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RECONNECTING CITÉ AND VILLE

Philip Graus

Introduction

This chapter asks why ‘good’ strategic plans and urban design often translate into poor physical places. Richard Sennett offers an insight, referring to a ‘cité and ville’ divide: cité, the accumulation of fine-grain human places that people value as an experience; ville the comprehensively planned city of top-down plans and policies (Sennett, 2018). In contemporary global cities, placemaking is overwhelmed by metropolitan-scale urban infrastructure and the economic and governance models and processes driving them, narrowing and overwhelming the placemaking process itself. Strategic planning and urban design in isolation cannot deliver successful placemaking. A three-part proposition to deliver improved places is set out here to narrow the divide, in essence, elevating the role of placemaking by adopting its processes into the current economic and political decision-making process. This comprises adopting an iterative, rather than a linear process, more closely aligning and integrating urban governance, and broadening urban economic models including cost–benefit analysis. The chapter provides an overview of contemporary strategic planning and urban design, their urban governance and economic drivers, examining their impact on placemaking with respect to two case studies, one in the author’s city, Sydney, the other in Tokyo. The conclusion details the three-part proposition to improve placemaking.

The cité/ville divide

This chapter has been prompted by a number of observations and questions arising over experience of several decades of professional practice in planning and urban design. Why do ‘good’ comprehensive strategic plans and even urban design often translate into poor physical places? Are the process or forces driving comprehensive planning the issue? Or is it poor urban design, or a disconnect between the two, with respect to both process and sequence? Poor outcomes are manifested in two ways: the destruction or erosion of existing places, and the creation of ‘placeless’ new places.

Sennett provides a series of helpful insights, referring to a ‘cité and ville’ (Sennett, 2018) divide. Cité is the accumulation of fine-grain human places that people value as an experience, that evolve slowly over time, tinkered with and adapted from the bottom up at the local level.
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where we ‘dwell’; the messy vibrant places described famously by Jane Jacobs (Jacobs, 1961). Ville is the comprehensively planned city of top-down plans and policies. For Sennett, ville and cité have become divided, as national economic and governance priorities grow in importance in competing global cities in particular. Sennett associates Jane Jacobs, the journalist and later urban activist, with the cité, and Lewis Mumford, the regional planner, with the ville. The disconnect between the two was famously illustrated by the conflict between Jane Jacobs and Robert Moses, the New York parks commissioner and highway builder, seen as protagonists in a battle between the cité and ville respectively (Brandes Gratz, 2010). While one might think of strategic planning as ville, and urban design as cité, the distinction is more subtle.

In contemporary cities, especially global cities, fine-grain human-scale placemaking is overwhelmed by city-scale urban infrastructure and the economic and governance models that drive them. This may not have been the case prior to the early twentieth century where there was little distinction between cité and ville, as cities were planned and designed at the human scale. Returning to such a preindustrial past is not possible in contemporary cities, especially global ones where ‘city shaping’ infrastructures are necessary. We cannot therefore choose between Moses’ city-shaping infrastructure and Jacob’s fine-grain neighbourhoods; rather the two need to be reconnected by elevating the role and process of placemaking to more strongly influence the structure and impact of economic and governance drivers, in particular adopting the more iterative, aligned, and broader processes inherent in the placemaking process into these models. The influence of economic models is manifested in particular by city-scale project infrastructure business cases, reinforced by top-down non-iterative governance models funded at the national level driving infrastructure projects through subsequent state and local levels. Furthermore, national economic priorities, including economic growth favour infrastructure projects such as transport over open space or civic improvement. These forces narrow and overwhelm the placemaking process itself. It is clear that planning and urban design in isolation cannot deliver placemaking or the experience of place.

