About the Post-Urban Heritage Landscapes: Planning and Design, Public Spaces, New Geographies, and Decline

TIGRAN HAAS*[1] AND KRISTER OLSSON[2]
KTH[1] (Royal Institute of Technology), Stockholm, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology MIT, Cambridge, and [2]Krister Olsson, Gothenburg University, Department of Heritage Planning, Department of Conservation and Linköping University, Department of Thematic Studies (TEMA)

ABSTRACT

In this viewpoint paper, we discuss divergent but converging ideas about post-urban and cultural heritage, urban planning and design, public spaces, new geographies, urban renewal, and how heritage and planning and design can reverse decline and contribute to urban development. Urban heritage is understood as an infrastructure comparable with other infrastructures that provide an arena for urban planning and design and urban social and economic development. The forces of decline, abandonment, and decay have fallen on the city center and neighborhoods for years. Focus on "place" and how heritage/preservation/adaptive reuse is a way to contribute to fostering a 'sense of place' becomes crucial. The paper raises the question that can be asked surrounding the topic of heritage and preservation: How do you create a vibrant public realm in a declining city that has little or no public realm left? Moreover, how can heritage contribute to that? Moreover, the paper includes a short discussion about five contemporary urban planning and design ideals that dominate the contemporary planning and design discourse and their different views of the past and urban heritage. The paper looks into urban renewal and heritage's positive and negative aspects. It concludes that in any given situation and context, the dominating urban planning and design ideal defines the specific urban heritage and, thus, influences how we will understand the past – today, and the future through the prism of place and space. Space becomes the essential element of the battle for the "equal" city, a city of all genders, sexes, and ethnicities; an all-inclusive city where parts, most notably its public spaces as the dominant pillar of democracy, will be available and utilized by all. Therefore, the paper focuses on an emerging phenomenon of post-feminist new geographies, public spaces, s, and cultural urbanism as tools for more vibrant and sustainable development of declining cities. The paper concludes with some tailor-made recommendations about future visions through placemaking ideas.

Key Words : Urban Renewal, Cultural Heritage, Space and Place, Feminist Geographies, Cultural Urbanism

INTRODUCTION

Urban heritage is increasingly expected to contribute to future urban development, not least in declining cities that have experienced harsh economic, social, and spatial structural change. This increased interest can be regarded as a response to changing prerequisites for urban development during the last few decades, including economic and cultural globalization, de-industrialization, a diminishing public sector, increased mobility, and tough territorial competition. Consequently, development challenges contemporary heritage management and traditional ways of working with heritage issues. Urban heritage has become essential in branding and development strategies, aiming at attracting new inhabitants, visitors, and investors.

The world is becoming predominantly urban in the hyper-social, cultural, and economic globalization age.

New Geographies are emerging, bringing rapid rural migrations, new economic opportunities, and enhanced global motilities; cities have spatially expanded dramatically, resulting in urban transformations and structural changes endorsing new challenges to their character and identity. Several factors influenced the practice of urban planning and design to address large-scale structural change. In particular, past urban design ideals are revisited for contemporary social, economic, and environmental problems, where modern planning and design are believed to have failed. A stimulating question lies in using urban heritage and planning and design measures to revive cities, communities, and neighbourhoods. Can urban heritage and urban planning and design be viewed as effective measures for the reinvention of cities and towns that experience structural change?

The term "post-urban world" refers to a hypothetical future or a conceptual framework that envisions a significant transformation like urban environments. It suggests a departure from traditional notions of urbanism and explores alternative forms of human settlement and spatial organization. In a post-urban world, there may be a shift from dense, centralized cities to more dispersed, decentralized forms of habitation. Technological advancements, changes in work patterns, environmental considerations, or social dynamics could drive this.

The concept of a post-urban world recognizes the challenges and limitations of traditional urbanism, such as congestion, pollution, inequality, and social isolation. It imagines new models of urban living that prioritize sustainability, liveability, and resilience. Post-urbanism often emphasizes the integration of nature into urban areas, the creation of green spaces, and the promotion of walk ability and public transportation. It may also embrace concepts like mixed-use developments, smart cities, and digital connectivity to enhance the quality of life.

Moreover, a post-urban world may involve rummaging social and economic structures, focusing on local self-sufficiency, community empowerment, and cultural diversity. It is important to note that the term "post-urban world" is not a concrete reality but a conceptual framework that stimulates thinking about the future of urban environments. It encourages discussions about alternative urban models and strategies to address the complex challenges of urbanization in the 21st century.

Another Twist on Urban Heritage: Urban Renewal and Cultural Heritage:

The standard method employed in urban heritage management is identifying and protecting monuments, specific objects, and well-defined areas that are especially valuable from a historical perspective. Hence, the management is based on expert values within academic fields traditionally concerned with urban heritage, *i.e.,* art history, architecture, and archaeology. However, as expert values are decided upon independently of values held by other interests, the latter often have multiple perspectives concerning the urban environment, such as those held by urban and regional planners, real estate owners, and developers, are, and presumably, local citizens. In that sense, the role of current public heritage management in urban planning and design needs to be clarified.

