

**AESOP**

*thematic group*

**Ethics, Values & Planning**

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

# Operationalizing the Just City

*24-25 February 2022 (online)*



## **Organisers**

Dr. Stefano Cozzolino [ILS – Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development](#)

Dr. Arend Jonkman [Delft University of Technology](#)

## **With the support of**

ILS – Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development (Dortmund)

AESOP - Association of European Schools of Planning

## **Contacts**

[stefano.cozzolino@ils-research.de](mailto:stefano.cozzolino@ils-research.de)

[A.R.Jonkman@tudelft.nl](mailto:A.R.Jonkman@tudelft.nl)

## **Index**

Participants

Conference programme and Zoom-link

Sessions and presentations

Abstracts

In the past decade or so, the positive and negative side effects of the [urban triumph](#) have become increasingly discussed in the literature. Negative effects include [inequality](#), [polarisation](#), [segregation](#), [gentrification](#) and unaffordable urban [housing](#), for example. In response, pledges for the advancement of more [inclusive](#), [accessible](#), [liveable](#), or socially [sustainable](#) cities have been put forward, commonly discussed under the umbrella of [the Just City](#). What that entails, what this concept practically implies, often remains vague and poorly articulated. Moreover, although at a first glance everybody agrees with having a more just city, [different ideas and concepts of justice](#) – and so of ‘the just city’ – exist. Nevertheless, the question of what a just city is cannot be evaded, as its answer has great implications for the implementation of [urban policies](#) and [planning interventions](#).

In this conference we want ‘to get our hands dirty’ and try to genuinely operationalise the concept. In fact, at a superficial level everyone wants a ‘just city’, but once we make explicit what that means, the differences that exist and the difficult [ethical choices](#) that need to be made might become apparent and sometimes even permeated by deeply [contrasting views](#). We believe that this approach will favour a more [honest discussion](#) and, in the end, the development of more aware, effective and legitimate policy-making choices.

With this call, contributions applying the concept of the just city in empirical research and contributions providing reflections on the following issues are welcomed:

- How to apply different theories/ideas of justice and the just city?
- Which theory/idea of justice is legitimate to apply in a specific situation and why?
- Which goods, capabilities, distributive rules and so on, to apply and in which circumstances?
- How are different dimensions of the just city (e.g., distribution, democracy, recognition) related?
- What indicators and measures to use for the valuation of justice and its different dimensions?
- How does a just city relate to other values (e.g., kindness, dignity, equality, freedom)?

More specifically, we are searching for contributions that put into [practice](#) this abstract concept by emphasising its concrete social, spatial and political implications. We expect to collect contributions that provide [empirical explanations](#) and, at the same time, relevant [general reflections](#).

## Participants

Alfasi Nurit - Ben-Gurion University of the Negev  
Altamore Sara - La Sapienza University of Rome  
Alvandipour Nina - University of Central Florida  
Ariani Camilla – Independent Researcher  
Artmann Martina - IOER -Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development  
Claudia Basta - PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency  
Bryer Thomas - University of Central Florida  
Camerin Federico - Universidad UVA de Valladolid and Universidad UPM de Madrid-GIAU+S  
Certomà Chiara - Ghent University  
Cohen Nevin - City University of New York  
Cozzolino Stefano - ILS - Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development  
Davy Ben - University of Johannesburg  
Efrat Eizenberg - The Technion, Israel Institute of Technology  
De Franco Anita - Polytechnic University of Milan  
De Leo Daniela - La Sapienza University of Rome  
Gawryszewska Beata Joanna - Warsaw University of Life Sciences  
Harms Philip - IOER -Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development  
Hartmann Thomas - TU Dortmund University  
Hendawy Mennatullah - TU Berlin/ UMASS Amherst/ Ain shams university  
Hoch Charles - University of Illinois at Chicago  
Janssen Céline - Delft University of Technology  
Jehling Mathias - IOER - Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development  
Jonkman Arend - Delft University of Technology  
Katsavounidou Garyfallia - Aristotle University of Thessaloniki  
Killingier Mabel - IOER -Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development  
Kimhur Boram - Delft University of Technology  
Kohdrata Naniek - Udayana University  
Krisnandika Anak Agung Keswari - Udayana University  
Mady Christine - Notre Dame University  
Mlotshwa Khanyile - University of KwaZulu Natal  
Moroni Stefano - Polytechnic University of Milan  
Müller Susanne - IOER -Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development  
Ng Mee Kam - The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
Privitera Elisa - University of Catania  
Rauws Ward – University of Groningen  
Rocco Roberto - Delft University of Technology  
Rot Claudia - Wageningen University and Research  
Savaya Yael - Ben-Gurion University of the Negev  
Schmitt Peter - Stockholm University  
Sezer Ceren - RWTH Aachen University  
Sondermann Martin - ARL – Academy for Territorial Development in the Leibniz Association  
Thaler Thomas - University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences  
van Lanen Sander - University of Groningen  
van Leeuwen Bart - Radboud University  
Vanoutrive Thomas - University of Antwerp  
Vidyarathi Sanjeev - University of Illinois at Chicago  
Weck Sabine - ILS - Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development  
Weghorst Max - Utrecht University  
Wong Hilary - The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
Youness Achmani - University of Tours

