



Fondazione
Giangiacomo
Feltrinelli

8 Research Paths For The City Feltrinelli Camp 2018

**A cura di
Paola Piscitelli**

**Utopie / 66
Città e cittadinanza**

UTOPIE

8 Research Paths For The City

Feltrinelli Camp 2018

a cura di

Paola Piscitelli



© 2018 **Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli**
Viale Pasubio 5, 20154 Milano (MI)

www.fondazionefeltrinelli.it

ISBN 978-88-6835-296-7

Prima edizione digitale maggio 2018

Tutti i diritti sono riservati. Nessuna parte di questo volume può essere riprodotta, memorizzata o trasmessa in alcuna forma o con alcun mezzo elettronico, meccanico, in disco o in altro modo, compresi cinema, radio, televisione, senza autorizzazione scritta dalla Fondazione. Le riproduzioni effettuate per finalità di carattere professionale, economico o commerciale o comunque per uso diverso da quello personale possono essere effettuate a seguito di specifica autorizzazione rilasciata da Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli.

Segui le attività di Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli:



facebook.com/fondazionefeltrinelli



twitter.com/Fondfeltrinelli



instagram.com/fondazionefeltrinelli

About this book

The first edition of Feltrinelli Camp took place on February 16th and 17th, 2018, two days of closed-door workshop in the field of urban studies. One hundred young researchers and practitioners with international background gathered into the large luminous space of the multifunctional hall in Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli to discuss the present and future of cities. Eight thematic tables were the center of the exchange of research and professional experiences, as well as of discussion and debate, issues, mapping exercises, sketching, generation of new ideas, claims and arguments. The eight working table attempted to conceptualize proposals for solutions to crucial problems affecting our cities. Each thematic table corresponded to a theoretical and practical challenge to be solved in relation to a bundle of issues.

The following publication collects and returns the most relevant outputs of the two days and is divided in two different volumes:

1) the former, collected in this eBook, includes the specific points of view of the coordinators of working tables in relation to the thematic challenges of the conference. Eight experts offered their own contribution to the conceptual redefinition of the questions, both on the basis of their experiences and skills and of the close confrontation with the other participants to the Feltrinelli Camp. Eight reports curated by eight rapporteurs, thus, summarize the results of the discussion at the table. The reports contain at least three key issues related to the main challenge and three possible solutions responding such issues. Some of them contain a

proposal that could be possibly considered as the legacy to About a City - Places, Ideas and Rights for 2030 citizens, the festival about cities and citizenship by Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli.

2) the latter proposes some cases studies and research proposals related to the the eight themes constituting the backbones of the working tables by some of the camp participants.

Contents

<i>Introduction</i> , Paola Piscitelli - Ilaria Giuliani	9
<i>8 Issues, 8 Challenges</i>	12
1. Envisaging fairer divercities	13
2. Realizing potential urban landscapes	16
3. Making the city through housing	19
4. Regenerating the city as a common	22
5. Planning the immaterial city	25
6. Designing new naturescapes	28
7. Pushing the borders	32
8. Framing mobility as a spatial capital	35
References	38
Final Reports	43

8 Research Paths For The City

Feltrinelli Camp 2018

Paola Piscitelli, Ilaria Giuliani

Introduction

The first edition of Feltrinelli Camp took place on February 16th and 17th, 2018, two days of closed-door workshop in the field of urban studies. One hundred young researchers and practitioners with international background gathered into the large luminous space of the multifunctional hall in Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli to discuss the present and future of cities. Eight thematic tables were the center of the exchange of research and professional experiences, as well as of discussion and debate, issues, mapping exercises, sketching, generation of new ideas, claims and arguments. The eight working table attempted to conceptualize proposals for solutions to crucial problems affecting our cities. Each thematic table corresponded to a theoretical and practical challenge to be solved in relation to a bundle of issues.

Each challenge was named by an action, both as a direction to look at in the future and as a part of an action-research path that Fondazione Feltrinelli aims to keep as trajectory for its recently launched Observatory on Cities and Urban Transformations.

Such selected eight research paths were:

- ENVISAGING FAIRER DIVERCITIES, which suggested to look at the city from the perspective of social diversity in relation to issues of cohabitation, conflict, rights, minorities and forms of social inclusion in order to highlight possible ways to govern our cities so to make them just, inclusive and characterized by reduced

inequalities and enhanced diversity.

- REALIZING POTENTIAL URBAN LANDSCAPES, which proposed to understand how to realize the unexpressed potential of urbanity while it is occurring a phase of re-definition of urban elements. It specifically tried to understand how to trigger urban transformations through resources identification for the implementation of innovative possibilities.
- MAKING THE CITY THROUGH HOUSING, which aimed to look at the private dimension of housing as a way to realize fully public and planned way of living for everyone by reflecting on the evolution of cities and their state of health through urban housing history.
- REGENERATING THE CITY AS A COMMON, aimed at re-defining the issue of commons within cities through a review of different cases of social innovation compared with bottom-up and self-organization initiatives.
- PLANNING THE IMMATERIAL CITY proposed an evaluation of urban immaterial dimensions in order to identify strategic priorities to plan an equal redistribution of resources and a truly open access to them.
- DESIGNING NEW NATURESCAPES explored the ecosystem of project proposals and policies that can shape a new urban landscape to effectively reformed the alliance between nature and cities.
- PUSHING THE BORDERS, which proposed a wordplay to improve the difficult rethinking of boundaries as well as of the role they play within the social, political and administrative constitution of our cities.
- FRAMING MOBILITY AS A SPATIAL CAPITAL, reflecting upon how we can best exploit the intrinsic capital of mobility and translate its fundamental value into material and immaterial infrastructures, as well as in effective policies able to support urban populations.

The following publication collects and returns the most relevant outputs of the two days and is divided in two different volumes:

- the former, collected in this e-pub, includes the specific points of view of the coordinators of working tables in relation to the thematic challenges of the conference. Eight experts offered their own contribution to the conceptual redefinition of the questions, both on the basis of their experiences and skills and of the close confrontation with the other participants to the Feltrinelli Camp. Eight reports curated by eight rapporteurs, thus, summarize the results of the discussion at the table. The reports contain at least three key issues related to the main challenge and three possible solutions responding such issues. Some of them contain a proposal that could be possibly considered as the legacy to About a City - Places,

Ideas and Rights for 2030 citizens, the festival about cities and citizenship by Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli.

- the latter proposes some cases studies and research proposals related to the the eight themes constituting the backbones of the working tables by some of the camp participants.

The proposal of two different volumes aims to respond to the need of leaving adequate space for the richness and heterogeneity of contributions emerged during the two-days debate. In this concern, it is particularly relevant to underline some comments received by some of the participants concerning the general mood of the initiative, conceived as "a free space for open conversation, where ideas have risen simply by enabling the exchange that was not necessarily output-oriented".

With the same objective, the two-volume publication aims to fix such exchanges as well as the seeds of potential change generated by the camp already planned in a longer-lasting path. Within this framework, About a city is itself an intermediate output, that will open up to other possibilities in the future.

Feltrinelli Camp, thus, tried to lay the foundations of a strongly desired research path designed as a shared and collective action taking based on the contribution of many and aiming to catch the interest and commitment of more.

Exactly in the same way the cities we want to live should be imagined.

8 ISSUES, 8 CHALLENGES

1. Envisaging fairer divercities

Planning for the just, diverse city

Elena Ostanel

In the age of migration and mobility, cities are more and more intersection hubs where diversity is not only related to ethnicity but to socio-economic status, lifestyles, attitudes and activities. In and beyond Europe today we witness strengthened structural spatial divisions within city neighbourhoods, with increased inequality and sharper lines of division (Marcuse; van Kempen, 2000; Tammaru et al, 2016). Polarisation of urban space in many cases coexists with ethnic concentration and situations of social exclusion and deprivation.

Polarization patterns spread incomes away from the middle and, spatially, polarization involves not only an increase in the income gap between neighbourhoods, but also the erosion of middle income neighbourhoods and their transformation into either a rich or a poor neighbourhood (Walks et al, 2016, Blanco et al, 2017).

I elsewhere highlighted the need of repositioning the discourse about justice in the planning practice (Ostanel, 2015): the aspiration to give rise to the just city within the paradigm of the city of difference must be moved by a drive to transform the ways in which identities and differences are produced (Fincher, Iveson 2008) rather than the need to affirm class, race,

gender, sexuality and abilities as traits of difference.

Planning practice is today tested by radical challenges in social relations and ways of collective decision-making. Spatial planning, planning instruments and planning systems are part of the dynamics of involved actors and their practices and the institutions produced, transformed and maintained by these actors (Servillo, Van Der Broek, 2012).

The diverse city gives rise to social and political debates that go well beyond questions about technical efficiency of planning practice: the core questions are nowadays related to equity in decision making processes and empowerment of weaker social groups and functions.

Despite such an apparent importance of local democracy particularly pushed by the pervasive discourse of co-production at city level, diverse community members raised a concern about losing local democratic control over how neighbourhood change occurs. Co-production techniques are often transplanted in poor places without sufficient understanding of their effects or effectiveness – a worrying example of mimetic isomorphism (Kleinhans, 2017).

