

SCUPAD NEWSLETTER

SCUPAD Congress 2005 Metamorphosis 1960s – 2040: Challenges of Shaping the Future

Forty years ago, a group of architects and planners established SCUPAD after attending a Salzburg Seminar on Urban Planning and Development. To mark this anniversary, the SCUPAD Congress 2005 will look back over the last forty years to reassess past practices, learn lessons of that experience and look forward to encourage a direction of fresh and sustainable planning principles.

The rationale of the 1960s, facing post-war recovery and development, is different from the rationale of the 21st century, facing environmental, global and societal issues. Massive urban planning projects and preconceived ideas marked the 1960s and were influenced by the ideas and designs of Le Corbusier. In contrast, citizen participation, incremental change and democratic process, as embodied in the precepts of Jane Jacobs and others, have gained new influence and increasingly dominate current thinking. In fact, both strategies have always been evident with the balance between them shifting in time and place.

Keynote speakers, case studies and workshop discussions will reflect on this evolution and transition. Participants will engage in a conversation on how planners can best incorporate these lessons in forward thinking planning theory and practice. In so doing, the Congress will examine:

What did we learn from the recent past?

What are the ways to deal with the challenges now and into the future?

How can we combine lessons from the past and current challenges in developing planning strategies for the future within the broadest context of world issues.

SCUPAD CONGRESS 2004

The SCUPAD Congress 2004, "**The Open City: Hopes and Dangers**", was held in Salzburg, Austria between May 13 and 16, 2004. Participants were welcomed to the opening session by SCUPAD President Franz Oswald. Franz explained that the topic of the Open City was chosen to enable the Congress to focus on aspects of people's daily lives such as security issues, migration, crime rates, and to examine what effect the extension of the European Union to new nations will have on the movement of people and jobs. He argued that the city as an urban institution may no longer be a framework for integrating differences. If so, the idea of the open city may be in question and planners and designers will be faced with new challenges.

The program continued with Hartmut Arras, the coordinator for the Congress, explaining

the format for the first session in which Bruno Zanon and David Guggenheim would role play candidates running for Mayor of the imaginary city "Scupadopolis."

Bruno, representing the candidate running on a platform for an "open city" spoke about the benefits of an open city -- new energy, new enterprise, innovation-- and he stated that in an open city, the best solutions for problems can be readily chosen. He argued that there is a network of people connected by solidarity, and that the market place is the engine of the open city, producing less taxes and a more competitive economy.

David, as the candidate of a "closed city", said that a city without borders is not a city: a city needs to have edges/borders to be able to be identified as a place. He went on to say that cities are formed by the character of its

citizens and that if cities are open-ended, people don't feel at home.

Hartmut then asked the group to vote for their candidate for Mayor, but people were not ready to do so since the candidates had not addressed the important issues of migration, transport, communication or the openness to cultural development. The candidates then went on to answer questions about rural areas and environmental issues, equality and human rights in heterogeneous populations. and the loyalty of citizens in an open or closed city. When the election was held, the participants voted for David as Mayor, by a vote of 18 to 6.



Opening Session – Keynote

Walter Siebel, from the Carl von Ossietzky University in Oldenburg, Germany, presented an address at the opening session on May 13, 2004, entitled “The Open City – Chances and Dangers.” He focused his comments on three main themes: integration in modern societies should be based on heterogeneity; being a stranger is normal for all in the modern city; a segregated city is a second best solution. Cities were said to be the places where strangers live (the stranger is the prototype of the city dweller); public spaces are where strangers meet. Urbanity was said to include the promise of strangers being integrated into the society without losing his/her strangeness.

In the “melting pot” model of an integrated city, immigrants assimilate into the society, taking on a new identity, while in the “mosaic” model, there is social space for the co-existence of different groups.

Siebel posited that assimilation and melting pots are not viable models for modern societies. An open city offers democracy and functioning housing and labor markets; the open city is the utopia of accomplished democracy and economic equality of opportunity.

The city as a mosaic of segregated villages or ethnic communities is a model that enables

immigrants to cope, but immigrant quarters can be limiting. The open city is a place of voluntary segregation, but it needs public places where strangers can meet. Public places need social control and anonymity, but social control can threaten the freedom of urban dwellers. Siebel went on to describe public spaces in the open city of today as spaces of possibility or ambivalent spaces where:

- ◊ History is present a reminder of other possibilities of urban life --the current form is only one of many possibilities
- ◊ Unused industrial premises have attractions for entrepreneurs and cultural uses because they are economically devalued and where the new uses don't have ties to the building's former industrial drudgery
- ◊ Architectural aesthetics of the buildings and new social or economic functions are compatible
- ◊ Neighborhoods with large immigrant communities have public spaces with productive tension between physical proximity and social distance.