# Conference programme and Zoom-link (Central European Time)

	Thursday, February 24	Friday, February 25
9.30		
10.00		Session 5 (9.30 – 11.00)
10.30	Opening (10.00 – 10.30)	
11.00	Session 1 (10.30 – 12.00)	
11.30		
12.00		Session 6 (11.30 – 13.00)
12.30		
13.00		
13.30	Session 2 (13.00 – 15.00)	
14.00		
14.30		Session 7 (14.00 – 15.15)
15.00		
15.30	Session 3 (15.15 – 16.45)	
16.00		
16.30		Session 8 (15.30 – 17.30)
17.00		
17.30	Session 4 (17.00 – 18.15)	
18.00		Closing
18.30		
19.00		
19.30		
20.00		
20.30		
21.00		
21.30		
22.30		

## Sessions and presentations (Central European Time)

### Day 1 - Thursday, February 24

#### Session 1 (10.30 – 12.00)

Moderator: Ward Rauws (University of Groningen)

- [What can we really learn from Rawls? Still on the road towards theorizing the just city](#)  
Stefano Moroni (Polytechnic University of Milan)
- [What is wrong with displacement? On the limits of moral monism](#)  
Bart van Leeuwen (Radboud University)
- [Urban social reproduction: a new perspective on the requirements of just cities](#)  
Sander van Lanen (University of Groningen)
- [A scoping review of practical and scholarly implications of the Just City: a pilot study](#)  
Nina Alvandipour (University of Central Florida) – Thomas Bryer (University of Central Florida)

#### Session 2 (13.00 – 15.00)

Moderator: Ceren Sezer (RWTH Aachen University)

- [Approaching spatial justice in practice: a European comparative perspective on the relationship between \(un\)just processes and \(un\)just outcomes in local development actions](#)  
Sabine Weck (ILS - Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development) – Peter Schmitt (Stockholm University)
- [Just Infrastructure - Scenarios of Contradictions and Interferences](#)  
Mathias Jehling (IOER - Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development) – Thomas Hartmann (TU Dortmund University)
- [Urban Planning Standards and Guidelines: Just Implementation?](#)  
Mee Kam Ng - Hilary Wong (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
- [An action-oriented framework to work on the just city](#)  
Max Weghorst (Utrecht University - PhD candidate)
- [Expanding the boundaries of food policy: The turn to equity in New York City](#)  
Nevin Cohen (City University of New York)

#### Session 3 (15.15 – 16.45)

Moderator: Arend Jonkman (Delft University of Technology)

- [Comparing conceptions of dignity, planning and the common good](#)  
Charles Hoch – Sanjeev Vidyarthi (University of Illinois at Chicago)
- [Contrasting organized crime for the just city. Not only a legal but also a social justice issue](#)  
Anita De Franco (Polytechnic University of Milan)
- [Social justice or historical justice? What just city in post-apartheid South Africa?](#)  
Khanyile Mlotshwa (University of KwaZulu Natal)
- [The 'small data' for making 'the just cities'. Reflections from the case of a Sicilian petrochemical town](#)  
Elisa Privitera (University of Catania)

## Session 4 (17.00 – 18.15)

Moderator: Kathrin Specht (ILS – Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development)

- [From mute to resonating human-nature relations for just cities and beyond](#)  
Martina Artmann - Philip Harms - Mabel Killinger - Susanne Müller (IOER -Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development)
- [Between justice theory and physical realities: urban gardening and cultures of spatial planning](#)  
Martin Sondermann (ARL – Academy for Territorial Development in the Leibniz Association) - Chiara Certomà (University of Turin)
- [Is it sacred? Informal greenery as a focal point for experiencing nature. Case studies of Warsaw \(Poland\) and Tabanan, Bali \(Indonesia\)](#)  
Beata Joanna Gawryszewska (Warsaw University of Life Sciences) - Naniek Kohdrata (Udayana University) - Anak Agung Keswari Krisnandika (Udayana University)

## Day 2 - Friday, February 25

### Session 5 (9.30 – 11.00)

Moderator: to be defined

- [In search of tools to reduce spatial injustice within the urban project](#)  
Camilla Ariani - Daniela De Leo (La Sapienza University of Rome)
- [\(Re\)questioning the City's concept to implement the ideas and practices of justice](#)  
Achmani Youness (University of Tours) - Sara Altamore - Daniela De Leo (La Sapienza University of Rome)
- [Are good intentions enough? Evaluating social sustainability goals in urban development projects through the Capability Approach](#)  
Céline Janssen (Delft University of Technology) - Claudia Basta (scientist at PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency)
- [The commodification of public real estate assets. The privatisation of former military land in Spain between 1984 and 2021](#)  
Federico Camerin (Universidad UVA de Valladolid and Universidad UPM de Madrid-GIAU+S)

