suburban residents could share more infrastructure and commercial and recreational points of access.
The Problem

2. Uneven development

- The center/periphery dichotomy created by the radial structure inevitably increases the economic gap between different areas within the city.

- This then leads to both overdevelopment and slumification.
The Problem

3. Inefficiency of movement

➤ The uncontrolled urban sprawl is inherently illogical and inefficient, especially in terms of movement.

➤ Makes devising an effective public transportation system costly and politically divisive (i.e. skewed toward the interests of certain communities).

➤ In mega cities like LA, getting from Point A to Point B almost always requires private vehicles.
My Solution: a city of densities

While *not* scrapping the age-old concepts entirely, my ideal city makes use of the same concepts under a renewed priority: *what is a more efficient way to design a city?*

→ The solution is to move the focus from the center/periphery dichotomy to a rational distribution of densities.
GRIDs + CENTERs + PERIPHERIES = DENSITIES
Governing principles

1. My ideal city shall juxtapose different densities next to one another.
2. High-density areas must be short widthwise and long lengthwise.
3. Low-density areas shall surround high-density ones.
4. No two high-density areas shall abut each other.
5. Major high-speed roads and transportation pathways shall traverse both high- and low-density areas.
6. In high-density areas, the presence of transportation will be kept underground as much as possible.
MY IDEAL CITY: BASED ON TODAY’S LOS ANGELES
MY IDEAL CITY: BASED ON TODAY’S LOS ANGELES
1. My city mitigates the deadly crowding issue associated with a metropolis such as LA all the while maintaining a sense of vibrant urban life by rationally modulating different densities.

2. My design improves the quality of life of its residents by closing the gap between central areas and suburban locales in low-density areas.

3. The length of roads, highways, and railways will be kept to the minimum while serving more localities, saving resources, energy, and preventing pollution.
4. **The city ensures even development.** Suburbs and satellite cities are an inevitable consequence of modern city planning.

   The solution is not to exclude them, but to **embrace these natural formations** naturally within the city’s framework from the beginning. Also, this extends the access to quality transportation to these locales without much added costs.
5. The city will have much less redundancies. Some elements (e.g. corporate offices, shops, hospitals, and government facilities such as courts) are better suited for high-density environments, while others (e.g. parks, lakes, museums, and sports complexes) fare better in low-density environments.

By juxtaposing high- and low-density locales immediately next to each other, my city allows for an efficient distribution of different elements throughout the city. Also, this allows both urban and suburban populations to share the same large-scale amenities like parks and stadiums.
6. The city will be highly sustainable and energy-efficient. The ready presence and easy access to high-speed public transportation eradicates the need for private vehicles.

7. The rational planning of the city will make it easier for anyone to navigate.

8. The city will be pedestrian-friendly, as much of the traffic will be underground.
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