He concluded his talk by emphasizing that "the open city is a utopia with a functioning democracy, the housing and labor markets accessible for everyone, public space as places of urbanity and urban socialization of the individual." However, we don't live in utopia, so that "integration policies have to balance on the small ridge of the segregated city between the impossibilities of assimilation and the dangers of exclusion."

There was a very lively and lengthy question and answer period after Walter Siebel's address, which is summarized below.

Q. What is the impact of new technology - the virtual city - on your model?

A. The virtual city enhances the classical heterogeneous city with its segregation of city space; the virtual city is not an alternative, but a re-actualization of the heterogeneous city.

Q. How to manage balancing of segregated cities? What new strategies/forms do we need?

A. Modern society allows for strangers to exist there without losing their strangeness or individuality e.g., the Jews as financiers in the medieval city. Cities have to allow for

voluntary ethnic segregation, but also allow for economic and social mobility and develop informal mechanisms for mediating conflicts. School systems are the best places for achieving this.

Q. In NYC, the school system is more segregated than it was thirty years ago. How can we measure the success of systems in bringing us closer to utopia; how can we achieve better functioning of markets so that they accomplish what we want them to do?

A. There is a need in Germany to convince politicians to allow voluntary segregation. The requirement in some places that there be no more than 50% immigrants in an area needs to be changed. Integration is a process – we need to look at whether people are on the way up or the way down.

Q. Often segregation is not voluntary; how do we deal with forced segregation?

A. Policies have to act in the direction of enhancing choices. For example, in Germany voluntary segregation in areas in decline has a negative fate for individuals who buy/stay in the areas where native Germans have left.

Some other comments included:

- ◊ the definitions we are using now for a complex topic are insufficient; too much talk of "we" and "they"
- ◊ there are differences in talking about large or small cities
- ◊ is it segregation or is it giving people what they prefer?
- ◊ should there be the right to have self-created segregated areas?
- ◊ it is easier to develop new ideas than to get rid of the old ones?
- ◊ public space can be used by different groups at different times; the challenge is how to develop public space successfully
- ◊ anonymity is a characteristic of the modern city, but within ethnic communities, people know everything about everyone else

Walter responded that the traditional notion of "we" and "they" doesn't hold true for modern cities because all are strangers there. Also, the fear of strangers is the fear of oneself and one's repressed desires. Many

phenomena are expressed in the word “segregation” – segregation in time such as a visit to an opera or segregation by type of activity such as joining a golf club. The important issue is whether segregation is voluntary or forced. As planners, we need to be concerned about forced segregation.

He concluded by saying that people must have access to public space and that public space must also accept symbols of different cultures such as mosques. It is only on the basis of a secure ethnic place (where people have a secure private identity) that people can function anonymously in public spaces.

Case Studies

Dino Borri – Bari

On Friday morning, May 14, Dino Borri of the Technical University of Bari, Italy, presented the first case study on the city of Bari, entitled “Crossing the Adriatic in a Multicultural Context: Opportunities and Threats.” Borri began by describing the recent migrations in the Southern Adriatic. In the 1960’s and 70’s the first ship linkages between Bari and Dubrovnik took place with illegal commerce in which local Mafia groups were engaged. During the 1980’s, Bari became the port through which goods from Turkey and Greece entered the European market. It was a time also when poor people from the Middle East and Asia began to come to Europe, using the Southern Adriatic as a point of access.

Social and economic relations across the Adriatic resumed significantly in the 1990’s. The continuous flow of boat people from Albania, the Balkans, Asia, Africa and the Middle East included political refugees, poor people and some involved in illegal commerce. Many of the newcomers were segregated in mobile homes in abandoned areas since the government authorities were not able to provide proper homes for them. Some immigrants were assisted by religious groups to settle in the city. Currently, the Balkan immigration has stopped, largely because a new law requires that people have work contracts in order to obtain visas.



Apulia (the region where Bari is located) is a place where people stop for a short time before going to Northern Italy, other parts of Europe or other developed countries. Many Albanians work in agriculture in Apulia; migrants also work in supportive domestic jobs and in assisting the elderly.

