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The INTA34 World Urban Development Congress

INTA 34 was a magnificent Congress. We are grateful to Gipuzkoa Aurrera and the many sponsors and authorities who hosted us, to the numerous participants who joined us from more than 40 countries worldwide, to the animators and speakers who were willing to share their stories, to the Scientific Committee and the reporters, to the many volunteers who contributed to the smooth organization of the event and the successful reporting, through writing, filming and blogging.

Rethinking the Urban Region is not an easy task. We need to come together during events like these to share our successes and difficulties, to find inspiration in the work of others, to fully reveal the potentials of our urban territories.

Territory is the physical space in which we operate and seek to manage. But increasingly we live in a virtual world with the cell phone as our third hand giving us global connectivity and accessibility. Can we, as urban practitioners manage this interaction? How will individual lifestyle activities and patterns impact on what has been a collective approach to planning?

Are these shifts creating new vulnerability? How can we improve the quality of life in rural areas, connected to urban regions?

Our approach has evolved from cities to city regions, to clusters of cities. Now we must go further and envisage metropolitan areas that include the whole ecosystem, within which we foster collaboration at a range of levels and seek internal cohesion and external connections. Each problem has its own level and scale.

We must also rethink our priorities. People and better quality of life remain at the core of all our effort with technology as a means to that end. We seek social cohesion and respect identity. We aim to prosper the economy, protect the environment and provide social wellbeing.

Finally, another word of thanks to the City of Donostia-San Sebastian for hosting this Congress. What a perfect city for an urban Congress!

INTA President, Budiarsa Sastrawinata
WORLD URBAN DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL – THE FUTURE OF METROPOLIS

The third session of the World Urban Development Council (WUDC) focused its debate on the implicit questions raised in the Congress of INTA in San Sebastian about the Future of Metropolitan development.

Can we effectively consider the Future of the Metropolis and develop the vision of a large and coherent territory without first asking by which social tools and with what means this vision can be achieved? Are regional cities of sufficient size to provide the diversity called for by the new economy, and the full range of functions (port, airport, labour market, financial services, education, diverse places of production, housing market, etc.) and geographic settings that will curb delocalization?

How could metropolitan development lead to a new form of sustainable development without reducing it to green construction, symbolic planning gestures, or resorting to an anti-consumerist, growth economy?

Is the conceptual breakthrough restricted only to ensure a more integrated and inclusive urban investment with a significant impact on the territory and its inhabitants? In the context of economic crisis, how do we respond to specific local concerns about structuring investment: housing, employment, transmission of knowledge and personal fulfillment? If citizens have a "desire for decision" should technological solutions be individual or universal?

Maybe the crisis is not of production of the city but rather of the redistribution of the surpluses that are generated? The paradox is that so far we have lived the growth momentum but not yet the real city; in a context of slower growth how will we live in the city? Are we looking to plan by usage or do we go back to the basics of urban development: proximity, natural cycles, geography, climate, soil and underground, short circuits, etc.? Is the identity of a city as much the history of its past as the history where its people project themselves?

How do we put into perspective the future relationship between infrastructure and territory, when it is apparent that traditional hard infrastructure alone is not creating social links and is poorly adapted to the new mobile society? The pressure of technological innovation accelerates changes and shortens time to adapt. "The inertia of immediacy" gradually clears urban memory and without memory the future will not exist.

The answer cannot come from one side alone; to be precise the future of cities is too serious to be left only to architects and planners. INTA is uniquely positioned with the creativity and strength to bring together all urban stakeholders, including representatives of the people, to develop a multi-dimensional vision of the future city and territory.

The INTA34 Congress challenges public and private actors engaged in the "production" of the city, to see how political and technical leaders can take advantage of the existing territorial situation to imagine it otherwise, to renew and reshape it, to remodel and adapt it to a new collective vision. Presentations and discussions in the WUDC explored the mutability of cities for better livability in response to the wishes and needs of the people. In short, rethinking an urban development of movement, mutability, and metamorphosis.
INTA 34 WORLD CONGRESS: RETHINKING YOUR URBAN REGION

RENEWING OUR URBAN VISION – REINVENTING AN URBAN TERRITORY
As we face the challenge of accelerating change we find that classic urban models no longer apply. Our actions cannot be based on yesterday’s references.