### Session 6 (11.30 – 13.00)

Moderator: Roberto Rocco (Delft University of Technology)

- [Lessons from struggles: an analytical reflection on three studies for operationalizing the just city](#)  
Arend Jonkman - Boram Kimhur - Céline Janssen (Delft University of Technology)
- [Operationalizing the capability approach to assessing housing inequality: The measurement of multidimensional disadvantages in the housing process](#)  
Boram Kimhur (Delft University of Technology)
- [Adaptability, Responsibility and Care: operationalizing just planning](#)  
Yael Savaya – Nurit Alfasi (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
- [Kindness in planning and the need for explicit reflection](#)  
Vanoutrive Thomas (University of Antwerp)

## Session 7 (14.00 – 15.15)

Moderator: Claudia Basta (PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency)

- [Capacity building on spatial justice through public space provision: the UN-Habitat and NAHNOO in Lebanon](#)  
Christine Mady (Notre Dame University) - Ceren Sezer (RWTH Aachen University)
- [Towards a fair-shared city: Questioning the socio-spatial marginalization of children and teens in public spaces](#)  
Garyfallia Katsavounidou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)
- [Serious Gaming as a Method to Facilitate Just Planning Under Pressure](#)  
Claudia Rot (Wageningen University and Research)

## Session 8 (15.30 – 17.30)

Moderator: Arend Jonkman (Delft University of Technology)

- [Access to green, but the result is green gentrification: how we can avoid negative trade-offs within a just city idea](#)  
Thomas Thaler (University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences)
- [Do human animals in the just city kill and eat non-human animals? Revisiting the curious neglect of Rawls' theory of justice for "animals and the rest of nature"](#)  
Ben Davy (University of Johannesburg)
- [Spatio-visual \(In\)justice](#)  
Mennatullah Hendawy (TU Berlin/ UMASS Amherst/ Ain shams university)
- [Planning for recognition](#)  
Eizenberg Efrat (The Technion, Israel Institute of Technology)
- [A crisis of lost values: rediscovering the relationship between urban beauty and democracy](#)  
Stefano Cozzolino (ILS - Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development)



## Abstracts

### SESSION 1

Thursday, February 24 - 10.30-12.00 (CET)

Moderator: Ward Rauws (University of Groningen)

#### **What can we really learn from Rawls? Still on the road towards theorizing the just city**

Stefano Moroni (Polytechnic University of Milan)

In planning theory, many seem to think that clear and coherent theories of the 'just city' have already been developed. Therefore, the only real problem is how to operationalise these theories, that is, how to make them practicable. A corollary of this position is often the idea that scholars should abandon too abstract discourses on justice and take the courage to 'jump right in', to 'get their hands dirty'.

This paper highlights instead that there are still theoretical misunderstandings that should be thoroughly discussed. Once certain aspects have been clarified, operationalising certain positions will not present any particular problem. In other words, abstract discourses on questions of justice are not impracticable in themselves. Impracticability is due more to theoretical confusion than to abstractness.

The paper discusses this issue by considering the often inadequate way in which the Rawlsian theory of justice has been imported into planning. The objective is not only to critically revisit the planning approaches inspired by Rawls but also to discuss in more general terms what role a theory of justice could and should have for urban policies and plans.

#### **What is wrong with displacement? On the limits of moral monism**

Bart van Leeuwen (Radboud University)

Gentrification is the process of neighborhood change caused by the influx of relatively affluent residents accompanied by rising rents and prices of real-estate, often displacement of lower-income groups, and a general transformation of the built environment. Although gentrification has generated a vast body of social-scientific literature concerning its causes and effects, by contrast, there is surprisingly little work on the moral aspects of this growing phenomenon in our cities today. Yet a number of recent interventions do argue that physical displacement of inhabitants as a result of gentrification ought to be morally rejected. Although I agree with this conclusion, I disagree with the key arguments used that are all based on the moral principle of personal autonomy broadly conceived: displacement violates the option to exercise "place-based" or "located life plans" (see bibliography). The particular aspects of the neighborhood are seen as a necessary background for place-based activities of local citizens. So forced resettlement to another neighborhood threatens to cut people off from the context of choice that provides meaningful options to them. Hence it undermines a necessary means to the exercise of autonomy. I will argue that this attempt to morally value social attachments as means to exercise choice is unconvincing because it instrumentalizes social attachments instead of recognizing their intrinsic significance for those concerned. It is a new manifestation of an old tendency, namely to reduce all of our moral commitments to one and only one moral principle: personal autonomy and its social and cultural preconditions. The paper argues that this moral monism in the end is unconvincing, activist, unnecessary and subject to moral risk for the reason that instruments by definition are replaceable. Instead, I will defend a moral pluralistic approach by arguing that arbitrary displacement is morally wrong because it violates respect for social attachments.