Work in the informal economy is the rule and traditional street commerce has become dominated by Asians and Africans. Unemployment among young Italians runs as high as 15-20% in Bari and many of those with good education and skills move to the north or go abroad. Industrial firms from Apulia have created new branches in Albania or Romania. Borri concluded with the following statements:

- ◊ While the heritage of ethnic mixing in Bari meant that there was no explicit social opposition to immigration, it was not enough to achieve the full integration of immigrants
- ◊ Welfare policies of the past have been transformed by market policies, enlarging the discrepancies between Southern and Northern Italy
- ◊ There is a need for formal and informal institutions to cope with the massive immigration of poor people – volunteers are not enough
- ◊ A mixed economy is essential to sustaining the open city.

There were many questions after the presentation, including the following:

Q. Do immigrants live in segregated communities?

A. They are integrated into the urban space in Bari; usually they fill empty apartments in buildings for low-income people with many shops selling products for immigrants on the first floor of these buildings.

Q. Perhaps the non-governmental approach is working better than attempts at controlling everything as in Germany?

A. Decision-postponement is the new policy – maybe it is a good way to deal with the complexity of the situation.

Q. Is there a difference between migrants who stay for a short time (transitionals) and those who come to stay for a long time, as well as long term trans-nationals who live in each of two places for one half of the year?

A. There is no real problem with housing for transitional immigrants; Bari has a large construction industry.

Q. What language do the immigrants use? Do immigrants move to empty spaces in the city or villages? What is the relation between the formal and informal sectors?

A. There is a need to keep connections between the formal and informal sectors. Some of the immigrants may know French or Italian (the Albanians); generally, those from the Balkans are good with various languages.

Q. What about the work of organizations and the future for immigrants?

A. Bari has a declining population so immigrants are important for the future of the city. Immigrants need to be helped to form their own NGOs; public institutions need to be involved as well.

Q. What are the figures for immigration in Bari?

A. There are approximately 300,000 inhabitants of Bari, with 700,000 in the metropolitan region. There are 6000-7000 stable immigrants in Bari and about 100,000 in the region. The numbers are relatively small because there is not a lot of work for the immigrants. In Venice, the number of stable immigrants is much higher.

Q. Has there been any attempt to convene

with others to look at the situation in a larger European context, including the impact on rural areas?

A. Yes, there are institutions looking at the rural as well as regional issues / impacts.



Oriol Nel.lo – Barcelona

The second presentation was made by Oriol Nel.lo, the Secretary of Planning for the region of Catalonia, Spain, entitled “Urban Dynamics and Public Policies in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona.” Mr. Nel.lo began by giving some background on the city of Barcelona, the capital of Catalonia. Barcelona was an industrial, working-class city for the last one hundred years. About 30 years ago, shaped by public policy, it began a radical transformation from an industrial to a service economy.

Barcelona is part of a metropolitan region of 3000 square meters with a population of 4.5 million residents; Barcelona’s core is made up of 1.5 million people. In 1975, Barcelona’s population was 1.75 million; in the last twenty years, it has lost 250,000 people. There have been intra-metropolitan migrations by which smaller and more decentralized municipalities are growing, i.e., urban sprawl. Between 1991 and 1996 the area decentralized, but between 1996 and 2001, the population of Barcelona has been growing due to

immigration into the center of the city. In 1986, when Spain joined the European Union (EU), the income of its residents was 86% of the EU average; it is now 100% of the EU average. Barcelona is the 6th largest urban area in Europe. Its GNP is 90 million Euros, which is 15% of the GNP of Spain.

Barcelona is a city clearly differentiated from its environs and is an open city in terms of its values – it includes all types of uses and all types of people. The major issues that the city of Barcelona is facing include:

- ◇ Environmental problems related to population dispersion:
- ◇ The city doubled in size between 1972 and 1992
- ◇ The city is urbanizing at a rate equal to 4 soccer fields per day
- ◇ In the metropolitan area, one-half of the population works outside of the area in which they live
- ◇ 86% of families own their own dwellings
- ◇ Housing prices have risen at a rate 5 times more than incomes
- ◇ The new immigrant population is concentrated in older areas where prices are going down and there is a danger of ghettoization

Public policies were needed to change the trends described above. Therefore, the government has intervened in the market to foster the concentration of people and mixed land use. In particular, government intervention in the downtown (the old city within the walls) has created new public spaces, placed important cultural facilities such as a museum and a new university in the downtown, and supported affordable housing, which in turn was intended to stimulate private investment in housing. As a result of these efforts, prices are no longer falling in the old city.

Additionally, the government has intervened in the renovation of the city's waterfront. Initially, the Olympic Games held in Barcelona in 1992 were the stimulus for reviving the waterfront with the removal of unused railroad tracks, the creation of new beaches and middle income housing. Subsequently, a large investment of city resources in social housing and infrastructure projects in an old industrial area has created a new area of

centrality along the water. Barcelona has a long history of using exhibitions as the catalyst for investment and renewal and social cohesion which otherwise couldn't have happened. As in the other presentations, there were many questions for Mr. Nel.lo and an animated discussion ensued.