Citizen-driven innovation increases the possibilities for a broader range of people to become directly involved in all stages of social and spatial action, but social and spatial barriers are strongly preventing community participation of most vulnerable groups, particularly in those contexts affected by socio- economic and ethnic differences. In some particular neighbourhoods diversity, affordability, and social inclusion are increasingly at risk due to gentrification and real estate speculation. Particularly in these contexts, land use decision-making is particularly market-driven (instead of responding to community needs), compartmentalized (without coordination with among sectors and stakeholders) and privatized (lack of transparency

and accountability).

Likewise, acknowledging that the city of difference has plural needs does not alone tell us much about which needs are present: ethnicity is one identity marker that can diversify needs, so as the combination of economic condition, gender, age, capacity, timing, willing, preferences.

There is an urgent need, in my view, to position research in the institutions functioning (and in the planning system as a consequence): urban action is more and more a co-creation process but with different access to power, thus strengthening the gap between planning practiced and the planned.

Community planning and community organizing alone risk to be ineffective if we do not rethink the role of institutions (and the planning mechanisms) as guarantee of transparency, equity and durability. This shift is particularly urgent in a city of difference where some of its part are left by the wayside.

2. Realizing potential urban landscapes

Realizing potential urban landscapes in the era of planetary urbanization

Francesco Curci

In a completely urbanized world where the relationship between urban and rural is strongly stressed and subjected to processes of progressive crumbling (Brenner and Schmid, 2011) one of the main challenges for urban design, planning and policies is the creation of landscapes able to feed and regenerate urbanity, meaning by this the symbolic infrastructure (Zijderveld, 1998) that needs appropriate socio-economic conditions and spatial solutions to survive within a highly pervasive and differentiated urban condition.

Production and regeneration of urbanity, indeed, is a game of assignment and reassignment of social value to infrastructures, buildings and spaces that, even when socially produced, do not contribute – or have ceased to contribute – to socio-economic inclusion and integration. Especially where urbanity is weakened, latent or unexpressed, urban landscape should be understood not only as transformative potential of (planetary) urbanization processes (Brenner and Schmid, 2015) but also as the expression – and in some ways the materialization – of deliberate and targeted efforts to strengthen the symbolic and rational bonds that are typical of cities.

Indeed, what continues to make the difference between urban and non-urban is not simply a matter of size, density, morphology, heterogeneity and lifestyles; it is rather something that has to do with socio-economic and cultural complexity of what we continue to call 'city' making a metaphorical use of a word that has progressively lost its meaning during the twentieth century (Friedmann, 2002).

The healthy and fair perpetuation and renewal of this complexity, which certainly belongs only to a part of what we now call 'the urban', is one of the main challenges of contemporary 'urbanism' (Lèvy, 2012) which has to cope with fragments of the twentieth-century city and more recent urbanization patterns that are experiencing a critical re-definition under the current capitalism phase.

In particular, it is possible to recognize two lines of thought and work in relation to the unexpressed potential of urban landscapes: one related to spaces and infrastructures to which we must reassign meanings and values after that they have lost their original ones (industrial heritage, business districts, theme parks, dismissed facilities and power plants, as well as public housing estates and assets taken away from criminal organizations); the other related to portions of late-twentieth-century urban fabric that have never achieved a proper level of dignity and quality capable of contributing to the production or reproduction of urbanity (sprawling residential suburbs, industrial districts, tourist and second home settlements).

In discussing this topic, it is not possible to overlook some evidence:

- first, the importance of the contexts (both in spatial-positional and socio-political terms) with respect to the actual possibilities to build feasibility frameworks and implement urban transformations truly capable of producing an urbanity upsurge;

- second, the need to act on the concepts of public space and infrastructures as a preferential channel for urbanity reproduction;

- third, the weight that creativity and innovation (both in endogenous and exogenous terms; Florida, 2002) should have in any transformation process oriented to the strengthening of urbanity;

- fourth, the inescapability of contemplating the ecological and environmental dimensions in any transformation process of contemporary urban space;

- fifth, the awareness of the inability of the 'sharing economy' and 'platform economy' (Srnicek, 2017) to profoundly affect the quality of urban space and their only apparent capability to enhance urbanity;

- finally, the need to contrast, even through urban projects, the growing forms of social inequality and polarization that characterize the current urban societies.

3. Making the city through housing

Some critical and perspective notes on ‘making the city through housing’

Massimo Bricocoli

The right to the city as a rhetoric and abstract claim in the face of unaffordable rental housing markets.

In the face of a persistent economic crisis, prolonged regimes of austerity and precarious job market with related contraction of wages, the social demand of housing has become, in Italy as elsewhere in Europe, particularly prominent. In the past decades, extensive access to homeownership has entailed significant exposure to mortgages by families and high growth of real estate values, while neoliberal principles in public policies have had a significant impact on the housing crisis.

Housing affordability has become far more critical because of the effects of the economic crisis on income levels; even more so in the most dynamic and attractive cities.

Widely acknowledged factors are liberalised and increased rents, decreased real incomes, and a higher concentration of low income households in the rental market. At the same time, the shortage of affordable housing has become more acute, putting many at risk of eviction

and homelessness, and more extensive, in that it increasingly involves an impoverished middle class. Only recently, the European Commission policy documents and strategic frameworks have confirmed the importance of housing in the contrast of material deprivation. Moreover, the role of public housing stock as part of the patrimony of material welfare inherited by the XXth century planning and policy practices has been reaffirmed incorporating it in the notion of ‘social infrastructure’ which integrates the material dimension of housing with welfare services.

In the face of expensive rental housing markets in the most attractive and dynamic cities in Europe, the “right to the city” sounds very often as an easy rhetoric and abstract claim, while those who find a – mostly temporary - job opportunity and lack family backing have to spend most of their salaries to ensure themselves an acceptable housing solution. The provision of affordable housing is assumed as an essential action to contrast material deprivation and to foster social justice, but this requires far more targeted and accountable programs and projects to be conceived and developed by cities, public and private actors.

Targeting affordability: the need of more accountability in housing programs and projects Research on current policies prove how a system based on an enduring culture of homeownership as synonymous of social stability and on the lack of investment in public housing programs is today inadequate in respect to the social needs of the poorest as well as to the great deal of flexibility, mobility and temporariness required by the mutated socio-economic conditions (the precariousness of labour market, aging population, migration flows, etc.).

In a similar way, it is necessary to realize and publicly discuss that the recent developments in social housing programs promoted and developed by new actors supported by bank foundations and ethical funds are turning out

to be rather inadequate to answer to the social demand of affordable housing. The emerging of a 'social housing system', while broadening the spectrum of the providers and beneficiaries has contributed to further exclude the most vulnerable, who are composing the very social demand today, and has reduced the public role in the defence of the effectiveness of public policies, limiting its action to an unconditioned mandate to the private sector. Moreover, several social housing projects developed in the frame of the protagonism of new financial investors tend to be: a) overrepresented and playing a major role in the governance of housing at the cost of programs aimed at improving the liveability of public housing and the promotion of low cost housing projects; b) far too normative in their ideological call for communities and collaborative models while they are elusively seeking to guarantee a number of selected and reliable tenants to the investors.

In the field of planning and social sciences, studies concentrate on the evolution and complexification of the housing demand while studies that inquiry housing supply and the re-actualization of public action in the supply-side are limited and require urgent attention. A public campaign promoting a pragmatic debate on the "costs" of housing (rather than on pre-defined models and projects) and disputing the so-called "culture of ownership" by bringing a new "culture of usership" is to be welcomed at the city level. A more heterogeneous, dynamic and affordable rental sector represents a key prerequisite to support housing inclusion, in the light of higher labour mobility, increased adequateness of housing and highly diversified life styles and trajectories.

4. Regenerating the city as a common

The need to reflect upon city as a common

Marianna d'Ovidio

On a crucial text about cities and social innovation, it is claimed that regenerating the city means reinvigorating its urbanity: those urban qualities and social relations that define the city as a physical and socially cohesive entity (Vicari Haddock and Moulaert, 2009).

Cities are now threatened, on this concern, by the corrosion of public spaces, increasing inequalities and disconnections of the multiple elements composing them. The suggestion is therefore to start from the nature of the city itself and reflect upon the regeneration of the city as a common.

The challenge is valuable, as it allows and forces us to articulate a dense and rich discussion, that, also during the meeting of Feltrinelli camp 2018, has taken its form in three main lines of thoughts.

Firstly, it means to reflect upon the city as a common within the frame of regeneration. Secondly, we can strategically think how to use commons in order to regenerate the city; and finally, we can explore the issue of creating, recognising and managing the commons. These are all crucial topics and very much intertwined: it is on their connections that we want to reflect upon.

Here, let me point out the premises of that discussion.

We have to conceive the city as a fluidity, where all the possibilities can express: the urban is to be addressed as a fluid and dynamic ecosystem inhabited by different and changing populations. The city is the place where “the powerless make history without getting empowered in the process” (Sassen, 2012).

Today, however, the city is extremely fragmented, both in its social constituency and in its physical form: elite neighbourhoods, shopping malls, cultural and entertainment facilities, large exposition centres are often very well detached from the rest of the city, where residential neighbourhood for lower-classes are placed, where vast portions are abandoned and eventually occupied by the most marginalised groups.

