### THEME

#### LIST OF QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Economy and Financing</th>
<th>Nicky Kouwenberg 1st Interior Architect / Architectural Designer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Seven years ago the economic crisis hit many cities around the world. Real estate prices dropped and many people became unemployed. Due to the economic crisis and vast technological developments people became more aware and creative to organize their own needs. A real bottom-up oriented mind-set developed among the inhabitants of our cities; re-use, (self) sustainability, makers culture, DIY, redevelopment, and vacancy are well known notions nowadays. Vacant terrains in the city get new context due to the popularity of this mind-set while others stay vacant. New concepts stores, pop up stores, fab-labs, (feel good) markets and other small business take their place in vacant real estate and most of them started up from scratch. On the other hand we still see that new real estate is developing vast, the economical system still runs the same as before, policymakers still hold on to their old policy, enormous companies still grow and the salary of their &quot;top man&quot; touches the sky. Now I am wondering if the economical crisis was the real game changer or (except for some small changes) actually nothing changed? The bottom-up oriented inhabitants changed their whole mind-set and showed that they can be flexible, adaptive and sustainable towards a new way of using our space in the city. But the real top-down policy makers, chief executives don’t change their games; they only find the correct labels of sustainability to represent their companies with to collect enormous amounts of subsidies. Shouldn’t we change our policy so that the bottom-up oriented initiatives get more freedom and help to develop within vacant spaces in our cities? Isn’t this the way to organize the real densification in our city centers, by finding solutions to let bottom-up initiatives filling in the vacant gaps?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Cohesion (equity) and Territorial Cohesion (solidarity)</th>
<th>Chen Mao (冒辰) 1st Student MA+U / Intern at Provincie Noord-Brabant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The urban inequalities in developing countries”</td>
<td>In the last decades, the economy of developing countries such as China grows amazingly fast. We see the prosperity of Chinese cities. However, it is also important to be aware of the existing of poverty in the urban area. The huge gap between rich and poor become a big obstacle for the sustainable development of cities. If we take Shanghai as an example, the Gini coefficient is far over the warning line. The resources in the education and facilities are unbalanced; the living conditions for rich and poor are so different. We can easily see the bad residential areas, which are for the poor immigrants from rural area, next to the luxury apartments. The urban inequalities can cause social instability and violence. Finally, the city falls apart, rather than health develops.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tom Billingham 1st Landscape Architect at Billingham & Flygare AB |
| Are the economic forces behind modern urbanization too great to create environmentally and socially sustainable urban environments? And if so how can we counteract this? |

| Tim Bolleboom 2nd Assistent ontwerper / bouwkundig tekenaar bij Bureau Phi architecten en ingenieurs |
| “In the southern European countries, Italy and Greece, there is a big problem going on. According to the UN refugee agency, UNHCR, in 2015 already 1,800 migrants died in their attempt to reach Europe through the Mediterranean Sea. That is thirty times more victims compared to the same |

| Are the urban inequalities can cause social instability and violence. How can we start improving the conditions in poor/bad areas? Whose responsibility is it to improve the living conditions of the estimated 863 million people who are living in slums and how are they going to do it? We need to bring about the connections that stretches over capacity building, building better democratic structures with cultural and social resources/capital in to planning and government. We need a common language over barriers and local leadership generic skills able to build more solid local rooted structures. |
period in 2014. About 36,000 boat refugees reached southern Europe this year. In 2014 a total of 219,000 migrants crossed the Mediterranean. The problem becomes larger, but there is less supervision. In November 2014 Italy stopped the rescue mission Mare Nostrum. The cheaper EU operation, Triton, is more of a border guard mission instead of a rescue mission. A following problem that arises with the boat refugees’ survivors is that they have no house whereby they go wander. European countries are deliberating for a solution for the housing of boat refugees. There has been debated for a proportional division of boat refugees among all European countries.

The questions that raises is, what responsibility should we take as Dutch, or specifically as designers, to help the boat refugees on the Mediterranean Sea to avoid unnecessary loss of lives? How do we receive the refugees and where and how should we house them?”

Mandy Reijntjens 1st

“We will find that progressively a large proportion of the world’s population will migrate to live in the Cities. And, so far there is not yet an end of the urbanization in Sight. Urbanization can be promising and it could lead to growth, progress and innovation as we can be more productive and have a possibility to interact better to share great ideas. Living together in Cities would lead to compactness, which allows overall lower energy consumption and more unoccupied and unpolluted space left for the nature. (Edward Glaeser)

But what about the contradiction to the above, what about the missing social links and the people who end up in disadvantaged neighborhoods? In many cases, the City is an attractor for people to aim to better themselves and to gain new exciting connections, but a high proportion of those hopeful humans end up living in much worse places to the ones that they originally came from. The cities of today present us a lot of sad examples of areas with poverty, exclusion and vulnerability. And whoever thinks this only happens in the 3rd world countries is totally wrong, even in the ever-progressing Europe there are a lot of cities which are struggling with the same problem.

In my opinion a sustainable City, is a City, which offers the next generations the same, or even better opportunities than we have had. The challenge for the cities of tomorrow is to become a sustainable city, to create those social links instead of dividing the city into different social groups. With a strong cohesion and a society, which is being kept together with those social links, it is easier to have a place where the economics are growing and the collaboration for creating a better more durable city will be much higher.

The biggest problem we are facing is how can we resolve the issue of the missing links, how can we start improving the conditions in those poor/bad areas? It is a huge problem because it is really too expensive to solve this problem at once. Who is going to pay for it, who wants to invest money in those deprived areas?

I find the below Ted talk (Haas en Hahn) How painting can transform a community very inspiring, it shows how you can make a small difference and how to connect with another group in the society. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iCXfJVCq1LA
Tom Billingham 1st
Landscape Architect at Billingham & Flygare AB
Whose responsibility is it to improve the living conditions of the estimated 863 million people who are living in slums and how are they going to do it?!

Tomas Dahlberg
Cultural planner and creative advisor
"Hi Marc. I would like to address the issue of divided and segregated cities. The fact that gentrification tends to squeeze lower income groups and migrants in to suburban areas. How can the discussion about resilience and social sustainability apply and be rooted among disadvantaged groups? I guess these issues in some of the Swedish million home program are relevant in most countries. With experiences as a Community developer/cultural planner and former researcher at the Swedish national board for housing and planning, I see that we need to bring about the connections that stretches over capacity building, building better democratic structures with cultural and social resources/capital in to planning and government. We need a common language over barriers and local leadership generic skills able to build more solid local rooted structures. Nothing new here, but a lot to do."

Ecological and Energy Transition
Massimo Tadi 1st
Associate Professor at Politecnico di Milano. Director of IMMdesignLab, www.immdesignlab.com
“How design strategies could really contribute to climate mitigation and emission reduction?”

Joeri Schutte 1st
Assistant-architect/tekenaar - Archiburo BVBA & Student Master of Architecture - Academie van Bouwkunst Tilburg
“Counteract on growing waste production

Waste storage districts are getting bigger and bigger. The enormous amounts of waste and the methods of dumping isn’t only harmful for the environment, but also not for humans. The bigger part of the tree billion kilo’s of waste that is produced annually in Europe is burned or put underground. Isn’t this waste management, a waste of time and miss usage of the raw materials?

