Leveraging the city as a laboratory for developing socially responsive design strategies

JERUSALEM

[Inter]sections of urban conflict page 6

NICOSIA

Inhabiting edges page 14

LONDON

Constructing healthier urbanisms page 26

A perpetual engagement with multifarious urban borders
by Giorgio Talocci

Considering design challenges in a city divided
by Camila Cocina & Ricardo Marten

Planning in the face of political conflict
by Haim Yacobi & Camila Cocina

Understanding healthy places, designing healthier neighbourhoods
by Kay Pallaris

special insert
Depoliticising Verticality
in collaboration with
Advanced Graduate Design Studio
USF School of Architecture
+ Community Design
Tampa Florida, US

with a contribution by
Josue Robles Caraballo
Content

A perpetual engagement with multifarious urban borders
by Giorgio Talocci

------------------

JERUSALEM: [Inter]sections of urban conflicts
Planning in the face of political conflict
by Haim Yacobi & Camila Cociña

Participants’ reflections

------------------

NICOSIA: Inhabiting Edges
Considering design challenges in a city divided
by Camila Cocina & Ricardo Martén

Participants’ reflections

------------------

LONDON: Constructing Healthier Urbanisms
Understanding healthy places, designing healthier neighbourhoods
by Kay Pallaris

Participants’ reflections

------------------

Acknowledgements

------------------

Special insert
DEPOLITICISING VERTICALITY
Designing for Vertical Inclusion
by Josue Robles Caraballo

Introducing DPU summerLab 2018 series

------------------

Acknowledgements

DPU summerLab is a collective endeavour, owing much of its success to the endless effort and enthusiasm of our friends and collaborators, who brought ideas and suggestions during the preparation and realisation of the 2017 series programme. We wish to share our deepest appreciation to all the coordinators, partners and participants.

To Haim Yacobi, Silvia Covarino and Kay Pallaris for sharing their local knowledge with us and devising three challenging programmes in, respectively, Jerusalem, Nicosia, London.

To all the businesses and individuals in Jerusalem, Nicosia, and London who opened doors with grace and kindness – we thank you all individually at page 36!

To all participants for the energy, the passion and the committed determination in exploring uncharted territories and pushing themselves out of ‘conventional design’ comfort zones.

Thanks to Bostjan Bugaric and Giulia Carabelli for putting up the programme for the workshop in Trieste / Koper, that unfortunately we were not able to activate. Equal thanks go also to the local facilitators of the non-activated summerLab workshop in Palermo: Sharon Ambrosio, Deborah Navarra and the Scuola Politecnica of the University of Palermo.

Thanks to Camila Cocina for the work of coordination and facilitation during the workshops, and to Azadeh Mashayekhi for the great administrative work throughout all stages of the programme. Thanks to Ricardo Martén for his wonderful and patient graphic work on the present pamphlet, and for the facilitation of Nicosia’s workshop along with Silvia Covarino and Camila Cocina.

Thanks to Nkenji Okpara, Elsa Taddesse and all the DPU Administration for the support in planning and preparing the initiative, as well as to the all DPU members of staff for their ongoing support.

Special thanks to the DPU Director Prof. Julio Davila, for the continuous support and encouragement.

Without all of your diligence and partnership the DPU summerLab would have been just another summer school.
A perpetual engagement with multifarious urban borders

by Giorgio Talocci

The process of creating and controlling a multiplicity of tangible and intangible borders is a key task, an instrument and a by-product of today’s urban design practice. Urban borders separate insides from outsides through multidimensional mechanisms. Rather than being just spatial artefacts, indeed, borders configure as complex apparatuses made up of physical structures, of policies and norms, of surveillance devices, of discursive constructions. Urban borders configure nowadays as walls, fences, barbed-wires, but rise also through planning decisions, exclusionary urban and housing policies, public order regulations, social preconceptions, fear, stigma.

Urban borders, in their multifaceted and multidimensional character, were at the core of the investigation of the 2017 summerLab workshop series. Participants landed into the realities of two divided cities – Jerusalem and Nicosia – and, in London, explored potentially divisive discourses emerging around the concept of urban health. What kind of borders were we going to encounter? Which insides and outsides were such borders separating? How to do design research in fragmented urban realities?

This introduction, while presenting the material readers will find in this pamphlet, wants to reflect on the threefold impact that urban borders had on the workshops, on the way participants and facilitators conducted design research activities in the three cities. Firstly, on how borders framed our perspective, perception and interpretation of the cities’ dynamics of transformation – the way we actually read Jerusalem, Nicosia, London. Secondly, on how borders affected and informed the exploration and research methods eventually used on the field – the way we produced knowledge on the three cities. Thirdly, on the dimension of public engagement and our research ethos in working with local partners – the way we engaged with three fragmented urban realities.

Reading urban borders

In one of the short essays featured in this pamphlet, Haim Yacobi and Camila Cociña (page 8) reflect on Jerusalem’s borders, emphasising how the city’s geopolitics have been directly influenced by the enforcement of planning tools, through the implementation of power over territory and society. Beyond state violence and military acts, apparently neutral urban trends such as privatisation of space, gentrification, infrastructure development and touristic planning have instead contributed to the frontierisation of Palestinian neighbourhoods.

Camila Cociña and Ricardo Martén (page 16) similarly look at Nicosia as a city split by nationalist lines, remarking how the buffer zone stands as stark reminder of the current enforced separation between otherwise adjacent neighbourhoods. The buffer zone configures as a passive no-man’s-land, whose checkpoints have now been normalised in the everyday life of Nicosia, amidst the flow of tourists and visitors crossing daily.

Kay Pallaris (page 26) reflects on the production of healthy neighbourhoods and on the role of practitioners within such process. The author acknowledges those health-related discourses informing the plan of transformation of an existing town centre into a new urban hub – ‘green, vibrant and appealing’ – supposedly geared toward the local community. In doing so, she asks whether these ingredients are enough to deliver a place that is mindful of social inclusiveness too, essentially questioning who will benefit from such ‘healthy’ transformation.

Researching urban borders

Kay Pallaris’ piece focuses on the research methods used during the workshop: these were aimed to deconstruct the complexity of a neighbourhood’s well-being, of the actors that play a role into that, of the rhetoric behind socio-spatial strategies of transformation. London’s participants discussed at length how to research the impact that urban planning, urban design and architecture have over
well-being. One participants’ reflection (page 34) argues around the importance of broadening up the arrays of methods one can use to understand and critically portray urban transformation, to overcome those intangible knowledge barriers that would otherwise be met. From sensorial and perceptual approaches to mapping; to quantitative investigation of the micro-climate and environmental quality of an area; from ethnography as a means to understand the borders between perceptions and aspirations at the individual and at the community level; to using a ‘health map’ as a tool to expand the understanding of urban health to wider socio-economic and demographic conditions... All such methods are intrinsically conceived to understand and at the same time transcend borders.

Cociña and Martén speak of a navigational handicap, that forced Nicosia’s participants to explore the city facing the limitations brought by blockades, checkpoints, and dead-ends. Amongst the participants’ reflections (page 22), it is impressive to read the experience of Turkish Cypriot students that could have researched the Southern side of Nicosia only through the recount of their colleagues, as their citizenship status did not allow them to cross the buffer-zone. However, participants were obliged to look at the buffer-zone through a critical perspective, acknowledging it as a locus of appropriations and resignifications too, and therefore engaging with it at different levels through their design proposals.

In Jerusalem, the workshop’s title itself framed the discussion on research methods, as participants worked along ‘sections’ of urban conflict, and around the nodes produced by intersecting such urban landscapes of contestation. Such sections guided the participants’ activities design research, cutting across relevant scenarios of transformation and analysing how conflictive narratives encroached upon them. Importantly, such perspective on borders and conflicts opened up room for an interesting comparative approach, highlighting how the dynamics attended in Jerusalem could have been seen and critiqued in a vast array of other cities too, as Yacobi and Cociña explain.

Engaging with urban borders

Urban borders and conflicts affected our reflections on ethics too. Once again, the 2017 summerLab series put the emphasis on the imperative need to challenge practitioners with the task of engaging with uneven structures of power – and the act of design with the task of recalibrating such structures. The summerLab programme has always pursued such endeavours engaging with local actors, critically understanding their agenda and attempting to have an agency on on-going processes of transformation. The process of engagement is certainly an uneasy one, i.e. establishing a partnership carries the risk of altering local equilibria.

When the opportunity of a Jerusalem summerLab emerged, we questioned the possibility of not formally partnering with specific individuals, institutions, organisations. It was a novelty for the programme, but the decision fell within the aim of maintaining a neutral position amongst the several sides of the conflict. One participant’s reflection (page 12) reports the neutral words of Haim Yacobi (“we don’t stand for anyone and any position”) and celebrates such neutrality as the key to discard possible preconceptions and to learn humbly from any possible interlocutor.

