



International Society of City and Regional Planners (Isocarp)
Regional Workshop, London 6-8 June 2013

ISOCARP PLANNERS' EXCHANGE WORKSHOP REGENERATING CITIES FROM WITHIN - IN TIMES OF SCARCITY

Collaborative overview by Judith Ryser (Isocarp UK Head of Delegation), Nicole Wirz, Fabiola Cedillo, Helena Heyning, Martina Juvara, and Hugh Crawford

Background

The initiative to organise regional Isocarp planners' exchanges emerged from the discussion about the future of Isocarp (International Society of City and Regional Planners) in Munich, organised by the German national delegation in April 2013. The participants felt that annual congresses had grown increasingly large. As becomes a global Society, they were held in all parts of the world, albeit not easily accessible for everybody. Out of necessity the themes of these global congresses were very broad. There was thus a need for complementary smaller face to face exchanges focusing on themes of particular relevance to smaller regions.

The idea of local Isocarp events is not new. Even during the early times when Isocarp was less global, seminars were organised locally in preparation of the annual congresses at which the forthcoming theme was explored from more specific local points of view. This provided a rich mosaic of contributions to the congresses, besides presentations of individual experiences and more theoretical reflections. The UK delegation followed these wishes, thereby also contributing to the aim proposed during the deliberations on Isocarp's longer term viability, that members of Isocarp should get more directly involved in generating and running its activities.

The proposal of the UK delegation to organise a first Isocarp planners' exchange workshop in London was received with enthusiasm. Possible themes were explored with other Isocarp members in Europe and it was agreed to focus on 'Regenerating cities from within – in times of scarcity', a major preoccupation of planners in that region. The intention was to make this event as accessible as possible. For that reason, the local organisers (Judith Ryser - head of UK delegation, Martina Juvara and Fabiola Cedillo) were keen to make it free through their contributions in kind. To their surprise, Isocarp members from further afield – Brazil, the Middle East, Africa and the United States wished to join the event. The participation of some forty planners during the three day event was a very rewarding outcome. Those present expressed great satisfaction with this interactive format and the size of the group as it enabled everyone to actively intervene in the debates and share their experiences.



This workshop reinforced one of the key values of Isocarp. Unlike other international planning organisations, Isocarp consists essentially of individual members who constitute its prime resource. Nothing can replace creating and sharing knowledge at face-to-face encounters as they strengthen a sense of belonging and nurture personal friendships among professionals who are facing great challenges of city and regional planning. The organisers are encouraged by the wish of other delegations to continue this initiative with future Isocarp planners' exchange workshops, the next being in Basle in October 2013, with a further one planned in Scotland in spring 2014. The discussion about Isocarp's future will also continue at these workshops and outcomes will be shared with the broader membership at congresses and on the Isocarp website. Finally, there is a will to build up a knowledge base from these workshops. A modest start is this short overview of the main substantive discussion which is being disseminated throughout Isocarp. A more ambitious goal is to produce a fuller account of these planning exchanges which will include presentations of the experiences brought to the workshop by its participants.

The workshop was divided into three working groups which dealt respectively with:

- *Icon architecture and regeneration outcome in times of scarcity*
- *Infrastructure investment in cities with growth problems and under pressure to compete*
- *The role of heritage in supporting growth and regeneration in European cities in times of austerity*

The organisers invited three speakers to introduce these themes with the concrete projects they are carrying out in London, and who participated actively in the workshop discussion:

- *Urban regeneration, the bigger picture, dealing with large sites and long term timeframes*

by Kathryn Firth, Chief of Design at London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), about the Olympic park development legacy

- *Regenerating and reorganising urban transport interchanges*

by Declan McCafferty, partner of Grimshaw Partnership, about London Bridge station regeneration and long term fate of Waterloo Eurostar terminal

- *Renewing and densifying cities, the role and production of landmarks*

William Matthews, project architect of the Shard, Renzo Piano office.

Finally, the workshop had organised commented visits: a tour of the Olympic park and a walk along the South Bank from London Bridge to Westminster.

Working Group on Icon Architecture and Regeneration in Times of Scarcity

by Fabiola Cedillo (UK) and Nicole Wirz



Introduction

Iconic architecture is defined in terms of fame and special symbolic/aesthetic significance as applied to buildings, spaces and in some cases to architects themselves.

- Iconic architecture plays a key role in urban regeneration. Introducing the topic some key questions were raised:

- Does urban regeneration in practice achieve improvements by implementing iconic architecture?

Whom does iconic architecture serve in the longer term and in the short term? The citizens or the politicians?

- Is iconic architecture a measure to attract inward investment or to generate profits for the development industry?

- What is the value of Icon Architecture for the city? Is it the right measure to enhance the quality of work-live-play in the city?

- Is iconic Architecture a measure to put the city on the international, competitive map or up the global rank order (city marketing)?

Issues and opportunities of iconic architecture (IA)

The conclusion of the round table discussion is summarised with these issues:

- IA plays a large role in helping achieve political and economic agendas resulting in speculation and gentrification, so it becomes key to integrating a spatial plan that guarantees cross-cutting strategies for a wider area.

- IA often competes with previous IA, resulting in endless economic competition through labelling and marketing strategies, and in becoming another product of a global investment pattern that leads to gentrification.

- The use of famous architecture in IA is often considered a quick win which may lead to not working through the real issues either from the architectural or planning perspective.

- IA interventions must consider strategies to incorporate institutional challenges that come with engaging with a range of stakeholders necessary in weaving together regeneration processes.

IA has become increasingly overused as the tool for regenerating any city and everywhere within a city. It is becoming increasingly important to refocus on delivering good projects that address local issues thoroughly, allowing the production of iconic value to rise randomly through time. Conventional IA typologies have focused on the consumer society by creating consumption oriented spaces mainly for sport and leisure industries. Can we look at other typologies of IA that can rescue the productive component and help move in the direction in which our society should be heading?

IA plays a large role in creating and promoting symbolism to strengthen identities in a given location. Also, at points where identities from different nations converge IA can



play a role in promoting regional planning and urban development strategies across these nations. However, there is a risk of polarising existing differences (large or small) or creating new ones.

IA can play a role in creating sociability, not only through the building but also through its immediate surroundings through a rippling effect into the rest of the city context. In such a case, IA has the power to create places and to modify the structure of the city. We need to find ways in which IA increasingly creates sociability and consequently place-energy.

IA plays a large role in regenerating waterfronts, large sites for massive events and strategic points such as major transportation hubs in city centres, albeit often at the cost of a slow gentrification process. Therefore, there is a need to integrate IA with regeneration objectives that may create sustainable and inclusive opportunities around and beyond IA. IA plays an equally important role in delivering small scale buildings, not only large ones.

In terms of regenerating the wider area through IA interventions there are both successful and unsuccessful precedents. There are examples of buildings that were not designed as icons but resulted in the production of iconic value, and others that were designed to deliver iconic value but were not successful. Unplanned success, nevertheless, has shown the power of unplanned activities, such as becoming attached to a building, in building iconic value. Unsuccessful stories also show the need to identify and integrate unplanned activities with the creation of new places around them to benefit their wider context in order to regenerate intended iconic value or recognise the creation of a new unintended iconic value.

In the last decades - the period of globalisation - the emphasis in the world's top ranked cities has been on iconic buildings and static public spaces. Being composed in an "International Style" iconic architecture is mostly not contextualised in the sense of genius loci. These global icons of architecture and design are judged by critics as objects and interventions in space. Besides this, iconic architecture strives to turn more or less public space into a functional space for consumption, not only in the obvious case of shopping malls but more generally in all cultural spaces, notably museums and sports complexes. However, inspiring iconic architecture in combination with a built environment which serves mainly the citizens, may create genuinely democratic public spaces. In this way, the built environment and iconic architecture create inspiring human places where meaningful social interactions can occur.