**Urban social reproduction: a new perspective on the requirements of just cities**

Sander van Lanen (University of Groningen)

Conceptualisations of the just city often focus on the distribution of resources and services. Therefore, urban scholars have widely studied the material and immaterial consequences of urban income inequality, including the inaccessibility of adequate housing, healthy food availability, and stress resulting from life in deprived neighbourhoods. However, urban scholars have thus far not studied dynamics like urban exclusion and marginalisation from the perspective of the organisation of such vital needs by inhabitants. To fill this gap, this paper proposes using social reproduction theory in conceptualisations of the just city. Social reproduction entails the practices, responsibilities and relationships that make life possible on a daily and intergenerational basis. Starting from social reproductive needs rather than their material satisfaction provides a novel approach to identify what is lacking in unjust cities and what is required to create just cities. Social reproduction is often satisfied through a combination of paid and unpaid activities. For example, while income from work and (in)formal economic activities affords rent and food purchases, the preparation of food and cleaning the house often remain unpaid. Therefore, this paper proposes to investigate the practices and power relations that emerge where production and reproduction meet. It thus proposes that urban social reproduction, satisfied through unpaid and paid work, can reveal new understandings of urban lives, spaces and dynamics. Studying cities from a social reproduction perspective opens up new avenues to understand and encourage just cities beyond income distribution and formal economic participation. Such a framework can enable novel ideas to create just cities beyond traditional means of fighting inequality, which are already under pressure from automation, digitalisation, and labour market precarisation.

**A scoping review of practical and scholarly implications of the Just City: a pilot study**

Nina Alvandipour (University of Central Florida) - Thomas Bryer (University of Central Florida)

The idea of the Just City is a critical notion that has received a lot of attention in both theory and practice in the field of Urban Studies concerning the concept's definition, conceptualization, and antecedents. But in spite of that, mainly during the past few years, we have seen critiques regarding the very few academic endeavors in operationalizing this concept in comparison to well-developed and measurable notions such as spatial equality or territorial justice in urban and regional theory. In this article, we conduct a scoping review of the scholarly literature on the idea of the Just City to synthesize and discuss the practical implications of this critical concept in urban policy and governance. We review and classify both conceptual and empirical articles that address the idea of the Just City -and its related notions such as spatial justice- in practice to build a roadmap (conceptual framework) of strategies, urban policies, and specific planning interventions. The review will include peer-reviewed journal articles in the English language that have been published from 2000 to 2019 in databases such as Scopus, ScienceDirect, Sage, Wiley, and Taylor & Francis. We conclude by discussing the implications of the findings and outlining areas for future inquiry concerning urban policy and governance.

## SESSION 2

Thursday, February 24 - 13.00-14.45 (CET)

**Moderator:** Ceren Sezer (RWTH Aachen University)

### **Approaching spatial justice in practice: a European comparative perspective on the relationship between (un)just processes and (un)just outcomes in local development actions**

Sabine Weck (ILS - Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development) – Peter Schmitt (Stockholm University)

The notion of spatial justice embraces two dimensions: processes and outcomes, which are inevitably interrelated (e.g. Mandanipour et al. 2021, Soja 2009), but often dealt with separately (Uitermark and Nicholls 2017). This paper discusses findings from more than twenty local case studies that stem from a EU Horizon 2020 project, which analysed how spatial justice is achieved in practice across Europe. We identify and discuss generic types of procedural promoters and inhibitors that became evident in the governance of local development action and set these in context with the achieved outcomes regarding their redistributive qualities and the recognition of interests of diverse and so far little represented groups in the local decision-making processes. We propose indicators and measures to use for the valuation of justice in local development actions and its different dimensions: processes and outcomes. More specifically, we distil the factors and filters that enhance or limit local abilities to articulate needs and to realise concrete outcomes. Moreover, we identify promoters and inhibitors regarding the local capacities for exploiting the opportunities given by the action and the eventually induced policy changes across places and time. We then test the hypothesis in how far 'fair' procedures and mechanisms are key for a (more) just distribution of resources and opportunities. In conclusion, we discuss from a European perspective policy failure, lessons and prospects in approaching spatial justice in practice.

### **Just Infrastructure - Scenarios of Contradictions and Interferences**

Mathias Jehling (IOER - Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development) – Thomas Hartmann (TU Dortmund University)

Spatial infrastructures, such as the road network, the railway network, or educational institutions, create a basis for everyday life in cities and its surroundings. When deciding where and in what dimensions infrastructures are to be created, some areas profit, and others are not encouraged or even restricted in their development. The decision-making as to where public funds should be used for the expansion of the infrastructure is coordinated by spatial planning. Consequently, it can be said that planning makes some people poorer and others richer. This leads to conflicts and the fundamental question of how just allocation of infrastructure looks like. This question is inherently normative and political. Different actors, decision-makers and parties have different answers to this question. This contribution illustrates the contradictions and interferences resulting from plural understandings of justice, using three contrasting scenarios. These scenarios ought to help you deal more effectively with competing standards of justice in practice. For this purpose, various concepts of justice are compared with in a geo-spatial model based on infrastructure expansion in a thought experiment using a real case as baseline. The starting point for this - for illustration purposes only - is the expansion of the light rail network in the area surrounding the city of Karlsruhe. Ultimately, the contribution aims at the central societal challenge of considering incompatible, contradicting ethical principles in planning decision-making processes, and bringing them together into a coordinated and coherent spatial development.