In Nicosia, the partnership with a university from North Cyprus entailed the necessity, for the summerLab programme, to maintain a role of external and mediating institution, building upon the will to listen to all possible voices from the city’s contested landscape. Such endeavour presented its criticalities too, as it emerges clearly from one of the participants’ reflection (page 25), calling out the gentrification of the inner neighbourhoods of North Nicosia and almost refusing to take into account the input of a potential interlocutor advocating for a strongest presence of hipsters to facilitate the regeneration of an urban area.

In London, most activities were linked to the ones of the Lee Neighbourhood Forum, whose representatives attended most sessions and gave valuable feedback while sharing their aspirations. Participants, again, soon realised how emphasising solely the voice of the Forum would have meant a very partial view over the area’s redevelopment. Research methods were phrased precisely to highlight other stakes too. The exploration of London’s Borough of Lewisham, and of the Leegate transformation in the specific, showed how instilling urban health discourses over one place’s future had meant to condemn its present structures, as expressions of urban blight, to be erased and sacrificed on the altar of new developments for the upper-middle class.

Reflecting upon such dynamics, in the final pages of this pamphlet (37 to 43), the reader will find a Special Insert, outcome of the collaboration with the Advanced Graduate Design Studio (University of South Florida, School of Architecture + Community Design). The Studio’s engagement with Lewisham’s divided landscape of transformation lies in contesting the redevelopment of Leegate, challenging its programmes and narratives, and trying to open up its borders through the careful provision of communal spaces and a variegated housing offer.

The discussion on engagement and its ethics has been (and will keep being) central to the summerLab programme. Engagement is certainly necessary to seed possible workshop afterlives and have agency on a transformation process. Most importantly, though, engagement is fundamental in taking a critical stance over exclusionary dynamics, too. In his “Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive” (1999, New York, Zone Books), Agamben calls to reconceive ethics as bearing witness to the inevitable reduction of political life to bare life, and therefore to the mechanisms through which exclusionary dynamics emerge and replicate.

The summerLab programme is about such witnessing: engaging perpetually with multifarious urban borders means to deconstruct and critically interpret their narratives, and to attempt to recalibrate their exclusionary and divisive role. In the upcoming 2018 summerLab series (see last page), we look forward to exploring and engaging with Ulaanbaatar’s nomadic thresholds, Amman’s contested landscape of water infrastructures, Athens’ and Bar Elias’ spaces of refuge and, once again, the construction of narratives of healthy urban transformation in London... Stay tuned!
[Inter]sections of urban conflicts
in collaboration with
Haim Yacobi

The city of Jerusalem is manufactured by geopolitical practices including not just military occupation but also planning policy, demographic engineering and the production of imagined geographies. Yet, often these fields of studies are analysed separately, overlooking the relevance of urban design and planning to the changing geopolitics of the city and to the daily conflicts in this urban space. Moreover, there is a tendency to focus on states’ borders and national territory while ignoring the relevance of analysing the urban realm. Following this, in this summerLab we attempted to study the interrelationships between planning and the production of contested space in Jerusalem, emphasising the spatial intersections of urban conflicts both horizontally (i.e. between Israeli and Palestinian communities) and vertically (i.e. between past and present).

The Jerusalem\Al Quds summerLab has been a unique opportunity to study the production of contested space, and has taken place in a specific historical moment: 50 years of Israeli occupation of East Jerusalem. This was a special occasion to critically study and evaluate the history, politics and spatial dynamics of the city since 1967, and to question the influence of ‘top-down’ planning apparatuses on one hand and, on the other hand, ‘bottom-up’ responses of both Israeli and Palestinian communities, urban activists and NGOs.

Participants learnt from urban experts, leading scholars and activists that are concerned with the city’s spatial politics, and engaged in several urban explorations in both central and peripheral areas of the city, in order to acquire a critical understanding of the urban context as a whole. Participants were challenged to trace and investigate a series of urban sections, cutting across relevant localities and scenarios of transformation, at the same time critically enquiring and representing the overlapping of multiple narratives and dimensions of conflict over the urban space.
Planning in the face of political conflict

One way or another, we have all being exposed during our lives to some pieces of the history of Jerusalem; either through history lessons, watching the news, reading newspapers, listening religious ceremonies or in informal conversations, most people have heard something about the long-standing conflict that has taken place in the region.

But that very same excess of information leaves us sometimes paralysed when we try to understand and make sense of the complexities of a city in which any attempt at oversimplification fails to give account of the multiple layers that explain its current processes. Bearing this in mind, the workshop “Jerusalem: [Inter]Sections of Urban Conflicts” was an attempt to get participants immersed in the complexities of the case, through an intense six-day experience that combined lectures, walks, presentations, tours and discussions.

What came clearly throughout the workshop is that the city of Jerusalem is manufactured by geopolitical practices including not just military occupation but also planning policy and demographic engineering. Our intention was to look at urban processes, urban design and planning in relation to the changing geopolitics of the city and to the daily conflicts in this urban space. As we learned borders, boundaries, and territorialisation emphasised the spatial intersections of urban conflicts both horizontally (i.e. between Israeli and Palestinian communities) and vertically (i.e. between past and present).

Jerusalem\Al Quds: planning tools after 50 years of occupation

The Jerusalem\Al Quds summerLab was a unique opportunity to study the production of contested space, taking place in a specific historical moment: 50 years of Israeli occupation of East Jerusalem. This was a special occasion to critically study and evaluate the history, politics and spatial dynamics of the city since 1967, and to question the influence of ‘top-down’ planning apparatuses on one hand and, on the other hand, ‘bottom-up’ responses of both Israeli and Palestinian communities, urban activists and NGOs. Our meetings and tours with urban experts, leading scholars and activists that have been concerned with the city’s spatial politics were crucial in understanding the urban context as a whole.

The complex geopolitics of Jerusalem have been directly influenced by the enforcement of planning tools, which have shaped the city particularly through colonial practices both in historical terms, but also through the implementation of power over territory and society with a colonial logic. The 1948 war and the establishment of the state of Israel have dramatically changed Jerusalem’s geography, demography and politics. First, the separation of the city between Israel and Jordan was marked by the wall, which created a border zone. But the 1948 war and the national conflict also shifted urban development dramatically, shaping Jewish Jerusalem through two processes; during that period the city shrank back into its ‘safe’ quarters and expanded into its western hinterland.

A significant spatial turning point of Israel’s geopolitical conditions start after June 1967, when Israel occupied East Jerusalem among other territories. Following this, the Israeli government initiated some legislation acts in order to apply Israeli law on East Jerusalem, in spite of international objection to it.

In the case of East Jerusalem, two complementary strategies have been implemented by Israel to relocate borders and boundaries, shift populations, and reshape the occupied territories; the massive construction of an outer ring of Jewish neighbourhoods which now host over half the Jewish population of Jerusalem, and a containment of all Palestinian development, implemented through housing demolition and the prevention of immigration to the city.

The frontierisation of Palestinian neighbourhoods is based not solely on state violence, military acts and alike but rather on apparent ‘neutral’ urban trends such as privatisation of space, gentrification, urban design, infrastructure development and touristic planning. These practices bring to the fore new actors in the production of colonial space in the city, such as real estate developers and various interest groups.

Land use policy in Jerusalem encourages Jewish expansion while restraining Palestinian growth in the city. Prior to 1948 Jews owned less than 30 percent of the property within the municipality of Jerusalem. Nowadays, Jewish ownership and control of property in the city accounts for over 90 percent of Jerusalem. Since the post 1967 period, there had been also an emphasis on moving back down towards the Old City. Another planning mechanism that shapes Jerusalem and its surroundings since
1967 is the implementation of infrastructure, as the unequal distribution of transportation services, roads and other infrastructures, dramatically changes the cognitive map of the city, unifying the territory of East and West Jerusalem.

Reflecting on the challenges of Jerusalem – and of most cities

During the workshop participants coming from different countries and backgrounds were exposed to urban experts, leading scholars and activists that have been concerned with the city's spatial politics. Participants engaged in several urban explorations in both central and peripheral areas of the city in order to acquire a critical understanding of the urban context as a whole. They were then challenged to trace and investigate a series of urban ‘sections’, cutting across relevant localities and scenarios of transformation, and to critically enquire and represent the overlapping of multiple narratives and dimensions of conflict over the urban space.