The urban environment or landscape is a complex system of recognized monuments, modest buildings, and other structures. Consequently, the environmental context substantially defines a particular structure or object within the system. Each object has an external impact on the surroundings, which can be negative or positive, and will indirectly impact the understanding and valuation of adjacent objects. In this way, the surroundings, neighborhood, district, or city add and compound the value of each object. A vast majority of the structures in the urban environment have yet to qualify for preservation activities in traditional heritage management, i.e., monuments or well-defined conservation areas. It can be referred to as the general urban landscape, which includes a diverse set of spatially and socially linked artifacts. From this point of departure, it seems reasonable to consider the urban landscape as a totality in heritage management, monuments, conservation areas, modest buildings, and the urban landscape as urban heritage.

Thus, the view on urban heritage put forward here is a systems view, which means that the interplay between different parts of the system characterizes the urban landscape as heritage rather than separate monuments and conservation areas, which heritage experts have identified. Consequently, urban heritage is seen as a system encompassing defined conservation areas and heritage objects and tangible and intangible phenomena that link various objects and areas together, thus defining their value in a broader setting. Urban heritage, as the valued tangible and intangible legacy of the past but also a resource for the present and capital of the future, should

present a crucial asset for cities, not just in terms of place branding but much more of a systemic approach to everyday life, tourism, and investment. To attain and retain sustainable urban heritage, cities, governments, and local communities must create and nurture buildings, objects, spaces, places, contexts, and practices that have embedded meaning and value, are filled with historical narratives, and are enriched with local cultures and social interfaces.

The systems view gives a foundation to define urban heritage as an infrastructure and, hence, a public good, comparable with other infrastructures as a frame for people's daily activities and business development. Infrastructure is traditionally associated with technical systems, such as roads and railroads. However, a road, for example, is not in itself an infrastructure but has the potential to function as an infrastructure. Hence, the actual use (broadly) is significant for defining built structures as infrastructure. In sum, urban heritage as an infrastructure underlines its potential role for urban social and economic development, i.e., as a resource for people's everyday activities and business development.

Urban renewal can have positive and negative impacts on cultural heritage, depending on how it is implemented and the extent to which preservation and conservation efforts are integrated into the process. Here are some of the critical impacts of urban renewal on cultural heritage:

Positive Impacts:

1. *Heritage Preservation*: In some cases, urban renewal projects can lead to the restoration and preservation of historic buildings, landmarks, and cultural sites. This can help maintain a sense of continuity with the past and preserve important aspects of a community's cultural identity.

2. *Revitalization of Historic Areas*: Urban renewal can breathe new life into neglected or deteriorating historic neighborhoods. By restoring and repurposing old buildings, these areas can become vibrant centers for cultural activities, tourism, and community gatherings.

3. *Cultural Tourism*: Preserved and revitalized heritage sites can attract tourists interested in history, architecture, and local culture. This influx of visitors can benefit the area economically and support local businesses.

4. *Sense of Place and Identity*: Cultural heritage gives residents a sense of place and identity. Preserving

historical sites and traditions can strengthen the community's connection to its past and foster a sense of pride in local heritage.

Negative Impacts:

1. *Displacement:* One of the most significant concerns with urban renewal is the potential displacement of long-time residents, including those belonging to culturally diverse communities. Gentrification can increase property values and living costs, forcing out lower-income residents.

2. *Loss of Authenticity:* In some cases, urban renewal efforts may prioritize modernization over heritage preservation, leading to the loss of the authentic character of a neighborhood or community. New developments might not harmonize with the historical surroundings.

3. *Destruction of Heritage Sites:* Inappropriately planned urban renewal projects can result in the demolition of significant historical buildings or cultural sites, leading to irreversible loss of heritage.

4. *Dilution of Cultural Traditions:* Rapid urbanization and modernization can dilute traditional cultural practices and values as the focus shifts towards adopting more mainstream or contemporary lifestyles.

5. *Tourist-Driven Commodification:* While tourism can bring economic benefits, it may also lead to the commercialization and commodification of cultural heritage, reducing it to mere tourist attractions and eroding its authentic value.

To mitigate the negative impacts and enhance the positive effects of urban renewal on cultural heritage, planners and policymakers need to involve local communities in decision-making processes, prioritize the preservation and adaptive reuse of historic structures, and implement sustainable development practices that respect and enhance the unique cultural identity of the area. Balancing urban growth needs with heritage preservation is crucial for ensuring a more sustainable and culturally enriched urban landscape. Heritage and urban renewal can sometimes appear contradictory, but they can also work together harmoniously in urbanism if managed carefully and with consideration for the unique characteristics of each place. Let us explore both aspects. The contradiction between Heritage and Urban Renewal: Preservation vs. Development: Heritage conservation often prioritizes the preservation of historic buildings, sites, and cultural aspects, which may conflict with the need for urban renewal and modernization. Development

projects might require demolishing or altering historical structures, leading to tensions between preserving the past and embracing the future. Gentrification: In some cases, urban renewal efforts may lead to gentrification, where property values increase, pushing out low-income residents and eroding the cultural and social fabric of the area. This can be at odds with the idea of heritage, which often involves maintaining the community's historical identity. Community Attachment: Urban renewal projects may disrupt the existing community's attachment to their heritage, as changes in the physical environment can alter the sense of place and belonging.

