

CRAWFORD: We need to have a new public conversation about the suburban condition, and designers have to take a leading role. The discussion on the suburban condition is focused around the unhelpful concept of sprawl. “Landscape suburbanism” could have a huge role to play in reconceptualizing large-scale issues including the automobile. The sprawl discussion covers important environmental issues but also mere taste culture concerns: “Ooh, cars are horrible.” The suburban condition is that great terra incognita that everybody needs to study.

CZERNIAK: You should look at Sébastien Marot’s work on *suburbanism*.

PIEPRZ: For me, urban design is a way of thinking that can be taken up by architects, landscape architects, and planners. But urban design professionals can get paid to do things and think about things at many scales that individual architects or landscape architects can’t—pulling things together, framework, connectivity, diversity, not singly authored totalized places, like maybe Grand Avenue in L.A. will be.

KRIEGER: I agree. I think the problem is trying to provide a definitive definition for urban design; it’s many things. Working in downtown Boston is very different from trying to improve Tysons Corner. Robert Hughes’s book *The Shock of the New* describes how art produces things that culture is slow to respond to, and there has to be time to overcome the shock of the new. At the moment, designers seem to be suffering from the shock of the new more than the public. We’ve not yet come to terms with things like virtual culture or megamalls or sprawl, and therefore we resort to traditional urban models. We need to move beyond this shock. Those who think urban design doesn’t exist are wrong. It exists in many ways, including as a colloquial term for better planning and urban quality of life. I’m glad we’ve talked about some of them today.