Development can be managed through the creation of special districts, the selective use (in existing areas) of building moratoria, land-use controls, design guidelines and/or controls, and through the design review process. In commenting on the Rauchstrasse scheme, Rob Krier wrote:

> In order to achieve a coherent total image in an urban development plan of this size, the concept of the block must be clearly formulated in geometrical terms and should not embody exaggerated structural fantasies that represent only an individual artistic conception. For the sake of unity, each of the architects taking part must [exert] as much discipline as possible (Krier, 1988: 83).

The case studies show that internationally renowned architects are willing to work within strict guidelines if their purpose and the overall project's objectives are clear and make sense. The guidelines have to be based on a clear logic and on empirical evidence that they will work in achieving a design's objectives. Creating a sense of unity through controlled chaos is more difficult than a sense of unity through similarity!

There are a number of expressions of concern about the degree of control that exists in some of the all-of-a-piece urban designs included in this chapter and, in particularly the seeking of unity in designs. Many of the best-loved areas of cities in the world with extraordinarily high property values have a remarkable unity in design but to many critics this search for unity today represents an old-fashioned idea in an era of individualism. In terms of the total production of new segments of cities, business areas and new residential suburbs, the number that falls into the all-of-a-piece urban design category is low. One critic (Postrel, 2003) suggests that 'if you get the lots right, and the blocks right and the street right and the setback right, somebody can build a crummy' building and the ensemble is still fine. She is probably correct. I would add 'if you get the nature of ground floor uses right!'

The question comes back to the rights of individuals to do their own thing in democratic societies. In looking back at the turbulent history of his master plan (and implicitly the nature of all-of-a-piece urban design) and the evolving design of the World Trade Center site, Daniel Libeskind notes:

> Although [the site design is] not literally what was in my original images, it [i.e., the original design] shows a robustness and a new kind of idea about a master plan . . . It's the reverse of the Potsdamer Platz in Berlin, which is just a bunch of architects following exactly what was on paper . . . the superficial has changed not the principles. . . This is the art of making a master plan rather than an 18th century plan that is obediently followed. We're not living in Haussmann's Paris. We have a pluralistic society . . . I'm not [even] the architect of [Freedom] Tower [after the collaboration with David Childs] (cited in Lubell *et al.*, 2004).

Architectural style does not really matter in the design of cities, the urban character does. No doubt this position will be open to debate (see Chapter 11).