Working Groups on Infrastructure Investment in Cities with Growth Problems and Under Pressure to Compete

by Helena Heyning



Introduction

Kathryn Firth's keynote dealing with the Olympic Park development legacy in London¹ and more specifically the investments in its infrastructure, was a perfect kick off for this discussion. The experience of London was compared with those of other well known Olympic venues like Barcelona and Athens, as well as Genoa in terms of regenerating a dilapidated neighbourhood close to the inner city. A few more cities weighed down by the heavy economic recession were passed in review as the participants of the working group came from various countries and diverse cities.

Regeneration related to Olympic games

The Olympic games related objective - regeneration of a region/district thanks to large public money as a catalyst of the process - gave way to a discussion that centred on questions such as: 'seize the opportunity'; 'what problems can be solved'; 'is a vision needed'; and 'who pays what'?

In particular, is this kind of event a window of opportunity in an economically weak period or even during recession? Is it an instrument to install proper - much needed - infrastructure within a short period of time, dictated by the deadlines of the Olympic games)?

What makes such regeneration a success:

- the vision of the public sector i.e. the public sector 'pushing', followed by private sector delivering;
- the vision of the private sector 'pushing', followed by public delivery;
- or both (public-public and private-private cooperation)?

Who benefits:

- the city itself (the venue of the Games), the borough(s) concerned, the region and/or the country, private developers, citizens?

Triggers and obstacles of regeneration

Other questions explored 'planning strategies' coupled with Olympic Games, but also in relation to 'normal' situations of urban renewal.

Several projects and their successes (or failures) were quoted. The key characteristics were:

- an all-embracing/comprehensive approach: for example, Athens tried to regenerate the whole city by means of the Games; this amounted to a huge effort with enormous (negative) financial consequences in investments as well as maintenance costs;
- a piecemeal approach coupled with 'salami slicing tactics': this consists of rolling out large numbers of interconnected projects, as soon as the budget became available;
- an acupuncture approach which proved to be very successful in Genoa, but also in cities without the catalyst of Olympic games, such as Bilbao² triggered by the



Guggenheim museum, and Amsterdam⁴ where large stretches of brown field sites from disused ports were developed along the IJ river bank.

In the cases of Genoa, Bilbao and Amsterdam the municipalities had a vision or a master plan, but they lacked the money for overall implementation. They invested in a few small dispersed projects instead. often 'iconic', with adjoining accessibility or public realm. This generated confidence in the area, and private developers and citizens followed, slowly but surely followed, who invested in, and/or delivered projects and cashed in the added value.

The High Line in Manhattan New York was mentioned as a typical acupunctural approach. Note that it came into being with 100% private investment & maintenance. It triggered an unforeseen and unprecedented multiplier effect in the neighbouring districts, consisting of regeneration of premises by private enterprise and revitalisation of streets by the municipality, new restaurants etc. A piecemeal approach and, in particular, an acupunctural strategy need time – so preferably they are initiated without deadlines.

Planning tools

Following Declan McCafferty's keynote address about the regeneration of 'London Bridge Station' the discussion focused again on the physical topic of infrastructure with emphasis on:

- planning tools: type of instruments, tariffs, negotiation;
- EU funding;
- TOD (Transit Oriented Development); and TDR (Transferable Development Rights) practised in the USA
- energy.

The planning tools mentioned were an eye-opener, especially the variety of fiscal and planning systems in the various countries and their positive and negative repercussions for boroughs, cities and regions. In most countries, developments have to comply with a vision or a master plan etc. This appeared like a universal condition. sine qua non. However, the interweaving of private and public investments and their benefits differed widely.

Impacts of regeneration strategies

It was understood that in the UK (based on the case of the regeneration of London Bridge Station) benefits of added value accrue to the borough(s) where the development takes place, for example through new workplaces, contributions to the local economy, or sometimes land sales, etc. It has to be noted that much brown site regeneration land had belonged to public sector utilities (such as the nationalised railways in the case of London Bridge Station), which were privatised, together with their land holdings. The effect of such punctual regeneration projects could mean



little development in other London boroughs, regions and cities. Thus many poorer regions are weighed down by decline, i.e. decreasing populations, employment, local economy etc., or overall lack of development. At best, they benefit from some redistribution embedded in an overall development programme, or, alternatively, from 'little pockets of fresh 'energy', such as museums, music festivals, etc. For them, EU funding seems worth considering, if not imperative.

It follows that in a mono-centric country there is a strong risk that only the main or big cities are attracting all major developments in one way or another, and thus becoming a 'big drain' on the smaller cities. An example is the TGV effect between Paris and Lyon contrary to what was forecast. In polycentric Netherlands the municipalities and private developers cash in most of the benefits (and losses!) of spatial developments on their territory. However, the main part of the municipal budget comes from central government which distributes national tax revenues between regions (provinces) and municipalities, treating the richer and poorer (shrinking economy, population etc.) regions and municipalities more or less alike. Clearly an unofficial national policy is now in progress which consists of investing more in infrastructure of the growing large cities in the western part of the Netherlands than in the shrinking peripheral parts, under the pretext of 'why should we go against the trend' (akin to London?), or 'what is the added value of a new road in a peripheral region'?

During economic recession, major infrastructure projects for which there is less demand and fewer resources are available may not guarantee expected growth and added value. Nevertheless, 'content' programmes, usually driven by high end retail, employment, housing, recreation, community facilities and tourism continue to contribute to 'place making' and, in the case of the Shard, are expected to enhance the image of London as a city of 'opportunities and a centre of growth'.

Conclusions

- The most successful planning strategies are 'made to measure'. They are specific in rising to the occasion and therefore not easily repeated or copied elsewhere;
- Underlying (municipal) visions make provisions for adding development, and room for improvement and interpretation by the private sector;
- A facilitating administration/government is an asset (Civic economy, Big Society, etc.).

This 'hardware' was quickly followed by 'software', i.e. socio-psychological and political aspects,⁵ as well as policy. The following criteria were mentioned to be of utmost importance in boosting development and assisting the economy to recover from recession:

- Self confidence and a 'can do' attitude;
- Role of leadership and vision;⁶



- Aspects of 'urgency' and 'focus': matching problems, time and solutions in a fragile situation;
- Message 'framing': how to get the public energised;
- Scale: 'at what level to create real place'.

The interdependence of these issues seems to bring forth a coherent triangle or trinity:

'big event', 'key figure' (strong person or group of persons), and (enabling) 'context'.

Working Group on the Role of Heritage in Supporting Growth and Regeneration in European Cities in Times of Austerity

by Hugh Crawford

Introduction

The Heritage Group focussed their discussions on the means and mechanisms which can be employed in regeneration of the urban fabric of town and cities, and in economic stimulation of communities through improvement of their natural and built environment.

The members of the group drew on their experiences in Philadelphia, London and Edinburgh where the value of heritage has been identified, recovered and promoted. The common factor in these separate projects was the fact that the heritage was there to be brought into beneficial use, to the improvement of physical and economic conditions producing great environmental and cultural benefit and community wellbeing.

Philadelphia Heritage Navy Yard

Philadelphia has the Independence National Park, run by the national government. It is a site which goes back to the early 1700s, and now has World Heritage status. It is the birthplace of the nation, rich in historic assets to use in the economic development and regeneration of an area. In the promotion of an area as a heritage asset, politicians may have competing demands and fall into legal conflict in the use of the land. The American Constitution proclaims Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness, but says nothing about Heritage. Fortunately heritage is now supported by legislation, and applies to building interiors as well as external fabric.