The current environmental damage of this problem mainly consists of air, water and soil pollution and the emission of greenhouse gases. This has a great effect on its population. Regulation to solve this problem in the European Union is lacking and isn’t rectilinear.

A solution to further reduce waste can consist of already existing recycle methods. Should methods such as ‘cradle to cradle’ and ‘life cycle thinking’ be more of a normal situation and implemented in current (building) regulations to avoid further problems? Or are there other solutions to solve this problem?”

How design strategies could really contribute to climate mitigation and emission reduction? The dense cities have less and less buffers to react on natural changes. We need to ask ourselves how our built environment can change from being artificially disconnected from the natural cycles.

Seeing the city as an eco-system is not enough and might not be such a holistic perspective as usually argued. The danger of this conception is that we will see nature as a system that we completely understand and can manage for our own benefits of (urban) life. The real challenge is to find connections and interactions between the urban area and the natural, where they are equal to each other and working in the same chain of this life on planet earth.
### Restructuring Urban Area’s due to flooding’s

The global climate is changing and causes all kinds of problems; mainly flooding of rivers is an actual threat. Various regions like New York and New Orleans as well as our own country deals with this danger. Cause to peak rainfall rivers can over-flow, dikes can break and water systems can be crammed with water. Consequences concerning this problem are enormous.

In many urban areas the threat becomes bigger and bigger. Citizens of these areas will notice the effects more and wonder themselves how big the chance is that their neighborhood will overflow.

In some cities you see developments regarding this problem, because these developments can also bring new chances. A good example is the city Nijmegen, which needed more ‘room for the river’. The area around the river De Waal is restructured which also provides an economic boost and helps to improve the liveability.

Do cities have to take responsibility by restructuring urbanized areas to provide the best protection for its inhabitants concerning flooding?


### Natural resources, including materials, water, energy and fertile land, are the basis for our life on Earth. However, humanity's rapidly growing consumption of these resources is causing severe damage. Our climate is changing; fresh water reserves, fish stocks and forests are shrinking; fertile land is being destroyed and species are becoming extinct. In order to continue to thrive on this planet, our lifestyles will need to become more sustainable, so that we are able to protect our natural resource base and the fragile eco-systems on our planet.

Humans today extract and use around 50% more natural resources than only 30 years ago, at about 60 billion tons of raw materials a year. It is expected that the number of people on earth will be more than 9 billion over the next 50 years, with three out of every five people living in an urban area. That means that the use of resources will only increase in the upcoming years. How long can we expect to go on like that?

Soaking out the elements from our planet is not the only case. Every day we create tons of waste products in our daily lives but overall 35% of municipal waste was recycled in Europe in 2010, a significant improvement on 23% in 2001. The EU mandated targets to recycle household and similar waste by 2020 is 50% for the EU countries, but many countries will find it extremely difficult to meet these numbers. Though the European countries are developed countries, they cannot even balance the use of resources. This problem will grow with the growth of the population of course. In order to create a more sustainable and equitable world, regions with high levels of resource use, such as Europe, will need to sharply decrease their resource use in absolute terms. What kind of major changes do we need to do to be able to increase the recycle and create zero waste future cities?
A documentary named “Manufactured Landscapes” from the artist Edward Burtynsky, who won many prices with his works, can give an impression about how urgent the problem is and what kind of world we are going to leave to our children. 
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kVybNCPzG7M

Joske van Breugel 1st  
Opzoek naar een werkvaringplek | Master of Urbanism  
“Water as a security

Since the emergence of the Netherlands we are engaged in protecting our habitats from the water. In the beginning there were these little dykes and terps, but over the years, the Dutch knowledge about protecting its Delta become with large constructions and dyke structures. After the extreme floods in 1993 and 1995 we recognized that it had to change. Making higher dikes is no longer sufficient. With the climate change it will be rains more and harder. Therefore the government started in 2006 with the program “Room for the River” are within this program at 39 venues provisions made as secondary channels and water storage. These measures protect our environment until 2018! Then, the water levels will be high again. This year the new Government was adopted a program measures to protect our country to water, the Delta Programme in 2015.

My question when does it stop? Our whole life we are fighting against the water and we do everything to keep our dry habitats. But if you know that the water comes, why can we not accept the water? And new habitats adapt to the water.

The BNA has recently launched a research project to this problem:
http://www.bna-onderzoek.nl/project.php?id=83#VYkN71zPAr

Nicky Kouwenberg 1st  
Interior Architect / Architectural Designer  
“Nowadays we already consume more than 150% the resources the earth can possibly and sustainable deliver in a year. The prognoses for 2040 lay over 300%. The question would be how we can rapidly reduce the quantity of resources we ask from our planet earth? So that next generations also can live on our planet earth.

Please check the following link about the works of Edward Burtynsky, a small movie can be found that relates to his documentary of Manufactured Landscapes. Also take a look on his projects. Here we can really start questioning what we are asking from planet earth and its inhabitants.
http://www.edwardburtynsky.com/site_contents/Films/Manufactured_Landscapes_Film.html

Roel Bekkers 2nd  
Projectmedewerker at Architectenbureau JMW  
First of all: I do think that being progressive in terms of sustainability is a great good. That being said, I also believe that sometimes being progressive can seem a bit of a pilot exercise. In our country we deal with a quite soft climate. Relatively we don’t have to heat that much during winter and we also don’t need to cool that much during summer. During the last study trip to Shanghai I got acquainted with a totally different climate (and culture). I think that almost every room in Shanghai (there are a lot of them) is being equipped with a separate air conditioning unit. In
the Netherlands we have these very high terms we should meet when it comes to reducing energy consumption. We try to reuse energy, store heat or coolness into the ground or come up with other concepts that reduce the amount of our (modest) energy consumption. Of course we need to change the consumption of energy but as long as energy is being squandered in huge amounts at the other side of the world, we haven’t really solved anything.

For us it is kind of easy to give the right example while other countries can do very little while making an equal effort. There are some global agreements regarding CO2 emission (like the Kyoto protocol), but due to the unequal climatic and financial circumstances, not every country has got the same reduction target.

If the Netherlands and Europe have worked out how to deal with this sustainability issue, how can we expect the same from the rest of the world? Other climates may require more complex / more expensive solutions. The issue concerns a global manner, should we not act accordingly? Does the solution not ask for a much more co-operative approach rather than a competitive one?

Or is it okay to say that regions with a difficult climate are allowed to pollute the earth much more than other regions? Should areas with these hard climates even stay populated if they take that much of the earth’s resources?

Sander de Koster 1st
The effect of dryness on a global scale is enormous. Not only the food production is a serious threatened, also other sectors like the production of drinking water, cooling for industry and power plants are threatened. Also the damage to nature and the risks of forest fires are increasing dramatically. The economic damage caused by drought is, for example, in the USA more than the damage caused by other natural disasters such as floods or hurricanes. Industries can severely hampered by lack of cooling water. Hydroelectric power plants have cut production or even shut down. This drought also extends to the city, due to climate change the weather is unstable. Sometimes the rainfall will be extreme in a short amount of time and the droughts will be longer. In addition, there will be periods of higher temperatures. Dew the rise of the temperature the evaporation increases. This can have consequences in the summer, the evaporation increases with 3 to 15 % and that leads towards dryness. In the city, this leads to damage of the public green spaces and the water quality reduces. Also the buildings get damaged of the drought, due the decreasing of the ground water level the foundation of the building will get instable, the repair cost of the building can reach up to 54.000 euro per building.