### **Urban Planning Standards and Guidelines: Just Implementation?**

Mee Kam Ng - Hilary Wong (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)

According to Aristotle, 'All virtue is summed up in dealing justly... you become just by performing just actions'. This quote implies that justice has to be a collective endeavour to do things 'justly' so that a virtuous society can be achieved. To build a just city, a virtuous one, for everyone, procedural justice is required. Rawls (1971) defines justice as distributive justice, about allocating tangible and intangible things in such a way that socio-economic inequalities should not be permitted unless they work favourably for the least well-off members of society. Since planning standards and guidelines are instrumental in implementing or operationalising an urban plan, this paper attempts to review the formulation, revision and contents of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) with reference to the concepts of procedural and distributive justice. The paper attempts to examine if the formulation of the HKPSG has involved all relevant stakeholders and whether its formulation and revision follow the principle of procedural justice. It will also selectively review chapters that determine the urban form and evaluate if the HKPSG helps distribute environmental qualities fairly across the city.

### **An action-oriented framework to work on the just city**

Max Weghorst (Utrecht University - PhD candidate)

The main focus of the 'just city' discussion in planning theory is currently on the formulation and operationalization of different substantive conceptions of justice for application to urban contexts. Defining and operationalizing the 'just city' is, however, not sufficient for making justice actionable for (individual and collective) actors in the planning process. To solidify substantive conceptions of justice into actual just planning outcomes, actors need to know what concrete planning actions (i.e. instruments and activities) can and sometimes should be employed to this end. In this paper I set out to develop a framework that connects substantive conceptions of justice to specific planning actions. Its purpose is to help actors in the city planning process to determine what range of concrete planning actions they can and sometimes should employ to promote (the desired conception of) justice, and why, when and how they can and sometimes should employ them. Different substantive conceptions of justice might require different sets and/or timing of planning actions. To explore this difference, the framework starts from four general categories of substantive conceptions of the 'just city' proposed by Edwin Buitelaar: the prosperous city, the egalitarian city, the providing city, and the free city. The framework describes for these four conceptions 1) what planning actions can be employed for converting them into just planning outcomes 2) how these actions can influence the solution space – defined as the changing space that contains all the available real options for action, or pathways, leading towards the eventual planning outcome, 3) at which specific moments/windows of opportunity in the planning process these actions can be employed to be effective, and 4) what are the necessary minimal considerations to take into account for being able to employ these actions justly and effectively.

### **Expanding the boundaries of food policy: The turn to equity in New York City**

Nevin Cohen (City University of New York)

Policymakers acknowledge that the food system is multidimensional and that social determinants affect diet-related health outcomes, yet cities have emphasized programs and policies narrowly connected to food access and nutritional health. Over the past fifteen years, the boundaries of food governance have expanded to include a wider range of issues and domains not previously considered within the purview of food policy, like labor, housing, and education policies. This presentation illustrates how this shift occurs by presenting the case of New York City, which has broadened its food governance to a larger set of issues, requiring cross-sectoral initiatives that have led to a more expansive notion of food policy. This shift has resulted from an increased political salience of income inequality and poverty, and a change in municipal leadership that led

to a greater emphasis on equity and social justice. Efforts to address equity affected the food system, and in turn led to diverse policies that have expanded the boundaries of food policy. The paper traces this evolution and outlines the implications of these findings for food governance and future urban food policy development and research.

## SESSION 3

Thursday, February 24 - 15.15-16.45 (CET)

**Moderator:** Arend Jonkman (Delft University of Technology)

### **Comparing conceptions of dignity, planning and the common good**

Charles Hoch – Sanjeev Vidyarthi (University of Illinois at Chicago)

In the United States, racist beliefs and practices spawn forms of humiliation that deny African Americans human dignity. The Black Lives Matter movement, for example, focuses on the lack of dignity inspiring wider recognition of these undeserved humiliations. This presentation will focus on illustrating how the moral damage of humiliation offers a compelling basis for solidarity. Dignity is a concept we apply to comprehend how people seek to obtain freedom for self-expression and accomplishment in a world comprising conflicting forms of cultural belief, moral custom, and disparate modes of governance.

We draw comparisons between the insights offered by Mick Lennon (2021) and our pragmatist approach to explore complementary and contrasting theoretical conceptions of planning practice sensitive to the demands of virtue in the face of conflicting norms. For instance, both might agree that bravery expresses a virtue that we employ as we resist the imposition of the will of another. We retain our dignity by fighting back even if victory seems remote. Dignity is not something we possess, but something we accomplish within a particular community facing a specific situation. However, bravery cannot reconcile different and often competing conceptions of dignity. Lennon proposes that planners rely upon the traditions of moral practice finely attuned to the complexity of each situation. Real moral value flows from reflective planning practice within an emergent tradition. The pragmatist calls for planners to build common ground exploring and adjusting these differences using democratic forms of practical inquiry and experimentation conceiving a common good. New forms of solidarity generate the context for the possibility and feasibility of a shared moral reality.