On the other hand, it is possible to make Heritage and Urban Renewal Work Together through *Adaptive Reuse*: Instead of demolishing historic buildings, adaptive reuse can be employed, converting them for modern purposes while preserving their heritage value. This approach respects the past while accommodating present needs. Secondly, via *Inclusive Planning:* In urban renewal projects, involving the local community in the planning process is essential. Understanding their attachment to heritage and incorporating their perspectives can lead to more balanced and acceptable outcomes. Thirdly focusing on *Heritage Districts*: Designating heritage districts can help protect historical areas while allowing for appropriate urban development in other parts of the city. Fourthly the key is *Sustainable Design*: Urban renewal should embrace sustainable design principles to minimize negative impacts on heritage and the environment. This involves considering the preservation of historical landmarks and using eco-friendly practices. Fifthly, *Economic Revitalization*: Urban renewal projects can stimulate economic growth while promoting local heritage, ensuring that cultural assets become an economic driver for the area. Sixthly, Public Spaces and Identity are crucial: Integrating heritage elements into public spaces can help retain a sense of identity while allowing modern development. Moreover, finally, *Balancing Preservation and Innovation*: Striking a balance between heritage preservation and urban renewal is crucial. Some areas might be better suited for preservation, while others can embrace new development, thus creating a diverse and vibrant urban landscape.

Overall, it is essential to view heritage and urban renewal not as a contradiction but as complementary components of urbanism. By considering the historical significance of an area and involving the community in the renewal process, cities can achieve a delicate balance between honoring the past and embracing the future.

Applied Social Sciences of Urban Planning and Design and urban and Cultural Heritage:

Urban design is a complex concept, and there is no commonly accepted definition of urban design in academia or practice. In its most straightforward interpretation, urban design can be described as architecture on a larger scale and within a broader context or as a bridge between architectural design and urban planning. Urban design connects many disciplines: architecture, planning, landscape architecture, and engineering.

Urban planning can be defined as a political, economic, and social 'framework' that has direct and indirect consequences for technical and political processes. It is primarily concerned with the welfare of the citizens; water and land use management; shaping and composing – designing – the urban environment, including transportation and (tele) communication networks; and with ecology through the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.

Planning can be distinguished as a process-oriented activity, and design as a product-oriented activity. Therefore, urban planning and design is a cross-border field specializing in static and dynamic urban conditions. Dynamic processes are characterized by flows of people and their interactions that give kinetic energy to the environment. The dynamic defines how we view our spatial landscapes and experience a particular urban condition and context. Static processes are defined by their permanence of assemblage, *i.e.,* the creation of stable built forms and shapes – the streets, buildings, squares, and open spaces that define the environment to provide a stable reference system and a performance structure. One cannot exist without the other, and both permeate space, place, and time.

Throughout the last three decades, several ideals have influenced the practice of urban planning and design. In particular, five different ideals dominate today's urban planning and design discourse:

- Re-Urbanism, which could be described as oriented towards constant urbanity, addressing the repair of the urban fabric;
- Green Urbanism, which is focused on ecological sensibility;
- New Urbanism, which, among other things, is based on a neighbourhood concept and walkability;

Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci. | July & Aug., 2023 | **10** (7 & 8)

(460)

– Post Urbanism, which could be labelled as generic hybridity with a focus on reinvention and restructuring;
– Everyday Urbanism could be described as vernacular spatiality with a bottom-up approach.

Ideas about contemporary and future society, and, hence, approaches to the past, are expressed differently in these five urban planning and design ideals. For example, post-urbanism connects to the idea that the past is irrelevant to future development. It is based on rejecting, or freedom from, traditional ideas about what characterizes the urban environment and urban planning and design. Instead, it emphasizes, in particular, architectural monuments and iconic buildings that claim to be innovative and to express a new era. This reflects directly the heritage of the future – which is being created in cities and towns by 'Starchitecture' – the new iconic flagship architecture. On the other hand, new urbanism is based on ideals and qualities from the time before modernist planning and is trying to re-create these qualities in contemporary urban planning and design. It includes mixed-use ideas and emphasizes public spaces and environments suitable for pedestrians. Moreover, in everyday urbanism, emphasis is put on the present; thus, ideas about the future and approaches to the past are not necessary. Everyday urbanism can be connected to the idea that society is the unintended consequence of peoples' actions rather than urban planning and design efforts. In Table 1, all five ideals are, in short, positioned *vis-à-vis* the past and urban heritage.