Understanding these urban logics, participants faced a challenging task: to make sense of such a complex reality and to present, by the end of the week, a reflection of the dynamics observed. This seemed to be an ambitious enough scope, considering that any design-based proposal produced in such a short period of time, given the complexities of the case, might fall short in giving a thorough account of the realities experienced during the workshop.

During our final conversation, one interesting reflection highlighted how many of the urban phenomena observed in Jerusalem are not unique to this city, even if they are perceived as exceptional from a foreign eye. Segregation, inequality, abuse of power, exclusion, conflict, violence can be observed in most cities, sometimes hidden, sometimes evident. Rarely, however, in a way that is as explicitly materialised and crystallised as in Jerusalem. In most cities one finds identity borders, creating areas in which some people, given their class, cultural or racial background, will feel excluded; in most cities there are neighbourhoods without infrastructures, neglected by the regulations and planning system; in most cities there are people that are treated – even if legally they are not – as first and second class citizens. In Jerusalem, most of these things have a name: a wall, a fence, a rule, a checkpoint, a line in the territory, a demography-based planning system, various differentiated citizenship statuses. As one can name such issues clearly and directly, these seem to be easier to identify, and at the same time more difficult to forget.

Far from diminishing the relevance of the city as a case study, these materialities position Jerusalem as a fundamental paradigm to understand urban processes in general. While in most cities contemporary urban trends and challenges tend to become implicit, in Jerusalem they manifest in materialities that are spatially and politically crude and well defined.

Challenges move from the untouchable sphere of the ideals, utopias and normative desires, to concrete physical and institutional constructions in which planning tools seem at the same time hopeless – given the complexities of the geopolitical conflict – and essential – given the territorial and material deployment and traces of the injustices.
Ben Stains

I come from a background in architecture and the majority of my work takes place in the rural context. Participation in this workshop gave me the opportunity to engage with the built environment at the urban scale. I had always wanted to visit Jerusalem, and to have the unique opportunity to explore this city through the lens of the DPU summerLab was an unforgettable experience.

The most rewarding aspect was working alongside an international group of people from a wide range of cultural backgrounds with diverse skillsets and experience. It was an intense week of exploration and I was grateful for the different perspectives everyone offered. Being able to come together at the end of the day to discuss and critically examine what we had learnt was invaluable. I also appreciated how the tours and lectures from local activists and urban experts allowed for a rich physical and academic engagement with the city and allowed me to see first-hand the many ways planning and design affect the residents of Jerusalem. It was encouraging to see how NGOs and Israeli activists are working with Palestinian communities in an effort to give them a voice in the planning system.

One of the most impactful things was actually experiencing the sheer contrast between the built environments that make up East Jerusalem. Well-designed Israeli settlements with great infrastructure, amenities and room to breathe (and expand), overlook and cut between Palestinian neighbourhoods which are forced to (illegally) become more dense and slum-like, constantly being refused permission to build on adjacent land. Seeing the extent to which these disparate existences are crafted by deliberate planning decisions was eye-opening. I realised that the manifestation of contested space in East Jerusalem is as much about the expansion of Israeli settlements as it is about the suffocation of Palestinian neighbourhoods. It was sometimes difficult to process such glaring urban contradictions.

On the first day we were given a map of the Jerusalem municipality that detailed the tangled configuration of Palestinian neighbourhoods, Israeli settlements, unused open space, security fences and separation barriers. To me it looked messy, complicated and made little sense. After 6 days I came to understand that this map perfectly captures the reality of the city. Jerusalem is messy, complicated and makes little sense. A microcosm of the larger Israeli/Palestinian situation, its rich history and profound religious significance turn it into a multi-layered urban expression of the wider national conflict.

During my time in Jerusalem I saw how planning and design can be used as a tool of separation that perpetuates conflict but I also met people who strive to use it as a framework for cooperation and peace. As a designer working in the built environment I will take inspiration from these people.

Keyu Tan

‘We don’t stand for anyone and any position. We are just here to learn.’ Haim Yacobi stated this on our first day. This is somewhat usual for me. But it turned out that, not choosing a side and positioning oneself as the problem solver becomes greatly helpful for me to sense and reflect on my own assumptions and beliefs. It also helps me to be aware of the perceptions about people we listened or talk to. This is how true observer should be like: not to judge but to learn humbly, I thought afterwards. Moreover, this nebulisation in mind made me feel more peaceful inside than it probably would have been.

The week of learning also made me start to question the roles and relationships of identity and political system in a society, and how they play out in different kind of society and groups. How is the relationship between Israeli government, people and Palestinian similar and different, say, from the Chinese government, people and Tibetans? How is this ‘colonisation’ process different from others in history and why is it still happening?

Diego Puente

It is important to acknowledge that all cities are divided to a certain extent, and that different political and geographical contexts determine how a contested space functions. Contested cities mainly deal with issues of pluralism and sovereignty where imbalances in power, status, and welfare exist, and disputes about rights, equity, and social entitlement are also present. These discrepancies are interwoven and have different impacts on the people inhabiting those spaces. Moreover, space is socially constructed through social interactions defining a social space, and space becomes then an active agent in the social formation of the built environment.

The Jerusalem\Al Quds summerLab was one-of-a-kind chance to study the production of a contested space during a particular occasion, after 50 years of Israeli occupation of East Jerusalem. This seminar consisted of lectures, field exploration, exercises and discussions that critically examine and evaluate the history, geopolitics and spatial dynamics of Jerusalem since 1967. The workshop encompassed a variety of urban exploration in central and peripheral areas of Jerusalem that exhibited the city’s spatial politics in order to have a critical and holistic understanding of the urban context. Several experts, scholars, and activists shared their knowledge of the interrelations between planning and the production of contested spaces in the city.

In this sense, this summerLab allowed me to delve into these interrelations and realised about the role of urban planning in the production of contested spaces. The workshop was a space to question the impacts of top-down planning mechanisms and bottom-up reactions of both Israeli and Palestinian actors, such as communities, government, activists, and the civil society. It was actually very shocking to evidence how urban planning is used to contribute to the Israeli occupation of Palestine, to witness the disparities in the provision of basic services between Israeli and Palestinian neighbours, or the creation of artificial national parks that constraint the development of Palestinian settlements. It was clear that the Israeli neighbourhoods were booming all over the territory while the Palestinian ones were oppressed and limited in more than one way.

When talking about contested spaces, it is usual to focus on states’ borders and national conflicts rather than considering the relevance of the urban realm. Jerusalem is a city shaped by geopolitical practices including a variety of mechanisms, ranging from military occupation to urban planning policy, which establishes the imagined geographies. However, this overlooks (or hides) the importance of urban planning and design in the strategic game of the geopolitics of the city and of the conflict. After exploring several intersections, it was revealing that urban planning plays a key role in this game and it has been used (and is still used) as a silent and Machiavellian tool to occupy territories, create narratives and harm people.
JERUSALEM - [Inter]sections of urban conflicts
NICOSIA
Inhabiting edges
in collaboration with
Silvia Covarino, Girne American University

Cyprus is an island marked by a multiplicity of borders, concrete manifestations of social and political conflicts, which have affected the production and reproduction of landscapes and urban environments. Most noticeably, a buffer zone divides the island and the city of Nicosia in two parts, North and South, with existing crossing points accessible only since 2003.

Participants attended a series of seminars to critically understand the history and politics of Cyprus’ borders, as a fundamental step to interpret the divided urban realm of Nicosia. Here, participants navigated the city’s complexity, from its historic Walled City to the contemporary sprays in the urban edges. The workshop enquired layers of perception and memory of the city’s division, and explored the edges of its multiple borders, along with the way these are re-appropriated, used and inhabited. Importantly, we projected such explorations on the background of the future urban vision recently shaped by The Nicosia Master Plan – a singular case of bi-communal initiative of urban planning in an area of conflict.

The workshop offered a contribution to the current and contested debate on urban borders, attempting to put forward a shift of perspective on the way border narratives are constantly constructed and deconstructed, negotiated and contested. Such shift was pursued involving a multiplicity of stakeholders, from authorities, to activists, to local communities, and engaging with their discourses and everyday practices.
Considering design challenges in a city divided

The complexity of cities –of any city– is impossible to capture through a mono-dimensional snapshot. Every city has multiple recognisable layers of history, culture, political moments and technological capacities that have shaped their current form. But there are some cities in which this multiplicity of historical moments constitutes the very substance of their existence: they have been for centuries the encounter line between different cultures and religions, becoming contested points in the territory, places of friendly exchange or violent conflict, a sewing line in the landscape.

The strategic military and economic position of the island of Cyprus, at the core of the geographical encounter between Asia and Europe and multiple international interests, places Nicosia as an exceptional place that has witnessed conflict and coexistence over the years. Its current remarkable status of peaceful but tense division, is impossible to grasp without recognising such a key position.