So my question will be, how can we prevent the drought in the cities? And what if the drought is extreme, what will happen to the inhabitants of the metropolis, is the metropolis losing his habitats?”

Joost van der Zanden 2nd
Eigenaar / Ontwerper bij Bureau van der Zanden

“Today, we are dependent on finite products. Drinking water is perhaps the most important essence of our existence. We will therefore have to ensure that it remains available for everyone in the future. Focuses mainly Certainly the growth of the world population and the growth direction of the city. On those places we must find a solution of that problem. An example is Benidorm, the largest resort in Spain. An area with most skyscrapers per square meter in the world after Manhattan."
Every year, around 5.5 million people visit this beach town. They consume about 22 million hm² of water per year. This equates to about 850 liter of drinking water per person per day. Compared with the Netherlands or Germany, where average consumption is 150 liters per person per day. Less than half of this water comes from the area of Benidorm, but in the hinterland. This turn the hinterland in to dryness, what the effect is that plants, animals and people be compromised in that area. Since nature makes a healthy circulatory system this circle should be maintained. The disturbance will also have affect at the groundwater and a beach town like Benidorm, in just 10 years without drinking water. The consequences of this place will not be incalculable. People will safe their own lives and have to forced emigrate.

Joyce Verstijnen 1st
Assistent ontwerper bij Bedaux de Brouwer Architecten

“Equal interactions between the natural and the urban.

The world is experiencing the most abrupt shift in human settlements in history. After decades of the rural shifting to the urban living, there are estimations that at the end of this century 80% of the people will live in cities. It seems that for the first time in human history, the Homo sapiens that evolved on the natural grounds of Africa, is becoming an urban species.

However, we need to question ourselves the impact of it on the way we live and the way we have notion of our ‘natural existence’ on this planet. We cannot ignore the fact that we will always have to deal with the natural and biological reality of life. We are born, need food, water, air in our lungs, and a physical place on this planet to live.

The issues of the built environment become visible with the problematic increasing impact of natural disasters in these rapidly growing cities. The dense cities have less and less buffers to react on natural changes. We need to ask ourselves how our built environment can change from an autonomous city into a city structure that finds its place within the natural cycle of this planet.

How we conceive (and physically experience) nature will have a big impact on how we deal with our own (urban) living environment, the habitat of animals and the planet more in general. Seeing the city as an eco-system is not enough and might not be such a holistic perspective as usually argued. The danger of this conception is that we will see nature as a system that we completely understand and can manage for our own benefits of (urban) life. For me the real challenge is to find connections and interactions between the urban area and the natural, where they are equal to each other and working in the same chain of this life on planet earth.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ey1LynXGNvA&feature=youtu.be

Claude St Arroman 2nd
Architecture Lecturer at University of East London

“I would say the longevity of what has been built in the past 15 years is a problem. Many claddings started failing apart within a few years of completion, they often don’t get replaced for a long time after the cavity was exposed. Pests through the M&E services invade some buildings. I suspect buildings like the Strata Tower have a maximum life span of 30 years - huge implications on the economy and on sustainability in terms of drawing from the planet's resources. Another concern I would raise is the implications of airtightness and minimal window sizes on health, which are only
just now being properly investigated and uncovered.”

Tim Greenhow
Senior Consultant at SIPU International
“Interesting challenge!
Continued rapid urbanization into a relatively few main centers in individual countries is leading to considerable depopulation in rural areas; a severe decline in services as basic as health, education and policing. This of course drives an even faster move to the cities, but with a resulting massive disparity in quality of life between urban and rural, rich regions and poor regions. It may, or may not, be good for the environment, including forestry - but ironically this may also support moves to much more "industrial scale and style" agriculture and forestry - with less biodiversity, and a poorer overall "environmental services."

Francisco Serrano, MLA, RLA
MLA RLA
“I like to add one:
Is the impact of the destruction of forests that includes wildlife habitats to cover it with concrete (urbanization) will be ever considered by developers and be reduced and compensated with alternate solutions that combine both or is greed the only motive behind development and the environment won’t be ever considered.”
Identity and Liveability

Chen Mao (冒辰) 1st
Student MA+U / Stagiair Provincie Noord-Brabant
"The attitude to the city memory in China"
China is in the transition period. Everything is moving forward, except the culture. In my opinion, the urban culture is disappearing. In the last decades, China is gradually dominated by western culture. We can see it clearly from the city development of China. In the "western" cities such as Shanghai and Shenzhen, people accept the western city spirit and lifestyle. It is very difficult to see the power of memory in these cities anymore. And the bad thing is that more and more cities in China are taking this road, abandoning their past, and becoming genetic cities. It is terrible to see that after 50 years, a totally new city appears, just under the same city name. According to me, it is really critical to discuss where is the way for Chinese cities, when facing towards future, still holding the spirit of the past?

Anton Van Hooft 1st
Directie van Hooft architecten
"Should public green spaces of a city be sacrificed when a city can no longer expand, to handle its required growth?"
I have been wondering about this for quite a while now. In many cities green spaces are generated to improve the quality of life of the immediate surroundings and of the city. In order to achieve this it is not uncommon that green spaces are given up or can no longer function as a green space. The priority is to add quality of life, but could this entail that these newly added or extended green spaces in cities may have to disappear to allow urbanization in the near future?

Sidney van Well 1st
Designer at ARCHES architecten BNA
"Cultural Heritage"
Cultural heritage, it gives an image of our rich culture and history. Nowadays the Netherlands has around 62,000 buildings that are registered as heritage. The preservation of heritage is a must for the society, this ensures the character of the place and shows history of land and nation. But what is the future of this method? While this list of preservation of characteristics of humanity is still increasing, this also gives problems. For example, if one looks at Italy then the huge amount of heritage also shows a certain degree of impossibility. The Government has enormous costs to the enforcement of all elements and this has its impact at the expense of the further development of the country. Can companies or citizens maintain these monuments as well, or is this method to shortsighted? If not, what is the future in cultural heritage? Next to that in some parts of the world there is a state of imbalance, cultural differences and new rival behavior causes huge treat to parts of society and in that case also to the cultural heritage in this area. What can/should we do to preserve these elements of history?"

The urban regions are challenged with changing conceptions of time, speed and distance, and have to consider how that will influence our physical environment. But even more important, how these new conceptions will have impact on how we experience and feel identified with the places where we stay.

The challenge is how 'slow spaces' (which are important for people’s attachment with their physical living area, sense of identity, and wellbeing) can be provided in the future city of global movement and compressed time.
Sidney van Well 1st
Designer at ARCHES architecten BNA

"Food re-located

In its origin human settlements are formed around fertile areas. A location of fertile soil was the perfect reason to settle. These are the places where cities developed for decades. However, the fertility of the soil at these places decreased. Cities get their raw materials from all over the world, first by waterways then also over land and even by air. Location no longer determines what one eats; food production is made as efficient and in large quantities so that it then is spread all over the world.

By this spread cultural differences slowly disappear. Unique local food becomes rear, the cooking art of the residents of a country or city decreases. One was used to be tied to seasonal food, nowadays one eats what ever he likes. This system is not sustainable, not only for the use of the planet, also for the resident of an area. Nowadays food comes from the supermarket, not from your backyard or the countryside near you.