How Can Heritage and Planning and Design Contribute to Urban Development?:

In many cases, conservation projects focus on contributing to a sense of place through the material conservation of monuments, objects, and well-defined areas. Considering urban transformation in terms of economic, social, and physical change allows for a more complex analysis. Shifts in the relationship between a sense of place and everyday activities that result from structural transformations can trigger destructive processes that affect long-established urban settlements.

As opposed to urban planning and design, architecture has a different role in heritage management. The 2005 Vienna Memorandum addressed the integration of contemporary architecture into a historical context. It focused on the following six principles:

1. Concept of the historic urban landscape.
2. Importance of understanding place.
3. Avoid pseudo-historical design.
4. New development should minimize direct impacts on historic elements.

Table 1 : Urban heritage in different urbanisms – urban planning and design ideals			
Urban Planning and Design Ideas	Urban heritage	Grapheme	Hallmark
Re-Urbanism	Adaptation to the existing urban environments. Restoration and interpretation of the historical and contemporary form of the city in the semi-context of the surrounding.	Buildings-fabric-people-context-time-density.	City-based tourism and visitor economies of urban heritage re-creating present, past, and future;
Green Urbanism	Past and present are subdued to a healthy and sustainable future of biophilia and resilience. Focus on the Nature of Order and sustainability with innovative ecological approaches.	Nature-gradience-connectivity-accessibility-preservation.	Revitalizing the city and nature; Innovative systems of protection and planning urban heritage;
New Urbanism	(Re-)Creation of the past as a dynamic reference for the present. Physical structures and complete town-making principles have more importance than objects. Placemaking Design Codes.	History-human scale-density-accessibility-fabric-urbanity.	Heritage is seen as city memory and sense of place; Urban heritage as a form of social capital and placemaking;
Post Urbanism	The past is irrelevant. Monuments have primacy as works of art. Objects are more critical than the structure of the urban fabric—a built environment used as a quasi-contextual backdrop.	Transformation-hybridity-time lapses-self formation-reconfiguration.	Global and mega-city competition; Cosmopolitan urban heritage and re-creating of new identities and new spaces of flows;
Everyday Urbanism	Everyday culture is more important than physical features. Focus on the present and temporary—reproduction of existing urban environments through culture, place, and identity.	Continuity-kineticism-grounded reality-hidden dimensionality.	Urban spaces, traditions, and intangible heritage; Community approaches to and uses of urban heritage and place;

5. Contemporary architecture should be complementary to the values of the historic urban landscape.

6. Cultural or Visual Impact Assessment.

What is needed is something similar but at least a discussion about urban heritage in urban planning and design aiming a turban development, acknowledging the urban heritage as an infrastructure. Traditional methods in heritage management are based on expert values, which are assumed to correspond with values in society at large. Generally, it is reasonable to assume that there is a standard view among various interests that conservation activities are worthwhile. However, this is not self-evident in a specific case in which concrete values of different kinds must be weighed against each other. Furthermore, the traditional way of working, i.e., stressing historical monuments and well-defined conservation areas, implies that modest buildings and the general urban landscape will be neglected, and, thus, systems view on urban heritage should be acknowledged. To include a broader view of urban heritage in urban development, it is first necessary to examine social and economic values rather than historical ones defined by experts. Thus, the question is how to define urban heritage as an infrastructure and a public good based on how people and businesses use and benefit from the urban environment. Also, for heritage sites and 'historic urban landscapes' to develop into a more robust mechanism, as in emerging urbanism, it will inevitably have to be part of a universalizing approach to urban heritage.

Post-Feminist New Geographies, Public Spaces, and Cultural Urbanism:

From its earliest origination, a defining feature of feminist geography was its intellectual cross-fertilization and multidisciplinary approach; this remains one of its strengths today (Nelson and Seager, 2005), but it needs to go further in what we call *post-feminist new geographies*. The basic premise of *feminism* —that inequality between the sexes exists and that inequality should be eradicated—has been an essential call for change. This can be transferred into the urban environment and cities' spatial definition and characteristics. Gender is part of the *geography of everyday life:* gender is intertwined with what people do, how they relate to one another, the spaces they use, and the places and landscapes they make (McDowell and Sharp, 1999). Space becomes the essential element of the battle for the "equal" city, a city of all genders, sexes, and ethnicities; an all-inclusive city where all its parts, most notably its public spaces as the dominant pillar of democracy, will be available and utilized by all.

As the anthropologist Shirley Ardener (1993) notes, no particular emphasis on the distinction between the terms "space" and "place" should be set or posed. In various disciplines, from urban planning, social urban geography, urban sociology, urban design, environmental psychology, anthropology, urban geography, and others, the terms have been (re) conceptualized frequently, often contradictory. One view, prevalent among urban geographers, sees "place" as a geographically and historically specific instance of the social use of space. On the other hand, Michel De Certeau (2011) states that space is a practiced place in a constellation that is the opposite of the usual definition in geography. Doreen Massey (1994) explains that space and place, spaces and places, and our sense of them (and such related things as our degree of mobility) are gendered through and through… Moreover, this gendering of space reflects and has effects back on how gender is constructed and understood in the societies in which we live. What the post-feminist new geography needs to look at is firstly the core of differences between how men and women but also trans-gender groups, the LGBTQ+ community experience and use spaces and places in the city, secondly to show how these differences in uses can help to create both gender and better places, and thirdly to see what urban planning and design paradigm(s) is (are) best suited for creating inclusive urbanism glocalized public places convivial to all groups: the relation between globalization and modernization, as well as transformation and integration coupled with context ualization and culture and history of cities.

