

impinge on urban design, but whether city planning and urban designing are conterminous or whether urban design is simply a sub-field of city planning or vice versa is open to considerable debate. Some product types may well be both city planning and urban design. Many new towns fall into this category.

Both landscape architecture and architecture are concerned with the detailed design and implementation of specific products at one time. Given this observation it could be argued that what has been identified as total urban design is often simply large-scale architecture. The logic for including some such work in the mainstream of urban design in Part 3: 'The Core of Urban Design Work: Procedures and Products' is that its comprehensive treatment brings together all the design fields into focusing on single three-dimensional, multi-building design endeavours. Neither landscape architectural nor architectural work, *per se*, does that.

The qualities of streets, squares and other urban places and the links between them, as behaviour settings and as aesthetic displays, are amongst the core concerns of urban design. The distinction between landscape architecture and the core of urban design work described in 'Part 3' depends on whether the enclosing elements form part of the design or whether it is simply the ground surface between buildings that is of concern. The first is urban design; the latter falls into the realm of landscape architecture. Many landscape architects will dispute this position saying that any design in cities is urban design. In this way, landscape architecture differentiates itself from horticulture and garden design. If landscape architecture broadens its concerns to embrace the three-dimensional world of buildings it is well placed to claim urban design as its very own.

Architectural societies around the world give urban design awards to the products of everyday architectural work – individual buildings. Certainly, all buildings affect their surroundings but many architects pay little heed to how their work affects the public realm. Either they know not how to do so or the social context in which they are working prevents them from doing so. Most buildings represent private rather than public interests. Architects' prime obligations are to their clients – those who pay them – and to their own need to market themselves in order to stay in practice. It is only through the application of controls and design guidelines that they are compelled to deal with public interest concerns. Single building design is not urban design except, perhaps, when a building has been located as a catalyst to encourage development around it as part of a public policy. Designing a complex of buildings may well be urban design.

The three chapters that comprise this part of the book cover the work of the traditional design professions and the products that are associated with them. The products described in the case studies used to illustrate the work of what these three professions regard as urban design are only really urban design if they deal: (1) with the three-dimensional world and (2) their impact on their context, and not simply the consequences of the context for the design. The conclusion ultimately is that the product-oriented view of urban design is an important but limited one, if the desire is to really understand the nature of the field and its complexities.