

and even the allocation of resources into (mostly) physical strategies to guide the work of architects, developers, and other implementers. For example, many public planning agencies now incorporate one or more staffers titled urban designers, whose role is to establish design criteria for development projects beyond basic zoning and then help review, evaluate, and approve the work of project proponents as they advance their projects through design and into construction. Such a design review process is an increasingly common component of regulatory frameworks especially in larger cities and facilitates discussion of traditionally controversial issues like aesthetics. It is the urban designer's presumed insights about good or appropriate urban form that are seen as crucial to translate public policy or programmatic objectives into architectural concepts, or to recognize the urban potential in an emerging architectural design and advocate for its realization.

However, a subtlety within this process is often misunderstood. The translation of general or framework plans into designs is not meant to be a sequential process—always emanating from planning to affect design—but instead an interactive one. The urban designer's own expertise in architectural thinking should inform the formulation of planning concepts so that these are not fixed prior to consideration of physical implications. This design version of shuttle diplomacy between planner-formulators and design-translators is important, to be sure, but it cannot rely only on mediation or persuasion to be effective. Urban designers must help others see the desired effects of planning. This requires various visualization and programmatic narrative techniques by which goals and policies are converted into useful design guidelines and sometimes specific design ideas. It leads to the idea of urban design as a special category of public policy, an improvement on traditional land-use regulations that shy away from qualitative assessments of form. So urban design should then be considered:

A Form-Based Category of Public Policy

Jonathan Barnett's 1974 *Urban Design as Public Policy* argued this very point and became highly influential. If one could agree on specific attributes of good urbanism (at least in a particular setting, as Barnett tried to with New York City), then one should be able to mandate or encourage these through regulatory requirements. The radicalism embedded in this self-described pragmatic approach was to incorporate many more formal and aesthetic judgments—indeed