

it is not necessary to agree with the values of the process nor with its products, but that it is necessary to better understand how and why they come about in order to be able to manipulate them and thereby achieve better outcomes.

Duany, *et al.*, are closely associated with the New Urbanism movement – a movement that has received a mixed press and has gathered a lot of baggage that serves to obscure rather than to clarify central messages. In particular it is often reduced to debates about architectural style, as Duany, *et al.* (2000: 208) complain: *'For many architects, it is impossible to see past the pitched roofs and wooden shutters of Seaside and Kentlands to the progressive town planning concepts underneath.'* (see also Ellis, 2004; Calthorpe, 2005). Moreover, as they later state,

*'... there is absolutely no incompatibility between traditional urbanism and modernist architecture – far from it: modernist architecture looks and works its best when lining the*

*sidewalks of traditional cities. Some truly great places . . . consist largely of modernist architecture laid out in a traditional street network. These places do not suffer in any way from their modernist vocabulary, and neither do neighbourhoods that combine many different eras of architecture in a true urban fabric. Such is the power of the traditional street.'* (Duany, *et al.*, 2000: 211–12).

But this mistaking of the part for the whole is not something that is exclusive to views on New Urbanism and pervades the urban design field more generally. Duany, *et al.*'s paper is simply about enabling good – or, at least, better – urban design. It therefore relates back to Francis Tibbalds' paper at the start of this Reader and to Tibbalds' golden rule that 'the place matters most'.

*Matthew Carmona and Steve Tiesdell*