In this context, the DPU summerLab aimed to explore the city of Nicosia and to share new ideas for its sustainable development. The workshop combined lectures, walks, mapping and design exercises, providing an interdisciplinary platform to critically discuss the current processes of the walled city, in order to create design strategies and a critical vision of the divided Nicosia.

Nicosia: the last divided capital of Europe

Cyprus is an island shaped by a multiplicity of borders, which are concrete manifestations of historical and current social and political conflicts. These borders have affected the production and reproduction of landscapes and urban environments. Driven by external political interests, the territorial divisions that have given form to contemporary Cyprus describe a country with complex regimes of sovereignty, where claims over land and cultural identity frequently clash with the physical divisions in place. The strategic interests from Greece and Turkey –as well as the United Kingdom, by way of its military presence – have consolidated a country split by nationalist lines. With equally divided international allegiances and geopolitical recognition, the case of Cyprus remains an outstanding case of territorial fracture and the unwilling disposition to revert it.

Among the many dividing lines that run across the island, the most representative one lies at the heart of its capital, Nicosia. A UN-controlled Buffer Zone (that extends along the country) divides the city in two parts, North and South, with crossing points accessible only since 2003. Established as a result from the armed conflict between Greek and Turkish sides, the Buffer Zone stands as a stark reminder of the deep separations that still exist between otherwise adjacent neighbours. The strip, which has frequent variations in width, is a derelict collection of empty streets, abandoned infrastructures and physical barriers, and the most evident collision between its three sovereign spaces.

This unique urban arrangement has pushed Nicosia to exemplify two different ways of living and co-existing in an otherwise common city. Its historical past makes the division all the more dramatic; from the historical idea of a Renaissance city surrounded by circular Venetian Walls, inner Nicosia’s open, circular shape collapsed after the civil war between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots (1955-1964), and the arrival of the United Nations. The Buffer Zone, thus, created two different countries, within the same island, and two different cities.

After decades of division, the North and South sides of Nicosia reveal different approaches and capacities for urban development and integration. Similarly, the Buffer Zone has gradually consolidated as a passive no-man’s land, an inevitable yet accepted reality, where the administrative checkpoints now operate with relative tranquillity amidst the flow of tourists and visitors crossing daily. Considering the north side of Nicosia (and the Turkish side in general) is not recognised by the United Nations, the disparity in the access to international funds has further accentuated each side’s identity and vision for the future.

North Nicosia is still considered a developing city, lacking many basic services, and struggling to deal with a complex social fabric. Infrastructure is visibly damaged and restoration projects are few and far between. At the same time, the northern side holds a strong cultural identity and, despite its financial limitations, has experienced a considerable improvement in response to increased tourism. On the other hand, the capital of the Republic of Cyprus, (South) Nicosia, has developed its urban fabric with the support of the European Union. This includes several landmark initiatives that have focused on modern commercial and residential projects designed by famous architectural firms, and a more ‘generic’ template where international brands and franchises lie next to each other along the main commercial strips.
In this context, the DPU SummerLab aimed to better understand the dynamics brought by such different conditions, stimulating critical thinking and design principles for participants to share their collected impressions and ideas.

The workshop and the role of design in Nicosia’s future

With participants coming in from six different countries, as well as local students from our hosting partner, the GAU, the Nicosia DPU summerLab 2017 ran on the theme of Inhabiting Edges. From its outset, the programme was designed to question how the current division and projected future can be seen as a window of opportunity for the capital of Cyprus. The exchange between local and foreign participants, together with guests from North and South Nicosia, contributed to broad debates about national identity, cultural biases, and the role of design in contexts of spatial division and contest.

From the outset, the physical division between north and south sides became not only a daily administrative process (as for the border crossing), but also a ‘navigational handicap’, that forced participants to explore the city with the limitations brought by blockades, checkpoints and dead-ends. The first days of the workshop were designed for the group to complement presentations about Nicosia’s context with walks across the city. With a strong emphasis on mapping, these brief urban research activities were conceived to look at the different aspects of liveability along the Buffer Zone and inside the divided Venetian Walls, analysing the contrasts and analogies between the two sides of the city.

The main focus of the workshop centred around a re-imagination of the Buffer Zone, either as a sustainable corridor for the existing social and urban fabric, or as a catalyst for interventions beyond its limits. However, participants were encouraged to develop their own perspectives, with freedom to explore and emphasise specific aspects of Nicosia’s urban reality. This was evident in the final presentations, which ranged from architectural interventions in the Buffer Zone, to capacity-building and networking, to reflections on collective memory, heritage and mobility.

The interventions proposed by the three teams – formed by local and international students – focused on the Buffer Zone, the Venetian Wall and the Inner City, respectively. Aware of the limitations of design proposals in the context of wider geopolitical conflicts, the proposals focused on the potentials of urban design and spatial planning as tools to imagine future realities. Using art interventions, physical and programmatic transformations, and envisioning possible processes of community and political engagement, the proposals seek to trigger a wider conversation about the potential future of the city, envisioning scenarios of integration and coexistence.
Participants' works from the summerLab in Nicosia. Participants devised multifaceted spatial strategies and emphasised the transdisciplinary character of their approach, working at different levels to design proposals that directly engaged with the complex border division inside the walled city of Nicosia.
NICOSIA - Inhabiting edges

NETWORK AND SOCIAL ANALYSIS

In the South, people are more active and philosophical, wary of what happened.

People are born from mixed families.

In the North, people are divided into middle class.

I only had half a childhood, because only one half the people could learn. I only had half the friends.

Southerners think that in the north, you can eat bread. They will steal your children.

Turkish people movement would have to leave from Turkish Cyprus and they don’t tell or build in...
Prior to starting the summerLab I prepared the programme having my own expectations about the possible results. In a one-week span, interacting with the team, the international participants and the local ones, my perception of the city changed, to the extent of developing a new perspective: the context acquired different shape and details, after three years I had been working and living in Cyprus.

The energy and the exchange between local and international participants have been the strength of our work. They realised that the ‘Cyprus problem’ is not easily intelligible, particularly for what concerns Nicosia. The support by lecturers from different universities and local stakeholders fostered rich collective discussions, which sparked off a great interaction and a multitude of reflections. Excerpts from such reflections are featured in these pages.

Silvia Covarino,
Local Coordinator at GAU

**Staff & Guests**

**Alessandro Bruccoleri**

Nicosia is a contested city, fragmented by the Buffer Zone or no man’s land. It represents a paradigm, the last European divided capital city, where two communities ‘share’ the walls. The intact rounded Venetian walls, work as another space in relation to the suburbs of the two cities. Time perceptions are so different within its ramparts, depending on the side of the divided city we observe. The Buffer Zone dividing both parts, configures a unique case, as a gap, as a physical barrier creating two approaches of the inhabitants of living the public spaces.

The so called Green Line still dictates a geographical, political and cultural fracture of the island. If we look at the Greek Cypriot part of the walled city, it is evolving into a diverse mix of residential, commercial, religious, and cultural uses, where architects as Zaha Hadid and Jean Nouvel have worked on interesting projects. Ledra street, the central axis of the Greek Cypriot community, maintains a very ‘European’ look, with shopping centres, meeting point, squares and churches, working as nodes and landmarks.

During night time, people gather in the street and use the city. In so doing, the connections from western Europe are evident. However, if one crosses the checkpoint, the North side of Nicosia seems not yet affected by logics of globalisation. I used to cross to the Turkish side by night, and the urban realm was completely different, with the absence of spectacular advertising boards, no people around, closed shops, and no lighting.

**Dr Melissa Godínez**

This programme allowed the participants to have a multidisciplinary vision of the current situation in Nicosia. The participation of both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot panelists allowed to open the debate of what could be the future scenarios in the case of a possible unification. The workshop proposed a reconnaissance of the territories adjacent to the buffer zone, and mapped out their different public spaces, in an effort toward devising an initial strategy for a future integration. In the future it would be interesting to take such analysis to multiple scales, to investigate alternatives and planning strategies to be adopted at different levels.

**Husam Husaim**

This programme allowed the participants to The DPU summer-Lab was a great opportunity to look at the debate on urban borders in attempt to develop a comprehensive understanding on the way borders and buffer zones affect the development of urban areas. Contributions from activists, lecturers, tutors and participants offered an ideal environment to look beyond the difficult political situation of the region, and to develop an interdisciplinary approach to deal with the changes of the global aspects of everyday life.