Threats as failed harvests by climate change or a lack of fuel for cultivation, extraction, transportation and cooling of food products caused by a boycott have profound more and more consequences. Next to that in Europe over the last years the use of the food bank has increased enormously, by economic relapse in England more than 900,000 inhabitants are forced to use these services in order to survive. Also in Greece, Spain and France a major growth in food bank services is visible.

Because food is no longer grown by citizens itself, sufficient income is an important condition for the availability of food. What should we as humanity do to ensure human health which is less linked to economy? Can we go to a system wherein basic needs can be provided by cooperation of citizens?"

Niek van de Calseijde 2nd
Trainee (architecture) @ ARCHES architecten BNA & student Master Architectuur @ Academie van bouwkunst

"It was the fifth of June this year. Getting out of the plane walking towards the train station. Some kilometers I guess. A huge distance to travel. It were not only my feet that were tired. Also the twenty-three kilograms heavy weight behind me had a difficult time. Shanghai it is called. A composition of forces, actions, reactions and individuals creating a bigger collective. As far as you can see there are housing blocks, power circuits, garbage and humans. A huge urban soup with all vegetables species in the world collected together in just one dish. It was an experience of a lifetime and it makes you realize what we are and what we’re doing on this spherical object called earth. One thing for sure: busy all the time. Continuously thinking about how we can re-compose all earth’s elements.

Apparently cities are a popular topic to work on. I don’t know whether this composition – referring to China’s pearl - is perfectly composed. For me it was the first time I experienced such a scale. Out of scale you might say. Of course I mean the human scale next to the one of Shanghai. Maybe I’m a bit itchy on this, but to what scale should we humans refer if we discuss cities? What scale should we consider if we question these phenomena? Are cities scale-less? For me it looked scale-less,
due to the fact the earth is a spherical thing and the city simply disappears thirty six km in front of you. Maybe cynical, but for me it addresses a larger problem. It addresses the needs of us. Apparently we need these large structures to be sustainable or be less vulnerable. We humans are fundamental individuals. Though we cannot deny we cluster all any place, any time.

We feel the need to cluster and we found out it works somehow. Urbanization, more and more people are joining the cluster. It creates more actions, more physical movements, more mental intensions and more complexities. So, more needs. The clustering of all those needs creates scale. Can we understand all these city related chemistries? If I think back to Shanghai it seems they lost a sustainable thought already thirty years ago.

Do we need to understand? Metabolism everywhere. A system that looked so overloaded almost no one can understand. What a city truly is? If we talk about cities, we talk about complex matter. We can’t grasp it: we do not fully understand these walking creatures. Almost like sand dunes they dance on physical geographies, with us as creator. The birth was almost excessive, the evolution maybe even more. Getting bigger and denser. Does these chemical reactions solve problems or create new ones? Are they becoming too big? So can these phenomena – we call cities - live on forever? Or will they die at the end?

Igor Sokolov
‘Reuse’ and ‘recycle’ are probably the most frequently reoccurring words in architectural and urban concepts, speeches, projects and social media space of these days. While it has become something not unheard of and not so radical, as it used to be when it was first conceived, there is still no significant shift towards a responsible society. There is a reason for that: the very concept of an all-round recycling seems to contradict the underlying principle of a consumption economy, the economy based on constant production and consumption indicators growth. Big money always associated with power sees that concept as a major threat and use every other chance to protect it from change, the goose that lays the golden eggs for the limited number of people. To resolve the issue it is obviously not enough to keep repeating the same words at all conferences over and over again and waiting for the results like manna from heaven. Perhaps it is time for architects and urbanists to make the next huge step by putting forward the question of how to alter the consumption society system so that its driving forces function properly without imposing obstacles on the way to make our living environment better.

Interventions without cultural studies (blindness of modern architects)
I have recently come across different proposals for the Grand Paris project made by both smaller local bureaus and huge renowned offices. What stroke me personally about their concepts is that all of them, of various scales and different approaches, generate the solution for the spatial and environmental problems without studying peoples who live on the territory they design for. This problem is linked to the internationalization of architecture, when an architect who has never left their office in Europe designs for Maldives or Emirates, for instance. Misunderstanding, opposition and tension can hardly be released until modern architects and urbanists embrace the misleading practice of approaching and judging other nations and cultures by their own. DEEP studies of a mixed-culture community should precede any design. Only then such a design can be effective and contextualized to become relevant for local communities.”
Joyce Verstijnen 1st  
Assistent ontwerper bij Bedaux de Brouwer Architecten  
“Today’s global movement compresses time and space.

Thinking about the impact of urbanization on our physical surroundings reminds me of my journey to India in 2013. I travelled to both the sparsely populated Ladakh area in the Himalaya and the overcrowded region of New Delhi. I couldn’t imagine myself a bigger contrast of physical experiences as these two. How restful and slow the Himalaya was, the more hectic and fast was the urbanized city of New Delhi.

According to Barbara Bender (Professor of Heritage Anthropology) we are touched by the physicality of ‘things’, they are of big importance of how we feel in our living environment. This environment is more than making practical things possible, it is a space filled with stories, memories, relations (with others) and will influence how we feel. In the end people are always in search for a sense of belonging (Bender, 2001), a sense of identity and attachment with their place. One extremely important condition is that people can have their moments of ‘pause’ to really feel that they are ‘in-a-place’ and can experience that specific physical environment. Time and speed are the important influential factors.

Along the urbanization of cities the amount of movement increased significantly, like the city of New Delhi (compared with the rural landscape of the Himalaya). Due to the ability of fast and long distance movement, we are able to move with high speed and over greater distances than ever before. Not even mentioning the complex virtual world where we can be digitally connected with the other side of the globe in a second.

The urban regions are challenged with changing conceptions of time, speed and distance, and have to consider how that will influence our physical environment. But even more important, how these new conceptions will have impact on how we experience and feel identified with the places where we stay.

The challenge is how ‘slow spaces’ (which are important for people’s attachment with their physical living area, sense of identity, and wellbeing) can be provided in the future city of global movement and compressed time.  

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E4Qyqr4CVAg&feature=youtu.b

Goijaart van Dijk 1st  
Staff at Fontys Universities. Writer.  
Looking from the perspective of a ‘user’ of an urban area, rather than of someone involved in ‘making’ the urban area, I am worried greatly by how the mistakes from the past, influence our today as well as our future.

Take my home town Tilburg, where in the 1980’s it was decided that the town would have a huge expansion build to the west of it, the area now as the ‘Reeshof’. It has become a massive housing estate, a suburb if you want, about the same size as the original town of Tilburg in the ‘80’s. But it lacks ‘gezelligheid’ (for non-Dutch speakers: the word expresses a feeling of warmth, belonging and ‘home’ that seeps into every aspect of a Dutch person’s life).
In historically grown, rather than planned, villages, towns and cities, this "gezelligheid" comes into existence because on one corner, someone decides to start a pub, and in one street a few houses are torn down and 'a-presto'; we have a playground or a park, elsewhere a shop attracts so many visitors that other shops decide to establish themselves there and after a while we call it a shopping precinct.