Q. Isn't there a high vacancy rate in the new housing and commercial space?

A. In the Diagonal Mar developments, there are vacancies because there was a break with the traditional development patterns and what the city government tried to do in other areas; there are no "corners" or places where people can gather.

Q. The strategy destroys areas where prices are low and where social integration can take place – isn't it destroying the potential of an open city?

A. One wants spaces for transition, but not in the old city and its old working class areas. They are trying to create new developments where 20% of the lots developed are for affordable housing for newcomers. Public investment is being used to create social cohesion in an inclusionary and integrated manner.

Q. What about the need for affordable housing for the middle class; where do poor people go when prices go up in their area?

A. Some social housing is developed in the same area for some of the poor. Poor people tend to stay in old areas, while young middle class people tend to move away from the center. The government is trying to attract the middle class to the city center. Since a crucial element for the middle class is education, there has to be public investment in the schools.

Q. Some families have bought apartments in Barcelona and the coast. They don't live in Barcelona, but are holding their apartments for investment purposes.

A. In Spain and in Catalonia, 34% of housing is secondary housing. The government is trying to discourage secondary housing in an effort to decrease the housing shortage.

Q. Where do the migrants live in Barcelona?

A. Migrants are not dispersed throughout the city, but are concentrated in certain areas. To avoid creation of ghettos, the government

invests in public space, commerce and creates opportunities for social housing throughout the metropolitan region that is for migrants and others. However, there is a problem, in that there is not a metropolitan authority to address this issue.

Q. Isn't the continuity of policies and politics is a key to success?

A. In Spain, they had time to plan during the period of dictatorship and then were able to implement their plans when Spain became a democracy. Barcelona is trying to combine economic innovation, urban renovation and social cohesion in facing the challenges of the city's future.



Brad Lander - New York City

Brad Lander, the new Director of the Pratt Institute Center for Community and Economic Development made the third case study presentation entitled, "Post-Industrial New York: So Open, You Can't Get In?"

Brad Lander began by describing recent trends in New York City. Notably, the work of community-based groups on development initiatives and the move from a manufacturing to a service economy. These have been important factors in New York's reversal of housing abandonment and the decline in manufacturing prevalent in the 1960's and 1970's. However, between 1980 and 2000 there has been a growing inequality in incomes of residents. The city had an increase in population of one million people due primarily to immigration, but it also had a 35% decline in the white population as they moved to the suburbs. There is a high rate of segregation of neighborhoods, with poverty remaining concentrated in certain areas where political representation lags twenty years behind population growth.

New York has seen a growth of 33% in the average rents along with a 3% increase in the average income of renters. More than 500,000 families pay more than 50% of their income in rent and there is a housing shortage of between 250,000 to 500,000 units.

The city of New York is now taking planning issues more seriously. However, there is no comprehensive plan for the city, but rather 20 different neighborhood plans. Various efforts have been undertaken by the Bloomberg administration to remake the city, such as:

- ◇ Rezoning manufacturing areas to office and residential use –The Far West Side, West Chelsea, Fourth Avenue, Greenpoint-Williamsburg, The Brooklyn Atlantic Yards..
- ◇ Redeveloping business districts for office and residential use - Lower Manhattan (including a new open space and transit hub), Downtown Brooklyn, the Bronx Hub
- ◇ Contextual rezoning with residential upzoning – Park Slope, Bedford-Stuyvesant, East and Central Harlem, North Corona
- ◇ Downsizing to "preserve neighborhood character" in areas of Queens, Staten Island and the Bronx.

These activities will result in 42,000 units of housing by 2013, 59 million square feet of commercial space and an investment of \$20 billion in infrastructure. The benefits will be:

- ◇ Construction jobs
- ◇ Higher office job capture
- ◇ High-end residential capture
- ◇ Improved tax base
- ◇ Substantial new open space
- ◇ Improved public transportation
- ◇ New space for culture, sports, conventions

The costs/risks of these efforts will be:

- ◇ Very little new housing
- ◇ Loss of additional viable manufacturing jobs
- ◇ Growing income polarization and segregation; concentration of poverty
- ◇ Continued middle class outflow to suburbs
- ◇ Potential over-concentration of jobs in FIRE sectors
- ◇ Continued concentration of noxious uses in lower-income areas