**Prof. Jose Madrigal**

As an invited lecturer, I had the opportunity to observe the different works and results of the workshop. My experience about this kind of activities let me pay progressively more attention to the scenario and the reactions of the participants facing the problems more than results. The personal experiences are ever not transferable. Their consequences will be always felt in a medium and long-term. The contexts are in the end the most important aspect. The scenarios are never repeatable.

One of the most common topics defining the Mediterranean Basin is the fact of being a cultural crossroad. The more their participants feel the consequences of the crossroad, the better results will be achieved. I would like to remark in this case the happy ‘marriage’ between workshop, participants, and local communities, with the Arabahmet district as the best symbol for it, with its two landmarks on the two sides of the old Victoria Queen.
Street: the church close to Paphos gate, and the mosque of Arabahmet.

Dr Paola Rizzi
The workshop in Nicosia was enlightening in showing once more how a narrow and specific vision of the discipline in the realm of planning does not work. The variety of contribution and diversity of participants offered a chance to prove it.

The most famous wall has perhaps been the Berlin one, but around the world there are more or less many of such walls. The length of the thirty most well-known walls is 57% the length of the Equator. Amongst these walls/buffer zones/barriers some are still developing and growing. In an era of decreasing communication and information barriers, we are facing instead an increasing of physical walls. The rationale behind erecting these fences were are mainly to be identified with countering illegal immigration, terrorism, conflicts, illegal trading, epidemic spreading. We are facing uncertainty and insecurity and therefore the trend is bound to increase.

The buffer zone in Nicosia is defined between two walls that are both physical and psychological. And thus the first distinction: is a wall a border or a boundary? A border is permeable, porous, adaptable and positive. A boundary is rigid inflexible, hard edged and negative. We need to break the wall while crossing the border softly. Nicosia’s buffer zone is for me a border gated between two boundaries: it is an edge, as one of the two types identified by Sennett (2004): a boundary that is “a guarded territory... (it) establishes closure”.

Talking about contributions since the beginning it was clear how rich the environment was: architects, urban planners, designers, sociolog, activists and members of the civil society were involved and offered their perspectives. The result was both enriching and confrontational: while the different views did not necessarily match, they all contributed to increase the participants’ knowledge and understanding. The groupwork’s outcomes reflect this: although developed in a short time, they bear in mind how design solutions cannot work without a proper contextualisation.

Tatiana Zachariadou
Borders can be both physical walls or limitations within people’s minds. I am a Greek Cypriot sociologist, and maybe I have a particular perspective of the division and borders of Cyprus and Nicosia in particular. That is because of my age, nationality, gender, and perhaps my profession. I was born in a divided city: Nicosia has been divided in 1963 as a result of the conflict between the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Before that, Nicosia was divided only in people’s minds, we didn’t have borders or walls and the two people had to coexist. Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot were communicating on everyday activities such as the exchanging of goods.

The division, however, was cultivated by the leaders of both communities. Differences in culture, religion, interests and political propaganda brought first the division first in people’s minds, then the total separation. The limitations on people’s minds have to do with the difficulties of accepting the other because of a different religion, culture, nationality, ethnicity. People create an imaginary line to separate themselves from the other. However, this imaginary line is not created overnight. Rather, it is cultivated as an idea by governments. The separation, then, cultivates hate. My personal experience of living in a divided city, after so many years, is that feeling of the unnatural that brings pain and anger. After so many years the pain has turned into numbness but the borders for me have never become a status quo. Ideally two different communities could coexist in peace.

Participants
Altan Ramadan Ozsutcuoglu
Touring the streets lined with old stone houses with children playing in the streets and people living their daily lives you could almost forget that the country is under a cease-fire. Until of course, you reach the border; then the military presence becomes frighteningly clear. The streets are cut in half by metal gates, barbed wire and distressing symbols and signs. Upon crossing the gate to the other side, you become aware of the space frozen in time that is the buffer zone. Seeing it was a surreal experience, everything was just dropped in its place; as though the people vanished but the evidence of their daily lives was left untouched, only reclaimed by nature.

Betania Soriano
“... the South is a ‘Rock’, whereas the North is like ‘Air’. In the North people are chaotic, relaxed, middle-eastern... when we play they dance and smile back at you. In the South people are serious and philosophical, more reserved and conservative... and really scarred by what happened”

Young British-Filipino woman, in Cyprus for the past 17 years; living in south Nicosia and working as an artist and singer in north Nicosia.

“ There are people from all over the world living here. This is Cyprus - we are cluster-f***ed.”

Young Colombian-Cypriot man, who grew up in the United States and Cyprus; artist.

As a researcher and practitioner, the Nicosia summerLab was an excellent opportunity to develop and explore methodological approaches to working in a context of deep-seated division, territorial and politico-ideological contestation. Rather than looking for solutions to the ‘Cyprus problem’ with analytical detachment, we were encouraged to explore and engage with the materiality of the city and its social context, embracing its complexity. In the process, we examined the fault lines in our own judgement, and of our own making – preconceived notions of a simplified reality, constructed around a dichotomised view of conflict pitting Greek-Cypriot against Turkish-Cypriot.

Besides interacting with professors, journalists, practitioners and politicians, and reading the bibliography available on Cyprus, we had the opportunity to conduct invaluable fieldwork. Some of us decided to investigate personal narratives and collect different perceptions on belonging and particularly
situated senses of identity. We were interested in framing division and its impact from the standpoint of the actors that cross Nicosia’s visible and invisible thresholds in an attempt to meet the ‘other’, forming unlikely allegiances, to build a sense of identity that bridges the fault lines of their existing landscapes. They were mostly young artists of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds; as well as local Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots that dared to venture beyond the rigid confines and shed some of the values of their communities. Thus, we uncovered shared spaces of ‘encounter’, both north and south of the buffer zone, where these groups meet – areas emblematic of tolerance of difference, and the finding of common ground.

The informal interviews conducted in these spaces yielded, in the evocative and charged language used by the interviewees, a wealth of qualitative input exceeding expectations, highlighting the importance of capturing voices beyond the well-known register – those whose stories will not feature on officially promoted, sanctioned narratives. As a snippet of this work, both quotes reproduced above testify to the individuals’ subjective and ingenious capacities to articulate, negotiate and ascribe meaning to the everyday; their struggles for belonging that co-exist with the need to develop and to affirm their own identity, and to break away from any restrictive ‘cluster’ to which they might have been assigned.

Upon reflection, this exercise demonstrated that identity is not necessarily bound by place, but it is relational and situated – it can only be conceived in regard to the material reality of place and its sustaining social networks. Identity is fluid, too, and in constant transformation, often being built and re-built over fault lines and unstable ground. As a researcher in contested spaces, I wonder how overlapping, subjective realities can be made visible; and how a divided city such as Nicosia can allow for the necessary breathing space so that personal narratives can unfold and transform in the presence of difference.

Hulya Bilgin
Nicosia is a site of global tensions that has attracted the attention of many researchers. During the summerLab, we had the chance to meet many people from diverse geographic, academic and professional backgrounds. This contributed to foster a different perspective, giving us the opportunity to learn from research done in different disciplinary fields. How can we break the wall that is embedded in our heads?

The summerLab provided us with a chance to build a different narrative: approaching the border, we could even feel the walls cry for unity rather than division. But at the same time we could witness the fact that the city moved together. Myself and a few friends from North Cyprus were not allowed to cross the border toward the south. We were only able to gather information from photographs and our colleagues’ experience.

In our project we gave priority to the buffer zone to reveal our project – nobody can enter the zone controlled by the United Nations, nobody has been there since 1974 – as the special place where citizens of different countries can work together.

Nisan Akalin
As a citizen of Nicosia, my aim in attending this workshop was to gain a different perspective on the city I live. The visits that we made made me feel like a tourist in my own country. I tend to pass through the streets of my city Nicosia rushing and racing with time. In so doing, I tend to miss important details in our spatial environment: the walking activities helped me to experience an otherwise missed journey.

Ogulcan Vurusan
How can we break psychological borders and reconnect the two sides of the city? Analysing the social condition of both sides was very important for me, as a Cypriot. The division is a very sensitive issue and this workshop gave chance to learn a lot about it.

Raphaël Chatelet
The DPU summerLab “Inhabiting edges” in Nicosia, more than helping me to discover a new amazing city and a specific and exciting territory, allowed me to face other young professionals or students from different countries, working on some essential and fascinating themes. Nicosia is an old and rich city, placed nowadays in the encounter point between western and eastern cultures. The greenline divides the city in two parts since 1974, with one single crossing point allowing the contact between the two sides opened in 2004.

