

the distinction between the four procedural types of urban design identified in the 'Introduction: the argument' – total urban design, all-of-a-piece urban design, piece-by-piece urban design and plug-in urban design – forms the primary dimension of any categorization.

A further distinction can be made amongst urban design projects based on the vocabulary of patterns that forms the basis of their design. The vocabulary, in turn, depends on what is perceived by a set of design theorists, or ideologists, to be the model, or paradigm, of good practice. During the past 50 years we have seen Modernist views on what makes a good city give way to other ideas based on a much broader definition of the functions of the public realm than the Modernists had. Nevertheless, the major paradigms that have shaped urban design schemes over the past 50 years are still with us and are still valid in specific circumstances: the City Beautiful (or Baroque), the Modernist in its rationalist and empiricist forms, and the post-Modernist in its rationalist and empiricist forms. The typology is thus based on the observation that urban design projects can be divided into categories based on the procedure that was used to implement them, the product types they represent and the paradigms within which they were designed.

The case studies included in this book provide the evidence for the typology being a useful way of organizing the examples of work that define the urban design field. The utility of the typology will be demonstrated in Part 3 of this book. Prior to that, however, Part 2 argues that the traditional design disciplines consider urban design in terms of the types of products they, themselves, produce. They do not see urban design as a collaborative venture. Their typologies are product-driven. That approach reveals neither the dynamics of the decision-making process nor the full scope of concern of urban designers.