

want. The opportunity space for negotiation, plotting and scheming is set by various considerations and constraints – or ‘rules’ – on the various development actors. In negotiating, the practical difficulty lies in knowing the limits of other actors’ opportunity fields and a key question for the designer, for example, is to know how far developers can be pushed. Bentley argues that the more designers (or any other actors) understand other actors’ opportunity fields – if, for example, designers understand financial feasibility calculations – the more effectively they can target their own resources.

Chapter 35 is **Allan Rowley’s** essay ‘Private-property decision makers and the quality of urban design’ – an important early piece of research on different development actors’ perspectives on the value of urban design. Originally published in the *Journal of Urban Design* in 1998, the paper looks in more detail at the motivations of different groups of development actors by examining the involvement of developers, investors and occupiers in urban design through a set of five case studies, six expert panels and a literature review. From the perspective of private-property decision-makers, it examines the role and importance of urban design considerations; the benefits of giving explicit attention to such considerations; factors constraining the promotion of good urban design; and incentives and other measures encouraging increased attention to urban design quality. It concludes that a better understanding of the relationship between urban design, the development process and the property industry is a prerequisite to achieving lasting improvements in the quality of the urban environment. While, in theory, ‘good’ (urban) design should add value to property development, Rowley argues that, in the UK at least, the notion that ‘better-buildings-mean-better-business’ is both new and debatable and that the dominant attitude in private property decision-making remains the ‘appropriate’ quality view (i.e. that higher-quality development, however defined, is unnecessary provided some sort of market exists for the development at a lower standard). The opposing attitude – the ‘sustainable’ quality view – is that high quality helps generate long-term commercial success.

Although written from a UK perspective, the lessons about how, in what circumstances, and to whom value is added by the design process are universal. Other work has since attempted to trace in a more systematic manner the potential value added by urban design (Carmona, *et al.*, 2000). To some degree, this body of work represents something of

a holy grail for designers, because if it can be shown that design adds value, and in what circumstances, then it is more likely that developers (and the public sector) will be willing to invest in it. Research therefore needs to examine the salience of design as a factor in developers’ business strategies and especially in their appraisal of risk and reward (see Tiesdell and Adams, 2004).

Chapter 36 is **Brenda Case Scheer’s** introduction to her 1994 edited book with Wolfgang Presler, *Design Review: Challenging Urban Aesthetic Control* (Chapman & Hall, New York). Usually based on restrictions of private property rights, systems of reviewing design and development invariably arouse great passions and sometimes controversy. Those who perceive themselves to be most directly affected – designers and developers – often make the most strident case against such forms of control, with some professionals demonstrably holding the inherently contradictory attitude that design controls should apply to everyone other than themselves. Design controls may be justified by the argument that they protect the composite values of all local property owners (i.e. that the maintenance of place quality benefits all property holders) and that they provide a more predictable – and, therefore, secure – investment environment. Case Scheer’s paper articulates many of the perceived problems with public sector design control/review processes from an American perspective. Again, many of these critiques are universal in nature and should remind urban designers engaged in public sector regulation that their role has inherent dangers that need to be understood and guarded against. Discussions that present a more balanced view of the public sector role can be found in Punter and Carmona, 1997 and Carmona, 2001.

Chapter 37 is the penultimate chapter from **Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk and Jeff Speck’s** 2000 book, *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream* (North Point Press, New York). This paper identifies lessons for inner-city/urban development through a comparison with – and critique of – suburban development patterns and designs. Acknowledging that suburban development is a ‘well-honed science’ and that new subdivisions ‘outperform the city in category after category’, the paper looks in detail at a selection of those categories – the ‘amenity package’, ‘civic decorum’, ‘physical health’, ‘retail management’, ‘marketing techniques’, ‘investment security’, and the ‘permitting process’. Throughout this paper, the discussion is embedded in an appreciation of development process – the underlining ethos is that