

land use planning and some of environmental planning, seek to shape the built environment. What makes urban design distinctive is that it has origins in a rich intellectual heritage that inquires into the human experience of the urban realm. Drawing on this heritage, integrative theory responds to the third challenge by specifying some of the constituents (legibility, meaning, and so forth) of our experience of built form.

What characterizes urban design, moreover, is that it seeks to sustain environmental integrity, or if that integrity has been undermined, to repair it, thereby shaping those environmental features that resist commodification. Having this as its calling, urban design benefits both from architectural inquiry and, unexpectedly, from economic debates about the roles of planning in capitalism. Therefore, integrative theory answers the fourth challenge: It seeks to unify what would otherwise seem to be disparate and irreconcilable economic and architectural traditions. It must be clear, however, that microeconomic theories of market failure, so often seen as potential theoretical sources for urban planning, cannot possibly serve as intellectual foundations for urban design. No microeconomic analysis could possibly generate the principles of interrelatedness across properties. It is rather through an integrative theory of urban design that planners can help make, repair, or preserve those environmental realms that pure markets would otherwise undermine through fragmentation and commodification.

Fifth, the concepts that this theory generates are eminently practical. In response to varied urban contexts, planners can work with proportions and contrasts, edges and landmarks, permeability and fine grain, and imported vs. indigenous meanings—each as contextually appropriate to shape better a place. It would be absurd to impose, say, Sitte's turbine plazas as a blanket requirement. Sitte's concepts, like those of others reviewed here, must be seen as sources of personal insight—as inspirations for the making of better plans, not as mandates. It would be a fundamental misunderstanding to take them as all-purpose policy recommendations or blanket prescriptions. It would be a further mistake to think of them as another kind of top-down planning. By elucidating the integrative principles, we do not at all have to revert to the idea that plans emerge as an act of will, thereupon to be hierarchically imposed on the city.

Like other planners, urban designers have to work in varied and complex institutions, in the midst of the push and pull of electoral democracy, subjected to

varying political and budgetary stresses. They must pay attention to others' views, engage in give and take, and act as politically astute advocates of their ideas, using their rhetorical capacities to argue for good design. The design ideas they advocate should, nonetheless, be well founded on substantive principles. Having learned to explicate the integrative principles underlying our experience of the city, as for example the formal relationships of balance and proportion exerting effects across property lines, the urban designer would be better prepared to articulate and prepare for public scrutiny the arguments implicit in good design.

References

- Alexander, E. (1992). *Approaches to planning*. Philadelphia: Gordon and Breach.
- Bacon, E. (1974). *The design of cities*. New York: Penguin.
- Banerjee, T., & Southworth, M. (Eds.). (1991). *City sense and city design: Writings and projects of Kevin Lynch*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Barnett, J. (1974). *Urban design as public policy*. New York: Architectural Record Books.
- Calthorpe, P. (1993). *The next American metropolis*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Cullen, G. (1961). *Townscape*. London: Architectural Press.
- Dalton, G. (Ed.). (1968). *Primitive, archaic and modern economies: Essays of Karl Polanyi*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Duany, A., & Plater-Zyberk, E. (1990). *Towns and town-making principles*. New York: Rizzoli.
- Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Geddes, P. (1968 [1915]). *Cities in evolution*. London: Ernest Benn.
- Gottdiener, M. (1997). *The theming of America: Dreams, visions, and commercial spaces*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Hall, P. G. (1988). *Cities of tomorrow*. Cambridge, England: Blackwell.
- Hill, D. R. (1985). Lewis Mumford's ideas on the city. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 51, 407–421.
- Innes, J. E. (1998). Information in communicative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 64, 52–63.
- Jacobs, A. B. (1993). *Great streets*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *Death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House.
- Krueckeberg, D. A. (1995). The difficult character of property: To whom do things belong? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61, 301–309.
- Lynch, K. (1960). *The image of the city*. Cambridge, MA: Technology Press and Harvard University Press.
- Lynch, K. (1981). *Good city form*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Madanipour, A. (1997). Ambiguities in urban design. *Town Planning Review*, 68(3), 363–383.
- Marx, L. (1990). Lewis Mumford, prophet of organicism. In T. P. Hughes & A. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Lewis Mumford: Public intellectual* (pp. 164–180). New York: Oxford University Press.