Before any intervention on Nicosia it is necessary to understand well the complex context, that nowadays is still an irresolute political situation. Our reflections involved different scales, first of all defining an overall strategy after a common brainstorming, then studying some neighbourhoods and asking inhabitants to highlight the ‘soul’ of some specific places of the city. In a final step we relayed our observations spatially, coming up with plans from which we elaborated a vision for Nicosia’s specific territories. My team project proposal consisted in suggesting the creation of different hot spots in each part of the city, in order to develop a network that would have emphasised the poly-centrism of the city, while building bridges between communities.

This DPU summerLab offered me a new working method combining theory and practice, and strongly grounding on a bottom-up approach. The presence of various local students accelerated the understanding of the territory and broke the language barrier with the local population: I perceived an outstanding sense of open-mindedness and hospitality, with a great hope of reunification of the island.

Seran Sonmez
When I came to Cyprus as a student, I was surrounded by the mysterious charm of Nicosia – there is a magic that leads people to observe further: I found different questions in every building that I saw, every stone that I touched and every sight that I could not reach. I was investigating, documenting, and trying to learn from the local community. I was researching and learning more, with the advantage of study
architecture, and some of my projects were precisely taking place in the divided city. In the workshop, we met many people from different cities: while I had been living in Nicosia for 4 years, many of them came to Nicosia for the first time. It was a great feeling, because we were all from different backgrounds, but we were wondering about and questioning the same things. They asked me, I asked them, thus learning more.

We thought that our design should have taken into account the needs of the local people and their potentials, while encouraging peace and at the same time protecting the historical memory. Because of this, we stressed the importance to talk to people and understand their problems and aspirations, and to collect their ideas. I could not attend the interviews in South Nicosia because we Turkish citizens cannot go to Southern Cyprus. But for the first time I could incorporate the ideas of people on the South side into my own work. It was an incredible feeling to listen to objective views about the two sides from participants coming from different countries.

Sharon Yavo Ayalon

As we were strolling during our first tour of North Nicosia, we came across a young freelance architect who spoke about artistic interventions in Nicosia. With sparkling eyes, she mentioned the street art festival that was due in a couple of weeks, in which she among other activists were working on. In response to our question about Nicosia’s future she said laughing: “If you ask me, more hipsters, that is what we need”.

Her remark echoed many others I have heard during my PhD research, regarding the relationship between art and the city. Much like in other deteriorating urban spaces, artists see themselves as ‘shamans’ aiming at fixing the city’s ‘problems’ with their collaborative/participatory art. No doubt, Nicosia as ‘the last divided city’ has its share parts of such problems. We delved in its subtleties and complexities during our week of work there. In one of the workshop’s lectures we even got acquainted with the terminology “the Cyprus problem”, the way in which locals refers to the current situation.

The young architect’s remark led our group to explore the soft new-born seeds of artistic interventions in Nicosia. During the four days of fieldwork, we tried to grasp ‘the Cyprus problem’through the eyes of local artists. We located two twin cafes: one in the north and the other in the south. Both, we were told, are the gathering places of the artistic community, both are also places of encounter between south and north. We spoke to as many artists as the short time allowed, in order to learn how they perceive the city and their own work on it. At the same time, we walked around both sides of the city and mapped those artistic acts in order to see what our interviewees actually ‘do’: the artistic interventions we observed were similar in nature in both sides of the city – mainly graffiti, a few art-galleries, and two mapping projects. The one on the south called to identify interesting spots and marked them with pink posters, while the one in the north used blue footprints to indicate a walking route.

The sketchy impression I got from our mapping and interviews was that the artists try to bring forth messages of diversity, plurality and peace. Aspiring with their activity to see common thing rather than accentuate the differences, to better the urban environment and contribute to the community, to do good. However, going back to my alarmed feeling when hearing the request for “more hipsters”, I identify this as the first stage of almost every urban renewal project, adding tensions to an already conflictual, contested environment.

This alarm aims not necessarily to critique artistic interventions in the urban realm, but rather to question their dosage – a profound question that I strive to understand in my own research too. My premonition is that those artistic seeds will be picked up by municipalities and that urban planners, at one stage or the other, will ride the cultural train in order to ‘revitalise’ Nicosia. At this stage the question of dosage will be a crucial one: How much art? Which art? Whose art? And can we rely on these – possibly naïve – initiatives as a way of healing the city?

Taylan Tasoren

We had the impression that we had been wandering for hours on both sides: we had focused our attention on multiple aspects and manifestations of Nicosia’s urban life – the age of the buildings, the development of the streets, the urban, the areas of social importance, people’s associations, sense of belonging. It was really exciting to grasp such a complexity and tackle it with our creativity.
The design of our built environment can have a profound impact on inhabitants’ physical, physiological and psychological wellbeing, irrespective of – and possibly more detrimental with – particular age, gender, class or bodily ability.

This year’s London summerLab critically explored the latest research on how the designed environment can affect our experience of a place. Conventional urban design approaches tend to emphasise design elements such as form, morphology, density, visual aesthetics and materials, with the primary aim of maximising the economic value generated by the spatial transformation of a place. Urban design and architecture are often informed by the subjective bias of designers themselves, and by the logics of marketisation of the design product.

Rarely are the health impacts of such considerations taken into account, yet urban transformation processes affecting the micro-climate, air quality, the provision of green and public spaces. All have a direct or indirect impact on wellbeing.

The summerLab asked participants to reflect on a variety of design approaches, provoking a debate on how rethinking urban place-making can put health and wellbeing of people firmly at the heart of redevelopment proposals. A sensory exploration of a place allowed participants to experience first-hand the impact of urban design on how they feel and experience the place. Learnings and findings were put into practice as participants were asked to collectively work on proposals for a chosen town centre in south-east London.
Understanding healthy places, designing healthier neighbourhoods

To construct a healthier neighbourhood one has to experience a healthy/unhealthy neighbourhood. During the 2017 summerLab, we challenged the participants to think about what a healthy place actually is and how, as planners and architects and other professionals of the built environment, we can go about addressing the key components of health-promoting places.

We challenged participants to explore Lee using a defined set of field techniques, aimed at immersing oneself into the urban environment and experiencing it from different perspectives. It is only when challenged to really think about how one feels in a place and experiences its offer that one truly grasps how the components come together to form a ‘feel good space’.

“I learned more of what being an architect in the real world looks like” (Meg).

The field techniques included both conventional and unconventional design charrette approaches, each designed to ‘think differently’ about the space. As planners and urban designers we tend to concentrate on plot sizes and metrics such as densities and form/layout of the building or block. But rarely do we consider how the outcome of this reasoning impacts people the same way doctors, politicians and other professionals do, to promote and even more create healthier environments for humans to thrive in.

Lee is classed as a ‘District Centre’ which should form an important local hub of retail development that offers a range of shops and services. The Leegate Centre as it is known, redeveloped in the 1960s, has since suffered decline. There are now plans to transform the existing shopping centre into a “vibrant and appealing hub for the community” by St Modwen – the site owner. The vision is bold and the strategy suggests positive design measures like “extending green boulevards”; “landscaped resident gardens”; “active frontages”. Are these ingredients enough to help deliver ‘health-promoting’ places?

To some extent the elements of a healthy place are simple and the Leegate Plans already incorporate the right strategy buzzwords. Over 200 and counting online guides tell us what the ingredients of a healthy place. Numerous ‘place-shaping’ frameworks define the key ingredients (Healthy Streets, WHO Health Map, Fives Ways to Wellbeing to name a few); yet it is how these ingredients come together that is important and that takes a deeper understanding of what it’s like to be in a healthy place.

While exploring Lee through different perspectives, the participants were also asked to think creatively and respond to the Leegate proposals and put forward wider spatial strategies that could improve the health aspects of the neighbourhood.

One group explored Lee using an EEG Monitoring Device, walking through different parts of the Lee town centre and beyond. The readings from the monitoring device were compared to the perceptions recorded by participants showing similar results. The results nicely illustrate a very clear environmental differentiation and how such different parts of the designed environment have a physiological impact on our mental wellness as we walk through the streets of the city. This impact is more often than not, sub-conscious. Were designers each to experience the environment in this way, it begs the question about the types of places and infrastructures they would otherwise really design.