The city is thus faced with a series of planning options for shared/sustainable prosperity:

- ◊ Inclusionary zoning for affordable housing
- ◊ Regional affordable housing development
- ◊ Zoning for job retention
- ◊ Community benefits agreements on large-scale commercial development projects
- ◊ Workforce development linkages
- ◊ Infrastructure investments to:
- ◊ Education and quality of life in low-income communities
- ◊ Reduce environmental harms
- ◊ Convert/retrofit to new and sustainable technologies

There were a number of questions for Brad, including the following:

Q. What are the long-range impacts of the middle-class leaving the city?

A. It is a problem because there is no national investment in urban infrastructure

Q. What impact will the rezoning plans have on the segregation of uses in communities?

A. Rezoning plans are leading to increased segregation of uses.

Q. What will be the next areas of innovation?

A. Bushwick in Brooklyn, among others are now facing development pressures and have the potential for large-scale displacement.



Message from Tom de Wit, President of SCUPAD

SCUPAD is a wonderful organisation. On the one hand, SCUPAD is an informal network that makes it easy to meet professionals from all over the world and make new friends. On the other hand, SCUPAD organises planning Congresses on a very high professional level. I consider this to be a very good mix.

As the new President of SCUPAD, I would like to introduce myself. I have been a member of SCUPAD since 1991. Leo van der Meer, former President and 'member for life' of SCUPAD brought me into the organisation. In 2000 I became a member of the Committee by succeeding Frohmüt Gerheuser as V.P. for Internal Affairs and I became President in May 2004. I always take much pleasure in preparing the Congresses and I admire the Scupadian way of succeeding in organising an interesting Congress despite the somewhat chaotic discussions during the preparations.

My background is urban design. I have a Master's degree from the Academy of Architecture in Amsterdam. Although I'm primarily a designer, I have always been fascinated by the relationship between urban design and urban life. What makes a public place a good place; what makes an urban area liveable and attractive. The continuing quest for the sense of place or the soul of the city –that is what engages me. SCUPAD has had a number of interesting Congresses on this subject in recent years, which I have enjoyed very much.

Outside of SCUPAD, I am Managing Director of a planning consultancy firm in the Netherlands, named AmerAdviseurs. I established AmerAdviseurs in 1983, after working for a number of governmental Planning Departments and consultancy firms. AmerAdviseurs has now grown to almost 30 professionals in the fields of urban design, physical planning, process-planning and legal advice. AmerAdviseurs is primarily commissioned by governmental institutions. I am a member of the Dutch Professional Organisation of Urban Designers and Planners and also a member of ISOCARP. I have lectured at different planning institutes and I advise on building designs for several Planning Committees, including a Planning Committee for Listed Monuments. But best of all, I love being the President of SCUPAD, and look forward to working with you all in the coming years.

Working Group Presentations

The participants were divided into three working groups, which met twice on Friday to address the three questions posed in the Conference Brochure. The questions for discussion were:

1. What does an Open City mean on a physical, social/cultural, economic and political/administrative level?
2. What potentials and risks does an Open City have?
3. Which planning tools do we need to promote and sustain the Open City?

Each of the working groups presented the results of their discussions on Saturday afternoon and are summarized below.

Group 1

Monica L. from Romania made the presentation on the work of Group 1, which she referred to as "The Open City: To Be or Not to Be" – that is the question. Monica first outlined the group's definition of the open city in response to question #1:

Physical

- borders
- growth limits

Social/cultural

- strong identity – no risk of losing values/traditions
- meeting places – group interaction
- accessibility – functions/services
- opportunity to find your own dwelling place
- mutual adjustment to cultural values/tolerance/respect

Economic

- Bari – freedom, laissez-faire, opportunities
- Barcelona – politically driven, regulation, civic acceptance
- Rotterdam – freedom of choice, unfeasibility
- Communist cities – controlled, regulated by State, ideology, industrialization

Political/Administrative

- Unequal rules leads to discrimination
- Economic-based segregation is accepted
- Effective democracies – rules as well as rights for minorities

As to the potential risks of an open city, the group mentioned:

Negatives:

- Wholesale chains vs. small retail
- Externalization of public services
- Inaccessibility/unfeasibility of services
- Migration, brain drain

Positives:

- Networks – city, metropolitan area, region
- Influx of know-how, innovation, creativity, new power
- Openness due to new media, new technology, marketing

The comments on the planning tools needed included:

- Do we need an open city?
- How long can we afford to have an open city?
- Side effects of regulation
- Mixing immigrants in all residential areas
- Losing important values/spaces
- Too much planning is a risk

Group 2

Petra Hirschler reported they had an interesting but confusing discussion. They felt that neither an open city or a closed city exists – there is a mixture. They also talked of the "modern city" involving more than the people who live there – the historical context is important. Immigration is important, but what is the resulting impact on the city's identity? Planners should not control immigration since it is a political question.