In a case study in Pennsylvania, arising from the recognition of the value of heritage, there is land in the State, which, three hundred years ago, was virgin forest. With the passage of time and industry, that has now gone, leaving a redundant system of canals which formerly provided for the passage of coal and wood, also served local communities. Where these were left untouched by subsequent development, that



area became the key asset of the heritage area which became the Schugkill Highlands Heritage Area.

A modern tourist attraction was created based on that natural and industrial heritage. Management and development had to be carefully aligned to avoid the destruction of the asset with inappropriate development. An old factory building had to be brought back into suitable use and further development had to conform with a list of preferred uses. A three year analysis was carried out to monitor the economic health of this heritage and community revival, and to ensure it went forward to a sustainable future, even with a new venue for the Philadelphia Festival.

London Kings' Cross

In the case study in London, based on the railway land and community associated with Kings Cross Station, there were local concerns about the social and cultural heritage of the area when the land was identified by a developer as having scope for change. There was a danger that the heritage was being set aside, and the local community, where lives and wellbeing were being disregarded did not want an office city imposed upon them. They formed the Kings Cross Railway Lands Group to oppose the destruction of their community and their heritage.

An alternative plan was prepared for the redevelopment and regeneration of their community. They brought in expertise from UCL (University College London) and an alternative development plan was prepared. That was backed up by community workshops, sound methodology and participation by local residents.

The outcome was that the community defending its heritage, lost out to the economics of development value. Much of the heritage was lost, but some of the older buildings from the 19th century are still there. An existing gasworks and canal have been incorporated into the new development, in an attractive landscape. Streets of housing have been lost and a new town created within the town. Over a twenty year period, the overwhelming weight of land value overrode everything else, including the community's wishes to retain and conserve what was there.

The outcome for the communities, on the former railway land is a mismatch between the present day inhabitants, who have moved into the area and the heritage of that community. They have no sense of the heritage and are not interested in the historic fabric. As immigrants, they are understandably more concerned about having a place to live and work.

London Olympic Park

Within the context of the London Olympic Games site, the issues of heritage, land recovery, economic benefit and a forward plan, were demonstrated by the work carried out, to take a severely debased river valley back from the edge of complete



despoilment. The work carried out associated with the Games, recovered the natural features of a valley corridor with its river, ponds and green spaces. A warehouse has been recovered and brought into beneficial use. The Olympic Park in its own right is now an important heritage feature.

Edinburgh Old Town

The Edinburgh example is the identification and recovery of the social, cultural and built environment of the Old Town. The period of the second half of the 19th century saw the further development of the classical New Town of Edinburgh and increased migration of population from the historic core. This left the social and economic substance of the Old Town greatly depleted with a consequent decay and loss of fabric of the old medieval centre. The central, east west axis of the High Street, stretching from the Castle to Holyrood gives access to the closes which run north to south. Over the centuries, these had been grossly over-developed, restrained by the physical boundaries of the city. They were unsanitary and unhealthy. Something had to be done - but not their indiscriminate destruction.

Patrick Geddes and others of his time saw the need to preserve the history and charm of the ancient town centre even while demolition was taking place. The value of the heritage of the Old Town was encapsulated in a statement by J Bruce Home, an artist and illustrator of the time, when he wrote:

“The City has suffered from the reckless and senseless destruction which, in comparatively recent years, has obliterated those relics of former ages which - did our townsmen only realise it - constitute one of our most valuable assets, not only on a higher plane of aesthetic and historic worth, but even on the commonplace ground of the value of our antiquities as mercantile investments. Only when our “own romantic town” has been completely stripped of its historic and traditional memorials, and has become commonplace, shall we begin to appreciate the direct loss of income, resulting from the diminution or cessation of the concourse of strangers at present attracted by just those features which we are recklessly and irrevocably throwing away.

The process of destruction was arrested, and care taken to preserve buildings and closes of note. The heritage value of the ancient capital was identified, saved, enhanced and now cherished.

Round-up Discussion on the Three Sub-Themes and Outlook

by Judith Ryser



Introduction

The ‘Planners’ exchange’ concluded with a general discussion on ‘regenerating cities from within – in times of scarcity’, based on highlights presented by the three working groups with additional contributions from various participants.

Overall, major infrastructure projects appeared to symbolise economic and population growth, while declining regions and cities tended to experience stagnation as negative change which they had to redress. However, when economic recession extended globally, major infrastructure projects were no longer able to guarantee growth and value added owing to declining demand for infrastructure related development on industrial sites, as well as green field sites for housing, despite existing and continuous housing shortage in many cities.

Nevertheless, in growing cities like London, development programmes continue to leverage and/or contribute to financing (transport) infrastructure improvements and claim to be place-making by providing new, often high end amenities, such as luxury hotels and residential premises, or retail, office space and tourism facilities. The ‘Shard’ is a typical example of such development driven by global inward investment on central sites and privatised public land. Supported by the mayor of London and central government, such development is intended to enhance the image of London as a ‘city of opportunity and centre of growth’. This was contrasted with the transformation of an existing traditional icon, Philadelphia’s history navy yard which became an example of general economic leverage for the city attracting employment and manufacturing, especially in the field of alternative renewable energy. There, instead of mobilising global capital, the task of urban management consisted of re-evaluating the existing city and fostering place-making initiatives which were able to produced city-wide added value.

Working group on “Infrastructure investment in cities with growth problems and under pressure to compete”

Four main issues arose:

- Is the role of infrastructure in economic crisis to follow or to lead as an engine of recovery?
- While infrastructure is essential for urban life can it be used as a trigger for real estate development, (e.g. Shard, regeneration of London Bridge); is recession accelerating this process?
- Can deadline-driven projects (like the Olympics), which are generally accompanied by the appointment of strong leaders and extraordinary powers, be used as a vehicle to achieve a commonly shared vision for an area? Or are they only undemocratic investments depending on the will and leadership of the promoters?
- Economic growth is not identical with development. Infrastructure investment is likely to be an engine of economic growth in areas with growth potential; conversely, lack of infrastructure may prevent shrinking cities from recovery.



Participants contributed to these points with their practical planning experiences.

National investment

The three presentations on the development strategy accompanying the Olympic games, the redevelopment of London Bridge Station and the construction of the iconic Shard on transportation land showed that London is using transportation infrastructure to re-lance its economy. These projects are mainly funded from general taxation or other contributions from the public sector, such as making land available. This raises a (re-)distribution issue. Generating a great concentration of investment such projects raise the question of what impact they have on development opportunities elsewhere: in other parts of the country or within a large city. It was generally agreed that London is privileged in the UK and that other British cities are lagging behind. However, this is due to a broad political approach and the investments are not directly reducing investment elsewhere.

Regional investment

In Cairo no amount of extra infrastructure provision made any difference to improving traffic conditions and the city is subjected to increasing polarisation. The capital has a very intense pull, people move to it, as well as international head-quarters, ancillary government functions etc. Cairo is similarly over-dominant as a capital akin to those in many other countries. It has moved some government functions to New Cairo in the desert and created new suburbs with high speed links to the old centre which reinforces their dependence on the centre. Providing infrastructure (roads, water, energy, etc) to these settlements in the desert is unsustainable as it has not managed to downsize existing traffic and congestion and a more viable planning solution is still outstanding. A similar strategy of decentralisation took place in the Netherlands some twenty years ago. The argument was that employment should be distributed more equitably through the region. However, recent government policy reversed this trend and relocated public sector employment in the Western part of the country to the detriment of employment in the peripheries amounting to a loss of government investment.