Rethinking territory
Territory is the physical space in which we operate and seek to manage. But increasingly we live in a virtual world with “the cell phone as our third hand” giving us global connectivity and accessibility. Can we manage this interaction?

New technology – new opportunities, new challenges
Instantaneous communication and global connectivity result in increasingly informed individual behaviour. This is changing the city, its patterns and its infrastructure. Direct access to online services such as healthcare can transform service delivery.

How will individual lifestyle activities and patterns impact on what has been a collective approach to planning?

Technology now enables real time information on how cities, buildings and citizens are performing. Our planning and management can be based on continuous post occupancy feedback, which enables us to model, simulate and measure activity and performance. Thoughtful cities are emerging where even plants can send a message when they need watered. Have we grasped the breakthrough this offers?

Workshop 1 (Workspace urbanism / Intensifying urban environment around technology: New patterns of production space. Interactions between industry, logistic, urban services, innovation & territory.) was focused on different strategies for the integration of production centres (mainly software industry) in city centres. All the projects presented were founded on a new design of production and work facilities as spaces of activity, exchange and socio-cultural encounter. They represented urban scenarios that are diametrically opposed to the fashion of “Corporate Cities” that proliferate in the outskirts of many cities. These projects were raised as urban revitalizers cleverly integrated into the city and not autistic parts anchored to large road infrastructures.

The workshop addressed the ability of architecture to absorb the multitude of uses through its flexible nature. “Why not measure architecture in light meter or circular meters rather than in square meters?” Beyond the literal sense of these issues, is the need to subvert the basic principles of architecture and urban planning (reflected in its rigid rules), so that it is able to respond effectively to the needs of a changing society.
We can conclude that these new models of production, to which the title of the workshop is referring, are conditioned mainly by the level of technological sophistication of industries and their incorporation into city centres must be accompanied by strategies that qualitatively affect the socio-cultural aspects of the persistent tissues in which they are inserted. We can no longer think of mono-functional production models but we must begin to develop new types of labour and production organization that is able to respond comprehensively and encourage some protocols in the constantly changing human relations.

The many discussions on innovative infrastructures and networks showed us the duality between the intellectual lobbying of large industrial groups (Cisco, Siemens, Arup, GDF-Suez, Eiffage, General Electric, IBM…) and the growing conservatism of the traditional stakeholders of urban development. It was stressed that these new technologies and innovative developments through virtual and physical infrastructures are no longer restricted to developed countries. An important vector of development will associate more with the citizens through participatory processes in planning.

Workshop 4 stressed the issues of urban innovation on infrastructure and networks (Innovative infrastructure for competitive Urban Region. Networks for mobility, goods and services). New metaphors of the city are used (complex city, resilient city, ecocity, vibrant city, compact city, intense city, city 3.0, low cost city, city as living lab…) and show the evolution of the city. From delivering security to managing sedentariness (living) and mobility (access/use), there is a growing need for pedagogy of city (“affordable modernization”, GE). Innovative infrastructures and networks embrace different layers (social, economical, technical, political…) and is still a controversial topic: social dimension vs. ICTs, additional component vs. integrated point of view, low tech vs. high tech, and social vs. technical. The topic of economic of urban innovation has been raised, debating on old and new scenarios (circular economy / function based oriented business model). New competences were emphasized to provide innovative networks: citizen’s proposals as the third party and engineering firms, more generally, showing the importance of enlarging the range of tools (phosphore labs, smart works and community centres, knowledge hubs…)

Rethinking governance, promoting inclusion

Our approach has evolved from cities to city regions, to clusters of cities. Now we must go further and envisage metropolitan ‘areas’ that include the whole ecosystem, within which we foster collaboration at a range of levels and seek internal cohesion and external connections. Each problem has its own level and scale. Through governance we can generate and allocate wealth and achieve leverage.

Workshop 2 (Thinking the Urban Region across scales. Different understanding of stakeholders in developing a metropolitan region), provided the opportunity to debate extensively about the
governance of complex territories. The discussion highlighted the different perspectives of stakeholders on the development of the metropolitan region.

Once again, citizen participation was emphasized as key to the transformation of the territory. Citizens must be involved actively in the process of building a city. With more global action, resources are optimized for the benefit of the whole region. Models of public-private partnerships are funding schemes to promote. The government should properly combine the private interests and the citizens’ ones for the common good. The long-term projects are the means to resolve structural weaknesses. They must maintain its continuity besides the electoral changes and other social phenomena.