The question has to be asked: openness for whom and for what?

- Migration has to be regulated
- Different levels of openness – different gatekeepers at different levels
- Cultural difference between urban and rural people

In regard to what planning tools we have, the group mentioned:

- Vienna and New York have urban district management where local people interact with planners
- What forces shape cities at different levels
- Formalized regulations vs. informal
- Acceptance of newcomers varies in different places – European cities have been more homogeneous; in USA immigration has been the norm for longer so there is more heterogeneity

Group 3

Rob Leek of the Netherlands reported that the group had initial broad discussions on immigration as a tool to halt the declining populations of western countries. They discussed whether investment in the third world economies should be made to avoid immigrants coming to wealthier countries or investments be made in the wealthier countries so immigrants could be employed. Their responses to the three specific questions posed to the groups were as follows.

What does an open city mean?:

Physical

- Every city is open in a sense, except for gated communities
- Cities are open when transport is there and affordable for everyone; mobility is a problem for poor populations

• **Social**

- Cities exist by a complexity of functions and density of people; cities are not homogeneous
- Identity is important; people have to feel at home and safe
- Psychological borders exist between rich, poor and ethnic neighborhoods
- The city should be seen as a mosaic with invisible borders

Economic

- An open system allows an informal economy
- We need to understand the processes influencing movement of people in and out of the city

Political

- The city is not fully open
- Openness needs some controls to create tolerance; every open city is a little bit closed
- To achieve equal rights, governments have to deliver a high standards of housing, education and public services

What are the potentials and risks of an open city?:

- Could be a source of a rising economy, cultural diversity and knowledge; an illegal economy can be the oil in the engine
- Potentials can become risks, depending on the balance between tolerance and control. The illegal economy can get too big; the stability between the old and

new population can be lost, resulting in a loss of social cohesion

Which planning tools do we need?:

- The big tool is integration, but it must be done wisely and pragmatically
- Control is needed, but not too much; it is a small ridge of tolerance
- Maintain urban space as a public good, accessible to everyone and contributing to the identity of neighborhood and city
- Citizen and immigrant should have the ability to make choices for where s/he wants to settle; there should be many choices of good urban environments

Plenary Session

The plenary session entitled "Toward Conclusions for the Open City," enabled participants to express their reflections on the Congress topic, the case studies and the group discussions. Comments included:

- Cities are by definition open to new ideas and creativity; what are the threats of a closed city?
- There are contradictions between different dimensions of openness; how will future priorities be set?
- We need to learn how to live with differences, not necessarily to have integration; if you are strong in your own identity, you can be open to others
- What are the structures for mediating differences? In cities it's usually left up to the market to mediate differences; non-profits can be a counterweight, but not enough to over-ride market forces
- Because there is no strategic planning in the U.S., people react to the patchwork through civic actions. In Europe, there is more state planning and less civic activity.
- A difference between the U. S. and Europe is that European countries have parliamentary democracies, while in the U.S. it is "winner take all," and new immigrants don't have voting influence.
- The Netherlands has had openness for 20 years; some cities are now moving towards controlling the percentage of foreigners in neighborhoods
- Open cities have to overcome the tension between freedom and regulation
- The openness of cities is related to the capacity of cities to provide housing and public space, ease of commuting and a

way of preserving identity.

- The definition of the open city is focused too much on immigration – we need to also be concerned with improving the quality of life for all residents.
- We need measures for how well school systems and housing markets are performing, not just measure GDP.
- There is a relationship between the open city and a learning society; education and community building is needed as well as physical building. Leipzig is the only German city open to immigration.
- Media should also be used as for education purposes.

Dieter Lapple and **Marco Venturi** made some final reflections on the Congress. Dieter commented on the rich discussion that in the plenary. He spoke of the ambivalence regarding openness and the need to look at specific historic settings. There are new concepts of the open city in national states and new mechanisms for closeness after physical walls come down. In many European places a welfare state was developed for a homogeneous society. We have to provide opportunities within the capacity of cities to absorb newcomers. Informal niches and education is needed to develop common understanding, while respecting differences. Marco stated that we need the “other” in order to define ourselves. He also talked about the factor of mobility – because people move so much, they lose their connections to place. People use networks to obtain needed services. We need to consider the costs of openness – who pays and how to create new resources.