International investment

The EU TEN (trans European network) policy aims to redress regional imbalance. EU infrastructure subsidies are favouring cross-border connections instead of strengthening national links. This may be to the detriment of national needs. For example, TEN investment between Lisbon and sparsely populated Southern Spain has had an adverse effect on Portugal, whose economy needed a better national link between its capital and the second city for which there is no TEN subsidy. Some supra- or national redistribution instrument is necessary for territorial balance though. Good infrastructure increases the resilience of cities. This is demonstrated in the increase of Amsterdam's role as attractor since the merger of the Dutch national planning agency and the Ministry of Housing and Planning which with the Ministry of Roads and Traffic into the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment.



Interdependence of growth and infrastructure

According to the UK system, most of local infrastructure (excepting national scale projects, such as rail or airports) is funded through contribution from development. This results in more funding or areas of growth and complete lack of funds in areas of decline, which therefore decline even further. Most of the north of England and Scotland (where population density and development rates are lower) lack both significant national investment projects and sufficient local infrastructure funds. This is not the case across Europe: central European countries have excellent infrastructure, and any further investment will not reverse shrinking regions of the Netherlands, where development potential must be fostered by regional socio-economic agencies, sometimes cross-border with Germany or Belgium. Other countries, however, such as Poland, Serbia or Cyprus still require essential investment, especially in public transport infrastructure, to create a more sustainable and resilient economy and social well-being. This is particularly pressing in establishing greater polycentricity in Poland between existing cities.

Critical population mass

A critical population mass is required to attract development through transportation infrastructure provision. This is lacking in Scotland. In the past, people were encouraged to 'get on their bikes' in areas of decline. At present, in order to curb economic drain and population loss, Scotland invests in education, health and even coffee bar culture. Punctual financial injection including into the environment is led by regional development agencies. Similarly, in shrinking regions of the Netherlands, development potential is fostered by regional socio-economic agencies, sometimes cross-border with Germany or Belgium. Cyprus is a different case. There, lack of public transport infrastructure makes it difficult to obtain investment into other (socio-economic) infrastructure.

Links between transportation infrastructure, real estate development and mobility

The assumption that development takes necessarily place alongside (transportation) infrastructure investment may not apply universally and its impact on the economy may be marginal or even contrary to predictions.

The Netherlands found that investment into its mono-use high speed rail network was generating only one dimensional extra value, such as travel time reduction, without creating broader development synergy, except near some high speed rail stations like Rotterdam. It therefore diverted investment into a bundle of integrated socio-economic infrastructure investments (MIRT). However, in times of austerity social infrastructure tends to be curtailed by making less use of planning gain legislation not to deter developers.

Transportation infrastructure tends to favour centralisation and central locations. After the opening of the first TGV line Paris-Lyon, the most mobile people from Lyon moved to live in Paris and continued to work in Lyon but seeking work in Paris, as opposed to expected decentralisation from Paris to Lyon. HS2 may have similar



perverse effect and ultimately benefit London rather than the north. In Lille, however, the TGV was specifically planned as a driver for development as part of a comprehensive strategy, which has transformed the city. Therefore, it appears that planning has a central role to play in ensuring that investments in large infrastructure are part of a deliberate strategy for balanced growth.

The role of the tax payer

Infrastructure investment costs are hard to control, often underestimated optimistically by governments, and generally paid for by the tax payer, even when in private hands. HS2 (planned High Speed 2 track between London and the North of England) in the UK is a current example. Such projects are too large to fail, so the state will ultimately bail them out. For example Eurostar's operations are profitable, but the debt financed tunnel infrastructure investment is impossible to pay back, so it has to be discounted in some form or written off. Land ownership is a crucial lever of infrastructure projects. For this reason, they tend to take place on public land, regardless of functional locational criteria. The value added due to infrastructure investment seldom accrues to the public sector land owner (or tax payer), other than due to special fiscal measures. Other (political) considerations have weight, such as job creation, facilitating trade, (time) gain for entrepreneurs.

Working group on “Icon architecture and regeneration outcome in times of scarcity”

Icon architecture is a selling point for urban regeneration.

Does it work in practice and for whom?

- to attract inward investment, to generate profits for the development industry? (exchange value)
- for the city? for the citizens, to enhance the quality of work-live-play in the city? (use value)
- to put the city on the international, competitive map, up the global rank order (city marketing).

Icon-architecture – a cover story?

Although the issue is not about icon architecture ‘per se’, the development industry, supported by the built environment professionals are using political, economic, cultural and physical arguments to justify icon architecture as direct driver and selling point of regeneration to investors, developers, politicians and the public. Is it working and can these claims be measured and verified in terms of money, or financial, social and cultural urban value added? Who verifies and monitors these claims with what legitimacy, and what happens when these claims (usually underwritten by the public) do not come true?

In Belgrade, for example, all new development includes iconic architecture, also in waterfront developments in the old western style. Belgrade is moving away from industry, the army, infrastructure. Building anew according to new, reconstructed



iconic identities is the engine of development. This reflects the development process (e.g. people's aspiration to car ownership, university education, innovative lifestyles), but Belgrade is slow in producing a more sustainable mode of infrastructure, amenities and new icons. What is needed is a reorganisation of this urban divide, integrating the old and the spontaneous new into a more sustainable system of development with social infrastructure being provided at the right level.

Productive or consumption space?

Cities used to be places of production but have tended to become places of consumption, which is not sustainable, with adverse effects on long term economic prosperity. The current trend of urban regeneration and urban growth is based on consumption. This is most visible at waterfront sites, with their new condos, leisure facilities, icon architecture, spectacle sites, etc. What is needed instead, to avoid the next economic crisis, is urban redevelopment based on production. Consumption does not add value, especially in times of scarcity where it contributes simply to financial accounting measures.

In the Netherlands, this type of "consumption waterfront redevelopment" is over. Harbours are being reused and revitalised, either as small harbours for recreation and passenger transport or as modernised ports for goods transportation. The government is behind this change. Rotterdam and Amsterdam are among the most important ports of Europe. Even Amsterdam is redeveloping and extending its port, but not as intensely as Antwerp and other competitors in the North Sea. This is bringing industry back to the city (more logistics, transformation of imported goods?). The Financial Times was ridiculing this as the Amsterdam Dream, but planners and local politicians consider it as a place making initiative. They believe that it is possible to re-launch production within high wage Europe through innovation, high value added and high quality goods and services which would strengthen the productive sector instead of favouring the consumption economy.

Railway station remodelling could be place-making for cities, instead of driving consumption. A condition of financing (transportation) infrastructure projects should be their vocation as place makers, as opposed to generating (consumption driven) economic growth.

Regulatory planning constraints

In the UK, planning is biased towards large corporate organisations because development policies and political visions are oriented towards their demands. There are no corporations in small cities with large premises, but planning does not favour SMEs (small and medium size enterprises), small premises, or flexible entrepreneurship which is detrimental to the local economy. In Italy, the planning system is also unable to encourage small businesses. However, informal development (including illegal housing) is tolerated, not only in small towns but also in large cities, on industrial estates, in derelict manufacturing premises. Such informal developments are in effect small, even in large cities and offer necessary flexibility



however in a totally unregulated environment without controls on safety, pollution, etc. Urban economy requires both large and small developments, premises and enterprises. Planning should facilitate entrepreneurship and include incentives for such complementary developments to corporate premises.

