

makes it possible to develop a typology, a system of classification of urban design projects, that adds clarity to discussions on urban design. A clear typology also enables design professionals to understand how different approaches to urban design have created the results they have in different socio-political situations. Before creating a typology, however, it is necessary to understand what urban design might mean at a general level. Then the specifics can be considered.

A Preliminary Note on Urban Design

It is 50 years since the term, ‘urban design’, was first used and probably three decades since it came into widespread usage. It is now difficult, if not impossible, to identify the actual sources of the term. A conference on urban design was held at Harvard University in 1956 under the leadership of José Luis Sert and the first education programmes in urban design were initiated before the end of the decade at Harvard University and the University of Pennsylvania. These programmes had antecedents in the civic design programmes that had worldwide impacts such as those at the University of Liverpool and the *École des Beaux-Arts* in Paris.

Urban design, as we know it today, has developed in response to the limitations of the philosophies and design paradigms, rationalist and empiricist, of the modern movement in architecture and city planning (see Chapter 1). Somewhat ironically, it developed in response to the very types of design paradigms – generic design approaches that are regarded as exemplars of good practice – that Sert advocated. The types of criticism received by architects involved in the Garden Cities movement and those using the Rationalist approaches to urban design of Continental Europe (as applied throughout the world) drove many city planners away from a concern with the physical character of cities and many architects away from dealing with problems with a social nature. Those architects who maintained their interest in social concerns and four-dimensional physical design were inspired to do better by the criticism of Jane Jacobs (1961), in particular, but also the reflections of architects such as Brent Brolin (1976) and Peter Blake (1977).

There were three points to the criticism of the way urban design was carried out under the aegis of the Modernists. They were: (1) that the models of people, human behaviour and the way people experience the environment used by designers were simplistic; (2) that the person–environment relationship was poorly understood and, as a consequence, (3) the paradigms and theory on which many large-scale urban development projects were based were inadequate for their purpose. Few critics would claim that we have succeeded in fully responding to the criticism but there have been many very well-received urban design projects around the world. Much can be learnt from them. Much can also be