### **Contrasting organized crime for the just city. Not only a legal but also a social justice issue**

Anita De Franco (Polytechnic University of Milan)

This paper discusses the problem of organized crime and its impacts on city dynamics. We could say that a “just city” is, among other things, a city free from organized crime that has a destructive effect on local business. To do this, it is necessary to counteract the control exercised by these organizations through solid support for the activities undertaken by citizens. Specifically, we will focus on the role of the entrepreneur, as the subject most oppressed by organized crime but also – and above all – as the pivot of possible local vitality and development. The basic idea is that, in order to fight organized crime, institutions must guarantee protection and stimulus to local entrepreneurship to effectively resist to organized crime. This view may integrate the typical practice of public interventions that devote huge resources mainly on directly eradicating organized crime. As we will try to show, fighting organized crime is, therefore, not only a question of “legal justice” but also of “social justice”.

### **Social justice or historical justice? What just city in post-apartheid South Africa?**

Khanyile Mlotshwa (University of KwaZulu Natal)

Recent local government elections in South Africa have revealed competing visions of a just city in postapartheid South Africa. While for established parties like the ruling African National Congress (ANC) and the official opposition Democratic Alliance (DA), social justice as encapsulated in efficient service delivery is seen as a step towards a just city; the emergence of independent and residents driven political movements revealed that for the grassroots, social justice is not enough. These emerging movements, together with youth driven parties like the Economic Freedom Front

(EFF) seem to prefer historical justice as encapsulated in the question of land reform as the panacea to building just cities. This is because for most ordinary citizens of South Africa, the nation equaled liberation in that it equaled the return of the land and their access to housing and other services that they expect from the state. This contribution positions itself in the debates on the nature of justice that South Africa desires to build just cities. It takes off from the debates around the land questions as implicated in the urban question. The main contest in the struggle over the land issue is the struggle over social justice and historical justice. Social justice concerns those issues that arise “when decisions affect the distribution of benefits and burdens between different individuals of groups” (Clayton and Williams, 2004: 1). Clayton and Williams (2004) argue that the roots of social justice are in the work of those philosophers that have dominated the study of political philosophy including Rawls. Miller (1999) notes that social justice has become central to politics in “modern democracies” although it is not all clear what its definition is (1999: ix). For Madlingozi (2017) social justice is implicated in the continued exclusion of black subjects at a time he terms “the time of neo-apartheid constitutionalism” and critical justice emerges out of a close understanding “the lived experiences of South Africa’s socially excluded and racially discriminated” (2017: 123). By closely studying the discourses that emerged in the 1 November 2021 local government elections in South Africa, this contribution seeks to answer the two questions. First, it asks if a city where people have access to all the services without owning the land on which their houses stand can be regarded as a just city. Second, the question is whether it is possible for residents to have access to all the services and justice in the city without owning the houses and land they live on.

### **The ‘small data’ for making ‘the just cities’. Reflections from the case of a Sicilian petrochemical town**

Elisa Privitera (University of Catania)

There is a rich debate regarding the search for a normative justice theory in which public institutions are the true subject of social justice.

While I agree on the relevance of institutions in reaching a more “just city”, I believe that a few critical points may be further expanded. First, to consider institutions as the paradigmatic subject of social may jeopardize the recognizing of the citizens’ efforts in self-organizing for experimenting with alternative just solutions. This weakness is even more patent in all those distressed contexts, in which institutions are often weak or even the main injustice perpetrators. Second, the “just city” theorization mostly disregards the relation between justice and the environment.

My contribution aims to navigate these two critical points with the case of Gela (Sicily). Suddenly converted in the 1960s into one of the main Italian petrochemical poles due to a top-down national policy, over time Gela became quite notorious both for its high level of environmental contamination and for the presence of illegality even (and above all) into the institutions. In brief, Gela seems to be the quintessential example of the “unjust city”.

My ongoing research in Gela seeks to demonstrate how an approach I named “small slow street” is able to catch all a series of small data that are “the ensemble of information – we would prefer to call it “stories” – embodied into the texture of life of human and non-human communities”. Small data are discrete, specific, and personal, and arise through emotional and sensorial experience. A “small slow street approach” entails an ethic positioning of the planner prone to collect small data in order to unveil memories of injustice, to recognize, map, and valorize local knowledge of the most affected communities, to envision a more just city starting from the already existing insurgent practices.