It is necessary to establish smooth communication between politicians and citizens to achieve the objectives and maximize the benefits of technical projects implemented for the development of the urban region.

Generating and allocating wealth and achieving leverage. Innovation in the social domain implies:
- identifying need
- using soft technology to address social need
- mobilise stakeholders

| Encourage cooperation rather than centralised control |
| Create networks of collaboration and sharing that address gaps |
| Both city wide leadership and local neighborhood participation |
| Issue: Cities for people or with people? How to balance top down and bottom up? |

Rethinking people and places
People, spaces, buildings …… in that order please!

Lively, attractive, safe, healthy, sustainable places.
Creating new spaces that provide the setting for creativity and talent.
Base transport strategies on prioritizing modes rather than balancing them.
Instantaneous communication and global connectivity resulting in increasingly informed individual behaviour is changing the city, service delivery and infrastructure.
‘Thoughtful buildings and places’ – real time information enables constant monitoring of performance and automatic response management.
Mobilise your local resources and people as a priority.
Issues: How will increasingly informed individual lifestyle activities and patterns impact on what has been a collective approach to urban planning?
Are we grasping the opportunity of technology that even lets plants tells us when they need watered and buildings when they need maintained?

Workshop 3 (Social visions of the Urban Region: identity, heritage, branding, and quality of life.) raised issues on how to develop a social vision for the territories. The urban practitioners involved in the regeneration of urban areas through an heritage approach stressed two different types of intervention: ones that focus on the participation process for regeneration, and the ones that focus on the technical procedures. The debate around the participation process was central and reinforced the importance of the role of the citizen.

A second stream of discussion was the necessity to integrate
economic efficiency policies and social justice objectives. How to obtain a fair city (social justice) as well (and not antagonizing) a global city (economic efficiency)? There is a need to coordinate ‘complementarity’ and ‘competitivity’.

When talking about people and places, heritage can have a major role. The main conclusions on the social vision of the territory using heritage, branding and identity as assets for urban development in a global and regional competition were:

1. Heritage conservation and redevelopment is the result of a balanced process that starts with the dialogue between all stakeholders (including public and private experts and citizens) creating a shared responsibility towards a common goal.

2. Heritage conservation and redevelopment starts from the basic assumption that cities are cultural products and vital living places that need to permanently adapt to changing social, economic, environmental and technological requirements.

3. Preserving buildings and city quarters should contribute to an even distribution of a variety of programs and services in order to achieve a "fair city" for citizens.

4. With increasing global competition we see that identity will be a key component in successful development and branding strategies of cities.

5. Identity is a concept that entails the material and the immaterial, relates to the uniqueness of place and region and the collective willingness of communities as a driver for sustainable urban planning.

Rethinking our priorities
People and the provision of a better quality of life remain at the core of all our effort with technology as a means to that end. We seek social cohesion and respect identity. We aim to prosper (the economy), protect (the environment) and provide (social welfare).

The Challenge of Change
Driven by Change? Reacting after the event; Clinging to traditional; Compartmentalised; Inefficient; Fragmented; Becoming peripheral; Uncompetitive; Divided; Independent actions;

Driving transformation? Anticipating trends; Innovative; Integrated; Maximising assets; Identifying synergies; Connected; Entrepreneurial; Inclusive; Partnership working;

Rethinking our mindset
We must continuously adapt. When we shape change we achieve transformation.

Be visionary ....... positive ....... proactive
Pessimism is a mood, optimism is a question of will
Believe a further shore is reachable from here.
If I were to wish for anything, I should not wish for wealth and power, but for the passionate sense of the potential, for the eye which, ever young and ardent, sees the possible.
And what wine is so sparkling, what so fragrant, what so intoxicating, as possibility!
INTA Objective 2030

- Which future for sustainable urban development?
- Fresh perspective on drivers for change
- Rethinking the urban development process
- Encouraging integrated thinking and delivery
- Designing effective policies
- Improving governance
- Extensive use of technological innovation
- Investing in knowledge based functions
- Prioritising social inclusion

Join us as we continue to rethink a coherent framework for policy and delivery