

almost finished examples, including University Park in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and MetroTech in Brooklyn, can be attributed partly to the haste of implementation of the original template. Master plans filled in relatively quickly, like the southern end of Battery Park City, may suffer from the look-alike architecture syndrome of a particular taste phase. Interestingly, Canary Wharf has had a more protracted and gradual implementation and thus has a lively mix of Postmodern and Neomodern architecture, offering a pattern book of recent trends in commercial design.

Most have blamed the quality of the architecture rather than the quality of the urban design framework for the monotony of the result. At a recent waterfront conference at Yale, Dean Robert A. M. Stern followed this trend, faulting the sameness of the new slender Neomodernist residential towers proliferating on the Toronto waterfront rather than the urban design of the new districts. Stern recommended a more robust decorative strategy, citing the differentiation in facade expression in the otherwise consistent prewar apartment building type that lines upper Park Avenue in New York.² Implicit in Stern's critique and remedy is the assumption that the logic and basic form of developer building types, the very DNA of any master plan, are a *fait accompli*. Worse than complicity with the forces of the real estate market, this position suggests a strategic disengagement of architecture from the preoccupations of developers and zoning code lawyers, the professionals that in most cities are primarily responsible for shaping the massing and circulation logic of buildings.

But more than the style of the architecture, it is the monopoly of a single scale of building that is the problem. Perhaps it is now safe to say that the serial repetition of a single building type—successful in Boston's Back Bay or in Bath, England—does not work for buildings with 35,000-square-foot floor plates. The only exception to such a rule may be Central Park West in Manhattan—the double-tower skyline looks great from Central Park. But insistent repetition of a single building type does not make for a socially rich street life.

A cultural and social critique of the neighborhoods that result from the Battery Park City method is much more complex, having to do with the monoculture meant to fill out such districts. Suffice it to say that the master developer's ability to maximize value at every stage of the phased development implementation (in office space leases, revenue from condominium sales, etc.) is predicated on the establishment and then reaffirmation of a "Class A" district. Recent public policies, such as "inclusionary zoning," which requires a certain percentage