A crucial constraint against such flexibility in the UK is that the public sector is required to look solely to best tax returns for public land. Reuse of public sector land by smaller enterprises would require subsidies. In effect, land conditions investment decisions. Nominal value is often linked to a single figure interest at 0.5% while at present profit on investment is expected to yield up to unsustainable 25% return. When it used to be some 6%, below SME investment return, there was a broader opportunity for diversification of investment. The argument in favour of a more diversified economy and sizes of economic units is about way of life. In Scotland engineering was diversified and innovative but the economy has changed into a bio-chemistry monoculture which is anti-intellectual and offers fewer opportunities for diversification and local enterprise.

Institutions

Development Agencies took over from local authorities and started to handle their large funding resources. This has given more power and funding to fewer areas, leaving entire regions behind. For example, the north east has now a big gap in infrastructure although they blame the EU for their decline. HS2 for them is a political showcase project notwithstanding that it will not bring necessary development potential, partially because of poor integration with locally planned development. Top-down projects are often misguided. For example, the displacement of the BBC from London to Salford was a massive waste of money as the best people did not follow and found other jobs in London. Moreover, this move requires a lot of energy as many people travel back to the capital where the core actions remain. The promotion of a truly balanced development in countries that have a strong capital, like the UK, require a lot of energy and multiple concurrent actions.

In Serbia, the UN Habitat programme 2005-2009, supported by EU grants and UNDP projects on integrated local development produced a change. Serbia has to develop its planning, politics and administration systems by integrating the instrumental socialistic, top-down approach with a bottom-up approach. Ideally, Serbia should try to combine the best of its top-down and bottom-up approaches but it is not clear whether the existing management structure is able to handle such a new context. Nevertheless, slowly, Serbia is undergoing a process of decentralisation and regionalisation.

Project driven approach vs institutional formats

The infrastructure, the economic and urban developments do not stop at the borders of the territories of the tri-national metropolitan area of Basel. Cross border cooperation has a long tradition: in 2010 an International Building Exposition IBA Basel 2020 started by a tri-national call for projects. The IBA Basel seeks new forms



of cooperation, driven by projects beyond institutional formats and legacy. One of the larger long-term projects is the Masterplan “3Land” for urban (waterfront) development. It is a tri-national vision for developing the area of Huningue in France, the harbour of Basel and the municipality of Weil in Germany. Within the concept of a long-term strategy each of the three nations has the opportunity to develop its own icon-architecture for his identifying part. For a good implementation it is important that the top-down process is combined with a bottom-up process, in order to balance economic and social benefits. The strategy of a heterogeneous icon-architecture instead of one “international” style should be sized and strengthened for local place-making.

Opportunities for alternative development?

The USA were formed by large entrepreneurs. Since the end of the cold war the market economy is assuming an almost hegemonic role. Its protagonists argue that the United States are becoming increasingly richer because the West is willing to take (debt fuelled?) risks. Opportunities are there for individuals, which may mean that (re-) distribution may decline. The role of the State government is to facilitate this by making a building budget available. Despite the crisis and national debt, consumer behaviour is unlikely to change, e.g. Californian house sizes are seen necessary to satisfy need, despite public policies encouraging smaller housing.

This raises the question of whether there is room at all for small entrepreneurs, perhaps during times of scarcity. Alternative spaces may be created and taken up by those who do not want to make money per se but aim at a good living, those who are not content economic growth alone but aspire to quality of life.

In countries like Poland, in transition from state planning to market economy, building infrastructure makes a difference to growth and development, because historic and existing infrastructure is very poor. Planners are wondering whether Poland would be able to leap-frog the stage of urban sprawl with increasing affluence. Post independence South Africa may be able to show the way.

Poland does not have an overpowering capital and has a more polycentric city structure. Thus decentralised development should be possible. It is a matter of distributing investment and EU subsidies to medium and small size cities, something that has been done in Spain and Portugal to satisfy the Lisbon Treaty about balanced territorial development and equality between regions. There was always an inherent contradiction between the two EU objectives of territorial balance and global competitiveness.

Organic real life processes

The Netherlands have produced flexible flagship projects in medium size cities. As an example, the urbanisation of a large area of farm land included a museum of agriculture, which became the catalyst to attract an agro--university exploring alternative agricultural processes. Unfortunately most of them disappeared from



2005-2008 and people lost their premises when 300 new investors put money in land during the crisis. Nevertheless, 160 SME investors and incubators remain. During an economic crisis, when neither a city nor small investors are strong enough to compete with large corporate investors, cities fall back to managing their existing assets, by attributing commercial value only to half of their land. This strategy took place at the local level without the involvement of regional and national government.

It is complex to handle large number of small investors. Research is needed to understand this process better and assess the adequacy of existing planning tools. Investment statistics apply differently to different investment structures and this needs to be taken into account, considering that half such flexible development undertakings are carried out by public-private partnerships and are provided neither by state agencies nor by large corporations. INURA (the international network for urban research and action) has worked on added value maps which reflect context-bound impact of knowledge and innovation. Their aim is to show where real growth and/or economic development is taking place.

Working group on “The role of heritage in supporting growth and regeneration in European cities in times of austerity”

Key issues included:

- What is the role in regeneration and which mechanisms can contribute to added value of real estate in decline?
- What is an appropriate balance between heritage and spaces for the future? Who is the arbiter of that? How much weight needs to be attributed to existing communities in the surroundings and on such sites?
- What are the rules of engagement for the attribution and redistribution of value of heritage?
- What is a sustainable scale and pace of regeneration?

Transformation of heritage built environment

Heritage can be construed as an economic leverage asset despite dereliction. The reuse of the New York highline was an alternative approach to regeneration of derelict heritage. In Philadelphia, old buildings were adapted to new uses in a disused Navy yard. The development company worked with the federal government on an energy efficiency programme. Empty spaces were rehabilitated and 270 existing buildings retrofitted which have become the assets of this development. This was done pragmatically, without a research programme and with private investment partners who provided the capital base to build new energy efficient buildings in the empty spaces. The synergetic development strategy branched out to create a centre of excellence on green energy and IT technology aiming to attract R&D companies in this field.



Role of existing communities on and around heritage sites

Disused land is often surrounded by declining communities and they have legitimate aspirations of obtaining a part the value added by the regeneration of adjacent land which used to be part of their livelihood, such as industries which had made them redundant. Local communities around the liberated railway land at Kings Cross London insisted to be heard and produced alternative development plans backed up by economic arguments to achieve more equitable urban redevelopment strategies. With the assistance of neighbouring universities, they managed to influence the development plans and obtain planning gains. The tension between the local multi-cultural community and the developers who wanted icon-architecture driven urban change was intense. A lot of heritage has got lost in this process, but more buildings have been converted into current and future uses, such as the granary building into the university of the arts than would have been without their intervention. Negotiation points were the values to attribute to heritage both buildings as well as spatial memory and cultural landmarks. Such large scale redevelopments take a long time to develop and lay derelict for years. As usual, many unused spaces had been colonised by locals who ran small businesses which would not be viable in the transformed urban fabric. Local interests can foster and promote heritage by showing imaginative reuse of existing structures.

Adding value

A distinction has to be made though between adding value or simply redistributing value. The former means (absolute) growth and the latter managing urban change while providing better, more equitable use of resources and assets without absolute growth. Total water management could be seen as part of the latter approach which does not require more water but makes better use of available water.

The United States self-management culture which means everybody for himself does not allow for any compensation or redistribution, except arguably in the case of TDR (Transferable Development Rights). It also fosters green field developments because they are cheaper and more lucrative even if ecologically such squander of land is not sustainable. In the UK, developers tend to hoard land (including with building permits), thus creating scarcity, land and real estate price inflation, without tax liabilities. This includes neglect of heritage buildings which are too expensive and restricted to redevelop in their view. Green field sites are preferred which explain continuous pressures on green belts, but which would be unsustainable, not least because they would require new infrastructure, seldom financed by the developers from their development gains, thus the liability of the public sector while all the value added due to change of land use would accrue to the development industry.