“Christopher Neal presented a whole new way to look at urban design, form and health. By measuring how spaces impact the brain we are able to use more than just our eyes or preexisting knowledge of the urban layout to really address the needs of what humans need in the built environment. By paying attention to how we feel we open up a channel to use our emotions, which all humans experience, to connect with the people who currently or possibly will occupy the spaces we design and or develop. By asking the simple question of, “How do I feel” we are able to look further in to the things that cause use to feel sad, mad, happy, relaxed, tense and all the other full range of emotions. We have a responsibility to people the same way doctors, politicians and other professionals do, to promote and even more create a healthy environment for humans to thrive in. Using more resources like public health experts, Geologist and Environmentalist we can look at all perspectives of health to guide our design decisions.” (John Steens)

A second group took to a sensory and perception mapping approach. Asked to hone into a singular sense (smell, touch, sound) participants were invited to observe/experience the environment through the singular senses and record how it makes them feel, what perceptions are inferred and what emotions are evoked. Of course in practice it is not natural to focus on just one sense, but this experiment allows one to really appreciate the impact of the sensory stimuli in the environment.
Surprisingly you notice stimuli which would otherwise go unnoticed and whose impact is again sub-conscious, yet powerful. Often it is not until the resulting space is in situ that the factors that create its ‘sense of place’ shine through; the sensory element is potentially harder to get across in design, but not impossible. Careful consideration of how building morphology, materials, orientations and colours can really impact the human sensory system could go some way to avoid negative impact.

“The exercise forces you to examine the urban condition in a concentrated method. By isolating your individual senses you become more consciously aware of the urban designs that begin to affect your perception of the given area. It helped me realise the impacts of urban design from large infrastructure design to the smaller scaled factors like a material choice, and placements of foliage or garbage cans. These elements can be identified through this experiment. Once identified, design interventions can be implemented into their fullest effect. Perceiving the world through the senses is what creates experience, and a huge factor into a memorable space.” (Zac)

A third group explored the micro-climate and environmental quality (air quality, thermal comfort, light) using a compact optical dust sensor and a mobile ‘weather station’ recording temperature, air movement, relative humidity and illuminance. While recordings measured the objective environmental factors, participants were also asked to record their perceptions at different locations along the route to gain a better understanding of how the morphology and form of the surroundings impacts the micro-climatic conditions and how a space therefore feels. This type of information is perhaps the easiest to incorporate into the design process and sophisticated modelling technology already exists to model the impact of a design proposal. We rarely, however, use the full potential of spatial data and technology to assess impact on cost grounds.

“This information can help to change the way a person designs, and the way we as people interact and perceive the world. It can help to think about the shape of a space differently, of the size of the objects around it, of the amount of sunlight it gets”. (Jeremy)

The last group used the Health Map as a framework for assessment as they walked through the neighbourhood, capturing the elements which were health promoting and health detracting. The tool not only makes you think about the material and physical aspects of a space, but also the wider determinants of health, such as access to jobs, and the wider socio-economic and demographic conditions, which design charrettes simply miss.

“exploring the aspect of the health map I acquired a whole new lens of how I view the urban fabric. Permeability, walkability, and cultural trails as guides through the city are a few aspects about urban form, design and health that I wouldn’t otherwise think about. It makes me want to go back to each project I have done and apply these ways of thinking to see how much richer it could have been.” (Mario)
Participants’ works from the summerLab in London. Participants analysed the everyday dynamics of the study area through diverse research methods, with the aim of grasping multifarious perspectives over the area’s current transformation and future development. A series of urban design proposal were presented as alternative to the current Leegate plans by St Modwen, and discussed with representatives of the Lee Neighbourhood Forum and other local residents.
The design of urban spaces can affect, both positively and negatively, people’s wellbeing. Traditional design approaches to the built environment generally highlight features of the formation of space such as visual aesthetics, morphology and densities in order to maximise its value. These approaches overlook other socioeconomic elements related to the construction of healthy places. This refers to the impacts of urban design on people’s behaviours, emotions, economy, social relations, and physical and psychological health. These effects on health are hardly considered when planning or designing urban spaces, having, therefore, (in)direct impacts on wellbeing.

This summerLab was a unique opportunity to dive into urban health and have a grasp of how design affects our experience of a place. The workshop comprised lectures, in situ exploration and exercises designed to apply the learning to our case study in Lee Green, in the London Borough of Lewisham. We were allocated into groups to explore the study area through an urban health lens using different methodologies that touch upon wearable sensing technology, sensory analysis and perception mapping, quality of the micro-climate such as air quality and aesthetics, ethnographic exploration and a health map framework. Critical reviews of the current masterplan proposal in the case study area were delivered at the end in order to put forward additional insights addressing health issues discovered during the workshop.

This experience allowed me to explore the interconnections between several urban interventions and their wider context in a built environment. This workshop led me to critically consider the dynamics among different urban agents, either these were human or non-human. And to reflect on how wellbeing is impacted by urban planning and design. The ethnographic approach was extremely significant for me.

As an enthusiast of urban planning, not a practitioner, but an occasional contributor to local initiatives and mostly an avid reader of books devoted to this topic, I signed up for the DPU summerLab in London to meet with like-minded people. In fact, it was for me the first time I had the chance to have a conversation with urban design practitioners.

The workshops and the accompanying walks with great speakers gave me a completely new perspective on various aspects of urban design of which I wasn’t aware. The one that still resonates with me on a daily basis came from a walk amongst skyscrapers in the City of London. It challenged my previous way of experiencing this area purely based on its architecture or office purpose: in turn, it introduced to me the concept of placemaking and made me aware of the effects of urban design interventions on the climatic conditions of their wider surroundings.

The ‘healthy urbanism’ topic triggered interesting conversations amongst us participants, about the places we visited and the feelings they conveyed. I particularly valued the array of observations each of us put forward, and of urban features each of us appreciated or disliked, given our diverse backgrounds. I strongly believe that such discussions are of paramount importance and they should happen much more often to improve our wellbeing in the urban space. The workshop also made me more aware of the fact elements such as connectivity via public transportation and green spaces – that I take for granted living in London – might be instead a novelty in other areas of the world. Likewise London may lack what other cities have to offer.

Working with the Lee Neighbourhood Forum on envisioning a healthier Leegate, coupled with my experience with my local community, made me conscious of the kind of groups of people who tend to be active in such initiatives, and of the lack of people of my age. From my observations the involved parties are mostly parents who want to provide safe space for their children and elderly who sense pride for the place associated with living in the area for a long time and who have more free time. The summerLab inspired me to start such involvement ‘from myself’, to be more involved with local projects and try to encourage neighbours and friends to do likewise. We all co-use the shared urban space and all voices should be heard, not only when something becomes an issue that needs addressing.

In hindsight, I would definitely recommend the programme to non-practitioners, which is to say, essentially to everyone who cares and shares interest in the quality of space they live in.

Being a student studying architecture in a school which relies heavily on form based work, I never got an opportunity to really understand the depth behind how buildings affect each and every thing around it. I found it fascinating that, as technology begins to increase, somehow our buildings progress in sometimes unintended ways. Some tall buildings drive the wind down towards the ground and if surrounded by a cluster of other tall buildings can create a space rather unenjoyable. The methodology presented in one of the lectures and then a hands-on walk through London helped in changing and/or intensifying my ideas of Urban Health. Urban Health is much larger than the mental and social realm but also it has so much to do with the physical things – how do our buildings affect others (humans or surrounding buildings) positively or negatively, and how can cities create healthier cities that have historical value and can’t be torn down?
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We are indebted to the Old Tigers Head in Lee who were such wonderful hosts during the week, especially to Kayla and her team who made everyone feel so welcome with refreshments and wonderful food on the final day.

We especially want to thank all the guest speakers and group leads for sharing their fantastic knowledge and insights: Professor Derek Clements-Croome, University of Reading; Briony Turner, Institute for Environmental Analytics at the University of Reading; Chris Neal, Stockholm Environment Institute, The University of York; Marcus Grant, editor-in-chief of ‘Cities & Health’ journal and an expert advisor to the WHO; Joanna Chambers, Changing Cities; Julie Futter Urban Generation; Alkis Kotopoulos, University of Kent; Chloe Jennings, King’s College London.

A big thank you to Josue Robles from the University of South Florida who joined his students and with his great humour and energy was a great help to the running of the week. And finally to the wonderful participants.
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Since 2013, USF School of Architecture and Community Design students have participated in the London Summer Lab, allowing them to obtain a critical perspective from different locales within London. This year’s lab allowed us to focus on the Lee community in East London.

The lab incorporated both evidence based analysis and community collaborative workshops. The environmental based analysis was able to contrast different information between several locations within London and Leegate, illustrating the effects of built density, and automotive saturation. The evidence based analysis identified the different range of built challenges within the community particularly environmental pollution and pedestrian stress levels. While the community collaborative workshops allowed the residents to voice both their aspirations and items of concern.

The community voiced the need to preserve their pristine housing stock, historic buildings and landmarks while expressing the lack of community inclusive businesses.

