

design's focus on "the public realm" and an architect's focus on the microprogramming of buildings, opportunities are lost for a more fine-grained planning at the ground plane.

Rather than grudging acceptance of the status quo, perhaps better designed urban frameworks provide a way both to create a more vital and diverse urbanism and to incite more innovative architectural production across a broader spectrum of American design culture. For this to occur, urban designers and architects are going to need to conspire with enlightened real estate developers and public policy experts to find opportunities for new planning and building paradigms at the intersection of real estate finance logic and the regulatory context. For example, creative negotiation will be necessary to call into question the conventions of office floor-plate dimensions and urban zoning frameworks. Many urban design and architecture conventions are the result of ingrained assumptions of large American firms, habits compelled by the expediency of early-phase project planning. But a new paradigm for urban design can arise with a creative coordination between building types, parcel configurations, and larger urban design frameworks.

Adopted in 1979, the Battery Park City master plan by Alexander Cooper and Stanton Eckstut established a durable paradigm for large-scale urban real estate development in North America. This approach, still the primary model of urban design practice in the United States for blue-chip firms like SOM, Cooper Robertson & Partners, and Sasaki Associates, is a distant echo of the reengagement of the city by American architecture theorists in the late 1970s and early 1980s. This trajectory begins with Aldo Rossi's *Architecture of the City* (translated into English in 1978), Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter's *Collage City* (1978), and the brief influence of the brothers Krier (Robert and Léon) in East Coast architecture schools in the early 1980s. Instigators in this realignment included the Cornell University School of Architecture, specifically the urban design studios run by Rowe, and the publications and programs of the Institute of Architecture and Urbanism in New York. Before this almost instantaneous embrace of both "contextualism" in architecture and the practice of "urban design" by architects, both progressive architects/theorists (e.g., Michael Graves, Peter Eisenman) and the architects favored by high-cultural patrons (e.g., I. M. Pei) were primarily focused on the architectural project as an autonomous sculptural artifact. And while this is a schematic overview of a much more complex shift in