## SESSION 4

Thursday, February 24 - 17.15-18.30 (CET)

**Moderator:** Kathrin Specht (ILS – Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development)

### **From mute to resonating human-nature relations for just cities and beyond**

Martina Artmann - Philip Harms - Mabel Killinger - Susanne Müller (IOER -Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development)

Despite an increasing awareness by Western countries that the intensifying social-ecological crisis is harming human life on Earth, current collective and individual responses are still failing for a significant turn-around. In this talk it is argued that a root cause for today's social-ecological crisis are mute non-affective human-nature relations hindering the establishment of human-nature resonance for sustainability transformation. Due to the physical and mental distance to nonhuman nature, consequences of the global crisis such as biodiversity loss, resource depletion, climate change and social injustice are merely getting visible in the everyday life of urban Western populations, although this is slightly changing in terms of extreme weather events. However, in material terms Western urban societies are hardly externally affected by the finiteness of nature's resources. This material alienation is a result of complex and distant worldwide supply chains having ethical implications for global justice. Thus, material mute human-nature relations foster the exploitation of social and ecological resources of distant places to secure a high living standard in Western cities and beyond. To overcome the external distance, it needs internal relational capacities such as empathy, compassion and solidarity to foster material self-limitation as crucial quality for a good life. In this regard, the talk will discuss the role of worldviews and values of non-human nature for fostering resonating human-nature relations. Thus, for human-nature resonance it will need a shift from considering nonhuman nature as soulless object holding only instrumental values to a sentient and intelligent subject of intrinsic value having the right to flourish in an urban human-nature partnership. In the end of the presentation, potential strategies for fostering human-nature resonance in urban development will be discussed by focusing on urban human-food relations, rituals for urban residents to strengthen spiritual human-nature connection and acknowledging nonhuman nature legal personhood in urban planning.

### **Between justice theory and physical realities: urban gardening and cultures of spatial planning**

Martin Sondermann (ARL – Academy for Territorial Development in the Leibniz Association) - Chiara Certomà (University of Turin)

Urban gardening projects are considered as valuable contributions to sustainable urban development as they have diverse functions. But to what extent do they contribute to spatial justice – or even to new injustices? Urban gardening practices are considered as part of a wider cultural change moving towards more just spatial development as they are bottom-up initiatives which address spatial (in)justices, challenge top-down planning approaches and increase the plurality of actors in spatial development (Certomà/Martellozzo 2019; Certomà/Tornaghi 2019). As gardening activists state: "Inequalities, impoverishment, marginalization, disintegration and exclusion generate socio-spatial injustices in the city, but also call for experimenting new forms of collective aggregation and recognition. From a simple leisure activity, urban gardening takes on a political dimension because it can express forms of contrast and resistance to widespread social injustices and environmental degradation" (Certomà/Sondermann/Noori 2019). Nevertheless, urban gardening projects "have evident limitations, contradictions and ambivalence with regard to justice" (Certomà/Sondermann/Noori 2019): Focusing on urban gardening activities thereby helps to reveal why aiming for social and spatial justice is such a struggle: who benefits from an urban gardening project and who does not? What other uses of space are impeded by urban gardening? Such questions are considered from a cultural perspective on spatial planning: Spaces – in



accordance with prevailing norms and values – are socially produced and charged with meanings: “Orientations of planning towards the common good and spatial justice correspond to certain planning laws, instruments, and procedures, which in their application then influence the use and design of spaces” (Sondermann 2017, translated). Thereby physical artefacts (such as fences as symbols of exclusion) are considered relational to planning practices, action guiding mindsets and institutional scopes for action. The aim of this presentation is to bridge a gap between theoretical justice concepts, planning practices and physical realities.

**Is it sacred? Informal greenery as a focal point for experiencing nature. Case studies of Warsaw (Poland) and Tabanan, Bali (Indonesia)**

Beata Joanna Gawryszewska (Warsaw University of Life Sciences) - Naniek Kohdrata (Udayana University) - Anak Agung Keswari Krisnandika (Udayana University)

Paper draws attention to urban wastelands, perceived as a resilient and self-sustain nature in the era of Anthropocene (Gawryszewska et al. 2019). Furthermore, it has been proven that such areas are characterised by rich both natural and cultural values (Sikorski et al. 2021). Finally, the Wastelands are easily accessible handy green spaces, providing contact with nature and thus fulfilling the conditions of equitable access to public goods (Egoz, Makhzoumi, Mitchell 2016). The research deals with the problem of evaluating different way functioning areas of wastelands by drawing on the contemporary post-human theories of vernacular democracy (Miessen, Mouffe 2012), the new perspectives of human and non-human actors in the cityscape (Latour, 2010), and the theory of common goods (commons) (Mies, 2010). The research method is based on a comparative case study of two wastelands in Warsaw and Tabanan, based on behavioural mapping and interviews with users. Important for structuring space was also the theory of the vernacular arrangement of inhabited areas (Gawryszewska 2013, Suartica 2013). Historical studies of the studied sites completed the analysis, allowing for a better comparison of these sites' origins, purpose, and image. Although the way they are used considerably differs, the results confirm that the inhabitants consider the natural values of uncultivated land as unique spaces, in Indonesia explicitly called sacred. The procedure applied in this paper can be used for similar types of assessments in the domain of landscape architectures.