The crucial element here is, obviously, the public space (physical or not) as a field open to participation and where relations are developing among all formally equal citizens, who recognise themselves as such.

Due to the current globalisation and commodification dynamics, the city is endangered by an increasing process of erosion of its urban character and it has become more and more the place of individualisation, privatisation and disintegration of the social fabric (Sennett, 1990). The regeneration of the city is often conceived as a pacification of those (once public) spaces where diversities gather, meet and sometimes clash; a pacification often obtained through the privatisation of the places and the eviction of the most different ones.

It is urgent to conceive urban regeneration as a practice able to create interrelations and to create spaces, understood, in a circular meaning, as the products of such interrelations (Massey, 2005). Addressed as such, both production and use of the urban space become a profoundly political action,

because constitutive of the creation and actualisation of the political subjectivity of citizen: the act of acknowledging and recognising diversities and interrelation among them is at the core of the political sphere of society.

Regenerating the city as a common means, therefore, conceiving the urban as a political process of building space and, at the same time, a process of building identities; it means creating a city capable of accepting, making emerge and interrelate all possible subjectivities.

5. Planning the immaterial city

Planning the Immaterial City

Mark Deakin

The immaterial city is an illusive concept. Attempts to define it have to first wrestle with the notion of the immaterial and then grapple with the challenge of qualifying how such properties now define the nature of the city we all experience.

This poses an immediate problem, as the immaterial is understood to mean: spiritual, the intangible, incorporeal, the disembodied, impalpable, ethereal, even unsubstantial properties of the city. Whereas the material relates not to the spiritual, but the physical and to the composition of the organic material from which a thing is or can be made tangible and whose underlying corporeal properties embody the worldly, earthly, concrete, real, solid and substantial qualities that surface as the data, information and technologies of the city.

If the latter can be directly related to the rise of the industrial city, then the former lies in the idea of the post-industrial city dominated by services sectors and notion of immaterial labour lying not so much with industrial production, but with cities as centres for the accumulation of capital. In that sense, with cities where the productivity of the extractive, manufacturing and construction sectors are supplemented with the service that cultivate a

process of wealth creation whose use of data, information and technology produces knowledge now seen as key to the continued existence of the city.

Key to the continued existence of the city in that such an understanding of the immaterial unlocks the potential which they, not industries have to become the powerhouses of economic growth and prosperity. That is to say, become the powerhouses of an economic growth, whose prosperity is now seen to rest not so much on an accumulation of material wealth, but augmentation of those immaterial properties which any such objectification of the city serves to qualify in terms of science and technology. In particular, in terms of that science and technology which serves to cultivate modes of communication able to assign value to the images and symbols this produces. To the images and symbols, this in turn produces as an equivalent measure of the corporeal, tangible, mundane, worldly, earthly, concrete, real solid and substantial existence of cities. That equivalent measure which the data, information and technologies not only now desire to embody, but also make sense of for the vast majority of the world's population who now inhabit what would otherwise be the other worldliness of a highly alienated, even delirious state of existence.

As the embodiment of a desiring machine, the immaterial city is just as equally challenging not only in terms of the society this cultivates, but in relation to the science and technology it also assembles to scaffold such a worldly, earthly and concrete reality. For the society this cultivates is still divided in terms of access to the intellectual capital such a process of capital accumulation is founded on, as well as the ecological destruction this wealth creation in turn gives rise to. In particular, the ecological destruction this process of wealth creation in turn gives rise to and which is not only socially inequitable, but also serves to impoverish the vast majority of earth's population by leaving them alienated from any solid or substantial claim to the proceeds of that labour. To the proceeds of that labour, which being

insubstantial and liquid leaves the vast majority of earth's population unable to participate in the prosperous future any such notion of the immaterial city otherwise lays claim to.

6. Designing new naturescapes

The preferred color of the future's cities

Laura Gatti

Every workday, hundreds of thousands of people drive them downtown from their home on the outskirts of the city of Milano, and every day, they would enter a cloud of smog, where pollution exceeded the safe levels set by the European Union. Something's needed to change—in our life, and in the way we think about our cities. Today more than half of the world's population lives in urban settings, and that proportion is projected to increase to more than two-thirds by 2050. Currently, urban areas cover around 2% of the

planet's land area, but by 2030, they could stretch to almost 10% of the world's land surface. That means losing some 1.2 million square kilometers of other landscapes to urban construction alone, many of them rich in biodiversity. From the other hand, getting lots of people to live close together could help to improve a creative and efficient use of energy, water, sewer systems and land, leading to more efficient use of resources and smaller carbon footprints.

We should learn better ways to design and manage our cities so that they are no longer competing with nature but are coexisting with it. Cities can incorporate the natural world in new and innovative ways. This knowledge

is crucial to the development of planning measures that provide the right green infrastructure, for example in the form of urban tree cover, gardens and urban green spaces, sustainable urban drainage systems, green roofs and walls and others, necessary to facilitate the conservation of urban biodiversity in otherwise highly fragmented urban ecosystems and for a sustained ecosystem delivery

to the urban population and human well-being, together with improved adaptation and urban resilience.

There are many really good reasons to improve different natural elements such as trees, green roofs and walls, wetlands, and rain gardens.

Green complements grey: the lifespan of hardscapes can be extended when they are built in tandem with green infrastructure. Green roofs, walls and neighboring trees can make individual buildings more energy efficient and climate friendly by reducing heating and cooling demands and greenhouse gases.

The water pollution is reduced by green infrastructure more cost effectively than grey infrastructure alone: vegetation, drainage layers and soils retain water and reduce stormwater volumes. Trees and vegetation directly remove air pollutants. Lower air temperatures slow the formation of ground-level ozone or smog.

Community gardens and green roofs provide both recreation and better access to local, healthy food.

Connected green spaces make cities more livable, encouraging people to hike, bike, walk, and enjoy nature more often.

Urban forests, green roofs, walls and wetlands which embrace species

diversity creating habitat for native bees, birds, butterflies, rare plants and other species.

Contemporary cities are run by machines that use fossil fuels and change them into energy, carbon dioxide and industrial pollutants. In recent years the attempt to switch to renewables to avoid the need for using fossil fuels has started, but the percentage of energy provided by these alternatives remains small. Yet, there is an alternative technology available, which we have barely begun to apply to its full potential.

Nature provides a rich portfolio of sometimes unlikely living technologies that may shape our near-future lifestyles in new ways. We do not have to copy nature but can directly design and engineer her processes with such precision – and on a range of scales – that we can think of them as a new kind of technology.

A different view of the unprecedented migration from rural to urban areas reveals that cities could offer a hope for the survival of other species and ecosystems in the Anthropocene. Cities are entirely shaped and created by humans to protect and separate them from the natural world, allowing selected species in and keeping others out. But since cities do not exist as islands in isolation, it could be seen that a surprising

amount of wildlife now depends on the human-made environment. The mix of human-introduced plant and animal species, and those opportunists that migrate to the urban environment, are interacting to produce unique ecosystems that exist nowhere else, helping us understand how cities serve as wildlife corridors.

Nature in cities, as living technologies has unique properties that may enable us to plan and realize urban spaces in a different way, since makes the city itself more adaptable, robust and giving an incredible ability to

transform one thing into another. While nature needs cities because they represent a resource-efficient way for people to live, cities also deeply need nature to become also producers, not only consumers.

7. Pushing the borders

Unchartered boundaries

Luca Gaeta

Boundaries are not destined to disappear in the next future. The enthusiasts of a flatten world have rejoiced too soon after the demise of the Iron Curtain and the subsequent triumph of globalism. At different scales, ranging from local to international, boundaries are proliferating (Foucher 2016) also because they matter for the everyday lives of billions of people.

According to recent estimates, international migrants worldwide account for 3.4% of the world's population (United Nations 2017). Inversely, then, the overwhelming majority of people live in the country where they are born, even in the same administrative area.

A clear misunderstanding permeates the discussions on boundaries. This is the deeply rooted idea according to which boundaries are a hindrance to movement. Often depicted as barriers and walls (Brown, 2010), namely material artefacts purposely designed to impede the free movement of people and goods, boundaries are rather intrinsic to movement.

According to Thomas Nail (2016, p. 21), «a theory of the border also requires a reinterpretation of society itself as a process of movement and circulation». However, it is not necessary to imagine the border as

something material that is superimposed on social motion, thus blocking and diverting it. My contention rather is that boundaries are quite misunderstood if taken as self-sufficient entities, either material or social.

Let us imagine for a moment boundaries as the settings of everyday life and, more exactly, as tracks of the ordinary comings and goings of people. Let us imagine boundaries as embedded with routine motion patterns. Adopting the viewpoint of everyday practices, along with a theory of practice, the result is that boundaries are integral to social motion, not external to it. Accordingly, boundaries do not exist apart from regular practices and their related motions.

This does not mean to put aside the issues of power and control. Rather, this means understanding control as based on the comings and goings of people. It means understanding the mutual interplay of social and administrative territorialities. Boundaries become the sharp lines of demarcation we are familiar with inasmuch administrative powers attempt to trace the motion patterns of people.

