advantages that transit-oriented villages provide, as opposed to building bare-bones park-and-ride lots at the station sites.

Apart from the Cornelius town center with its longer time span, all these projects were planned during the years 2000 and 2002. In America's recession-prone economy, burdened by threats of global terrorism and a general loss of confidence, the impact of the plans on the ground has been modest – with the further exception of the Mooresville master plan – which helped attract a major corporate headquarters to the site. This limited implementation within a one- to three-year period after completion of the plans should also not be judged a failure, because town building is a long-term process. It is not uncommon for a complex architectural project to take five years from inception to completion, and for urban design and town planning projects; this time frame can easily be doubled or tripled. We were very serious in the Greenville case study when we mapped out a potential implementation schedule that lasted 20 years!

For the professional, urban design is necessarily about deferred gratification. As experienced professionals now in middle age, we know we may be retired before the plans we draw today take shape in the world. The trade-off for this long time scale is the scope of action and influence: we get to do a lot more than design buildings, honorable as that labor is. We get to design towns and cities! The public dynamism of urban design, and the constant interaction with communities trying to shape their future, are very satisfying architectural and planning endeavors. To continue analogies we've drawn from Gordon Cullen and Camillo Sitte, we urban designers are a bit like composers, whose music needs musicians to be heard. We create an urban score, but nothing happens unless other professionals and citizens play their parts by transforming our lines on paper and words on the page into political action and bricks and mortar. Delayed gratification it may be, but oh, the joys of composition!

We deliberately chose our case studies to illustrate a hierarchy of urban scales: creating a regional framework for collaborative development among many municipalities; restructuring a faded suburban area in a large city around urban village centers; creating a new urban village on a greenfield site to make patterns of suburban growth more sustainable; revitalizing a poor inner-city neighborhood; and regenerating a decayed town center. Our work on these large and small projects has convinced us of one of New Urbanism's central propositions – continuity and connections in design thinking exist between all scales of urbanism, from the region to the block.

Some professional opinion still maintains that Smart Growth operates at a large scale of 'planning,' while New Urbanism concerns itself with the smaller, 'design' scale of individual projects (Wickersham, 2003). In our view this is fundamentally mistaken: it perpetuates the divorce of planning from design. To take the design content out of Smart Growth, so it becomes just another set of planning policies, is to give it the kiss of death. Smart Growth, above all else, is about the *redesign* of our communities to help solve environmental and social problems, and to create new patterns of sustainable living in places that nourish the soul while providing for everyday necessities. Smart Growth and New Urbanism are indivisible; together they form a comprehensive approach to development, redevelopment and conservation at all scales.

Our work is living proof that New Urbanism isn't just about making cute suburbs for the well-heeled middle class. It can, and should be an agency of social change and improvement. But one of the most severe testing grounds, for Smart Growth and New Urbanism alike, is in this arena of social equity. New Urbanism has garnered a reputation, somewhat unfairly, as merely a means of creating environments for the pleasure of the wealthier classes in American society. The economically distorted legacy of Seaside, and our enjoyment of Birkdale Village, in Huntersville, North Carolina, exemplify this problem. But this categorization *is* unfair because it ignores, among other things, the great contributions to affordable housing evident in HOPE VI projects that are based squarely on New Urbanist principles. But the belief still lingers, and as we noted in Chapter 6, opponents of Smart Growth have developed a potentially powerful new tactic of branding Smart Growth as 'snob growth', the preserve of a wealthy upper-middle class that excludes lower income families and individuals. To overcome this slur is vital, but aspects of American society make it a very difficult challenge.

For an allegedly 'classless' culture, America in the twenty-first century is handicapped by a stratification based on money and race, all too self-evident in the form of the nation's cities. Low- and moderate-income households are often concentrated in parts of cities many miles from centers of employment, with limited means of getting to and from workplaces, schools, and health services. Wealthy citizens keep poorer members of the community away from their

suburban enclaves by means of large-lot exclusionary zoning that means smaller, more affordable homes can't be built in those locations. More rampant social and spatial segregation by means of gated communities is increasingly commonplace. On occasion, we've been interviewed by towns seeking consultants for a new comprehensive plan, only to find that our stated ideals about the importance of social equity and affordable housing in all communities immediately disqualified us from further consideration. Such municipalities seek compliant consultants who will institutionalize discrimination, and they find them. However, we believe that to be complicit with this agenda is a reprehensible breach of professional ethics.

The equitable distribution of affordable housing throughout the community is both a founding principle of New Urbanism, and one of the hardest objectives to meet. America's sprawling settlement pattern means that on average, American households spend more money on transportation than on food, and only a fraction less than it takes to provide a roof over their head. Shelter consumes an average of 19 cents of every dollar, transportation 18 cents, and food, only 13 cents. For poorer households who desperately need money for decent housing, the distances between home and work mean that transportation costs alone take a whopping 36 cents out of every dollar, leaving too little for reasonable accommodation (Katz, 2003: p. 47).

While federal programs in America do provide support for affordable housing initiatives, it would be overly optimistic to hope for the implementation of a more proactive national policy mandating the equitable distribution of such accommodation in communities. It will be left to individual towns and cities to solve this problem as best they can. In this context, charrettes, master plans and new design-based zoning ordinances like the ones described in these case studies can help achieve social equity by designing it on the ground, neighborhood by neighborhood.

The authors don't want British readers to get too smug about the problems besetting America's towns and cities. The growing racial and class conflicts in Britain's inner cities, particularly in older failing urban areas in the north of the country bode ill for the future. Even in once prosperous industrial cities like Newcastle-upon-Tyne, which underwent decades of decline before fighting its way back to some semblance of urban health, the much-heralded and praiseworthy revitalization of the city center and quayside is contrasted with bitter urban decay in working class neighborhoods only a couple of miles away. This is not an isolated problem.

All is not sweetness and light in Albion's sceptered isle, and Americans who build their image of Britain from the BBC and Masterpiece Theater would be startled to comprehend the pressures and problems in British urban society. But, as we've said earlier in the book, there are national policies and support for planning and urban design that provide a framework for more comprehensive solutions than in America, and we're somewhat more optimistic about British cities than their American equivalents. In America, we simply have to work harder and put design to better use. As we hope we've shown in this book, design isn't simply an issue of aesthetics; it is a means of solving problems, and urban design provides the techniques for solving problems in cities through three-dimensional thinking. Contrary to Mies van der Rohe's assertion, in this case, less is *not* more. The extra third dimension provides designers and planners with more sophisticated tools to tackle urban problems than two-dimensional planning concepts that deal only with location and function. Urban design makes real places to live, to work, to shop, to worship, and to fall in love; urban planning makes only abstract models of cities.

The renaissance of American urban design is related in many ways to the British tradition of town planning – where the disposition of a community is organized according to physical criteria as well as social, economic and cultural considerations. It is the premise of the case studies that this kind of design-based planning can meet communities' needs in a way that conventional two-dimensional techniques cannot. Our work, and the work of many other professionals across the USA, reaffirms the tradition of physical master planning. We create a buildable vision and the means to implement it – as opposed to statistical planning methods that emphasize only analysis and policy formulation. The closer we get to the real world of places and people, the better we can solve the problems of cities, towns and neighborhoods. We, and others like us, are trying to reshape America for a sustainable future, one place at a time.