

ing old) ways in which city form and transportation systems may be integrated. At a fairly mundane yet significant level, this is what fuels the current fascination with Transit-Oriented Development in newer areas of urbanization, and with dense mixed-use, often joint public-private development adjacent to multimodal transportation centers in larger cities.

The twentieth-century love affair with the car—still considered the ideal personal mobility system—has diminished the range of conceptualizing about urban form and transportation. We were too mesmerized by the magic of Sant’Elia’s Italian Futurists renderings and those of Le Corbusier’s *Ville Radiuse*. An entire century later we are rediscovering that integrating urban form and mobility depends on more sophisticated umbilical cords than open roads. This is especially so since the engineering world is shifting emphasis from hardware to systems design, from adding lanes, for example, to traffic management technology. It is their acknowledgment that factors such as livability, sustainability, and economic and cultural growth—in other words good urban design—are the real goals of infrastructure optimization.

Agreeing with such a sensibility, some leaders of landscape architecture, a field that has generally pursued a humanistic perspective on planning, have recently advanced another perspective on urbanistic action that they are calling:

Urban Design as “Landscape Urbanism”

In the past few years a new school of thought about cities has emerged: “landscape urbanism.” Its proponents seek to incorporate ecology, landscape architecture, and infrastructure into the discourse of urbanism. The movement’s intellectual lineage includes Ian McHarg, Patrick Geddes, and even Frederick Law Olmsted, though its polemical point of departure seems to be that landscape space, not architecture any longer, is the generative force in the modern metropolis.

To return to the 1956 conference for a moment: it produced a good deal of rhetoric about how landscape architecture was to be an integral part of urban design. But this aspect was quickly subsumed under the architecture/planning spectrum in which urban design would occupy the mediating middle. Momentarily there was no conceptual space left for landscape architecture. Ironically, more areas