Added value of heritage sites also depends on location and site characteristics. Waterfront sites, often left over from industry are prime targets as they carry a premium in the property market. The Philadelphia navy yard benefited from this characteristic. It could attract cruise ships and valorise its access to water in various



ways, something that is not available to land locked sites. Thus, heritage development does not stand equal chances everywhere.

In Conclusion

Transportation infrastructure investment can be an important driver of development, However, balanced and resilient growth is not directly derived by it: it is necessary to plan investment, development and social well-being at the same time, including other (socio-economic) infrastructures, such as education, health and/or other public services.

Supra national spatial strategies and related subsidies (e.g. EU TENs Trans European Networks) can influence national transportation infrastructure strategies positively as well as adversely. The supra-national goal of creating a Europe of more balanced regions may contradict national or sub-regional objectives.

Transportation infrastructure projects are long term and require large scale investment. They do not take place without direct (grants) or indirect (state guarantees, discounted public land) contribution from the public purse. It is imperative that they are accompanied by strategies to ensure balanced outcomes, without which they can generate unpredictable outcomes with winners and losers; they are context- and time-bound and not necessarily those earmarked in predictions. They always entail significant displacement and gentrification which disadvantage or benefit different groups. The arguments about environmental benefits and drawbacks vary with the choice of contextual variables.

Although infrastructure investment focuses on cost considerations, costs are hard to control, often due to political consideration, tend to overshoot and are paid for by the tax payer. When in private hands, such projects are too large to fail, so the state will ultimately have to bail them out as well. For example, Eurostar's operations are profitable, but the debt financed tunnel infrastructure investment is impossible to pay back, so it has to be discounted in some form or written off.

Often infrastructure investment remains within the confines of technical approaches and lacks the leadership, vision or power to engage in multi-layered planning and integration in the physical and social fabric of the areas in which it takes place. The assumption that the new infrastructure 'per-se' would deliver balanced positive outcomes is not necessarily true. Strategic planning and political leadership have a key role to play.

Land ownership is a crucial lever of infrastructure projects. For this reason, they tend to take place on public land, regardless of functional locational criteria. The value added due to infrastructure investment seldom accrues to the public sector land owner (or tax payer). Other (political) considerations have weight, such as job creation, facilitating trade, (time) gain for entrepreneurs.



Transportation infrastructure projects are also influenced by professional lobbies (the development industry and the professionals of the built environment). Their arguments are often based on professional ideology (theory) and tend to consist of single track solutions. (e.g. the need for segregation between transportation modes – Buchanan, *Traffic in Town*; wind turbines to the exclusion of all else as renewable energy source). These planning theories (or ideologies) belong to a specific era and often require massive physical transformations at a future stage.

This ‘monorail’ approach also takes place in other fields than planning, e.g. economic policy (Keynesian vs neo-liberal policy; growth based on consumption instead of production, etc), which affects infrastructure investment and urban change more generally. It should be remembered that (economic) growth is not (integrated socio-economic) development. Ultimately, well being should remain the main focus of planning.

Place making with icon architecture is being used as a driver for growth of the economy and jobs, not least during the financial crisis. The question is whether it is appropriate tool of general planning? Depending on their spatial, locational and environmental advantages, this may lead to unfair competition between areas and cities, something that would contribute to wasteful use of resources and increase scarcity local, as well as cost of land and urban space generally. Growth in Brazil is mega-iconic and goes against the role of planners and planning. There is a need in Brazil to rescue the belief in regulated growth, planning and ultimately planners while more bottom up participation and decision making is also needed for a more balance urban development.

Icon architecture is often postured as an end in itself. In reality, it is a means to achieving rapid and large scale urban change without negotiation of the redistribution of the value added regeneration is bringing about. In fashion at present, and used as prestige by global investors in outbidding each other icon architecture is supported by political, cultural and physical justifications which may not materialise as they are not evidence based. For urban developments driven by icon-architecture it is important that the top-down process is combined by a bottom-up process to obtain a balance of interests between economic profit by (international) investors and social benefits for the community. Recent implementation of icon-architecture in “international” style (waterfront) developments did not lead to sufficient social benefits for the communities.

The jury remained out on the merits and drawbacks of gentrification and whether it was path dependent on regeneration. Gentrification is not an easy process to capture, nor to evaluate. What is the nature of gentrification, the effect of it on the existing urban population, on newcomers, on neighbourhoods, on the economy of the city overall? Is there room for alternative development strategies within the prevalent



capitalistic system? Who would initiate them? With what agenda, what legitimacy, and would it have to be bottom up?

The effects of gentrification are often divisive and differ between the macro-economic and the local levels, as well as over different timeframes. Undoubtedly, many urban areas would remain planning blighted if it was not for temporary users and colonisers of derelict sites, and they should be able to yield some reward for the effects they have on triggering urban change, regeneration and gentrification which is displacing them.

The weakest link seems to be the existing fabric, and especially that which has been discarded, at least temporarily even if this means for long periods of time, by the development industry. It has value, meaning and memory for those who live and work there or in the surroundings. They are often the unintentional custodians of heritage, including the built environment or spaces with a history. Those who realise value by revitalising such urban spaces are often distanced from the development process. Much of such heritage is succumbing to commercial pressures, although sometimes it is reconstructed by the very same forces which have destroyed it because they perceive new value added in it. Their pastiches may even generate new urban myths and become the heritage of the future.

Rethinking Planning and Planners

- Where do these development processes leave the planners?
- What is the role of planners in this process: technical, political, as intervener in townscapes, as mediator, something else?

Planning

Integrated development may be an appropriate tool of place making. However, new ways of thinking about development are needed. Integrated planning would have to include professional planning capacity building while citizens' thinking should constitute the contextual base of development. Many countries experience a trap in the planning law. New infrastructure is supposed to attract or generate economic growth. What it does in reality is to regenerate central cities while maintaining scarcity elsewhere. What planning should do is to manage change and spatial justice instead of promoting physical growth. One way out of scarcity would be a change in behaviour of politicians and planners. Current planning symbolism is the opposite of managing change and a new symbolism is needed to initiate such a shift from physical growth to managing existing resources better. In many countries, taxation is raised through the centre. Even if money is redistributed downwards financial accumulation takes place in the centre in different entities and they are controlling the Decentralising taxation powers, raising finance locally and making taxation powers more self-sufficient at regional, local level would be a way forward.



Planners

There was a general feeling that the planning profession is experiencing a downturn. Planning schools have difficulties in attracting new students. Planning lawyers seem to be running planning and it was felt that they should make space again for true spatial planners. Hiding behind technological neutrality is no longer an option for planners though and they need to recognise that planning is political. In some countries planning has been transformed into a purely regulatory job. Elsewhere planners are participating in decisions about planning, which means that planning is de facto a part of the (political) decision making process. In times of scarcity and greater awareness about the need for sustainable development, this may mean that planners need to acquire greater skills to manage urban change.

Outstanding issues

The means-and-end issue was left pending. Is economic growth a justifiable end in itself? Is it a means to an end, such as better living conditions, an improved environment, more job opportunities, a diversifying local economy? Is it justifiable to use Infrastructure only as money spinner for real estate and debt driven urban growth and change, instead of a public service to improve mobility and thus quality of urban life for all?