The Reeshof does not have all that. And I see the same in most other planned expansions on a bigger scale. Sure, the planners made space for shops, sporting facilities and a park, but it lacks a feeling of common agreement that those elements are there, right where they are supposed to be. So the people of the Reeshof commute elsewhere, into the old part of Tilburg, for their 'gezelligheid'. They also work somewhere else, so basically the Reeshof is a sleeping suburb, the size of a whole Dutch town. This commuting has an effect on the road system, public transport and the scale on which the old town operates when it comes to shopping precincts, pubs, cinema's, parking areas and green areas. It would, therefore, be an interesting question how urban planning can capture this illusive feeling of 'gezelligheid', of common agreement and of 'home', in order to make planned urban areas more liveable and keep older areas liveable at the same time."

Lieke Van Den Heuvel
1st Stagiaire architectuur bij Provincie Noord-Brabant

Shouldn't we stop enlarging the "large" cities but focus on the small villages to keep the identity of The Netherlands how we know it?

Both questions are kind of hinting in the same direction. But I think that change is not always necessary and that the strength is in maintaining what we have. Maybe the question is do we want to be like the rest of the world or do we like to keep our own identity?"

Loes Veldpaus
1st PhD candidate

"I would like to add this one:

Why do we know far more about why people eat peanut butter than we do about why people visit (or not), like (or not), or live in (or not) areas designated as (world) heritage?


Diarmaid Lawlor
2nd Head of Urbanism at Architecture and Design Scotland

"My disturbing question is: what is the future of urbanization without a new local institutional landscape of community decision making? Two forces are reshaping public services, as a concept and in terms of provision: austerity and a shift away from the public good toward public service as commodity. A future is if winners and losers, in existing places, but also in the frameworks that shape new places. How does urbanization reclaim fairness?"

Greater global resilience can be achieved if we seek ways of empowering 'the local'. How do we therefore ensure that cross-sector community partnerships (e.g. public, private and not-for-profit) become more formative in:

1) enabling renewable energy harnessing at the domestic level
2) democratizing food production, distribution and waste management, and through systemic cultural
Liudmila Neykova 1st  
Architectural and Urban planning Professional  
"Hallo Marc,  
As a mother of a small girl, the most disturbing question for me is – how rapid urbanization influences the wellbeing and future of our children? The topic is very broad and complicated, so I would like to focus on several aspects:  
Children have the instant need to play – during the play they gain important knowledge of life and practice essential social skills. But in highly urbanized areas there’s simply no sufficient space for that – roads are occupied by cars and public transport, every corner - by urban structures; there’s a severe fight in the city centers for every single vacant square meter. What choice has our children? Where do they play? Usually- at home: The typical city child is restricted to the house or (in the best case) a small yard and live in an isolated, nuclear family unit with a few other relatives and limited contacts. Limited space at home determines also the type of activities: instead of children’s typical physical activities (like cycling, running, jumping, etc.) their entertainment is focused more on TV/ media / high technologies, etc. That “shift” of activities causes increasing health and physiological problems to the “city” children – epidemic of altruisism, allergies, computer games addictiveness and many others. Something else - according to the results of a survey about relation between urbanization and children’s behavior  
http://www.culturalsurvival.org/ourpublications/csg/article/effects-urbanization-childrens-behavior  
even if the children from urbanized areas are physically and mentally healthy, they tend to show less helpful and responsible behavior than children from more rural areas. Furthermore, that negative influence of urbanity increase egoistic and aggressive behavior of children. Humans had created cities to live better, but now cities determine how humans would live."  

李柏 2nd  
Architect intern - VenhoevenCS architecture+urbanism  
"Interview is a method for collecting information is not new for everyone, especially as technology developed till now. Lecture from Petra Havelska, showed me one kind of mentality --- “negotiable”. It is very interesting to know all the normal people’s opinion about “the architecture project or infrastructure project” that takes place near by their daily life.  
But "Why we need ask people who lives nearby? "  
It sounds like a very “bottom up” approaches, it sounds very much democracy and sounds very peace. But what if these people within the conversation are wrong? Who will pay for the entire mistake?  
I didn’t ask the question in the lecture that “ it sounds like after discussion everything seems very nice, but if there is also some cases the result of bottom up discussion went complete wrong and the governments “dictatorship” was better?”  
I come from a country there is not so much negotiation between normal people and governments. But it was several years ago, due to the noise, pollution and so on; many citizens went to street against government High-speed train project. Now it proves that high-speed train project in China eastern coast is a remarkable power for Chinese economic grow.  
My question I am not very sure. But maybe when we try to do discussion like a bottom up
Thinh Pham  
First Architect at Popma & ter Steege  
"City – A drug of lifestyle"  
No matter how big the city is or where it is located. The people still keep moving from countryside to an area, where is bigger, more activities, and better for their generation, that is called city. Furthermore, the smaller cities are left behind by movement of young generation who desire to be part of the bigger and biggest cities’ life. Why is it happening? Whether it is considering by the brand of “city” in order to stick on their chest and be proud of that.  
In fact, the quality of life compared between countryside and city is a big difference. First of all, the material life with transportation, infrastructure, information technology, which are the main factors that make the countryside can’t be part of the city or considered an outside world. Secondly, the spiritual life – cultural essentials; in every such a region where always has sense of identity, history, public space. How about “social diversity”. It only appears when all of the people gather or concentrate in one area and by the time it becomes a city and develops along with those essentials. Therefore, the development in different period of time between those areas, which makes some areas become city, others are still countryside. We are losing the balancing between city and countryside. It has already been occurring since 19th century (Paris for example). And now, 21st century, the beam inclines much more to the city side. How are we going to deal with that, to get the balancing in appropriate way?  
Public space is becoming more and more popular as a solution example. Ultimately, is “public space” the key to bring back the balancing? Or it belongs to human psychology.  
http://www.theguardian.com/cities/2014/may/08/what-makes-city-tech-garden-smart-redefine  

Manja Adriaens  
First Internship at MAG architecten  
"Culture and language in a city"  
In a technical and prosperous city like Eindhoven are working a lot of foreign people. They come from many different countries, even outside of Europe. Because of all the different native languages, English (current world language) becomes the most often used language to communicate here in the city and in many offices. Even my neighbor, an expat from India, does not speak Dutch, because it’s not necessary to practice because the language in the company is English anyway. Also on the streets and other public or non-public spaces the people can speak English, it’s a accustomed language now. But how does this look like in 50 years? Do we speak more English? Do we forget our mother tongue? Is this dissolution of your own ‘culture’ seriously? Or how can we ensure that languages, dialects and cultures continue to exist?  
The language ‘problem’ is very big these days, take myself as an example I was born and raised in Limburg, I grew up bilingual, the General Civilized Dutch as one language and my dialect as the
other language. This dialect already has been adapted because my grandparents on my mother’s side come from another region of Limburg. This means that I sometimes use words that are not entirely from my own dialect. The moment I got a relationship I noticed again that my dialect began to change, because my boyfriend also comes from another region and I again began to use other words. When I think about the future of my own dialect, there is a good chance that my dialect will get lost if everyone is going to mingle. Is that bad? We still have the official dialect dictionaries to keep the language with us.

This example from a very small scale reflects the language of our world. The social media and the greater amount of leisure time and holidays gives the opportunity to get in contact with other languages, and starts to get ordinary. We all know that all languages are described in books so it is not lost, but does this also change our culture? Is the world going to be the same culture when we will be more in touch with all the other people?”