What Makes a Great Public Space? Numerous spatial and social qualities can make an excellent public space. Issues of size, scale, degree of physical enclosure, amenities, aesthetics, and other variables matter; public spaces at different times and in dissimilar contexts might change in their role of accommodating various and heterogeneous groups of people in the city (Carmona *et al.,* 2010). These changing roles also mean changing conditions for various social and economic groups, those inhabiting the adjacent urban realms, and those visiting or passing by (Amin, 2008). This urban complexity problematizes the notion of public space and redefines the grammar and system of public spaces, where no

universal vocabulary emerges (Haas and Olsson, 2014b). In feminist geographies, the study of geographies of fear has mainly focused on examining the relationship between women's fear and their perceptions and uses of public space. It has been contended that fear is entirely marked by gender and determines one's experience of the city and freedom of movement (Pain, 2001; Koskela, 2000; Ruddick, 1996; Valentine, 1989). Feminist geographers maintain that public space, particularly that of 'urban space,' is engendered and 'sexed' as predominantly masculine and heterosexual space (Duncan, 1996; Binnie, 1997; Fenster, 2007 Crinnion, 2013).

The issues of culture and context ualized urbanity are unavoidable elements akin to and compatible with this discourse. Suppose we see the city as the spatial product and the product of social processes, the kinetic and static elements coming together. In that case, the rising paradigm of cultural urbanism becomes even more pivotal in the city's struggle for just and all-inclusive gendered spaces. Todd Meyer (2014) looks at cultural urbanism as an approach that has seven major elements: paying attention to the context and history of the place as well as narratives, understanding the local preferences of all inhabitants, which allows for a diversity of users and uses, providing a variety of products, taking a chance to be different in space and place, establishing high-quality open space and public realms and one that creates higher real estate value because of all of the above. At first glance, such elements appear to support an ideal of what feminist urban researchers Delores Hayden and Clara Greed call the "non-sexist city" of localized facilities, shops, amenities, and a mix of uses (Greed 1994; Hayden, 1981). Projects like the High Line are a body of built environment new geography products that we call place branding and usually do not work on the premise of cultural urbanism but rather place branding and flagship architecture or urban design. Bridges are a favorite structure for expressing what Rem Koolhaas (1994) called 'the propagandistic nature of architecture' and a highly notable, visible, and prominent node, usually centrally deployed and capable of expressing aesthetic and engineering skills. Gregory Ashworth (2009) makes an essential twofold distinction about such flagship projects, i.e., that their 'success' depends on success in at least two respects. Firstly, architecture, urban design, or even engineering must be notable and noticeable, where the aesthetics do not matter much but more if the project is seen and talked about. Secondly, the artistic creator – master builder, architect, engineer, or urban designer-landscape architect/urbanist of the building/complex is almost as important as the building itself. The process of using a flagship building, as Ashworth suggests, is to stimulate broader cultural and economic development, which is sometimes known as 'Guggenheiming' or the Guggenheim Effect. The role of contemporary architecture in promoting urban regeneration, economic development, and city branding remains a complex and open question (Ponzini, 2011). What is often forgotten is that these projects should avoid homogenizing city urban landscapes and attempt to be more than just pure brands and signature nodes. Often residents do not see or have a vivid sense of their community's unique attributes through such place branding generic endeavors.

On the other hand, Cultural Urbanism promotes and celebrates the everyday, temporal, and occasional but also the timeless, which flagship buildings are only sometimes able to do. It is an approach that dwells deep into the spatial and social fabric of the city and the kineticism of relationships on the ground that defines the use and management of the built environment. It opens the differences and building environments that foster community interaction, enabling us to go deeper, see and understand what makes our cities so unique and exciting, and what is the foundation for creating genuine and authentic places. Such a paradigm also allows the dwellers and citizens to preserve the fine-grain urban distinctions, celebrating their tales, narratives, and histories, as well as differences that occur in space and time and between all different groups of users (Chase et al., 2008). Here Massey (1994) again brings the vital fundamental issues, issues also crucial to feminist geographies; those of space, where space must be conceptualized integrally with time, where a new thinking of space, not as some absolute independent dimension, but as constructed out of social relations must be brought in: that what is at issue is not social phenomena in space but both social phenomena and space as constituted out of social relations, that the spatial is social relations 'stretched out. The fact is that social relations are never still, never implacable; they are inherently dynamic and kinetic. Thus even to understand space as a simultaneity is, in these terms, not to evacuate it of all inherent dynamism. This is most evident in public places in our cities.

