

coming and going all the time. As a result people use the square at different times of day as a short cut and for relaxation; children wade in the fountains during the summer and clamber on the statues. Dogs are walked and people sit watching the people cutting across the square who, in turn, are watching them. The design of the square by Paul Cret adds to its ambience but, by itself, would have achieved little.

The Lawrence Halprin designed squares in Portland, Oregon add much to the city. Individually they provide attractive destinations and are much used. As a group they might be regarded as part of an urban design effort to give life to the central area of the city. They remain, however, works of landscape architecture and should be celebrated as such. The water garden Halprin designed in Fort Worth, dramatic though it is, has yet to act as a catalyst in the development of its surroundings (see Figure 5.10). It remains an isolated work of art in a forlorn cityscape.

The two examples of squares included in this book are of the types that many landscape architects regard as urban design. The physical frame in both cases was, however, given and not part of the design commission. The first example, Pershing Square, is certainly a highly urban space. It has had a life of being designed and redesigned. It has yet to fulfil a role as a great urban outdoor room. The second of them, the La Place des Terreaux in Lyon, France, is included in Carles Broto's collection of new urban designs (Broto, 2000). Through careful research we have learnt much about what makes lively, well-loved urban spaces (Whyte, 1980; Cooper Marcus and Francis, 1990; Madanipour, 1996, 2003; Carmona *et al.*, 2003). The problem is that the desire to create active places often conflicts with the desire to create a work of art. The two can be reconciled.



Photograph by Alix Verge

Figure 5.10 The Water Garden, Fort Worth in 2003.