

Introductory Report Workshop IV: Market Perspectives: Cross-Sectoral Views on Integration and Disintegration

Rapporteur: Baohui Zhai

Department of Town and Country Planning, Centre for Policy Research, Ministry of Construction, Beijing, China

Chair: Opuenebo Owei

Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

The Marketplace Session is a platform for discussions that intend to highlight the status quo of the planning profession. The eighteen papers in this workshop are drawn from eleven countries. Topics range from the use of industrial wasteland, biodiversity and heritage protection to the processes of social and spatial fragmentation which are occurring in various urban regions across the globe. Authors tackle the role of planning in this process in the context of land use policies and policies for economic revitalization. Most of the papers are set in a context of specific historic places, describing specific practical experiences, and applying quantitative and qualitative analyses to critically reflect the dynamics of urban social change that have transformed urban regions.

The discussions capture the physical manifestations of these changes, highlighting the forces of integration and disintegration and the challenges posed to the planning profession in the different countries. Papers show that integrative and disintegrative forces are generated from a variety of sources that operate both within and without the ambit of public sector planning. From the movement of global capital to national and local policies and programmes, the case studies also explore the responses of planning to the experiences of cities in the face of integration and disintegration. A fundamental observation that seems to run through all of the papers is that planning response is inadequate; and policies have clearly not achieved the objective of meeting the needs of ordinary citizens caught in the process of urban transformation.

Papers at a Glance

Several of the papers describe the process of disintegration which can occur within cities. Although the trigger mechanisms and settings are different, the process is similar. While development of malls and hypermarkets in Izmir (Kompil & Çelik) reflect the disintegrative push of international capital investment, Lusaka's shopping area segregation can be traced back to colonial urban residential development policies (Nchito). The collective reality in both cities is the emergence of a dual retail structure.

The papers of Workshop IV show clearly that any meaningful discussion of integration and disintegration in cities must carefully analyze the relationship between political and economic forces. The impact of political decisions to relocate residents as part of an urban decentralization strategy in Shanghai (Lee) is complicated by the involvement of economic interests wishing to manipulate the process for their own benefit. The result is that some families become not only physically dislocated but suffer financially as well. The experience in Alanya and Dalyan (Tamer et al) with international migration, shows the significance of economic considerations in determining the urban structure that results despite the increase in mixed marriages.

Economic decline is an important factor of disintegration in the case of Port Said (EL – Bastawisy, Helmy & Ali) with the elimination of the port's commercial free zone status and also in Xiaqiao with mine closures (Jiang, Shanshan & Jianjun). In the midst of such disintegration, location and ecol-

ogical attributes provide immense potential for economic revitalization. The ability of planning to recognize and utilize such potentials is important in promoting the well being of citizens.

Economic growth that introduces marked income differentials in the city promotes disintegration as, for example, in Maracaibo where settlement segregation is the result of petroleum based urban growth (Quijano & Rodriguez – Espada). Across cities, especially in developing countries, urban growth is marked by spatial segregation with the affluent classes isolating themselves behind gates and walls for protection and security. Behind these walls of isolation, urban services are provided not by municipal authorities but by the residents. This furthers the process of spatial segregation. Yet equality of access to urban services is an important factor in examining disintegration in the context of improving quality of life. Discoli et al demonstrate a method for assessing urban quality using people's perception in Buenos Aires. City planners, especially in developing countries, need to do more data collection and statistical analysis in this area to serve as inputs to policy making. The contribution of special projects such as the Athens Olympics (Beriatos) to new infrastructure development in the city can serve as instruments for promoting integration. This is often left unexplored.

Yet improving the quality of life in an area is not always successful in the context of land use planning as the implementation process is subject to balancing the needs of private capital against those of ordinary citizens. This is the experience of the urban regeneration plan for Metaxourgio (Makrakis) and the “Third Solution” for Lisbon (Craveiro & Lobo). The role of both the state and private capital is particularly important in determining the outcome of the plan. Private interests, for example, provide opportunities for successful innovative public/private partnerships in the protection of biodiversity in Sydney (Gary, Philips & Doret). A more careful examination of how city planning fits into the interface in the relationship between state and capital will open up opportunities for resource generation in planning.

Policies, both national and local are decidedly principal factors in defining urban spatial structure. The cases of Mexico City (Castillo) and Rosario (Bragos, Mateos & Pontoni) where chunks of urban space have been privatised with government authorisation are examples of how policy instruments can justify and strengthen social segregation in cities.

Emerging Issues

Several issues emerge from the papers in Workshop 4. A significant issue is that whereas integration and disintegration emanate from forces that operate within multiple arenas – from global to local - city planning is essentially a locally-based activity. What then are the limitations imposed on our ability to create better, economically vibrant and cohesive cities? Another issue is that while an inclusive urban plan seems necessary, how can it really reconcile the diverse interests existing across the city? Is an inclusive urban plan realistic? The outcomes of plans often differ from their stated objectives and the forces that come into play in determining metropolitan territorial structures often come from outside national boundaries. This is the reality of the complex processes that currently define urban regions. Cities are the outcomes of processes that are most often multiple and interlinked. Prosperi suggests three things that are necessary. These are: realistic visionaries, region – wide comprehensive thinking and real inclusion of citizens. Do we need an inclusive urban plan to cover these three conditions? Planning is, itself, a learning process and our ability to adjust our strategies and tools to positively engage these complex processes will to an extent determine the city structures of the future and the well being of its citizenry.