William Holy Whyte (1980) studied, in the vein of 'observational urbanism,' a series of urban spaces in New

York City and commented on why some were successful while others were not. Among Whyte's main and bearing ideas and findings were: The social life in public spaces contributes fundamentally to the quality of life of individuals and society; Designers have a moral responsibility to create physical places that facilitate civic engagement and community interaction; Public spaces should be designed from the bottom up, not top-down; Design should start with a thorough understanding of the way people use spaces and the way they would like to use spaces. These lessons are essential, especially if one deal with flagship projects and wants to be inclusive, but also if the purpose is to study the differences between how men and women, as well as the LGBT community, experience spaces and places and to show how these differences help to create both gender and place.

Gender ideologies and the practices of women and men are central to how spaces are constructed. These processes and practices are dynamic and fluid; they are constantly re-created and re-formed, even as the spaces they construct are changed and transformed (Staeheli and Martin, 2000). In line with that, as Louis Wirth (1938) and Fran Tonkiss (2014) observed, cities are fundamentally social forms, not necessarily built forms. City-making is a social process, and the intricate and close relationship between urban environments' social and physical shaping is crucial for creating gender identity and inclusive public spaces. Just as space, the network of processes and relationships that connect places (Massey, 1994) may be coded with a gender identity; it may also be given a (a) sexual identity. In feminist geographies, if public space is viewed as predominantly patriarchal, and heterosexuality is part and parcel of that form of masculinity—heteropatriarchy—then public space is sexed to the advantage of heterosexuals and the disadvantage of alternative sexualities (McDowell and Sharp, 1999 and Nelson and Seager, 2005). To challenge their spatial exclusion from the public place and resist their spatial containment in the private place, many gays and lesbians and the whole LGBT community around the world invert the identities of public spaces at specific times (Fellmann *et al.,* 2013) either squares or streets or parks, expressing thereby their identity and breaking the bonds and vicious circle of embedded masculine unshared spaces; thereby sustaining, challenging and altering gender and sexual identities *vis-à-vis* spatial geographies – those of spaces and places in the city.

Finally, a combination of post-feminist new geography outlooks that can give us explanations and answers as well as solutions for public realms, coupled with explorations in crucial elements of cultural urbanism where a nuanced understanding of public space is brought in, might be an approach that many of our cities are missing at this moment in time. The role of Flagship projects in the above outlooks, such as High Line, remains under debate. However, policymakers can critically reinterpret these projects as exploring new *cultural places*, involving a broader set of actors and interests, and fostering a more sustainable evolution of urban landscapes (Ponzini, 2011). 'Culture is the software of cities just as the built environment is its hardware,' says Peter Calthorpe (2010). According to him, software and hardware co-evolve with each coming time and generation, 'culture informing and transforming the hardware of a city while technological change and infrastructure redirect the city culture.' The critical thing to remember, as Calthorpe (2013) observes, is that while each place is unique, universal human traits set the fundamental DNA of great cities: *human scale, diversity of action, and social interaction.*

Introduction: Some concluding Remarks On Placemaking:

As cities and towns face the complex challenges of deindustrialization and global economic crisis, "Placemaking" has been considered a new local urban improvement strategy. It has various definitions, and the interventions and projects use different methods and means depending on the context. Still, generally, they all emphasize citizen participation in the planning process.

In practice, the urban environment can be associated with different, and sometimes competing, value dimensions, such as real estate and historical values. These values are generally based on self-interests or expert perspectives and, consequently, do not necessarily reflect a broader view of urban heritage defined as an infrastructure. However, in the context of our short analysis, we need to see and understand that urban heritage – with its physical and social qualities – is situated in a spatial continuum. In our understanding, urban heritage is the interplay between different features in the spatial continuum and their relational meanings. Therefore, it becomes a vital value category in contemporary urban planning and design aiming at urban development.

Profound and apparent changes in city skylines and

urban spatial boundaries, transforming the notion of urban heritage as we know it, are often accompanied by more subtle transformations that aim to preserve the present but also promote their pasts against competitive demands for space that cities compete for. As heritage managers, urban planners, and designers, we must be cognizant of how the urban landscapes and structures we provide, and the built objects that we conserve or design, affect people and spaces directly and indirectly. Such interventions form habits and create ways of life; they allow users to pursue individual happiness and create relations with others when embedded in space and time. However, we must equally recognize how forces of structural change contribute to shaping the urban landscape. The resulting urban heritage affects people's urban experience, stimulating or limiting how people live their everyday lives and providing opportunities or restrictions for business development. In the end, it is all about "designing the past." In any given situation and context, the dominating urban planning and design ideal will define the specific urban heritage and, thus, influence how we will understand the past – today and the future.