Either for securing general welfare or to achieve social control, territories are divided into districts. However, the administrative layers of spatial ordering are built upon the customary territoriality of common citizens. As life goes on, mismatches inevitably occur between administrative boundaries and everyday practices. Control is never achieved permanently. The spillover of social motion puts administrative boundaries out of joint from time to time.

In this sense, it is useful to remember Michel de Certeau (1990) and his appeal not to overlook the subversive aspect of everyday practices, their inexhaustible inventive vein of uses unforeseen by the authorities. Unchartered boundaries are generated through unpredictable changes in

motion patterns and daily routines as well as through disruptive technological innovations.

Reconciling administrative districts with the paths of citizens is a task that requires strong practical expertise of boundary making and an intellectual understanding of boundaries as mundane horizons. Experts in this domain must be sensitive to the intertwining of society and space. Above all, what is crucially needed is an ethical capacity to discern in concrete settings the emancipative potential of a boundary line from its segregative potential. The resulting space may be more or less democratic in essence, more or less tolerant of diversity and coexistence (Massey 2005; Williams 2006).

Living with boundaries is not only possible but also inevitable as long as we share the planet and its continents with billions of people. Boundaries change their position, shape, functions and symbolic meaning over time. Everyday practices go on everywhere and always, either in peaceful or painful circumstances, and leave traces of their presence.

8. Framing mobility as a spatial capital

Mobility: what spatial capital

Paola Pucci

New research evidence, combining social and spatial theory in new ways (Sheller 2011), suggests a transformative nexus for explaining the role of mobility in contemporary cities, superseding simplified interpretations of mobility as movement through space, to reconceptualize it as "part of the process of social production of time and space" (Cresswell 2006, p.5).

As a "spatialisation of time and temporalization of space" (Kaufmann, 2014) mobility opens up new interpretative and operative perspectives, also for the urban policies.

On the one hand, mobility as a cause and consequence of changes in the organization of daily life "(Urry 2000), becomes "a total social phenomenon" through which "understanding the connections, assemblages, and practices that both frame and generate contemporary everyday life" (Adey and Bissel 2010).

Based on this interpretation, mobility represents an "analyser" (Bourdin 2005, p. 17) useful for describing the socio-spatial-temporal transformations in urban life and work-programs (Bourdin 2005; Kaufmann, 2002, Sheller and Urry 2006; Cresswell 2006) and identifying the urban rhythms - "the

coordinates through which inhabitants and visitors frame and order the urban experience” (Amin and Thrift 2002, p. 17).

At the same time, following another perspective, mobility plays a constitutive role in the structuring of urban spaces, not only because of the intensity with which the territory and its networks are used, but because mobility becomes an “act of territorialisation” (Raffestin 1980). According to Lévy “mobility is not only a technical tool for linking places. Insofar as the accessibility between places is a condition of existence of the city itself, mobility becomes an indisputable process of urbanogenesis”. In doing so, “the accelerated reorganisation and restructuring of the geography of movements define the spatiality of human societies (Soja 2004, p. 176).

Both perspectives, focussing on the material conditions of mobility and to the associated practices, it allow to reconceptualize mobility as a product of social practices and, at the same time, as a "producer" of spatiality, so as to be reinterpreted as spatial capital.

Mobility practices mobilise capital but, at the same time, thanks to the various forms of interaction triggered, they in turn generate new capital” (Coleman 1990, p. 302).

As a spatial capital, mobility is “a resource for action” (Coleman, 1990) thanks to the accessibility that conveys individuals’ “capabilities of performing activities at certain locations” (van Wee, 2011, p. 32), assuming that a person’s accessibility depends on both context (transportation systems, land use patterns, temporal availability) and individual features (such as vehicle ownership, income level, abilities, time sovereignty).

Overcoming the traditional approaches to accessibility that focus only on places or transport supply, accessibility is re-conceptualized as capacity to reach valued activities, to provide opportunities and contribute to

participation in social life .

In this framework, combining available resources (material and immaterial, physical and personal) and personal projects and capabilities (both economic and cultural), mobility turns in spatial capital thanks to accessibility.

References

Aitkenhead-Peterson J. and Volder A. (2010), *Urban ecosystem ecology*, ASA CSSA SSSA.

Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (2002). *Cities. Reimagining the urban*. Cambridge: Polity.

Benedict M. A., McMahon Edward T. (2006), *Green infrastructure; linking landscape and communities*, Island press

Bourdin, A. (2005). Les mobilités et le programme de la sociologie. *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie*, 118(1), 5–21.

Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2011). Planetary Urbanization. In M. Gandy (ed.), *Urban Constellations*. Berlin: Jovis Verlag.

Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2015). Towards a New Epistemology of the Urban?. *City*, 19 (2–3), 151-182.

Brown W. (2010), *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*, Zone Books, New York.

Certeau M. de (1990), *L'invention du quotidien, tome 1: Arts de faire*, Gallimard, Paris.

Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: Mass.

Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. London: Routledge.

Fincher R., Iveson K. (2012), *Justice and Injustice in the City*, *Geographical Research*, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 231-241.

Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.

Forman. R. T. T. (1995) *Land Mosaics; the ecology of landscapes and regions*, Cambridge university press

Foucher M. (2016), *Le retour des frontières*, CNRS Editions, Paris.

Friedmann, J. (2002). *The Prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Girling C., Kellet R. (2005), *Skinny streets & green neighborhoods; design for environment and community*. Island press

Grant G.(2012), *Ecosystem services come to town; greening cities by working with nature*. Wiley Blackwell

Kaufmann, V. (2002). *Re-thinking mobility. Contemporary sociology*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Kaufmann, V. (2014). *Mobility as a tool for sociology. Sociologica 1*

Kennen K. and Kirkwood N. (2015), *Phyto; principles and resources for site remediation and landscape design*, Routledge.

Kleinhans R., (2017), *False promises of co-production in neighbourhood regeneration: the case of Dutch community enterprises*, *Public Management Review*, Volume 19, 2017 - Issue 10 Levin M.J., Kim K.H.J., Morel J.L.,

Burghardt W., Charzynski P. , Shaw R. K. (2017), Soils within cities; global approaches to their sustainable management. CATENA soil sciences Lévy, J. (2012). Public space in a global perspective: Criteria and cultural dimensions. In J. Acebillo, J. Lévy & C. Schmid (eds.), *Globalization of urbanity* (pp. 94–111). Barcelona: Actar. Louv R. (2005) Last Child in the Woods: Saving Our Children From Nature-Deficit Disorder, *Workman Publishing Company*.

Marcuse P., Van Kempen P. (2000) *Globalizing Cities: A New Spatial Order?* Springer, UK

Marsh W.M. (1983), *Landscape planning; environmental applications*.Wile

Massey D. (2005), *For Space*, Sage, London.

Nail T. (2016), *Theory of the Border*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Orfeuil, J.P. (ed.) (2004). *Transports, pauvretés, exclusions: Pouvoir bouger pour s'en sortir*. La Tour-d'Aigues: Éditions de l'Aube.

Ostanel E. (2015), Toward a just intercultural city space in Marconi G., Ostanel, E. (eds, 2015), *The Intercultural City: Migration, Minorities and the Management of Diversity*, IB Tauris, London

Raffestin, C. (1980). *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*. Paris: LITEC.

Sassen, S. (2012) Urban capabilities: an essay on our challenges and differences. *Journal of International Affairs* 65.2.

Sennett, R. (1990) *The conscience of the eye: the design and social life of cities*. Knopf: Distributed by Random House, New York.

Servillo L.A., Van der Broek P. (2012), The Social Construction of Planning Systems: A Strategic-Relational Institutional Approach, *Planning*

Practice & Research, Volume 27, 2012 - Issue 1.

Sheller, M. (2011). *Mobility*. Sociopedia.isa. Available at: <http://www.sagepub.net/isa/resources/pdf/Mobility.pdf>. Accessed in August 8, 2013.

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 207–226.

Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Soja, E. (2004). Le temps des nodalités post-métropolitaines. In S. Allemand, F. Ascher, & J. Lévy (Eds.), *Les sens du mouvement* (pp. 175–181). Paris: Belin.

Tammaru T., Marcińczak S., van Ham M., Musterd S. (2016), *Socio-Economic Segregation in European Capital Cities. East meet west*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis, UK

Tasan-Koc T., Van Kempen R., Raco M., Bolt G. (2014) *Towards Hyper-Diversified European Cities. A Critical Literature*

Thompson W. J. and Sorving K. (2000) *Sustainable landscape construction; guide to green building outdoors*, Island Press.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2017), *International Migrant Stock: The 2017 revision*, www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/est

Urry J., (2000). *Sociology beyond societies: Mobilities for the twenty-first century*. London: Routledge.

van Wee, B. (2011). *Transport and Ethics: Ethics and the Evaluation of*

Transport Policies and Projects. Celtenham: Elgar.

Vicari Haddock, S. and Moulaert, F. (2009) *Rigenerare la città: pratiche di innovazione sociale nelle città europee*. Il mulino, Bologna

Williams J. (2006), *The Ethics of Territorial Borders. Drawing Lines in the Shifting Sand*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke.

Zijderveld, A. (1998). *A Theory of Urbanity. The Economic and Civic Culture of Cities*. New Brunswick. London: Transaction Publishers.