The three-part proposition

The three-part proposition in this chapter proposes changes to the processes and scope of economic and governance models, more aligned to the finer-grain iterative process of placemaking. The three parts are highly interdependent. First, adopt an iterative, rather than linear, process between comprehensive planning and fine-grain urban design. Second, more closely align and integrate urban governance through genuine partnerships. Third, broaden urban economic models when evaluating cost benefits. This will require a closer alignment of the various levels of government and an expanded context within which urban economic models, such as business cases, are framed to bring placemaking closer to the centre of these processes. The lack of an iterative process or alignment between various agencies and context have separated and narrowed the placemaking process, effectively pushing it to the end of the process where major design decisions have already been set. In this way the placemaking process can integrate cité and ville more closely together to maintain or create valued places. The first part of this chapter examines the evolution of contemporary strategic planning and urban design, their relationship to placemaking as well as the changing relationship between them, driven to a large extent by the role of urban governance and economic models. The second part examines these impacts with respect to two case studies, one in the author’s city, Sydney, and the other in Tokyo (Graus, 2019). The third part describes a more engaged role for urban design in the economic and political decision-making process. The conclusion sets out the three-part proposition.
Contemporary planning and urban design

Ville – planning, governance, and economic growth

How cities are governed has significant implications for how cities are planned and the places that result. This has had a particularly significant impact on global or rapidly growing cities. As Clark and others have observed, ‘if the 20th century was defined by the nation state, the current century will be driven by global cities’ (Clark, 2017). Clark also notes that the relationship between city and central government is complex and will require a much stronger partnership between the two, if both are to benefit. Planners in advanced metropolitan cities since the Second World War in particular have described strategic planning as ‘managing growth,’ largely to provide rapidly growing urban populations with access to jobs and services as the metropolis expanded. This contrasts with earlier metropolitan plans where civic improvement was an integral part of such documents (Chicago Plan, 1909). In Australia, Spearritt described Sydney as, ‘haphazard suburban development of the twenties, a decade in which enthusiasm for expanding the metropolis exceeded interest in improving it’ (Spearritt 1978, p. 26). An early case of ville overwhelming cité.

Over the twentieth century a number of strategic-growth-plan typologies were developed, principally all variant forms of urban containment, from cores surrounded by green belts with satellite centres, to corridors, to the compact city where density is increased, and more recently to economic growth corridors where the focus has shifted to economic productivity. Fainstein (2010) and Sorensen (2002) identified economic growth as the primary driver of contemporary metropolitan planning in the US, Europe, and Japan, respectively. These were seen as the most important elements in ensuring a continually improving standard of living and therefore became important politically. Providing access to jobs and services continues to be a significant driver of strategic planning and requires significant metropolitan-scale transport infrastructure, as in Tokyo where transport infrastructure has been more critical to productivity rather than open space or green infrastructure. Moses, whom many have criticised for his destructive freeway program in New York City, built them to provide recreation access to Long Island’s beaches for the average New Yorker who previously had been denied access (Caro, 1974). More recently the focus is shifting to public transport. In either case this results in significant ‘city shaping’ engineering infrastructures with mixed results with respect to placemaking, especially fine-grain and walkable precincts. Such projects are increasingly evaluated via economic business cases measuring benefits against cost. How the various costs and benefits are allocated obviously impacts on which projects provide the highest cost benefit as well as the nature of the project. Political considerations as well as planning also come into play as different communities either benefit or are disrupted.

Cité – urban design and placemaking

The relationship between cité, urban design, and placemaking is complex and it is important to define each as well as the relationships between them. Sennett describes cité as a person’s lived experience of a place, or the act of dwelling rather than building. Cité is experienced at the human scale – either static places like squares or streets that one moves through. Hence the interest of many placemakers in spaces where human exchange takes place; the street and marketplace. Cité is the end result of successful placemaking. Urban design can be thought of as the process of shaping place, described by Jonathan Barnett as ‘the generally accepted name for the process of giving physical design direction to urban growth, conservation and change’ (Barnett, 1982, p. 12). It is not necessarily bound to operate at the cité or ville scales. For the purposes of
this chapter, the relevant aspect of urban design is the iterative design process capable of mediating between scales in developing physical three-dimensional urban forms.