Is absolute growth needed for urban change for the better to occur, or is it possible to achieve it through managing existing resources and spaces better, as well as more equitably?

Planners consider themselves as active partners in the redistribution process, but that would need to be embedded in planning legislation and powers, something that governments seem to shun, resorting to the justification of austerity and scarcity to withdraw from this political process and leave it to market forces. Would it not be the role of planners to expose the confusion between economic growth and urban development, for example by opening a debate about investment of petro-dollars into uninhabited luxury housing in city centres? Is it not the role of planners to advocate alternative ways of changing the management of space by maintaining as well as increasing its use-value instead of its exchange-value alone? The bottom line may be that their professional responsibility is to resort to their initial role as mediators between private individual gain and the public good.



Annex I

International Society of City and Regional Planners (Isocarp)
Regional Workshop, London 6-8 June 2013

The Isocarp UK National Delegation is pleased to invite you to:

ISOCARP PLANNERS' EXCHANGE WORKSHOP

REGENERATING CITIES FROM WITHIN - IN TIMES OF SCARCITY

This regional Isocarp workshop has been initiated and organised by Judith Ryser (head of UK national delegation) in collaboration with Martina Juvara, Fabiola Cedillo and Elizabeth Milne, in discussion with Isocarp members from other countries and the support of Isocarp Secretary General. The purpose of the workshop is to provide a platform for Isocarp members to participate actively in a professional face-to-face exchange about their work and experience around a theme of particular relevance in Europe, and to disseminate their findings to all Isocarp members and beyond, thereby encouraging other Isocarp national delegations to organise regional Isocarp workshops in their area.

PROGRAMME*

Thursday 6 June 2013

Arrival of participants

17.00 Welcome of participants at SKM offices, London Bridge (host of the workshop) by Isocarp UK National Delegation.

17.15 *Purpose and expectations of regional Isocarp workshops*

Introduction to the workshop organisation and workgroup themes by the workshop organising team

Workgroup 1: *Icon architecture and regeneration outcome in times of scarcity*

Workgroup 2: *Infrastructure investment in cities with growth problems and under pressure to compete*

Workgroup 3: *The role of heritage in supporting growth and regeneration in European cities in times of austerity*

18.00 *Urban regeneration, the bigger picture, dealing with large sites and long term timeframes*

Kathryn Firth, Chief of Design at London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), about the Olympic park development legacy

18.30 Discussion

Informal dinner (optional)

*subject to minor changes



Friday 7 June 2013

09.00 Tour of the Olympic site by coach guided by LLDC staff member. Start from SKM offices.

11.00 *Splitting into workgroups*

- Introduction of themes by moderators
- Bullet point presentations (3 minutes) of case studies by hosts and selected participants to highlight key issues
- Discussion to identify challenges and common grounds relevant to planners and how they would influence or require new approaches to planning under austerity measures, neo-liberal demands for growth and market flexibility, etc.

12.30 *Plenary (1): presentation of workgroup findings by workgroup spokes persons*
Comparing notes, discussion

13.00 Buffet lunch and networking

14.00 *Regenerating and reorganising urban transport interchanges*

Declan McCafferty, partner of Grimshaw Partnership, about London Bridge station regeneration and long term fate of Waterloo Eurostar terminal

14.30 Discussion

14.45 *Splitting into workgroups*

- Continuing discussion of sub-themes
- Relating workgroup themes to experiences presented on London Bridge station and the Olympic legacy

16.00 *Plenary (2): bullet points by workgroup spokes persons and discussion*

Implications for punctual interventions and their role in city-wide spatial development strategies

16.30 Coffee break and networking

17.00 *Renewing and densifying cities, the role and production of landmarks*

William Matthews, project architect of Shard, Renzo Piano office

17.30 Discussion

18.30 Concluding session

Panel exchange with speakers on regeneration issues in Europe in times of scarcity, including Trenton Oldfield of This Is Not A Gateway.
General discussion and synthesis



19.00 Visit of the Shard viewing platform (optional)

20.30 dinner in common (optional)

Saturday 8 June 2013

09.00 *Review of Workshop achievements and lessons for future Isocarp events*

- Highlights from each workgroup and concluding session
- Agreement on dissemination of findings to Isocarp and beyond

10.00 ***Discussion on Isocarp's future***

As a follow up to the discussion organised by the German Isocarp delegation on the future of Isocarp, the UK delegation invites Isocarp members to participate in an exchange of views. After feedback on the Munich meeting, the focus will be on the feasibility of actions at local level initiated by national delegations or individual members and possible links to Isocarp congresses.

Afternoon

Guided visit: Long range urban transformation, Thames South Bank

The workshop organisers will accompany a walk along the Thames South Bank, starting from Borough market westwards, Southwark Cathedral, Golden Hinde, Clink prison, Vinopolis, the Globe theatre, Millennium bridge and Tate Modern with adjacent development, Thames-Link bridge, South Bank cultural centre, proposed redevelopment of the Shell centre, London Eye, glance at Grimshaw's Waterloo Eurostar terminal, County Hall.

- Optional extra: Coin Street Community Builders alternative developments, instead of proposed office scheme.

Self guided visit, view of the Olympic site and surroundings from the outside

A map is available showing how to get a good view of the Olympic stadium, the Aquatic building, the Arcelor Mittal sculpture, and the park which is under reconstruction, etc) from the 'Green Way'. It is publically accessible from the DLR Pudding Lane station and leads to Hackney Wick and Fish Island. The Olympic site can also be seen from the Westfield shopping centre. Other developments have taken place on Stratford High Street where Sugar House workshops are located.

- Optional: Bromley by Bow centre is nearby, a good example of a bottom up development in operation over more than two decades, initiated when Docklands regeneration took place and instrumental in the regeneration of this neighbourhood.

The workshop is free of charge. The venue is SKM, New City Court, 20 St. Thomas Street, London SE1 8RS, near London Bridge railway station. There are maximum 45 places on a first come first served basis. Workshop participants are asked to select in which workgroup they intend to participate. The participants are expected to take



care of their own travel and subsistence expenses, including dinners and visit fees. A list of hotels is included in the registration form.

Please register at:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1I0x0Hut3BOjhaCFqU_gtweoSEacjVJFBtK8Qj2zhxb0/viewform

The organising team is looking forward to welcoming you at the workshop.

Annex II

List of participants

International Society of City and Regional Planners (Isocarp)
Regional Workshop, London 6-8 June 2013

ISOCARP PLANNERS' EXCHANGE WORKSHOP
REGENERATING CITIES FROM WITHIN - IN TIMES OF SCARCITY

Attendee List

Name	Surname	Organization	Email.
Farnaz	Arefian	Phd Candidate. Development Planning Unit, UCL. London, UK.	farnaz_a_r@yahoo.com
Matteo	Basso	Phd Candidate. IUAV University of Venice, Italy - University of Westminster, London.	basso.matt@libero.it
Ronald	Bednar	Pennsylvania Planning Association	rkbednar@gmail.com
Iara	Castello	Federal University of RS/Professor	icastello@terra.com.br
Lineu	Castello	UFRGS (Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul) and Uniritter/Mackenzie Universities - Professor	lincastello@terra.com.br
Fabiola	Cedillo	Leeds Metropolitan University, Student. London, UK.	fc2005@alumni.lse.ac.uk
Joanna	Chambers	Changing Cities. London, UK.	joanna@changingcities.co.uk
Hugh	Crawford	Sir Frank Mears Associates Ltd, Director. Edinburgh, UK.	h.crawford@btinternet.com
Germin	El Gohary	Associate Professor in Ain Shams University. Cairo, Egypt.	gelgohary@hotmail.com
Andries	Geerse	We Love The City, Director. Rotterdam, The Netherlands.	andries@welovethecity.eu
Helena	Heyning	MB&A bv, director/owner. Amsterdam, The Netherlands.	hheyning@xs4all.nl
Rik	Houthaeve	Senior Planner at Grontmij. Belgium	rik.houthaeve@grontmij.be
Gwilym	Jones	Longboard Consulting. Bath, UK.	gwilym@longboardconsulting.net