Final Reports

THEMATIC TABLE 1. ENVISAGING FAIRER DIVERCITIES

Giulia Frova

The challenge

In the age of migration, cities appear as transit nodes and intersection hubs, presenting a mixture of different populations and cultures. Individuals with diversified origins and multi-local origins claim for new forms of citizenship and involvement. Old and new inequalities and spatial polarizations imply an urgent and substantial rethinking of urban participation and uses, as well as an effective acknowledgment of the increasingly plural demands coming from urban societies.

Looking at the city from the perspective of social diversity requires interrogating issues of cohabitation and housing, conflict, rights, jobs opportunities and forms of social inclusion, and it highlights the need to imagine possible new forms of governance and just and inclusive future characterized by reduced inequalities and enhanced diversity.

From a research point of view, classic and viable theoretical frameworks like the “intercultural vs multicultural vs cosmopolitan city” are often not sufficient to investigate these phenomena, which need to be researched at the ground level, a challenge that needs to be taken up through different

approaches and methods.

Analysing urban citizenship and participation, for instance, implies investigating the relationship between people and the institution at the local level, and it requires learning about a specific neighbourhood and their policy developments before widening the lens at city level. Likewise, acknowledging that the ‘city of differences’ has plural needs does not alone tell us much about which needs are present: ethnicity is one identity marker that can diversify needs, so as the combination of economic condition, gender, age, ability and so on.

An intersectional approach that considers all variables is often difficult to adopt, but it is the only way to get a more truthful and complex picture on spatial polarization, marginalities and inequalities.

Key issues

ACCESS TO RIGHTS

People with migrant background in “diverse” cities do not exercise their full array of rights as city dwellers for a combination of legislative frameworks: restrictive Citizenship Laws that prevent them from feeling equally recognized, National laws that criminalize immigration and produce an “army” of invisible and irregular dwellers, local administration bureaucracies that make it difficult for “foreigners” to access services.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Old and new inequalities and spatial polarizations imply an urgent and substantial rethinking of urban participation to enhance the political engagement of both new and old dwellers of the city.

WELFARE

The universal welfare system has been more and more reduced due to decades of multiple crises and unsustainable economic development models.

This has resulted in the rise of xenophobic attitudes towards “new citizens”, seen as competing for city-based welfare. On the other hand, standard welfare provision fails to recognize specific needs of citizens with a migrant background: inequalities are therefore re-instated instead of being reduced.

NARRATIVES

Toxic and stereotypical representations of migration on a national level are pervasive and influence the perception of cities: this prevents local, evidence-based, narratives to come to the fore.

Possible solutions

CITY-LEVEL CITIZENSHIP

Local institutions should drive a policy change that overcomes Nation-based citizenship rights and enforces a city-based system able to provide equal access to civil rights and public services.

ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP POLICIES

Researchers should participate in designing an integrated and publicly-led policy dedicated to encouraging active citizenship through a variety of tools such as community action-research in all neighbourhood, participatory art-based projects (“laboratori di quartiere”).

CITY WELFARE

A new welfare system at city level should be put in place by relevant stakeholders, based on community-based initiatives for an effective and diversified response to emerging social needs.

CITY LEVEL NARRATIVES

Place-based, city-level narratives that draw on the plural legacy of cities

as places of migration should be produced and promoted by all stakeholders.

A proposal

PROPOSAL FOR “ABOUT A CITY” FESTIVAL – “STAYING WITH THE TROUBLE”

In the midst of spiraling ecological devastation, multispecies feminist theorist Donna J. Haraway in her book *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene* offers provocative new ways to reconfigure our relations to the earth and all its inhabitants.

Learning to “stay with the trouble” of living and dying together on a damaged earth will prove more conducive to the kind of thinking that would provide the means to building more livable futures. Inspired by one of the most daring and original thinkers of our time, the Group proposes to develop a new Research framework to investigate Milan as a diverse city, to be launched during the Festival “About a city”.

Research would involve investigating identified challenges in the city of Milan, through a participatory action-research with visual and creative outputs.

THEMATIC TABLE 2. REALIZING POTENTIAL URBAN LANDSCAPES

Sara Troglio

The challenge

In accordance to the working group abstract’s general outline, which presented the degree of housing inclusion as a yardstick for assessing the cities’ “state of health”, the table recognised home as the basic individual requisite for having a “public existence” within urban societies and an active

role in urban life. Home is thus interpreted as a foundation of citizenship: a crucial precondition for satisfying the other social needs and, then, the fulfilment of individual aspirations.

In this light, by clustering the individual contributions of the participants, three main thematic areas were identified. They allowed the working group to define the terms of the problem, by addressing: 1) the major transformations underlying heterogeneous (and often conflicting) life styles, social needs, family structures, and, then, changing housing practices; 2) the social, political and economic conditions enabling an inclusive governance of the housing policy field – with a focus on the different roles of public institutions, market actors, non-profit entities, social movements and individuals; 3) the state of the overall housing system, the factors which put it under tension and its prospect of change – with reference to the public as much as the private existing stock, homeownership as well as the rental sector.

Along these lines, the challenge addressed by the working group, concerns the need of rethinking and innovating the housing policy field and the related governance arrangements, thus promoting a transition in the housing system, being responsive to the major factors of tension currently affecting the urban housing demand in the Italian context.

Key issues

Since the 1980s, major changes – such as labour recommodification, migrations, demographic transformations and general impoverishment – led to an increasing diversification of housing needs, which have underlain the housing crisis in Italy. On the one hand, they impacted on a deficient rental sector, with entailing problems of accessibility and permanence. On the other hand, these changes reflected on the living conditions of low-middle-class homeowners. Although being a key source of asset-based welfare,

indeed, homeownership has also proven to be a potential entrapment – by conflicting with emerging demands for higher housing mobility.

Existing housing policy instruments have shown to be inadequate to tackle these new factors of tension. In particular, both new marketised policy orientations and the increasing dependence from private investments resulted in: a lack of public regulation of market actors' initiatives (especially in terms of effective value capture mechanisms); insufficient governance coordination, lacking of a substantive steering role of the public actor; the absence of spaces of negotiation with social movements and grass-root entities, which has hampered the assimilation of local knowledge, inhabitants' good practices and bottom-up experimentations into the policy framework.

However, any change in the housing field must deal with the conditions of the existing stock as a whole. Firstly, the living standards in urban peripheries are affected by urgent problems of management and maintenance of the public housing system, which arose due to the drastic cost-cutting in this field. Secondly, as shown by the availability of vacant housing, the amount of housing units exceeds the overall demand; housing crisis rather depended on the specificity of the housing system, in terms of dimensions, typologies, tenure allocation and affordability of available units – where the high fragmentation of homeownership limits any scope for action.

Possible solutions

Enhancing (normatively and financially) the role of public institutions in structuring and steering an integrated and expanding affordable housing sector, including the related housing provision from public authorities, non-profit actors, cooperatives and individual landlords under a common, protecting and consistent framework.

Encouraging a new transitional conception of housing inclusion, through developing innovative affordable housing solutions which cover access, permanence and changes in time and space by taking into account the evolving and incremental nature of housing needs (as a result of migrations, labour trajectories and age-related conditions).

Solving the urgent problems of management and maintenance of the public housing stock through re-establishing a public funding channel for regenerating and readapting (in terms of dimensions, facilities and energy efficiency of the housing units) this stock, and promoting a positive change in urban peripheries.

Unlocking the public and private housing rental sector by: providing contemporaneously both new guarantees for landlords and social protections for tenants; mobilising the fragmented and underutilised private stock, with incentivising house splitting, innovative forms of co-habitations, activation of vacant properties, practices of re-use and self-restoration.

A proposal

A public campaign disputing the so-called “culture of ownership” by bringing a new “culture of usership” into the public debate. The campaign aims to problematize the centrality of homeownership in the Italian housing system, and the resulting excessive homogeneity of the corresponding housing provision arrangement. The proposal is based on the idea that a more heterogeneous, dynamic and affordable rental sector represents a key prerequisite to improve housing inclusion, in the light of higher labour mobility, increased transitionality of housing and highly diversified life styles and trajectories.

THEMATIC TABLE 3. MAKING THE CITY THROUGH HOUSING

Emanuele Belotti

The challenge

In accordance to the working group abstract's general outline, which presented the degree of housing inclusion as a yardstick for assessing the cities' "state of health", the table recognised home as the basic individual requisite for having a "public existence" within urban societies and an active role in urban life. Home is thus interpreted as a foundation of citizenship: a crucial precondition for satisfying the other social needs and, then, the fulfilment of individual aspirations.

In this light, by clustering the individual contributions of the participants, three main thematic areas were identified. They allowed the working group to define the terms of the problem, by addressing: 1) the major transformations underlying heterogeneous (and often conflicting) life styles, social needs, family structures, and, then, changing housing practices; 2) the social, political and economic conditions enabling an inclusive governance of the housing policy field – with a focus on the different roles of public institutions, market actors, non-profit entities, social movements and individuals –; 3) the state of the overall housing system, the factors which put it under tension and its prospect of change – with reference to the public as much as the private existing stock, homeownership as well as the rental sector.

Along these lines, the challenge addressed by the working group, concerns the need of rethinking and innovating the housing policy field and the related governance arrangements, thus promoting a transition in the housing system, being responsive to the major factors of tension currently affecting the urban housing demand in the Italian context.