Manja Adriaens 1st
Internship at MAG architecten

“The social impact of Urbanization.

People are becoming individualistic when they are going to live in a city. It’s not that common anymore that you’re going to live somewhere together with someone, people tend to live on their own, en they need to take care for themselves. People get an independent behavior and do more things alone. But why is it so hard for them to have a talk with their neighbors? Are there to many people where they can talk to? Is it too much for them?

We can call this an overwhelming of social contacts around the people; they want to be ‘alone’. In the country you were lucky if you had the opportunity to talk with someone. But the big amount of people can react to deter, people get introvert and don’t no how and on what to react. It’s hard to say hello to everybody while you’re cycling to work if you pass at least 40 other cyclists. People find it hard do have an uncontrolled social conversation because they are constantly stimulated by a potential social interaction. What will urbanization do with de social character of humanity? How can we make it more positive again?

It’s not just that people are not feeling like having a chat with other people, it also has to do with the so-called ranks difference. More people are living together in a city for example who have a high education, or a low education, or maybe no education. Or maybe someone is very poor and the other one is very rich. Because of these differences between people the old-fashioned rank differences is still visible. This also affects the behavior of the people; they don’t want to talk to everyone, afraid of the other rank. This leads to ignoring and disregard; people don’t want to know each other to protect their status. How are we dealing with this division in a city?”

Ingo Kumic 2nd
City Regeneration/ Place-Based Impact Program Development: partnership brokering, strategic design, leadership

“Hi Marc. Thanks for this opportunity. While this won’t solve all our problems, I think greater global resilience can be achieved if we seek ways of empowering ‘the local’. How do we therefore ensure that cross-sector community partnerships (eg public, private and not-for-profit) become more formative in: 1) enabling renewable energy harnessing at the domestic level, 2) democratizing food
production, distribution and waste management, and through systemic cultural change 3) promotes an 'idea of power' that it is accumulated by empowering others.”

Marlies Van Der Maarel 2nd
Interim Stedenbouwkundige bij Gemeente Ede

“Hello Marc,
I would like introduce 3 questions about how to manage urbanization processes in this era of:

1) The peoples power in relation to the power of the government and other professional institutions: people want and are able to influence more their environment than in the past (Adds: co-creation, possibilities of internet / smart cities, etc.)

2) Growing differences: we live in a situation of shrinkage of population growth in some regions and growth (with economic wealth) in other regions. Sometimes these differences show up even in the same region with growing and shrinking villages next to each other. (Adds: new perspectives for shrinking communities, etc.)

3) Ageing of populations: in huge parts of the Netherlands our population will become older and we will gradually be with a lot more elderly people. How are we organizing this? (Adds: new organization of health care, new ways of living together, design of public space, etc.)

In the Trendbureau Overijssel we study on these and other topics!”

Gert Breugem 2nd
Owner SUS | Smart Urban Solutions

“Hi Marc, very good to set up a list of questions regarding more adequate city planning. In my opinion most strategies for cities focus on building dwellings and lack an inclusive and integrated approach. Awareness of political bodies on the need for long-term agendas is necessary to establish sustainable urban strategies. Local politicians should take their responsibility on economic development, appropriate investments in upgrade informal settlements and mobility, etc. If they do so, business will be activated to bring in their expertise and support the overall process. This can trigger the process of economic prospective for many of their population.

Being involved in urban planning processes in one of the fastest growing cities within the Netherlands (Almere) I am convinced of the need of working with both a long term strategy and vision on city and regional scale and the short/mid-term goals to achieve. These short-term goals are important for citizens and investors because they will see results within limited time. So, my question to bring in is not content wise but process wise approach. Why are governments not able to organize a process for the future horizon of their city, out of their local problems and opportunities? What precisely are their impediments to set the right goals in collaboration with local business and stakeholders? And another question: What kind of best practices can help them to be aware of future opportunities?

Resilient cities are cities in which people will get chances to develop. Sustainable urban strategies can be the suitable precondition for these people to do so, is my opinion!”
Innovation and Territorial Development

Sungman Kim
PhD, MBA, MLA, AICP, GISP, PLA, SPHR

“How the globalization has impacted on the 21st century urbanization and what will be the future impacts on it? Through the IT and transportation developments, physical boundaries have been melted down and urbanization has been expedited. Thereafter, not just old metropolitan areas but also small towns in the world have seen rapid growths. The original concept of comparative advantage over globalization was to create economic advantages for all. However, what we see now is a worldwide geophysical plat (in growth). This has created most of the issues like global warming and, not to mention of, habitat reduction.”

anissa s. febrina
2nd
Urban Development Sector Professional

“When will cities cease to be growth machines?”

Mandy Reijntjens
1st

“The pressure on food production is growing. With the rising population in cities there is also a rising demand for food supplies. At this moment the European Union is depending on other countries for more than half of its need. And for those supplies we are fully depending on fossil fuels. It is even this shocking that 1 calorie of food on your plate requires the consumption of 10 calories of oil. These fuels are used for production, transport and distribution of the food.

When we run out of fossil fuels prices will rise, and with the more extreme weather conditions, due to climate change, there is also a possibility the harvest will fail. When this point is reached the urbanized areas will no longer be able to support themselves.

To make sure the city of the future is able to provide in its own needs it is necessary to change our future city’s from a consuming city to a producing city. The advantage of becoming a producing city is not only the independence we reach, but also the possibility to reduce emissions.

The problem for producing your own food in the city is space. At this moment there is not enough space to produce and feed all inhabitants of the city. There are already people who thought about building bigger vertical farms. But building a vertical farm will cost a lot of money, big building could have a big impact and we still have to think about new techniques to achieve it without using a lot of energy again, for example what to do with sunlight if we stack our crops? There are also other ideas about farms on rooftops, but will this be enough to replace intensive agriculture?

There are already ideas about producing food in the city, but how can we make sure there is enough food production to feed all the inhabitants, and how can we do it without using so much energy?”