Where does urban design sit with respect to cité and ville? It is generally accepted that urban design occurs at a range of scales from the fine-grain to the metropolitan. Given the divide between cité and ville it is perhaps not surprising that the term ‘placemaking’ has come to refer to the finer-grain local scale. Metropolitan-scale processes that have significant spatial impacts on the form of the city, are generally not place based; rather they are abstract and diagrammatic, lacking grain and human scale. For the purposes of this chapter placemaking occurs when metropolitan planning, urban governance, and the drivers of economic growth do not overwhelm the urban design process at the fine-grain local placemaking scale. This is contrasted with ville, which is generally conceived by those outside the community – professional planners, bureaucrats, and financiers for example. While cité tends to be local, ville is increasingly metropolitan in scale.

Prior to the advent of regional- and metropolitan-scale land use and transport planning in the early twentieth century, there was little or no distinction between ‘city planning’ and ‘civic design.’ The term ‘urban design’ did not exist. Barnett (1982, p. 13) traces urban design as a separate technical speciality to the University of Pennsylvania’s Civic Design Program begun in 1957, followed by Harvard’s Urban Design Program in 1960. Metropolitan-scale plans such as the 1909 Chicago Plan included both scales as ‘city planning’ and ‘civic design’ or ‘beautification’ respectively. The design of civic places was included in metropolitan-scale plans. In these plans, infrastructure was ‘civic infrastructure.’ The 1909 Royal Commission for the Improvement of Sydney and its suburbs brought together a new city transport plan with plans for the civic improvement of significant Sydney transport places including the Central Railway Station Area improvement scheme and the Circular Quay ‘enlargement and beautification of the waterfront’ (Brill, 1909). The divide identified by Barnett is echoed by Edward Relph (1976) describing the rupture between strategic planning and placemaking, as the separation of planning space from architectural space, with the latter a deliberate attempt to create spaces, and the former not concerned with the experience of space but rather with function in two-dimensional map space. Relph was one of the first to write about place itself as an experience in Place and Placelessness (1976), a reaction against Modernist abstract planning models and theories, preferring the ‘lived-world’ of day-to-day experience. Barnett offered a similar critique, describing Modernist ‘Urbanisme’ as a romantic vision of modern technology, freeing the individual from tradition ‘admirably suited to mindless bureaucratic repetition, and the cost cutting.’ The issues associated with the diminution of placemaking are complex. The case studies below attempt to elucidate rather than simplify the issues at play.

Two case studies – Sydney and Tokyo

Commonalities

Many of the issues discussed above were brought into sharp focus during a visit to a number of Japanese cities in May 2019 where the author was struck by similarities with Australian cities, Sydney in particular. What might a city like Tokyo, with a metro population of 14 million, have in common with Australian cities like Sydney or Melbourne, with populations of less than 5 million, and what insights might such a comparison provide? Reading Andre Sorensen’s (2002) The Making of Urban Japan: Cities and Planning from the Edo to the Twenty First Century, while catching trains and walking Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki sharpened and more deeply informed the author’s observations, especially the role of both governance and economics in shaping these cities and places. While Japan has been perceived as one of the few
genuinely ‘foreign’ countries by some, Sorensen sees significant similarities as well as differences with Western countries that share similar levels of wealth and urbanisation.

Central governments in both countries have significant control over funding of state city-shaping infrastructure projects. Marcus Spiller refers to this as a ‘vertical fiscal imbalance’ resulting in significant federal influence over large state projects (Tomlinson and Spiller, 2018). While such large ‘city-shaper’ infrastructure projects deliver much needed improvements with respect to accessibility to jobs and housing, they do not themselves create the fine, urban-grain fabric and open spaces essential to creating the places we value so highly. Sydney is similar to Tokyo, in that it is the fine, walkable scale grid that pre-dated post-war ‘comprehensive planning’ that create the valued places. While Japanese cities are no longer growing like their Australian counterparts, one can clearly see the impact on place resulting from decades of rapid and significant population growth as well as strategic plans underpinned by economic growth and infrastructure ‘city shapers’. There are also a number of relevant common characteristics, especially the conversion of extensive rural farming areas to greenfield development. The value of the comparison for Sydney is that rapid growth occurred in Japan earlier, and therefore one can see the impacts on place, and potentially apply the learnings to the Sydney context, and perhaps to other places, where extensive growth, especially greenfield, is still occurring, as well impacts on existing areas.

