Table 8.2 A model describing the likely degree of implementation of urban design guidelines

Level of clarity	Steps in guideline development and application			Effectiveness	Example
	Formulation	Communication	Administration		
High	Clear, operationally defined objectives and evaluation criteria based on empirical evidence	Written and illustrated guidelines that are publicly reviewed in meetings prior to acceptance	Single authority, legally empowered to enforce regulations, in control	Likely to be implemented and less battered by power relationships amongst stakeholders	Battery Park City
Medium	Objectives and evaluation criteria specified in general terms using words such as appropriate	Written and illustrated and placed on public display in exhibitions. Feedback in written form	A centralized agency or well coordinated multiple agencies under single authority	Partially implemented but subject to the whims of political change	Lujiazui
Low	Advisory guidelines without operational definitions	Written and illustrated but not subject to any public review	Multiple agencies at the same time or in sequence	Loosely applied depending on architects' and developers' values	Darling Harbour

Adapted from Soemardi (in progress).

predictive model of the context in which urban design guidelines are implemented or not (Soemardi, in progress). The level of clarity in formulating, communicating and administering the guidelines defines whether guidelines will enable the objectives of a scheme to be met. Political pressures and governmental corruption can be intervening variables.

Table 8.2 defines the characteristics of guidelines by level of clarity at each phase of their use in urban design projects. Those projects that are high on all three dimensions are those that are implemented while those that are low are unlikely to be implemented in accordance with stated objectives. Those that are a mixture of high, medium and low levels of clarity will be partially carried out and will partially fall by the wayside. Much, however, depends on the strength of the design ideas, the distribution of power amongst the stakeholders involved and the perceived necessity for coordinated action.

All the case studies presented in this chapter were a response to a perceived need for some level of coordinated action. The goal has been not only to have economic growth and design quality in mind but also to manage that growth.