Closing Keynote

Laura Balbo, the Former Minister for Equal Opportunities in Italy, delivered the closing keynote address. Ms. Balbo describing herself as a “sociologist of everyday life” went on to talk about the complexity of urban populations and the “learning city” - a model of a multi-level/multi actor system for governance of urban areas. Actors at different levels are: international agencies, national and local governments, the market (a plurality of economic actors), and NGOs, grass roots communities and social movements. The concept of the learning city thus focuses on the activities of listening and

negotiating. People need to be life-long learners; it takes learning to live together. Ms. Balbo concluded by saying that planners need to focus on the tensions/conflicts in Europe in the future and how to live with them e. g., the corrosion of citizenship and the inequality of rights for different groups in society. The elements of complexity and contradiction need to be addressed, using the multi-directional rather than the top-down model of social change. Comments on Ms. Balbo’s provocative talk included: The issue of complexity is very important for planners

- Learning is an ongoing process
- Developing a bi-cultural society means that cities receiving immigrants should take advantage of dual languages. Language needs to be taught in ways that meet the needs of newcomers, also Europeans should start to incorporate bilingual education early on
- In the concept of advocacy and pluralism in planning, the rights of different sub-groups need to be addressed



NEW SCUPAD FEE STRUCTURE ADOPTED

Beginning with the Congress in 2005, SCUPAD will have a Membership Fee of 80 EUROS. The Congress Fee will be 120 EUROS for members and 250 EUROS for Non-members. For students and young professionals up to 35 years of age, the Membership Fee will be 40 EUROS and the Congress Fee will be 60 EUROS for members and 125 EUROS for non-members

MINUTES OF THE SCUPAD GENERAL ASSEMBLY Salzburg, Austria, May 16, 2004

Attending: Hartmut Arras (Switzerland), Laura Balbo (Italy), Dino Borri (Italy), Hans De Wit (Netherlands), Tom De Wit (Netherlands), Thomas Dillinger (Austria), Hartmut Dumke (Austria), Frohmut Gerheuser (Switzerland), Lena Gerheuser (Switzerland), David Guggenheim (Israel), Hans Harms (Germany), Petra Hirschler (Austria), Eliza Hoxha (Kosovo), Hans Joosten (Netherlands), Cornelia Keim (Germany), Dieter Keim (Germany), Brad Lander (USA), Dieter Lapple (Germany), Rob Leek (Netherlands), Monica Lotreanu (Romania), Adam Mazor (Israel), Maria Mihai (Romania), Oriol Nello (Spain), Franz Oswald (Switzerland), Luljeta Pacolli-Kosumi (Austria), Maridea Petrova (Macedonia), Milan Prodanovic (Serbia), Sonja Prodanovic (Serbia), Gerhard Schimak (Austria), Henning Schran (Germany), Ron Shiffman (USA), Yvette Shiffman (USA), Walter Siebel (Germany), Joachim Siefert (Germany), Saskia Siefert (Germany), Ivan Stanic (Slovenia), Charlot Teng (Netherlands), Marco Venturi (Italy), Bruno Zanon (Italy), Elke Zlonicky (Germany), Peter Zlonicky (Germany).

1. Opening

President Franz Oswald opened the SCUPAD General Assembly 2004, welcoming all the members and guests and thanking Tom de Wit and Marco Venturi and their wives for hosting the Committee meetings in October, 2003 and January, 2004.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the General Assembly 2003, drafted by Secretary Bruno Zanon and published in the last Newsletter, were unanimously approved.

3. Reports

Website: Hartmut Dumke announced that the SCUPAD website address is www.Scupad.org. We are now using the Salzburg Seminar's server. The new website contains news about the SCUPAD organization and Committee members, and will also have information about the next Congress, including a registration form. Hartmut invited everyone to send him material for the website.

40th Anniversary of SCUPAD: Tom De Wit reported that the SCUPAD Congress 2005 will mark the 40th anniversary of SCUPAD's formation and that the first President of SCUPAD will try to be present next year. The Committee will be working on both the topic and program for next year as well as on a celebration.

Ohrid Follow-Up: Gerhard Schimak reported that in 2000, SCUPAD assisted in the conduct of a successful Congress in Ohrid, primarily for planning professionals from Eastern Europe. Last year, there was a meeting in Vienna among interested parties to discuss possible follow-up sessions and proposals were solicited from cities interested in hosting a next meeting. The two leading proposals were from Ohrid and Sofia. It was decided that the next meeting would be held in Ohrid in 2005, and the next one in Sofia. Due to his heavy workload, Gerhard will not be able to work on this event and Joachim Siefert will

coordinate the next Ohrid Congress for the group. Joachim announced that there is a preliminary program that he will distribute for comments and that the group planning the event is seeking additional people to participate in the preparations. Two German Foundations with locations in Macedonia and Sofia will be approached for financial help; Frohmut will also try to obtain funds from a Swiss organization to support the preparation of the event. Roberta Gratz, Vice-President for External Affairs, will be the contact for SCUPAD for this event.