This parallel approach of the summerLab became the conceptual foundation and base of engagement of this year’s architectural exercise. This allowed the students to take different avenues and respond to evolving dynamics within the Lee community.
Depoliticising Verticality

Designing for Vertical Inclusion

Josue Robles Caraballo, Faculty and Research Associate
School of Architecture and Community Design, University of South Florida

The summerLab London: Constructing Healthier Urbanisms served as a conceptual foundation for this academic exercise by exposing SACD students to the many virtues and opportunities for betterment within the Lee community. The active proposal of the Leegate Centre created a design framework for the graduate studio to build their design parameters.

The academic exercise focused on reinvigorating the Leegate Centre including significant historically vulnerable buildings within the Tigers Head junction. Students were asked to generate spatial opportunities for communal development. Including the extension of green boulevards while elaborating and creating green spaces for both public and private realms. Activate existing and create new pedestrian corridors for civic and business programs. Create sidewalks for healthier pedestrian thoroughfares that are currently affected by pollution and high vehicular presence in the area. Shaping built form solutions that both accommodate the programmatic needs and promote a rich quotidian life.

This effort incorporate the program specified by the existing development application for the Leegate Centre. The program included a food store with parking spaces, shops, restaurants, cafes, an education center, pub, gym, and 230 residential units. Along with addressing the program, the primary objective of the design studio was to challenge the interconnectivity of public and private communal life of both the street and vertical realms. Students’ proposals challenged the current available developments within the local market. Units spaces were shaped around the accessibility of natural light and passive ventilation within all units. In addition, each unit was design to have physical access to green and public spaces along the vertical communities.

In addition to communal interconnectivity, students were asked to analyze and propose design solutions for both market rate housing and micro-units. The market rate housing focuses on the needs of growing families and children while developing live-work scenarios that will bring more professional growth to the area. The micro units residents were developed for both young professionals and third generation residents in need of less space. Micro units focused on creating affordable opportunities and programmatic flexibility within a fun and playful ambient. To support both market rate and micro units, a fabric of support spaces was incorporated into each design. Design schemes included communal spaces that focus on social interaction, and visual and physical connectivity to the public realm. This auxiliary support includes wood shops, community kitchens, bike shops, gyms, and educational-business centers that would allow residents to fulfill personal and family needs while creating opportunities for social engagement.

The summerLab’s parallel exposure of analysis from international experts and the feedback of the community members allowed the students to have a critical perspective of architectural delivery that is shaped by communal inclusion within vertical communities.
This proposal mainly focuses on creating a public space that will host residential buildings, as well as, commercial. The intent is to create a successful, safe, and healthy environment for residents and visitors, while respecting the history and heritage of Lee. The educational center and a transparent, encased garden are differentiated from the rest of the site by dropping its ground level, to segregate it from its surroundings and create a noise isolated environment that has reduced air pollution, resulting in increased air quality combined with the garden. Each unit has an individual interior garden space linked to an exterior balcony that is shared with the neighboring units’ garden. The goal of the shared private space is to achieve an improved communication and social interaction with others.
For my proposal I designed a space which acts as an oasis for the residents of Lee Gate. Centered in the middle of my buildings is a plaza which has 3 water walls, this reduces noise from surrounding traffic; creating a dynamic plaza open to the public that the city of Lee would benefit from. The surrounding buildings on site are mixed use, with the pub being the small center building. This activates the plaza at night maintaining the idea of a safer neighborhood. Lee High Road is one of the busiest streets with foot and vehicular traffic, so the residential units are recessed along this street creating opportunities for spaces in the buildings to be opened to the public.

Zackery Sladden

My design solution for revitalizing the Leegate center and the surrounding community began by defining and developing a healthy configuration of residential units. The residential units had to promote an inviting atmosphere for communal interaction and also create a sensory stimulating environment. The overall structure of the towers had to be permeable in order to allow light and air through the buildings, this would allow plants to grow in the incorporated green walls between each building and also the imbedded planters. Integrating green and communal spaces in between the buildings would promote a new healthy living experience for the resident and community.
My proposal was a rendition of how density can be converted to create more community and green space. I wanted to utilize those leftover voids and turn them into spaces the community can eventually come to think of as their go-to's. I created extensions of these voids beneath green buffers that minimized noise and air pollution, and within a set of high-rise residential buildings that gave these residents private exterior living rooms. The expansion of Lee’s existing parks into and combined with a more commercial and dense lot creates an alternative location for the neighborhood locals, and an attraction for oncoming visitors to the Lee area.

Randy Brinez

The configuration of new infrastructure will be strategically implemented within the site to create a positive and memorable experience for locals and visitors. The design will create pocket parks along existing roads as welcoming points into public spaces, increasing the porosity of the of the neighborhood and allowing for new pedestrian ways along the site. The addition of new commercial spaces can function for the benefit of everyone during day and night time hours. Proposed residential and commercial spaces will create internal destinations that can be utilized as a gathering space for public events. The residential buildings will allow user to connect with public life via different levels of controlled transparency within units.
Nazia Hirani

The key to my project was to compose a sense of intimacy and tolerance between the three scales of community. This was achieved by introducing green spaces that were strategically designed and placed on certain units allowing neighbors to speak directly to each other. On the ground floor, the retail is organized in a manner that brings in new and innovative types of businesses that coincide with the “Happy City” diagram, preferably of services that are necessary in bringing growth and prosperity. Also, in between lies a creative green corridor with spaces that allow the community to shape what it should become. Ultimately, the final form was modeled through the simplification of the unit’s floor plans and allowing design to take place within each unit with their own unique view or green space that sets them apart.

Anabelle Castagne

The main aim for this project was to preserve the character of the surrounding area while enhancing the everyday experience for residents and visitors. At the center of the block is an orchard and garden space open to the public to accommodate numerous activities. Retail stores line the streets on the ground floor while academic and residential spaces start from the second floor. The buildings rise to a maximum of 5 floors sheltering the central urban space without towering above its neighbouring structures. There are several green spaces and a large presence of street trees to create the feeling of an “urban oasis” in the center of a dense city.
The Leegate site in London desired much needed community space; both indoor and outdoor. The two parallel buildings maximize sunlight throughout the day to allow multiple green spaces to flourish throughout the community. There are two types of residential types of flats in both buildings (market rate; with 2 bedrooms and 2 water closets, and a micro with 1 bedroom and 1 water closet) that alternate every other floor. The first floors are public space that includes shops, a restaurant, a pub, a grocery store, a gym, and a community center. In the center is high volume community space that is a combination of green space and café space.

My design is mainly aimed at improving the living environment in the Leegate area and making people's community life more comfortable and convenient. The design of the community as a semi-open community activates activities from the west and north side of the site, which enhances the attractiveness of the surrounding residents while ensuring community public activities. The north plaza and the three open entrances with road trees in the west side between residential buildings are a sign that draws people into the community.

There are gyms, swimming pools, bars, cafés, retails and a variety of outdoor space that suitable for different groups of people. Residential units are divided into market rate unit and micro unit, respectively for the entire family and individuals or couples living, while they have their own community space, but also have convenient access to all the public facilities in the community center, enhancing both privacy and openness. I also keep this idea in mind while designing public green area, private planters, entrances, facades and balconies of floor units.
The Bartlett

dpu summerLab
2018 series

leveraging the city as a laboratory
for developing socially responsive design strategies

AMMAN
INHABITING WATER INFRASTRUCTURES
27 AUGUST - 1 SEPTEMBER
in collaboration with Jawad Dukhgan (Studio-X Amman)

ULAANBAATAR
URBANISING NOMADISM
27 AUGUST - 1 SEPTEMBER
in collaboration with Badruun Gardi and Enkhjin Batjargal (GerHub)

BAR ELIAS
PUBLIC REALM AND SPACES OF REFUGE
3-8 SEPTEMBER
in collaboration with CatalyticAction

ATHENS
THE ARRIVAL CITY IN AGE OF AUSTERITY
10-15 SEPTEMBER
in collaboration with Stefania Gyftopoulou (Open Architecture Collaborative)

LONDON
CONSTRUCTING HEALTHIER URBANISMS
17-22 SEPTEMBER
in collaboration with Kay Pallaris (Mapping Futures Ltd)

The international participation fee for each workshop is £375 (early bird rate) or £425 (standard rate). The fee is discounted to £275 (early bird rate) or £325 (standard rate) for: currently enrolled DPU students (2017-18), DPU alumni, and for group applications (5 people or more). Discounted fees apply for participants intending to register to multiple workshops too: please contact us for further info. Please note that these fees do not include travel or accommodation, though advice and local information will be provided. The early-bird application deadline is Monday 4 June; the general application deadline is Monday 2 July 2018. For more information and to apply please visit www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/programmes/summerlab or write to dpusummerlab@ucl.ac.uk