Visions of the future are known to «conjure up images of invention, » as Goodman puts it. With this in mind, we encourage prospective participants to deliver papers that reflect on the following questions: How can we learn from historical futures through creative, critical reflection? Is it possible to take inspiration from historical material without succumbing to static ideas about originality, authenticity, and quality? How can architecture, landscape architecture, urbanism, and planning professionals project new futures along with a critical discussion of these projections? How are new futures imagined, directed, and critically reflected in contemporary practice?

Reflecting on histories and discussing futures, this symposium builds on an understanding of time, representing the gradual transformation of physical spaces like cultural heritage sites and being a source of imaginary future life. We, therefore, invite papers that challenge the hegemonic position within cultural heritage management, which tends to treat historic buildings, landscapes, and cityscapes as entities frozen in time. There are other ways of dealing with past qualities, such as sources of methodological inspiration and alternative solutions to current issues.

Can Heritage urbanism and historic preservation be used as an approach or a tool to do reparative city planning in the neighbourhoods of cities needing transformative change and new urban renewal? Can it encourage genius loci (sense of place), attachment, and healing experiences within the community; can it build damaged social capital by re-establishing trust between communities damaged and mutilated by all the social, economic, political, and physical processes? Moreover, Can, through this process of heritage and preservation as an active city planning and urban design tool, a tool for reparative place-making, enable city planners and historic preservationists to engage with each other in new and productive ways (Haas and Olsson, 2014a).

The Past in the Present:
This sub-theme calls for critical perspectives on cultural heritage issues and other critical reflections in historical research on built structures and land use. This could, for instance, be an exploration of cultural heritage management as a practice field and governance model through modern history or theoretical analyses of critical terms such as "experimental preservation," which redefines preservation as a forward-looking creative field.

Tomorrow belongs to nobody:
Le Corbusier proposed that "tomorrow belongs to nobody" in The City of Tomorrow and its Planning, in which he claims that contemporary needs are more important than remote futures. Herein lies an encouragement to explore the present and future relationship in planning and urbanism, as well as the historical configurations of this dilemma.

Utopian Landscapes of Reality:
Landscape architecture and other "green" disciplines" are spearheading a quest to make managing cities, buildings, and natural resources more sustainable. This desire to create a better planet has a long-standing tradition within the making disciplines, and it has made the leap from utopia to reality in various ways. This sub-theme invites papers dealing with ecology awareness in landscape design, the current appreciation of historical landscapes in contemporary practices, and new efforts at turning green visions into realities. In this context, new management tools and requirements for "Green landscape and building," such as guidelines by LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), become problematic as they support instrumentality in design rather than architectural quality, fantasy, and utopian

ideas.

Historic preservation is defined narrowly as interpreting historic events or uses in a place. More broadly, it is managing change in the historic built environment. There are multiple strategies to achieve historic preservation, including physical conservation of a building or landscape, development regulations that manage change, programming that reflects the place's heritage, or installation of signs and markers that explain the site's significance. Reparative city planning is defined as a process by which planners reengage with a community harmed by city planning in the past in a way that heals the community's trauma and rebuilds trust with city planners.

REFERENCES

Amin, A. (2008). "Collective culture and urban public space," *City,* Vol. **12** No 1 2008 Routledge

Ardener, S.(1993). *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps* (Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Women), (Editor) Bloomsbury Academic: London and New Delhi

Ashworth, G. J. (2009). The Instruments of Place Branding: How is it Done? European Spatial Research and Policy, Volume **16**, 2009 Number 1.

Binnie, J. (1997). "Coming Out of Geography: Towards a Queer Epistemology?" *Environment and Planning D:*

Calthorpe, P. (2010). "Conversations with Peter Calthorpe in Berkeley," February 2010.

Calthorpe, P. (2013).*Urbanism in the Age of Climate Change*, Island Press 2nd edition, Island Press: Washington DC.

Carmona, M., Heath, T., Oc, T., &Tiesdell, S. 2010. *Public places, urban spaces*. Boston, MA: Elsevier/ Architectural Press.

Chase, J., Crawford, M. &Kaliski, J. (2008). *Everyday Urbanism Expanded,*Monacelli Press: New York.

Crinnion, A. 2013. "The Slutwalks: Reappropriation through Demonstration," Manchester Metropolitan University Gender and Urban Space Gender Forum Issue 42

De Certeau, M. (2011). *The Practice of Everyday Life*, University of California Press, 3rd edition 2011

Duncan, N. (1996). "Renegotiating Gender and Sexuality in Public and Private Spaces." In N. Duncan (ed.), *BodySpace: Destabilising Geographies of Gender and Sexuality.* London: Routledge, pp. 127–189.

Fellmann, J. D., Bjelland, M. D., Gustavus, D. R., Montello, A.

G., Judith, G. 2013. Human Geography: Landscapes of Human Activities, 12th /edition, McGraw-Hill Education; 2013 New York

Fenster, T. (2007). "Gender and the City: The Different Formations of Belonging." In A Companion to Feminist Geography Edited by Lise Nelson & Joni Seager 2005 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd, London

Greed C. (1994). *Women and Planning, Creating Gendered Realities*. London: Routledge

Haas, T. (ed.) (2008). *New Urbanism & Beyond: Designing Cities for the Future.* New York: Rizzoli.