**Sydney**

Sustained and strong population growth has been identified as the overarching driver of metropolitan planning for Sydney. From a point of 4.3 million in 2011, Sydney is expected to grow to 6.4 million by 2036 and 8 million by 2056, an average of 85,000 new residents a year (Hamnett and Freestone, 2018, p. 77). Sydney’s first metropolitan plan, the 1945 Cumberland County Plan, was underpinned by the three pillars of ‘co-ordination, consolidation and conservation’ (Winston, 1957). While not an expansion plan, it was structured around the orderly planning of a growing population by co-ordinating the ad hoc nature of post-war development, consolidating growth and filling empty pockets, as well as conserving Sydney’s natural character. Inspired by Abercrombie’s County of London Plan of 1943 and Greater London Plan of 1944 (Hamnett and Freestone, 2018, p. 35), a green belt was proposed to consolidate growth. Similar to other major cities in the post-World War Two period, the quantum and pace of growth was much greater than predicted. Within a few years after the publication of the Cumberland Plan, the green belt was under threat. In 1968 the Sydney Region Outline Plan proposed ‘growth corridors’ along rail lines piercing the green belt. The theme of ‘managing growth’ has underpinned all subsequent plans. A more recent shift in emphasis has been the focus on economic as well as population growth. The 2014 metropolitan plan, A Plan for Growing Sydney, identified nine ‘city shapers’ to address the city’s projected growth. These included global economic corridors, road corridors, and rail corridors. The traditional emphasis on a centre’s hierarchy shifted to a combination of corridors, clusters as well as centres reflecting changing economic circumstances, especially economic globalisation manifest in the clustering of financial services and so-called innovation districts. The emphasis on transport, both public and private, reflected an acknowledgement that a catch-up was long overdue.

**Urban governance and economic drivers**

In Sydney’s case there has been an acknowledgement that traditional governance models of state and local planning not aligned to a metropolitan scale cannot effectively manage or plan a growing metropolis that now includes 55 per cent of the entire state’s population as well as
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an increasing contribution to national Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Planners have long asserted that a metropolitan level of governance and planning had been needed, and that Sydney had lacked this since the abolition of the Cumberland County Council. The relationship is complex in Australia where three levels of government each have defined roles and sources of funding. The Australian system of taxation creates a ‘vertical fiscal imbalance’ where the federal government collects over 80 per cent of taxes but the state is responsible for delivering major urban infrastructure. As a result, the federal government has significant influence in which urban infrastructure is funded. National economic productivity priorities may outweigh state priorities such as health and education, even though there are clearly links between the two. Accordingly, there may be mismatches between the level of government responsible for funding urban infrastructure and the level responsible for planning and delivering. While the states are responsible for delivering major infrastructure, they are dependent on federal funding. While there is a process of independent evaluation of projects, it is inevitable that they are seen through the potentially competing lenses of different levels of government. In many cases federal and state priorities do not align with city or placemaking priorities. This is exacerbated where a city is a major contributor to national GDP and the city in a sense becomes a national and state economic engine. Reflecting the need for a metropolitan level of urban governance, in 2015 the Greater Sydney Commission was established ‘to lead metropolitan planning for the Greater Sydney Region.’ The Commission released *Region Plan: A Plan for Growing Sydney*, proposing a metropolis of three cities, East, Central, and West, to ‘collectively create Global Sydney.’ This is currently being supported by a Western Sydney City Deal and a new curfew-free Western City Airport, a major ‘city shaper.’ The *Region Plan* also includes a series of place-based Collaboration Areas identifying those centres with the greatest potential for jobs growth.