SCUPAD Junior Program: Bruno Zanon reported that the Schloss will provide reduced fees for young professionals (up to 35 years of age) to stay at the Schloss during SCUPAD Congresses. Bruno stated that SCUPAD members (e.g. Peter Zlonicky and Ron Shiffman) have been involved in conducting workshops in different cities for students and young professionals. SCUPAD has the option of gathering young professionals in areas undergoing change. Marco Venturi commented that it was important to start this type of activity and that Franz Oswald has volunteered to coordinate it. Ron Shiffman commented that the Schloss has offered to establish closer links with SCUPAD and we should consider coordinating with some of the Seminar sessions. There will be a session on Public Space next year and perhaps we can have some input.

Vice President for Internal Affairs: Tom De Wit reported that there were 40 participants at the Congress from 13 different countries. The format change for the Congress this year, which had fewer presentations and more time for discussion, seemed to be quite successful.

Vice President for External Affairs: Roberta Gratz was not present. Franz reported that he had spoken with her and that she thanked SCUPAD members for their condolences and she expected to become active in SCUPAD again after the next three months.

Secretary: Bruno Zanon reminded the Assembly that he is stepping down as Secretary of SCUPAD. He said that the Secretary serves as the connection between members of the network and for that is dependent on having an updated mailing list. Franz thanked Bruno for his great work as Secretary for the last four years.

Treasurer: Thomas Dillinger presented the financial report for the last Budget Year (pre-Congress to pre-Congress). In May 2004, SCUPAD had 10,831 Euros in cash on hand. This is 2000 more than last year, and will be helpful in making the 40th anniversary celebration a success.

4. New Members

The Committee recommended seven people for membership in SCUPAD. After they introduced themselves, they were unanimously approved by the General Assembly. They are: Charlot Teng (Netherlands), Eliza Hoxha (Kosovo), Luljeta Pacolli-Kosumi (Austria), Oriol Nello (Spain), Dino Borri (Italy), Brad Lander (USA), Walter Siebel (Germany).

5. Elections

President Franz Oswald stated that according to the rules adopted by the General Assembly, the former Presidents (Ron Shiffman, Adam Mazor and Leo Van der Meer) made recommendations to the Committee for officers and new members of the Committee, which were approved. He reminded the members that Marco Venturi, Bruno Zanon, Saskia Siefert and himself were leaving their Committee positions. The nominations for officers are as follows: President - Tom De Wit; Vice-President for External Affairs - Roberta Gratz (2nd term); Vice-President for Internal Affairs - Ivan Stanic;

Secretary - Yvette Shiffman; Treasurer - Thomas Dillinger. David Guggenheim and Dieter Lapple were nominated as Committee members (2nd term) along with new members Hartmut Dumke and Annemieke Roobek. Ron commented that the Committee should be enlarged (all available slots filled) because the rules allow that only Committee members can be officers or else that the rules be changed.

Marco Venturi said that he thinks that the Committee should be smaller than it is and that the rules should be changed to reflect that. Frohmut commented that he also believed that the Committee

should be expanded. A motion to accept all the nominations was unanimously approved by the General Assembly. The new President, Tom de Wit, took over conduct of the balance of the meeting.

6. Future Congress Topics

A number of suggestions for the next Congress topic were made: Have the same topic as the first Congress (Rob Leek), combine two topics - Learning Cities and SCUPAD as a Learning Society (Peter Zlonicky), Looking Back 40 Years and Looking Forward 40 Years since many cities (New York, Israel, Barcelona, Buenos Aires) are looking at plans for 2050 (Ron Shiffman), City Planning and Civil Society (Milan Prodanovic). The Committee will determine the topic at its next Committee meeting in October. Tom de Wit introduced himself as a member of SCUPAD for 13 years and a Committee member for 4 years. He said that SCUPAD is a network organization of great people and that he will try to maintain the high standards of the group. Tom congratulated the new Committee members and officers, thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at noon.



Full Text of Presentations Available
For the full text of the presentations made at SCUPAD Congress 2004 and other information about SCUPAD, please go to newly restructured SCUPAD Web site at:

<http://www.scupad.org>