Key issues

Since the 1980s, major changes – such as labour recommodification, migrations, demographic transformations and general impoverishment – led to an increasing diversification of housing needs, which have underlain the housing crisis in Italy. On the one hand, they impacted on a deficient rental sector, with entailing problems of accessibility and permanence. On the other hand, these changes reflected on the living conditions of low-middle-class homeowners. Although being a key source of asset-based welfare, indeed, homeownership has also proven to be a potential entrapment – by conflicting with emerging demands for higher housing mobility.

Existing housing policy instruments have shown to be inadequate to tackle these new factors of tension. In particular, both new marketised policy orientations and the increasing dependence from private investments resulted in: a lack of public regulation of market actors' initiatives (especially in terms of effective value capture mechanisms); insufficient governance coordination, lacking of a substantive steering role of the public actor; the absence of spaces of negotiation with social movements and grass-root entities, which has hampered the assimilation of local knowledge, inhabitants' good practices and bottom-up experimentations into the policy framework.

However, any change in the housing field must deal with the conditions of the existing stock as a whole. Firstly, the living standards in urban peripheries are affected by urgent problems of management and maintenance of the public housing system, which arose due to the drastic cost-cutting in this field. Secondly, as shown by the availability of vacant housing, the amount of housing units exceeds the overall demand; housing crisis rather depended on the specificity of the housing system, in terms of dimensions, typologies, tenure allocation and affordability of available units – where the high fragmentation of homeownership limits any scope for action.

Possible solutions

Enhancing (normatively and financially) the role of public institutions in structuring and steering an integrated and expanding affordable housing sector, including the related housing provision from public authorities, non-profit actors, cooperatives and individual landlords under a common, protecting and consistent framework.

Encouraging a new transitional conception of housing inclusion, through developing innovative affordable housing solutions which cover access, permanence and changes in time and space by taking into account the evolving and incremental nature of housing needs (as a result of migrations, labour trajectories and age-related conditions).

Solving the urgent problems of management and maintenance of the public housing stock through re-establishing a public funding channel for regenerating and readapting (in terms of dimensions, facilities and energy efficiency of the housing units) this stock, and promoting a positive change in urban peripheries.

Unlocking the public and private housing rental sector by: providing contemporaneously both new guarantees for landlords and social protections for tenants; mobilising the fragmented and underutilised private stock, with incentivising house splitting, innovative forms of co-habitations, activation of vacant properties, practices of re-use and self-restoration.

A proposal

A public campaign disputing the so-called “culture of ownership” by bringing a new “culture of usership” into the public debate. The campaign aims to problematize the centrality of homeownership in the Italian housing system, and the resulting excessive homogeneity of the corresponding housing provision arrangement. The proposal is based on the idea that a

more heterogeneous, dynamic and affordable rental sector represents a key prerequisite to improve housing inclusion, in the light of higher labour mobility, increased transitionality of housing and highly diversified life styles and trajectories.

THEMATIC TABLE 4. REGENERATING THE CITY AS A COMMON

Luca Calafati

The challenge

A shared text that re-writes the challenge of each working table based on the exchange had during the camp

From the group discussion it emerged that the challenge *Regenerating the City as a Common* is too broad to engender a productive solution-oriented conversation. The group hence decided to split in 3 working groups exploring the following issues:

- Understanding the city *as a common*

Defining the commons is not an easy task. What are the commons? Are they specific natural resources or a way of managing resources? What does it mean to conceive the city as a commons? It is just about changing the perspective from which we look at cities or do we need to fundamentally rethink the concept of the city in itself?

- Regenerating the city *through* commons

What is urban regeneration? What are its aims? It is giving things to communities (new houses, new squares etc.) or it is about a broader process of political empowerment? In more general terms, is urban regeneration about the process or it is about the outcome, or both? How would

regeneration processes look like from the perspective commons?

- *Managing existing* urban commons

Despite unclear definitions and legal status, projects that identify as ‘urban commons’ have proliferated in cities across Europe and beyond. What can we learn from these experiments? What are their strengths and what challenges do they face? What do they need to stabilise, grow and improve?

Key issues

The 3 key issues that emerged from the discussion are:

- Recognise differences and balance out power-relations

Creating and managing commons is by definition a collective process where different actors – individuals, associations, communities, and institutions – interact. This poses a big challenge in terms of allowing/encouraging/safeguarding the different subjectivities, imaginaries and desires of the people involved. Furthermore it requires balancing out the power relations that might be engendered by such differences as well as by the status of the involved organisations.

- Sustain and connect the existing patrimony of urban commons

The recent interest of policy makers in urban commons is welcome yet risks to present urban commons as a ‘new thing’. Over the past decades, citizens groups across Europe have already created and safeguarded urban commons through bottom-up projects, including urban parks, community centres and theatres. Often this has taken place in conflict with governmental bodies and real estate developers. In this context, a crucial challenge is to find the legal and financial ways to stabilise and grow the existing patrimony of urban commons.

- Give value to informality, dynamism and fluidity

Inspired by modernism, urban institutions – governance structures, regimes of ownership, regulations – tend to be rather static and rigid. In contrast, cities are fluid and dynamic ecosystems inhabited by different and changing populations. Not surprisingly, informal urban setting – like abandoned buildings, parks and squares – rather than formal public arenas have been the ideal breeding ground of social innovation. This applies also to projects promoting urban commons. A third big challenge is hence to reshape urban institutions to make them open and flexible in order to accommodate the dynamism and fluidity of urban life.

Possible solutions

Reconfigure regeneration as political empowerment

Regeneration is often conducted as something that local governments do to people. Within this frame, local communities are constructed as needy and passive. Consequently participation of local communities in regeneration projects tend to take the forms of consultation. In contrast, from the perspective of the commons, regeneration should be a form of political empowerment. It would give local communities the space and the knowledge required to critically discuss and set the objectives of public action. Furthermore, it should be structured in a way that is inclusive and balances out the power relations between different groups so that everyone has a voice.

Municipal support of urban commons

Bottom-up projects creating urban commons refuse market practices and rely on unpaid volunteers to sustain themselves. Working outside the market economy provides freedom for experimentation, but limits the resources available to such projects. Municipal authority should recognise groups creating urban commons as producer of public goods. Therefore, municipal

authorities should use the resources they have to support such projects in order to stabilise and grow them. For instance, in the case of community-managed buildings, municipal institution could pay maintenance costs and utility bills. Municipal authorities should fully recognise the legitimacy of bottom-up projects promoting urban common, regardless the fact that such practices may not fit formal regulations and schemes.

Legal and institutional innovations In Europe commons have existed for centuries protected by specific norms and regulations. With industrialization, commons have undergone a massive process of enclosure, especially in urban areas. In parallel, most regulations enabling communities to use commons have disappeared. In the Italian context a few of these regulations still exist in rural contexts. To make space for urban commons is hence crucial that cities introduce legal frameworks and - more broadly - institutions that recognise the 'commons' a distinctive form of community ownership beyond public and private ownership. These frameworks and institutions should be open and flexible to accommodate the dynamism and fluidity of urban life.

A proposal

Towards 'political regeneration'? Rethinking urban regeneration as political empowerment

Urban regeneration is about reinvigorating the urbanity of a city, i.e. strengthening those urban qualities and social relations that define the city as a physical and socially cohesive entity. Politics is one of the crucial features of modern urbanity. As the work of urban scholars like Saskia Sassen, David Harvey and Edward Soja suggest, modern cities are defined by being the place where political subjectivities form and perform. Starting from this premise, our proposal for 'About a city' is to start a discussion about rethinking urban regeneration in terms of political empowerment of disenfranchised communities. Regeneration should be only about giving

deprived communities new houses, new transports and new public spaces or it should also be about building the capacity of communities to be independent political actors?

THEMATIC TABLE 5. PLANNING THE IMMATERIAL CITY

Giovanni Vecchio

The challenge

A shared text that re-writes the challenge of each working table based on the exchange had during the camp.

The future is already here, present in the image and symbols we choose to represent it, but the immaterial city is a proposition, a contested terrain whereby the materiality of the past present themselves as the immanent properties of an emergent future. On the one hand, technology enhances intangible infrastructures, such as the data streams and digital platforms of sharing economies; while on the other hand, existing immaterial dimensions acquire new individual and collective forms in relation to citizenship, community, public participation and trust in such governance systems. The rapid transformations of the global and the local configure new expert actors as institutions, companies, citizens and communities as well as the intrinsic relationships between them - be they vertical or horizontal, cooperative, or competitive.

This configuration of existing and new emerging relations within the immaterial city serves to highlight a number of inherent challenges. First, the immaterial properties of cities are systemic, pervasive of the contemporary world, but irrespective of this, shared definitions are still absent. Secondly, the newly emergent properties of the immaterial city serve to enhance existing relations from BIM systems that contribute to participatory architecture and tracking systems that enhance surveillance.

Thirdly, the effect such immaterial properties have on the city are ambiguous, given the divergent opportunities at the disposal of the Global North and South and inequalities this engenders in equal measure.

In dealing with these emerging challenges, traditional figures and forms of intervention are being increasingly questioned, calling for new scalable schemes of intervention and interaction, able to cope with (im)materiality of cities.