Francisco Serrano, MLA, RLA
MLA RLA

“Marc, back in the years I was in grad school I was trying to develop an urban design concept of the checkerboard development (it was just an idea back in 85). I believe some urban schools try to develop it before. Consist of leaving large areas undeveloped with developed areas in between following the checkerboard pattern. (Something like Central Park, NY) Of course the morphography and topography of the natural elements will force the urbanists to reshape some of the squares to follow rivers, deltas, mountains, etc., but is a concept and needs to be developed.”
## Mobility and ICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burcu Coninx 1st Architectural Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;When was the last time you were together with a group of young people who owned smartphones and not a single moment was interrupted by checking their smartphone, sending texts, Googling some information, taking pictures, uploading videos and photos to Facebook, Instagram, or other social media? In this contemporary world, smartphones are playing an imperative role in people’s lives. A smartphone can keep people connected with the world at their fingertips. Millions of people around the world are carrying around smartphones that keep them constantly connected to the internet. People are very fond of smartphones due to the many advantages that they offer. One can have increased connectivity, immediate access to data and information; play games and do office work with this hand-held device. Smartphones are altering the world in a remarkable manner by becoming an essential commodity for young people and drastically providing options such as having a personal assistance that can help in almost all demands. Smartphones impact people in the way they communicate, function in their daily lives, operate and engage in problems. With huge powerful applications, smartphones allow their users to stay in touch with each other in their work and extend their social connection in many ways. Millions of people now rely on pocket-sized computers to shop, play, read, date, learn, work out, take photos, and find directions. Technology and society are very much interconnected in the 21st century. The cultural and social revolution, which is brought on by telecommunications and information technologies, is transforming the field of architecture. We are now living in a world which data spreads invisibly around the globe. Populations were connected to each other culturally, but now they can follow the dynamic movements of international capital investments. Like Foucault said “We do not live in a spatial void in which things and individuals can be placed, but instead we reside inside an ensemble of relations that define emplacement.” (Kavanaugh, 2010) Developing communication technologies has already brought new aspects and new concepts to architectural era, which already started to change how our cities look like. Internet shopping causes empty shops at the city centers while creating big storage buildings outside the center. Through internet banking the number of bank offices decreases. We can already work anywhere we want which changes the office concepts and at the end maybe we won’t need any office building at all. It is possible to get education online with the technology of now. Can we guarantee that we shall need a school building at all over 30 years? At this moment we are able to enrich the traffic and transportation by using cell phone data. How would a city look like if we would be using cars without a driver? Technology develops faster than that we can follow up, so do people. How can we oversee what the technology will bring in coming decades and make our cities ready to change? How can we make our cities flexible to be able to change? Who actually benefit from technology at this level? Businesses, governments or citizens? Where are the boundaries of allowing the technology in our lives? Is it possible to create models for 21st century urbanization that promote and allow a shift away from consumerism towards a more sustainable model of living? (e.g. sharing economy, smart cities, driverless cars etc?)&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co van Griensven 1st Stedenbouwkundige bij Gemeente Breda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is Technology the face of modern dictatorship? We are telling everybody to act in a sustainable way, our cities must be healthy, our food must be fair, our bodies must be perfect and nature must be respected. We are breathing sustainability and selling it at every corner of the street. (at least we think so), but in the meantime everybody nowadays have got an smartphone, iPad, laptop, flat screen and electric car. We buy more stuff&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than we need (the market isn’t even producing quality products in a sustainable way but is purely
focused on the consumption and market profit), we drive more cars than necessary and the food we
eat is actually not what we think it is.

Despite everybody know the facts, we are not changing anything. We produce, develop and create
to profit in an individual way and forget all the principles we maybe had. The technology is taking
over control.

But why is everybody so focused on technology and matter? Why do we think that a big television,
internet, telephones and ipad’s are the things that matter in live? Do we really need this new
technology and this innovative way of communication and social interaction? Marketing branches
make us believe we need computers and other technological stuff to function better, be more
practical, be connected and live more sustainable, but is it really true? All these devices need to be
produced need electricity and everybody on the whole planet wants it.

There are positive sides in a social way. We can communicate faster, more often and all over the
world. On the other hand we are getting depended on this technology, have no privacy, every step
you make can be followed, this technology uses no sustainable production methods, exploiting
people for economic purposes, people get high bills and unnecessary loans we can’t effort, people
getting older and older sow they need more food, energy and material and in this way there is more
and more waste to pollute the earth.

But what can we learn from the fact that technology does not improve our social skills but makes it
superficial, we want expensive loans, we exploit other people and the earth, we are not so durable,
we are giving up our privacy, we are depending on technology, getting more mental illness and
more individualistic act? Our lifestyles are changing as a result of technological developments. It is
inevitable and we have to deal whit it.

I find technological gadgets fascinating but I never want to be dependent on it. Who actually benefit
from technology at this level? Businesses, governments or citizens?

At the time technology (directed from companies or governments) will determine that we have no
more freedom to make our own choices, we no longer live in a democracy.

How can an urbanist cope with the knowledge that technology determines to be the way we live,
and this is going to play a bigger role in the development of our society? Where are the boundaries
of allowing the technology in our lives?


Irene Huijben 1st
B BE
*Various networks in growing cities

The more a city grows, the more important is a good working traffic network. The complexity of this
subject is in its diversity of aspects. It contains more aspects than many think. Everybody will think
of the car roads first. Just for its importance to citizens and growing statistics it is necessary to have
a good road network in a growing city.
Mobility by car is not the most environmentally friendly. Studies show that a good environment is fundamental for a good and healthy future. CO2 emissions should therefore be limited. The CO2 emissions of the individual car driver are loads higher than that of for instance public transport. As example: transportation by train delivers more than five times less environmental impact than the same distance by car. To have a more sustainable future it is therefore crucial to build a good public transport network not only in cities, but nationwide, worldwide to provide a sustainable way of transportation over larger distances.

An even more nature friendly traffic network for cities is it to have a great network for cycling and walking. This way of mobility has no CO2 emission and is therefore a very sustainable way of mobility. A supplementary advantage of an effective network for cycling and walking is that it is better for people’s health. Recent studies show that how walkable the city is, the less chance population has to get overweight. Inactivity turnout to be an even bigger influence on the weight of the population than diet. So, cities that stimulate human movement are better for their citizens’ health and are nature friendly. To make a good working cycle and walk network is an additional approach necessary. Just like the other network aspects they need roads, but they also need urban nodes with varied facilities at attainable distances in the entire city. This allows the opportunity for a city to be a walkable.

Another network that a growing city need is that of the supply of products, a lot of forgotten necessary network. From a certain city scale it cannot provide for itself. Also, many daily used products cannot be produced efficiently in each area. All of this makes that a ‘truck network’ becomes very important for the existence of a city. Without a supply network, for example the food supply of a city will a city not be sufficient.

By the growth of a city becomes the importance of good traffic network increasingly important. It should therefore be a main part in city planning.”

Robbert Lancel

“What influence will technology have on our future cities? And to be more specific, what influence will technological development have on transportation and the public space in our future cities?

Most likely the people of our future cities are used to driverless cars ferrying them about while drones are delivering their online orders to their homes. To me, personally, that sounds great. Driverless cars drone delivery and on-demand transportation of all sorts will open up a large amount of opportunities.

The positives of (shared) driverless cars and other forms of transportation range from an increasing sustainability (because of less intensive use of individual vehicles resulting in less CO2 emission) to greatly reduced traffic and driving fatalities. Nevertheless they also present challenges to our future cities.

For example, the first test vehicle for Uber’s self-driving car program has already been spotted driving around the streets of Pittsburgh covered in cameras and sensors, replacing human drivers with robots. The same goes up for major truck manufacturers, which are currently testing large

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Engine type</th>
<th>Horsepower</th>
<th>Mileage (city)</th>
<th>Mileage (highway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>2.0 L 4-cylinder</td>
<td>150 hp</td>
<td>25 MPG</td>
<td>30 MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model B</td>
<td>3.5 L V6</td>
<td>220 hp</td>
<td>19 MPG</td>
<td>24 MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model C</td>
<td>1.4 L turbo</td>
<td>140 hp</td>
<td>33 MPG</td>
<td>35 MPG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
driverless cargo trucks. A lot of people will be left behind when technological progress races ahead. What is going to happen to all of the people currently serving as driver? Will technology leave large numbers of people out of work in the nearby future, making them unable to participate in the global economy?

New transportation and delivery options may also create new design challenges in our future cities. As designers we will be faced with questions like what to do with empty parking garages and parking lots, needles street lanes, and unused on-street parking now traffic becomes more efficient?