Urban economics has a significant spatial impact on cities, especially the paradigm of economic growth as the means to sustain high levels of employment lifting the standard of living. Cities are becoming stronger economically as capital investment and global businesses coalesce into major centres (Sassen, 2001). A global city may have a stronger relationship with a global city in a foreign country rather than to its own region. Australia is no exception, with capital investment in a relatively small number of metropolitan cities, resulting in their increased economic importance to both state and national economies. Cities are of increasing interest to both levels of government. As a result, federal governance and funding models in particular are oriented towards macroeconomic projects, including regional-scale infrastructure projects subject to business cases that tend to prioritise economic ‘value’ over social or liveability criteria. Governance and economic structures combine to prioritise metropolitan scale projects over local, in many cases to the detriment of placemaking. In many cases urban transport infrastructure, such as busways, unintentionally divides the urban fabric of centres. The above highlights the complex relationship between urban governance and economics and how they increasingly shape our cities. There is, however, a growing recognition that the most successful global cities are desirable places to live in, and that ‘business as usual’ governance and economic models may in fact undermine both federal and state economic objectives. The recent Australian City Deals between the three levels of government reflect an acknowledgement of the need to more closely align objectives through a partnership structure.

**Tokyo**

**Tokyo ville**

Sorensen argues that Japan’s political system, economics, and culture has remained a top-down national structure from the Edo to the present, with a focus on economic growth over
liveability following its devastation after the Second World War through to the 1980s. These priorities especially have deeply influenced the form of its contemporary cities. Sorensen highlights a number of impacts on Japanese cities: urbanised land increased from 15 per cent to 80 per cent over the twentieth century (not dissimilar to Australian cities, where both have rezoned very significant areas of rural lands to relatively low destiny residential at the edges of metropolitan cores); the world’s best and most heavily trafficked rail system; increasing road congestion and a vast network of elevated freeways; and a lack of public domain. The lack of controls in major metropolitan cities like Tokyo has led to significant sprawl. While roads were delivered as essential to deliver development, open space was not. Like Australian cities, the high cost of urbanised land mitigated against the purchase/allocation of sufficient open space for rapidly growing areas that transition from rural to urban. While Japanese planners introduced measures where a percentage of upzoned land was to be contributed for roads and other public domain, central government was not supportive. Central government’s strategy has focused on delivering national economic development projects first, postponing social and civic infrastructure. This is a high-risk strategy for Sorensen as outer areas rarely receive adequate social and public domain infrastructure as value uplifts on rezoned land make postponed acquisition unaffordable.

There are similarities as well as differences with respect to the impact of ville in Tokyo and Sydney. In both cases, very significant economic growth and infrastructure have transformed these cities. With respect to infrastructure, major motorways cut though both cities, especially Tokyo. In many cases motorways pay little or no regard to the existing fabric of the city. In the case of Tokyo many motorways were simply placed over existing streets, creating dark lifeless spaces below. Transport infrastructure and filling in of the harbour in cities such as Hiroshima, to create large areas of industrial uses, have separated the city from its harbour and former place of exchange and mercantile activity in a similar way to Sydney’s Darling Harbour in the early twentieth century. As Sorensen (ibid.) notes, the push for productivity resulted in industrial and transport infrastructure at the expense of civic infrastructure. This is evident in the lack of public domain, apart from temple, palace, and castle lands converted to parks. Notwithstanding this, in contrast to Sydney, Tokyo has developed an amazing and diverse jumble of uses, places, and built form, due in part to the lack of private domain regulation, but principally (in the view of the author) a much greater retention of the traditional fine-grain street pattern, due in large part to the inability of corporations to amalgamate the many small individually owned parcels of land in built-up areas. While central Tokyo experienced almost total physical destruction during the war, much of the traditional fine-grain street patterns remained, even while the buildings did not. The valued places are the small streets and lanes. This has resulted in high levels of street activity in the brownfield areas. The subsequently planned greenfield areas however lacked such a grain, shaped in the main by metropolitan scale infrastructure. As Sorensen notes: ‘the best places escaped “comprehensive planning”, the worst places were not so fortunate’ (ibid.).