Name	Surname	Organization	Email.
Martina	Juvara	SKM Colin Buchanan, Master Planning and Urban Design. London, UK.	MJuvara@globalskm.com
Dorota	Kamrowska	MIT/ Gdansk University of technology. Gdansk, Poland.	dzaluska@pg.gda.pl
Małgorzata	Kostrzewska	Gdansk University of Technology, Assistant Professor. Gdansk, Poland.	mpostawka@post.pl
Pierre	Laconte	Foundation Urban Environment, President. Kortenberg, Belgium.	pierre.laconte@fue.org
Ladipo	Lewis	AZDEC A.S.C., Design Consultants. Lagos, Nigeria.	ladilewis@yahoo.com
Alex	Macgregor	S.G. ISOCARP. Scotland, UK.	alarch@me.com
Elizabeth	Milne	ISD Associates, Director. London, UK.	Elizabeth.Milne@isdassociates.net
Tatjana	Mrdjenovic	U. of Belgrade - Faculty of Architecture, teaching asistant. Belgrade, Serbia.	tmdjenovic@gmail.com
Aafke	Nijenhuis	Municipality of Spijkenisse, project manager. The Netherlands.	aafke.nijenhuyzen@xs4all.nl
Geoffrey	Prince	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd, Director. Knightcote, UK.	gpkim16@aol.com
Stefano	Quaglia	University of Reading, Student. Reading, UK.	ste-86@hotmail.it
Judith	Ryser	ISOCARP, Head of ND United Kingdom. London, UK.	jryser@dircon.co.uk
Michael	Safier	Development Planning Unit, UCL	m.safier@ucl.ac.uk
Andreas	Schneider	HSR University of Applied Sciences, Professor. Rapperswil, Switzerland.	andreas.schneider@hsr.ch
Hendrik	Struben	Associate at Boer & Croon. Amsterdam The Netherlands	hstruben@me.com
Nicole	Wirz	ISOCARP BM Swiss National Delegation. Basel, Switzerland.	Nicole.wirz@isocarp.ch
Gijs	Wolfs	Wurck, founding partner. Rotterdam, The Netherlands.	gwolfs@wurck.nl

References:

Minutes of the Munich meeting on Isocarp's future, and summary of the discussion on Isocarp's future during the London workshop, both available on the Isocarp website - member area.



SAVE THE DATE

Cross-Border Planning and Cooperation - Urban and regional planning across borders

Symposium on 18th of October 2013 on the occasion of the IBA Basel 2020 Project Exhibition from 19/10/2013 to 9/11/2013.

(IBA International Building Exhibition)

Cross-border urban and regional planning is a typical European topic. Spatial developments in densely populated Europe do not stop at territorial limits of city regions. The resulting planning and communication tasks require increasing horizontal and vertical cooperation. Europe can offer a great deal of experience as well as organizational and methodological approaches.

The day before the public opening of the IBA Project Exhibition 2013, the IBA Basel 2020, which aims at a better integration of a cross-border agglomeration, seeks to discuss such issues using concrete practical examples all over Europe.

During the symposium solutions for cross-border planning based on case studies will be presented and discussed among experts, thus supporting the transfer of knowledge and experience. Thereby IBA Basel 2020 learns from international best practice approaches, methods and tools and brings its solutions into international practice.

ISOCARP, recognized by UNESCO and the Council of Europe as an International Organisation of City and Regional Planning, supports this meeting of the IBA Basel 2020.

Purpose of the symposium

The event deals with the problems of urban and regional planning across boundaries. The discussion will help to identify possible instruments for common approaches and to outline best practice examples with concrete solutions. It has the following objectives:

- Classification of the IBA and its methodological approach in the context of cross-border agglomeration development.
- Strengthening regional planning and overcoming limitations of territorial planning methods.
- Learning from best practice and formation of a network of European cross-border regional planning.
- Creating added value and insights for IBA Basel 2020.

Agenda

17th of October 2013 (visiting tour to IBA projects)

1.30 p.m.	IBA Basel 2020 Opening for participants
2 to 5 p.m.	Visiting tour of locations of IBA projects
6 p.m.	Welcome Reception in Basel

18th of October 2013 (Symposium)

9 a.m.	Opening of the Symposium
9.30 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Symposium and 4 parallel workshops
4.30 p.m.	Preview of the IBA Basel 2020 Project Exhibition
7 p.m.	Light and sound installation on the river Rhine

19th of October 2013 (Public opening IBA Basel Project Exhibition)

10 a.m. to 12 a.m.	ISOCARP meeting (only members)
10 a.m. to 7 p.m.	Public Opening of the IBA Basel 2020 Project Exhibition
4 p.m.	Welcome Reception of the IBA Basel 2020

Registration

Please register for the ISOCARP meeting on 19th of October on



Programme

8h45	Reception and coffee			
9h00	Welcome			
9h15	Introduction to IBA and the program			
9h30	<i>Workshop Group 1</i> Living Together Discussion leader: Pier Mael Anezo	<i>Workshop Group 2</i> Urban Spaces Discussion leader: Dirk Lohaus	<i>Workshop Group 3</i> Landscapes Discussion leader: Salomé Mall	<i>Workshop Group 4</i> Cooperation & Communication Discussion leader: Nicole Wirz Schneider /Susanne Fischer, ISOCARP
	<i>Urban development / integrated planning</i> Input: Vision 3Land, Basel <u>Case Studies</u>	<i>Urban development along mobility axes</i> Input: urban development along Tram 3 (St. Louis) <u>Case Studies</u>	<i>Added value: landscape</i> Input: Landscape Wiese <u>Case Studies</u>	<i>Regional planning and communication formats</i> Input: IBA Basel 2020/ Eurodistrict <u>Case Studies</u>
10h45	Discussion	Discussion	Discussion	Discussion
11h45	Lunch break			
12h45	<i>Workshop Group 1</i> <i>Communication, ownership, financing</i>	<i>Workshop Group 2</i> <i>Procedures, network of stakeholders</i>	<i>Workshop Group 3</i> <i>Regional planning and collaboration</i>	<i>Workshop Group 4</i> <i>Cooperation on policies and instruments</i> <u>Case Studies</u>
13h15	Discussion	Discussion	Discussion	Discussion
13h45	Reporting and final conclusions of the workshops by the IBA Kuratorium			
14h30	Final discussion: How can cross-border cooperation be concretized in Europe? Representatives of EU/CH/D and F.			
15h45	IBA Forum II: Preliminary visit of the IBA Basel 2020 Project Exhibition			
16h30	Preview IBA Basel 2020 Project Exhibition			
19h	Light and sound installation			

Location of the symposium: The event will take place in the auditorium at the IBA Voltastrasse 30, 4056 Basel. No parking space available.

Number of participants: max. 100. Registrations will be processed upon receipt.

The symposium is aimed at professionals in planning, architecture and landscape design, at project promoters and other interested persons.

Languages: German, French (Workshop 1 to 3) and English (ISOCARP Workshop 4).

Registration for Basle Workshop at:

http://www.iba-basel.net/de/aktuelles_d/fachtagung-cross-border-planning/

Please register for option Isocarp National Delegation Meeting