Urban designers' primary focus of concern is on the last choice, relocation, but such changes have to be seen in the context of the first two types of actions.

Relocation

For individuals, the first category of environmental change involves their relocation. The type of relocation varies by scale. At the small scale, it involves *micro-movements* to maintain an acceptable level of comfort in a situation through shifting of the body to another posture or to another place within the setting. At the larger scale, it involves the *macro-movements* of choosing another setting completely. The first type of relocation is below the scale of concern of an urban designer. The second is the type of change that is of primary importance in urban design. The question is: "What array of possible choices need to be provided in order for people to have an appropriate choice given their needs and potential needs?"

Environmental change

Changing the environment—that is, reconfiguring the environment—may involve: (1) changing the *micro-climate* by changing the temperature and other qualities of the air, the lighting and acoustical levels, and the nature of odors of a setting; (2) changing the *spatial configuration* of the setting(s) by changing the three-dimensional partitioning of space, and/or the nature of the partitions; (3) changing the *environmental hardware*—the furniture, plants, and other objects that define and control individual areas and the circulation within them; (4) changing those *environmental attributes* such as the materials, illumination, and colors of the elements that constitute the setting and give it its character and mood; and (5) changing the *symbolic attributes* of spatial configurations, materials, objects, and/or the position of these elements within the setting.

The basic concern in urban design is: (1) to identify/create and distinguish among possible future built environments, (2) to evaluate them given the resources that a society or an organization has available for building, (3) to consider/design ways of bringing them to fruition; and (4) to oversee their implementation.

Consequences for urban design

The concept of functionalism described here arises from an understanding of human needs. If one accepts it then a functional urban design responds to a much broader range of human needs than was traditionally considered under the rubric of functionalism. The most important departure from the past is the recognition that aesthetic display is a fundamental function of the built environment and should be considered as such. It competes with the other functions served by the built environment for the attention of the designer. It is not something added to the list of concerns when other functional requirements have been met. It must be recognized that aesthetic ends and other ends almost always have to be met to some degree for a design to be acceptable. A tradeoff among the requirements to meet each individual's needs in seeking environmental quality almost always exists, as there is never an infinitely elastic money supply with which to meet them. No design is able to totally meet all of everybody's needs simultaneously.

Considering human needs in an hierarchical manner as the basis for design requires great flexibility in the designer's thinking because it raises many questions. Designing by habit is easier. The design process requires creative thinking rather than the adaptation of a set of generic solutions or design principles that can be universally applied without much thought. The intellectual energy required of designers within the financial constraints placed on them is high.

Looking at human needs in the way proposed here as a basis for urban design inquiries and decisions raises questions about how tightly a pattern of the environment should cater to a specific set of behaviors. How well should the self-consciously designed environment *fit* an activity pattern or an aesthetic value of an individual or a group of people? It must, at least, *afford* the activity or the aesthetic demand. How specific or how tightly should the one fit the other? How *congruent* should the relationship between the pattern of the environment and the behavior be? How does one deal with potential future behavior changes? These are questions much debated when an architect moves away from designing for a specific person using his or her own values with a short-term future in mind to the more general, but fundamental, questions of urban design.

Urban designers like all other designers are always designing for the future. The future is always unknown, although there is much that we can predict with tolerable accuracy. The easiest way to deal with the unknown is to assume that tomorrow will be the same as today. For a short-run future this may be quite accurate. In the long run we know that there are likely to be substantial changes if the history of the past two hundred years is a guide. It is fortunate