**Urban governance and economic drivers**

Sorensen (2002) identifies a number of factors that continue to influence the urban form in Japanese cities. First is the dominance of central government that hasn’t changed despite post-war attempts to break down the centralisation of power. This is reinforced by the tradition of urban neighbourhood self-reliance for day-to-day needs, without meaningful local government authority or representation. Furthermore, central government funding has favoured economic development over social infrastructure. This has translated into a preference for transport infrastructure over public domain and placemaking investment.
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Money, politics, and design

The implications of these models’ impact on the design of valued places have not been sufficiently examined to date, nor what changes in policy, or thinking, may be needed to ensure that such forces do not overwhelm or narrow the making of place, especially in greenfield planning. This contrasts with the significant body of research into urban governance and economic models including their negative impacts on the economic performance of cities arising from issues like the federal–state fiscal imbalance and the allocation of urban infrastructure. How these models impact the design of place at the precinct scale and whether some models facilitate more valued places than others deserves greater attention. Such a gap in policy and practice impacts liveability and quality of life, including the creation and maintenance of places that people value. This is reflected to some degree by increased community opposition to development in Australia’s major cities, especially Sydney. While a number of policies may appear to address urban design, they do not generally address the more profound structural impacts of both governance and economic models, how they impact and narrow the design process and place outcomes.

While metropolitan-scale infrastructure may deliver much-needed improvements in accessibility to jobs and housing it does not by itself create the sort of urban-grain, fabric, and open space that create the places we value so highly. As reflected in the Tokyo case study, it is the fine walkable-scale grid that pre-dated ‘comprehensive planning’ that creates the valued places. While this combination of new infrastructure and fine-grain places may occur even in an ad hoc and highly compromised form in existing urban fabric structured prior to car dominance, the real challenge is how to achieve such places in greenfield areas where there is no fine grain, while satisfying the need for significant infrastructure delivered relatively quickly. In the case of the outer greenfield/formerly rural areas of Tokyo and Sydney this does not seem to have been successful, especially with respect to new open space or placemaking. This raises the question of whether it is possible to comprehensively plan the ville and ‘make’ cité places at the same time. A growing global city like Sydney does not have the choice between cité and ville if it is to sustain connected liveable places that people value. Creating a metropolitan ville where land use and transport are integrated at the metropolitan scale does not ensure equitable access to the places people value. This creates a significant challenge as current strategic planning processes are essentially linear, structured by state agencies around a hierarchy of spatial plans from metropolitan to local land-use zoning plans. Urban design is then applied largely by local government later in the process.

City planners such as Alex Washburn in New York have recognised the diminution of placemaking associated with the split between cité and ville advocating effective urban design as the combination of economics, governance, and design or money, politics, and design (Washburn, 2013). Without urban designers being actively engaged in the economic and governance decision-making process, people of importance in government and real estate see design as the icing on the cake. Washburn found that not only were the rich and powerful influencing change, there were also the communities living in the city – energy without consensus. Washburn needed ‘a political, a financial, and a design framework to relate to the full range of individual actors with a common good,’ providing the opportunity to communicate a common design interest.

Bringing cité and ville together in the three-part proposition

Sennett once remarked to Jacobs that she was better at cité, and Mumford at ville. To which Jacobs replied, ‘What would you do?’ Indeed, what should we do? Can we do both? To move beyond ‘business as usual’ planning, a three-part approach of aligning, integrating, and broaden-
An iterative process

The ‘business as usual’ approach to strategic planning and urban design is hierarchical, both linear and top-down, separating the two with respect to process and sequencing of key decisions. This effectively rules out placemaking, which requires a design process that is iterative and fine-grained as well as three-dimensional. In a linear process, metropolitan-scale decisions are ‘fixed’ prior to fine-grain placemaking. A more sustainable cité and ville planning and urban design methodology is to plan and design metro- and finer-grain scales iteratively rather than in a linear hierarchy. This is not to abandon planning hierarchies, but to work at the various scales concurrently recognising that city is not an end-state plan but evolves iteratively. An iterative process brings the more abstract or diagrammatic methodology of planning together with the more concrete place-based concerns of urban design, avoiding the tabula rasa view of places that has been common to much unsuccessful urban renewal. Designed iteratively with a finer-grain urban design process, a more strongly place-based outcome is far more likely to be delivered, while also achieving broader metropolitan scale outcomes.