Haas, T. (ed.) (2012). *Sustainable Urbanism & Beyond - Rethinking Cities for the Future*. New York: Rizzoli.

Haas, T. and Olsson, K. (eds.) (2014a). *Emergent Urbanism: Urban Planning & Design in Times of Structural and Systemic Change*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Haas, T. and Olsson, K. (2014b). "Transmutation and Reinvention of Public Spaces through Ideals of Urban Planning and Design,"*Space & Culture*, **17**(1) : 59–68.

Hayden, D.(1981). *What would a non-sexist city be like?* In C R Stimpson, E Dixler, M J Nelson and K Yatrakis (Eds) Women and the American City (pp 167–184). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Koolhaas, R.(1994). "Rem Koolhaas, Post-Nationalist Architect" In New York Times, 11th September.

Koskela, H. and Pain, R. (2000). "Revisiting fear and place: women's fear of attack and the built environment," *Geoforum*, **31** : 269-280.

Massey, D.(1994). *Space, Place, and Gender.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McDowell, L. and Sharp, P. J.(1999). *A Feminist Glossary of Human Geography.* New York: Arnold.

Meyer, T. (2014). "Cultural Urbanism: Distinct Urban Places that Promote Social Interaction and Create Value."THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION, Planning Magazine April 2014 pp.14-19

Nelson, L. and Seager, J.(2005). A Companion to Feminist Geography, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, London

Olsson, K. (2008). Citizen Input in Urban Heritage Management and Planning – A quantitative approach to citizen participation. In: *Town Planning Review*, **79** (4) : 371–394.

Olsson, K. (2008). Heritage management in urban development planning. In: Haas, T (ed.) *New Urbanism & Beyond: Designing Cities for the Future*. New York: Rizzoli.

Olsson, K. (2008). The Value of Preservation. Analyses of the Decision-making Processes in Urban Heritage Management. In: Mälkki, M., Mäntysalo, R. and Schmidt-Thomé (eds.) *Economics and Built Heritage – Towards New European Initiatives.* Espoo: Helsinki University of Technology.

Olsson, K.(2010). Cultural Heritage as a Resource in Place Marketing. In: Mälkki, M. and Schmidt-Thomé, K. (eds.) *Integrating Aims. Built Heritage in Social and Economic Development*. Espoo: Aalto University, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications B 98.

Olsson, K. and Berglund, E. (2009). City marketing: the role of the citizens. In: Nyseth, T. and Viken, A. (eds.) *Place Reinvention: Northern Perspectives.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Olsson, K. and Haas, T. (2013). Emergent Urbanism: Structural change and urban planning and design. In: *Journal of Urbanism: Internat. Res. & Urban Sustainability,* **6** (2) : 95-112.

Pain, R. (2001). "Gender, Race, Age, and Fear in the City," *Urban Studies*, **38**/5-6, pp. 899–913.

Ponzini, D. (2011). The Guggenheim Effect and the Roles of Star Architecture in Contemporary Cities," invited paper, *Finnish Journal of Urban Studies,* Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu, **49** (4) : 60–75.

Ruddick, S. (1996). "Constructing difference in public spaces: Race, class, and gender as interlocking systems,"*Urban Geography,* **17**, pp. 132–151. *Society and Space,* **15** (1997): 223–237.

Staeheli, L.A. and Martin, M.P. (2000). *Spaces for Feminism in Geography*. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science September 2000 vol. **571** no. 1 135-150

Tonkiss, F. (2014). *Cities by Design: The Social Life of Urban Form*, Polity Press: London

Valentine. G. (1989). The geography of women's fear, *Area*, **21**/4 : 385-390.

Whyte, H. W.(1980). *Social Life of Small Urban Spaces* (Editor) Conservation Foundation: New York

Wirth, L. (1938). "Urbanism as a Way of Life,"*American Journal of Sociology*, **44** (1) : 1-24

Tigran Haas is the Associate Professor of Urban Planning + Urban Design and the Director of the Halcyon Athenaeum Laboratory (HAL), Applied Social Science Research Platform at the School of Architecture and the Built Environment at KTH. Tigran Haas' expertise, current research, and teaching focus on contemporary trends and paradigms in urban planning & design, new urbanism, sustainable urbanism, social housing and urban transformations, and city development and design. Tigran Haas is also a Guest Research Scholar at LCAU Centre, Media Lab, Massachusetts Institute of Technology MIT, Cambridge.

Krister Olsson was the Associate Professor at the Department of Conservation, Gothenburg University and Department of Conservation and Linköping University, Department of Thematic Studies (TEMA). He holds a doctoral degree in regional planning from KTH – Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm. His research has included theoretical and empirical studies of urban and regional development strategies and planning. It has mainly been directed toward heritage management, urban planning and design, and place marketing. Between 2011 and 2014, he worked at the National Heritage Board in Sweden.

∗∗∗∗∗∗∗∗∗∗∗∗