Key issues

Planning the immaterial city may not be different from planning the material city, and this implies:

1) DEFINITIONS - a symbiosis of tangible and intangible layers: technology, practices, cultural norms, usable knowledge. The immaterial city is in fact intrinsically contested and varied, even in relation to the terminology adopted to define it. Every day, citizens are involved in constructing this relationship between the material and immaterial and alignment of them as a manifold of experiences both positive and negative. Nonetheless, few have learned to codify this tacit knowledge and reveal what it means to live in the digital age. Moreover, the everyday experience of the (im)material is not fully realized as a public issue, despite the manifold of positive and negative outcomes these relationships have on people;

2) RELATIONS - multiple actors are present, cooperating and competing with each other. Existing schemes are inadequate to understand this and acquire a knowledge of the emerging power relationships they in turn represent as the product of a complex dynamic between those subjects making up the materiality of these systems

3) APPLICATIONS - new forms of intervention are needed but are currently missing. From an operational perspective, the immanent

challenges which the emergent (im)materiality of the city pose need systems thinking and require new spaces of inter-action, whereby the material that exists between them can be negotiated as places which are not antagonistic, but that are emancipatory. Not antagonistic but emancipatory in not only tackling the inequalities, which the public are subject to, but also combatting the governance systems that otherwise legitimate such injustices.

Possible solutions

1. UNPACK THE IMMATERIAL CITY - investigate what is the (im)materiality of the city and what the contemporary manifestations of such properties are shaped by in terms of the dialectic between the tangible and intangible layers of such spaces. Start this exercise from the perspective of a people, as opposed to the techno-centric properties of the immaterial city. This assumes any such re-humanization of technology is necessary for making the (im)material city intelligible and key issue within the public realm.
2. OPEN PARTICIPATION - offer open access to such technology as a human right and readily available for everyone who wants to exercise this opportunity to rebuild confidence in virtues of the public realm, whose authority is necessary to foster trust in participation, accounting for it in terms of a governance that is not exclusive, but which is instead an inclusive, transparent and accountable system of governance able to enfranchise everyone into the spaces this opens up and offers access to
3. ENABLE PLACES – define enabling schemes for coordinating the actions of different actors. These frameworks need to be sensitive to local specificities, assuming different features according to the scales and issues of those places taken into account as those schemes able to configure a devolved power system, which should enable mutual learning between them.

A proposal

Our proposals focus on three specific, but crucial dimensions of the (im)material city:

- *security*: understanding the psychological dimensions (fear of crime) that impact the built environment; to be developed through an international exhibition of visual essays/presentations, presenting different contexts and their different concerns surrounding the safety and security of the immaterial city;
- *sharing*: plan and pilot strategies for a multilevel and distributed governance of locally defined needs; to be developed with an experimental call for practices, a contest of sharing experiences to be experimented at the level of a neighbourhood;

- *welfare*: to enable schemes which empower citizens and communities to coordinate the actions of different actors; to be developed in conjunction with a research programme on the welfare of the immaterial city and as an initiative whose emergent public realm is able to support the practices of governance systems whose desire for equity is just.

THEMATIC TABLE 6. DESIGNING NEW NATURESCAPES

Andrea Zucca

The challenge

Climate change and looting of biodiversity are just two of the big challenges that have placed the imperative of sustainability in urban planning. The technical lexicon and professional practices have been enriched with green-based solutions, circular economies and resilient approaches to reverse the trend of exploitation of natural ecosystems by cities. Within the emerging panorama of experiences, often enriched with the “green” rhetoric, the working group has investigated the existent practices in which nature and cities are/could be framed as an integrated system aimed at guaranteeing the survival of human ecosystems, as well as some fundamental rights connected to health and wellbeing. Students and practitioners with different backgrounds have shared their different perspectives on the topic, presenting their current researches, and have reasoned together on the major challenges to the contemporary urban environments. A complex and interdisciplinary panorama emerged from the collective debate, both from a technical and a political perspective. The struggles for an integrated nature-city system have been observed through the lenses of “threats” and “opportunities”, in the attempt of simplifying the topic considering both its positive and negative aspects. Within this frame, the group recognized that the influence of nature in the urban environment has been underestimated both by the architectural and by the urban planning discipline that have often relegated the natural dimension to a

theoretical debate but rarely practiced it in an integrated perspective. In addition, a lack of knowledge of the positive effects of nature in the cities still persists both among professionals and citizens, whose practices and habits seem difficult to be reshaped. Moreover, the power of the introduction of natural elements in the cities are undervalued, in terms of social inclusion, space appropriation and identity, as well as for their effective and scientifically-demonstrated ameliorations on health and wellbeing.

Key issues

Naturescapes are struggling to become a diffused practice because of many intertwined social, political, and economic factors. After a two-days confrontation, the group has decided to concentrate on three specific issues that question the agenda of different actors at different scales.

A first collective confrontation raised the need for citizens and decision makers to acknowledge the positive influence of the nature-based solutions at the local, urban and metropolitan level. Nowadays there is indeed a lack of data and technical knowledge from an institutional point of view on the ecological function of nature in city. Institutions should thus recognize them and adopt a long term vision in the design and implementation of nature-based solutions.

Secondly, the group has identified the problem of a conventional architectural and urban design, both from a functional and a formal perspective. In this sense, there are several examples of nature-based solutions planned or co-designed by professionals and citizens, which envisage new possible meanings, uses and management perspectives of the urban green spaces in cities.

Eventually, the team identified the need to work on the awareness of the

necessity of the natural element with different communicative tools, aimed at increasing the professional responsibility toward nature-based planning practices but also sustainable individual choices. Moreover, the group agreed on the need to communicate and share the positive impacts of the existing sustainable projects and practices to the whole citizenship, to enhance awareness and pride in achieving nature-oriented goals. These should be done, as described below, by disseminating in a participatory way the positive impacts of nature based solutions that lie at economic, social and environmental level. From an economic perspective, nature in and whit city contributes to generate new jobs and business opportunities; at social level these solutions promote inclusion and a sense of identity and belonging to the community for the citizens; lastly, at environmental level, they contribute to improve the environmental status of the cities.

Possible solutions

In discussing possible and feasible solutions, the team has decided to focus on three different scales of intervention: the scale of the “structure”, to be addressed to the planning discipline and decision makers; the scale of “spaces”, relating to an urban and local dimension which involves the key role of the active citizens; the scale of the “elements”, that challenges the professional knowledge of experts, designers and practitioners. These three different scales stimulated possible effective solutions to the identified issues, but did not constitute a rigid consequential frame of reference. Each of the following proposal can be referred to the three different scales and could address simultaneously policy makers, citizens and practitioners tackling at the same time the above-mentioned neglected issues. In details the group discussed the implementation of the following solutions in relation to the three mentioned different scales:

- At structure scale level the proposal is related to working at the planning scale to improve the quality of standards, through the development of a naturescape quality index in terms of ecological functions for policy and decision makers, investors and practitioners;

- At space level, it is important to involve civil society, association, NGOs and private stakeholders in the co-design process of naturescapes. This could be done through pilot projects at local scale to build evidence, use of dedicated tools (i.e web GIS) and appealing communication tools and strategies (i.e green ambassadors);
- At elements scale, the group recognized the need to promote the development of a dedicated technical agency at a metropolitan level to support the development, management and monitoring of naturescape projects. Target of this proposed solution is composed of private sectors, designers and practitioners.

A proposal

In the urban areas, many negative ecological effects occur: these may be mitigated by ameliorated urban and green areas design but the first step in doing this is to identify a quality index that could drive the design towards a more efficient, more resilient, more ecological space. The index acts as a goal to be implemented starting from the preliminary design, but also as monitoring instruments, with the aim to maximize and assess the influence of the design on ecological performance. The indicator could be a useful planning tool, facilitating the comparison between existing urban areas, helping to predict the ecological impact of new developments, and focusing the potential of possible amelioration like greening the buildings, using water sensitive landscape design, permeable pavings. Connectivity is also a major issue with the aim to explore the numbers and patterns of corridors required to connect urban green spaces as a part of an overall biodiversity conservation strategy.

The index should integrate Green Infrastructures components and should be developed constructing a conceptual framework at the interface between different disciplines: architecture and social, ecological, urban agronomy sciences).

THEMATIC TABLE 7. PUSHING THE BORDER

Ifigeneia Dimitrakou

The challenge

The group consisted of nine people of different (disciplinary) backgrounds and interests and their proposals addressed different aspects of the notion of borders. The diversity of perspectives on the one hand demonstrated how transversal the study of borders could be. On the other hand, the interactions within a multi-disciplinary group did not mean per se that disciplinary boundaries were crossed or even negotiated. The language, the use of specific terminology and the meaning given to the processes, the actors, the spaces, and the practices involved in the making and the crossing of any kind of “borders” became often the center of the discussion. The dialogue between these viewpoints exposed our disciplinary premises and revealed something of the complexity of notions used and often taken for granted by “experts”. Besides, the format of the workshop and the rush into “proposals” hindered possible negotiations between disciplinary viewpoints and unfortunately did not allow tracing possible interrelations between participants’ perspectives/ideas/proposals/observations (i.e. what they can learn from each other versus what they know already).