An aligned and integrated process

As noted in this chapter the various levels of government objectives do not necessarily align with city or placemaking objectives. Aligned governance at the geographic scale of metropolitan city is essential in achieving place-based outcomes. Such an alignment provides an opportunity to develop both cité and ville concurrently as a partnership between the various levels of government, facilitating an iterative process of co-design between cité and ville as described above. Alignment through partnerships is essential in governance structures such as in Australia where none of the three levels of government – federal, state, and local – covers the geography of the metropolis. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that the economic geography of global cit-
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ies is metropolitan and is not aligned with any one level of governance. It is therefore essential that partnership structures that create a level of metropolitan governance are established. Such partnerships need to integrate their operations to enable partnerships to be effective.

A broadened process

As noted above, economic models narrow the focus of city-making by limiting the variables of complex infrastructure planning in particular. In this regard the consideration of ‘city-shaping’ infrastructure needs to be reimagined; broadened as well as aligned. A sustainable city requires the integration of green, transport, and social infrastructures including evaluating the three as part of the same business case with equal weighting. Without broadening the cost–benefit analysis, a transport focussed business case in isolation will seek to maximise rail patronage via higher density to improve the project’s cost benefit. Such a density analysed more broadly may find that the built form exacerbates urban heat island, reduces the diversity of dwelling types, and thus reduces the opportunity to offer a range of potential price points. A broader analysis may well result in a significantly better outcome.

Conclusion

The Japanese city case studies demonstrate that infrastructure itself is not sufficient to deliver a liveable city. There is an opportunity to learn from this and consider how both the three infrastructures and ‘fine-grain’ fabric can be delivered to create productive and liveable new places for communities over time to develop both a cité and a ville. The context and evaluation criteria within which infrastructure and other business cases are developed, evaluated, and prioritised must therefore be broadened, recognising green infrastructure as of equal importance with transport and social infrastructure. Working iteratively at the fine grain concurrently, a walkable public-domain framework can be considered as much a ‘shaper of city’ as the larger-scaled metropolitan infrastructures.

References

Further reading in this volume

Chapter 2: Placemaking as an economic engine for all
James F. Lima and Andrew J. Jones
Preface: ‘Disastrous forces, accidental actions, and grassroots responses’
Tom Borrup
Chapter 9: From the dust of bad stars: disaster, resilience, and placemaking in Little Tokyo
Jonathan Jae-an Crisman
Chapter 13: Sensing our streets: involving children in making people-centred smart cities
Sean Peacock, Aare Puussaar, and Clara Crivellaro
Chapter 15: Un/safety as placemaking: disabled people’s socio-spatial negotiation of fear of violent crime
Claire Edwards
Chapter 19: Placemaking in the ecology of the human habitat
Graham Marshall
Chapter 20: Displacemaking 2015 and 2020
Catherine Fennell and Daniel Tucker
Chapter 24: Artists, creativity, and the heart of city planning
Tom Borrup
Chapter 28: Integral placemaking: A poiesis of sophrosynes?
Ian Wight
Preface: Evaluating creative placemaking: a collection of observations, reflections, findings, and recommendations
Maria Rosario Jackson
Chapter 42: Creative placemaking and placekeeping evaluation challenges from the practitioner perspective: an interview with Roy Chan
Maria Rosario Jackson
Chapter 45: How the city speaks to us and how we speak back: rewriting the relationship between people and place
Rosanna Vitillo and Marcus Willcocks