Daan Steeghs 1st
Student MA+U / Intern at CroonenBuro5

“70% of all people live in cities by 2050. When our cities grow, people within the cities have to be mobilized. Since the cities not only grow in size but also in density, the mobilization within the city should be effective and efficient. Nowadays we hit commuter flow limits in transportation hubs, during peak hours. Can these transportation hubs keep up in growth and are there any limits for the size of the hubs?

Not only does hubs grow in size, but they also grow in numbers. This creates a big city network of public transport hubs. Yet, all these hubs, or stops don’t make commuting faster and more efficient. Trains and busses need to slow down more often, causing to lose energy and time.

Is there a better way to organize our mass transportation in metropolitan areas?”

Daan Steeghs 1st
Student MA+U / Intern at CroonenBuro5

“Last week I’ve read a news article about the South Korean City of Songdo. Not only is this newly built city planned according to all the best features from successful cities, but also according to new technology standards. Homes were equipped with sensors, garbage disposal systems and cameras for child safety. The city itself is equipped with several safety systems, and in the near future technology is going to solve several urban problems in this city.

I wonder if also everyday use technology is affecting the way we plan our cities. Smart fridges, cars, mailboxes, and wardrobes, name it and it could be smart. Smart cities can be very clean, effective and safe, but are they also social? How do we plan the cities of the future?”

Tom Billingham 1st
Landscape Architect at Billingham & Flygare AB

The recent rapid urbanization we have witnessed is a result of the global economic systems and technological advances that we have ourselves made, but is urbanization on this scale something that is actually good or bad? Is it something that we want to promote or impede? I think the answer to this question would inform how we develop our strategies for dealing and working with urbanization.”

One can argue that a global economic system based on ever-increasing consumption is not sustainable in a finite world. Is it possible to create models for 21st century urbanization that
**Fontys / INTA survey for Habitat III**

"10 disturbing Questions on urbanization in the 21st century."

*Draft v1, Marc Glaudemans, 16 July 2015*

| Promote and allow a shift away from consumerism towards a more sustainable model of living? (e.g. sharing economy, smart cities, driverless cars etc?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can we most effectively share and apply knowledge, technologies and skills for recycling, upcycling, pollution reduction/mitigation and green technologies etc in the planning, design, building and running of our urban environments?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lieke Van Den Heuvel 1st**

Stagiaire architectuur bij Provincie Noord-Brabant

"Although the government is advertising to the people in The Netherlands to use public transport there is a huge change happening in the accessibility of that public transport. Instead on investing in more busses, trains, metro etc, the providers are cutting back in transport options. In small villages there are already not too many options other than by car to transport to a bigger city. So they are really appointed to a local bus or their car. But with vanishing of their local bus the only option left (for longer distances) is by car.

This will expand the demand for road in certain parts of the country, while we actually want to cut back in the amount of cars in a city. And the government is supporting people to use the car by expanding the network of highways and providing more lanes. Some will take on the problem by themselves and move to the city, what we actually already see happening. By maintaining these options of public transport we do not disturb the small villages but bring them back to life and accessible.

1. Shouldn't we provide a better public infrastructure to help and maintain the beauty of how The Netherlands is arranged? 

http://www.omroepzeeland.nl/nieuws/2015-02-25/819851/tientallen-bushaltes-verdwijnen-zeeuwse-steden#.VWoEi8_tlBc

**Paul Roncken 1st**

landscape architect, researcher and teacher

"Hi Marc, as a landscape architect i would expect a need to post items on the green and sustainable items. But they already seem to have become fashionable and integrated, if i read the first comments. Therefore, I address two other disturbing notions: (1) the danger of cycling fast as a means of transportation; (2) the lack of metabolism technologies, eg landscape urbanism infrastructures, to upcycle waste, water and warmth. I can provide references later if you are interested. We develop good thesis examples at Wageningen University."

paulroncken.com and landscapemachines.com

**Christopher J. Kok 2nd**

Project Manager at Topology

“What jobs will be available for people two decades from now if technology continues its advancement?”

**Harald Brynlund-Lima**

1. It is disturbing that the inhabitants in greatest need of proper surroundings, do not get it. Senior citizens and kids often do not have any influence on the urban surroundings, but if they have it will benefit everyone. I see seniors and kids as "urban agents", as proponents for a "soft urbanism".
1. It is disturbing that the politicians are not brave and dare to tackle the issue of parking. Why does every housing unit need 1 parking place? Why does every business need parking spaces? In some cities we see differentiated approaches like carpools, carpool membership included in rent, restricted parking only for EVs. More of this, more of proper urban governing concerning parked cars (often they are unused for 23 of 24 hours..)
Anton Van Hooft 1st Directie van Hooft architecten

"Globally there is an increasing general sense of concern that is triggered by the misery and suffering in the world. I am not referring to hunger or natural disasters or pollution but to the increase of religious extremism. Everyone knows about the acts of cruelty committed by extremist groups such as Al Qaeda and Isis. These extremist groups maintain certain ideological ideas regarding the West, non-believers and the Jihad. The ideology of this small group of extremists stigmatises the whole religious group that is increasingly and often wrongfully considered to be dangerous by others. This is a growing social and global problem. This small group of extremists commits extreme acts of cruelty that are completely beyond comprehension in order to create a climate of fear and uncertainty. The fear that is propagated can have an enormous impact on the lives of populations that feel threatened by these extremists. The effects of the influence of these extremists can already be seen in society. People who feel threatened move to safer parts of the city so that other parts of the city deteriorate. Or people become afraid to go out at night in certain parts of the city. These are current problems cities have to deal with.

How to deal with religious extremism in relation to future urbanism?
Is there a need for a city to be divided into areas where religious groups or populations get to live in distinct sub areas?
Is it easier to control the distribution of religious groups or populations in a city?"

李柏 2nd architect intern - VenhoevenCS architecture+urbanism

"Nowadays strategies innovation project is becoming very hot in Europe. As Joachim Declerck describe in the lecture that Architects’ role are changing. Architects become an actor between governments, clients and society. It is a trend that if architect want stay in the meeting table for a longer time, then they have to take part in many different process before design.

But it was my question in the lecture that: what should architect expect in this kind of “self-build” project.
As my experience that, these type of work start with discussion and definition of design problem. It may be will lead an pre sketch research so to say second phase; then will be discussion again; further research …… many office or designer end up with a booklet (for sure that, an architecture research do not have to lead an actual project), then investor come in, design start …. God help to realize It and keep the original idea but most of them turn into a normal commercial project.

“Self-build” project do not sounds as wonderful as it actually Is, it more sounds like A NEW WAY TO FIND PROJECT. Designer’s passion and society responsibility sounds only showing in the presentation and to clients.

But is this kind of “self-build” project will be the future of architecture? Or it is just a fact in the process of architecture evolution? Or it is a hint of new time will coming because Europe architecture field suffering similar time compare with Japanese post wartime?

With my own experience as a student and an intern in practice, I keep very much doubting about this type of motivation architecture project. But I also noticed that architect’s role is changing, if this way is not right after try out, then what is another way?"

Sebastiaan Blommestijn 2nd Internship bij Barcode Architects

"The continuous expectation of growth as the only way for future development and evolution of our urban landscape and society can/must be put into question. The foreknowledge of general population growth is clear, however, growth is still the only common assumption on which city development is based. The idea of non-growth/stagnation or even decline has not yet reached the