Key issues

- Compartmentalization of expert knowledge

Drawing on their own (everyday) professional experiences, participants further discussed about the processes through which “expert” knowledge on urban issues is currently produced. As pointed-out, “immaterial” boundaries between disciplines, intellectual, ideological, and institutional divides between researchers, policy-makers and practitioners, the rigidity of organizational arrangements framing routines, norms, tasks, desirable outputs but also the spaces in which knowledge is produced, do not enable meaningful interactions across and beyond fields of “expertise”. “Wicked problems” (i.e. poverty, climate-change (Alessandro Frigerio), migration (Giulia Scotto), metropolisation (Matteo del Fabbro)) are not study-objects of

one-single field or domain. Their ambiguous nature challenges these divides and questions the very meaning of “expert knowledge” (Paolo Patelli) or the “role of experts” (Micol Rispoli) in describing, explaining and addressing these kinds of problems.

- Lack of understanding of the potentials of multi-scalar citizenship

The mismatch between (an assumed) fixity of borders and the fluidity of actors’ practices across scales and levels has been a shared concern between the participants. All of them addressed different facets of this “controversy” and discussed to what extent “identity”, “belonging”, “rights” and the very notion of “citizenship” are bounded to territories or carry fixed territorial attributes and meanings. As participants suggested, actors carry and perform multiple identities (Rossella Ferorelli, Giulia Scotto), engage in networks and with objects (Paolo Patelli, Micol Rispoli) across territorial scales (Matteo del Fabbro), and reshape political and social spaces (Andrea) even if they are not fully aware (Diletta di Marco, Alessandro Frigerio). Acknowledging the networks and the interrelations in which we are embedded through our collective/individual practices is key for reconfiguring new forms of public engagement and citizenship.

- Contentious nature of metropolitan publicness

Public goods in metropolitan areas, such as land or urban collective services, are governed through discontinuous frameworks of public and private actors. The quality of life across metropolitan areas is unequal as well and local communities are involved in a dense network of competitive, collaborative and functional relations (. We assumed that an agreement among different stakeholders and actors cannot be reached in such complex settings also because of strong divergences of values. However, negotiation is possible and may be regarded as a never-ending activity of “metropolitan construction”, not only in relation with innovation and development but also with regard to governance and institutions (Matteo del Fabbro).

Possible solutions

- Co-creating spaces for expertise contamination

For addressing the compartmentalization of knowledge on urban “issues”, we need to explore or create the possibilities and the spaces to blur disciplinary/professional/

organizational borders. Refraining from a “purist” understanding of expertise, it might enable learning through dialogue and experimentation and the co-production of new forms of knowledge and values. Through reciprocal contamination, the hegemonic role of expertise in defining and managing urban problems can be questioned and different ways of drafting solutions can be explored.

- Reframing democracy from cities by acknowledging grassroots practices.

Insurgent practices and political innovations, taking place already in metropolitan areas, reveal new forms of democratic engagement and citizenship. Actors’ interactions, assemblies, alliances, movements and conflicts over the production and appropriation of urban spaces occur already across different levels and scales and push territorial, administrative and legal borders reframing how democracy is practiced. Acknowledging the transformative potential of grassroots practices/movements in cities, is key not only for institutional change but also for a wider democratization of the public sphere.

- Engaging metropolitan agonism to build common ground.

Setting aside residual hopes of universal agreement may not result in the clash of values among different urban groups if we engage metropolitan “agonism” as part of the strenuous process to build common ground and mutual respect. The concepts of boundary object and trading zone can both be applied to metropolitan settings in order to create projects and

provisional agreements between groups with conflicting values and interests. A metropolitan trading zone is both social and spatial: a “place” where conflict and cooperation do not exclude each other.

A proposal

Inspired by the experience of the Feltrinelli Camp, the working group "pushing the borders" proposed the creation of a Lexicon of boundary concepts. The idea is to collect set of key concepts, and terms used when discussing "urban issues" and try to bring together the multiple definitions given across disciplines and between "experts" on urban studies and the meanings given by "non-experts". First, participants proposed to collect the key concepts and notions discussed during the workshop i.e. informal/formal, grassroots/top-down – Giulia Scotto) or what they called meta-concepts (i.e. interior/exterior- Micol Rispoli). As a second step, participants proposed to collect some extra material for building-up the Lexicon during the Festival organized by Feltrinelli Foundation. A mini-questionnaire or a workshop with people joining the Festival "About a city" can be a way to explore other "boundary concepts" in the debate about the city and re-formulate definitions. Some first results can further be elaborated and discussed during a meeting/seminar organized by Politecnico di Milano. The form of the final output is to be decided during the process (i.e. a printed or digital Lexicon, a series of papers, blog etc.).

THEMATIC TABLE 8. FRAMING MOBILITY AS A SPATIAL CAPITAL

Paola Piscitelli

The challenge

Mobility can take different configurations. It corresponds to a basic and cultural need; to the search and distribution of resources; to a social

experience, expressing livability, access, sustainability, as well as forms of exclusions. Above all, mobility dramatically impacts space and shapes cities and urban life.

The most interesting shift which has occurred in the debate upon mobility in the last decade regards the capacity of framing it not only as related to infrastructures but also to socio-spatial practices, exactly for the same reason why cities are not just spaces of materiality but of sociability, too. In this sense, mobility can help to describe urban rhythms and timeframes, interpret urban transformations and govern them. Mobility as ‘spatialization of time’ and ‘timelization of spaces’ can help to detect differences in cities, so becoming a knowledge tool to interpret and govern their transformations. It can contribute to city life’s improvement by supporting the share of space and time through material and digital infrastructures. To recognize the multimodal uses of the spaces made through mobility helps to capitalize the space itself, as well as the spatial manifestation taken by mobility.

It is so that the spatial capital of mobility, meant as the potential in space linked to material qualities and social practices turning mobility into a resource, comes to surface.

The spatial capital intrinsic in mobility is fulfilled through the integration between the features of infrastructure as the “hardware” and the socio-spatial practices as the “software”. But in order for this to happen, a critical reflection of how mobility occurs which goes beyond its engineering functioning has to be carried out. It is needed to put in question technocratic vision of mobility, to rather detect how mobility takes place as a process of ‘urbanogenesis’. How social and spatial mobility are interconnected and to which extent social mobility facilitate spatial mobility and the other way round?

Reading mobility practice helps to understand the needs and the potential solutions in space and to really make it a capital.

Key Issues:

The discuss about human mobility has produced very fine theoretical frameworks but little contributes in terms of policies. The question about how mobility, as an action based on the search for resources, can be made a resource itself, remains open.

This is connected to the following issues:

1. How should the features of infrastructures adapt in relationship to the changes in mobility practices?
2. How is it possible to guarantee the sufficient level of accessibility (or basic accessibility) as well as space for the multiple forms of mobility? In other words, how can we combine the right to mobility and its multiple configurations?
3. How can technological innovations (including digital devices and plugging cars) can activate spatial capital?

Possible Solution

Mobility can be transformed in (a) spatial capital by guaranteeing accessibility, supplying transport and by supporting the capacity of subjects to move. Each of these conditions is a process in itself. Framing mobility as a spatial capital implies analysing it through a mixture of methods, involving primary and secondary data. The combination of methods is fundamental to study mobility in all its aspects, manifestations, intensity and extent as well as to match and elaborate data that can produce new representation of places in our cities. Applying new analytical approach based on multiple and integrated data source (both through qualitative and quantitative methods) to define new frameworks, protocol and guidelines that can promote adaptive design and policy solutions

A proposal

The proposal come out from the Feltrinelli Camp regards the possibility

of setting up a multidisciplinary research team that studies mobility practices combining qualitative and quantitative methods, as well as primary and secondary data. In this way mobility would not only theoretically framed but also practically employed as a source to analyse and produce spatial capital in cities.

Authors

Elena Ostanel, Marie Sklodowska – Curie Fellow, Università Iuav di Venezia

Francesco Curci – Adjunct Professor, DASTU, Politecnico di Milano

Massimo Bricocoli – Full Professor, DASTU, Politecnico di Milano

Marianna D'Ovidio – Researcher, Department of Political Science di Scienze, Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro

Mark Deakin, Professor of Built Environment and Head of the Centre for Smart Cities at the Edinburgh Napier University

Laura Gatti – Landscape designer and Doctor Agronomist, Laura Gatti Studio

Luca Gaeta – Associate Professor, DASTU, Politecnico di Milano

Paola Pucci – Full Professor, DASTU, Politecnico di Milano

Giulia Frova- Il Razzismo è una brutta storia - Gruppo Feltrinelli.

Sara Troglio - Researcher at Feltrinelli Foundation

Emanuele Belotti - PhD in Urban Sociology GSSI - Gran Sasso Science

Institute

Giovanni Vecchio - PhD in Urban Planning - Polytechnic of Milan

Luca Calafati - PhD Candidate in Urban Sociology, Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca

Andrea Zucca - Researcher at Feltrinelli Foundation

Ifigeneia Dimitrakou - PhD Candidate in Urban Sociology

Paola Piscitelli - PhD in Urban Planning and Policy Design and Researcher at Feltrinelli Foundation