## Day 2 - Friday, February 25

### SESSION 5

Friday, February 25 - 9.30-11.00 (CET)

**Moderator:** to be defined

#### **In search of tools to reduce spatial injustice within the urban project**

Camilla Ariani - Daniela De Leo (La Sapienza University of Rome)

In the last thirty years, France urban projects have been considered good examples of promoting urban transformations through complex tools and integrated cohesion policies (Ariani, 2017a) rarely questioned by the perspectives of Just City (Fainstein, 2006). In this context, the presentation has the opportunity to discuss the reframing of the Île de Nantes case study (Ariani, 2017b; Ariani, Donvito, 2019) in order to analyse in deep the role of housing affordability (and social housing) in controlling and reducing negative effects of urban transformation in the spatial justice perspective.

The case study is an urban re-development intervention on a large area made by underused urban fringes, dismissed industrial districts and fragmented urbanized neighbourhoods. This flagship project, in the last 20 years, promoted a new approach to urban transformation (“fabriquer la ville autrement”) with a strong public rhetoric based on social cohesion, social mix and social innovation. The project is based on consensus building, integrated approach, multileveled relationships of a multiplicity of actors, and incremental strategies through time to enhance the area and therefore to make the city more attractive; besides this ambitious cohesion goals, the importance of designing public space and, most of all, besides the combination of housing affordability, participatory process and green and social housing, different forms of spatial injustices increased as by-product of the urban transformation (Ariani, De Leo, in printing). Thus, the authors’ hypothesis is that the case study as a whole offers an opportunity to find tools for operationalizing the concept of spatial justice by reconsidering such kinds of integrated projects and above all the different scenarios of housing affordability and social housing, and also by trying to find appropriate approaches and thresholds for better dealing with complex and polarized communities within the large-scale urban projects.

#### **(Re)questioning the City's concept to implement the ideas and practices of justice**

Achmani Youness (University of Tours) - Sara Altamore - Daniela De Leo (La Sapienza University of Rome)

As it has been noted, from one side «just process leads to just outcomes (...) and when the results are unjust, the importance is to evaluate the process deeply» (Fainstein, 2006); from the other one, «urban movements do have some transformative potential despite being limited to achieving change only at the level in which they are operating» (Fainstein, 2009). In this framework, our research work is located at the intersection between (1) the discussion on the Just City as a whole and (2) the deep analysis of punctual transformations according to spatial justice ideas and perspectives.

The Just City has been implemented to evaluate spatial justice through a set of criteria (equity, diversity, and democracy) and literature shows diverse concepts of City, from different approaches (economic, actors, urban planning, administration, etc.) and definitions (“city as a space to construct”, Nadia Arab, 2009). In light of that, processes, institutions, ideas of Justice, regulations of conflict among stakeholders, social movements’ choices, and capabilities are relevant to achieving justice in space. Nonetheless, small-scale design solutions in the urban spaces can be the “project translation” of those criteria and, therefore, contribute to reaching the Just City.

By comparing different case studies and experiences, we show in which way and to what extent punctual transformations could be used for translating the idea of Justice in urban planning practices. The case studies' selection and presentation will contribute to discussing the importance of punctual intervention processes to operationalize the Just City through small-scale urban design practices and projects.

The 2 different approaches merged here underline the importance of:

- punctual interventions processes to operationalize the idea of the Just City (at the city level);
- punctual interventions projects for operationalizing the Just City from the planners' perspectives (at the small scale).

According to this, we stress one of the quoted Fainstein's definitions above by saying that punctual operations on the space «do have some transformative potential despite being limited to achieving change only at the level in which they are operating» (ibid.), by posing questions about the relevance of scale.

### **Are good intentions enough? Evaluating social sustainability goals in urban development projects through the Capability Approach**

Céline Janssen (Delft University of Technology) - Claudia Basta (scientist at PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency)

While insights have grown over the recent decades that social sustainability is an interpretive concept that should be specified in specific contexts, literature has scarcely addressed the dilemmas that occur when it is interpreted and operationalized in urban planning practices. Sen's Capability Approach (CA) is a promising evaluative approach to social sustainability's operationalization because it shifts the focus from the availability of resources, that is currently dominant in urban planning practices, to the actual freedoms of inhabitants to make use of these resources. Therefore, in theory, the CA offers a comprehensive perspective on the various dimensions that the concept consists of, such as quality of life, collective well-being and individual well-being. The aim of this paper is to provide empirical evidence for applying the CA as an effective approach to evaluate social sustainability goals in urban practices by exploring what new insights about social sustainability it brings. Through a single case-study of a contemporary urban development project in Amsterdam, intended goals of urban professionals pertaining to social sustainability were juxtaposed to its outcomes perceived by individual inhabitants of the project. The results reveal urban functionings around social sustainability that inhabitants value, and conversion factors that they experience before actually achieving them. The results also show that the concept can be categorized in four types of urban functionings that have different levels of individual variety, interpretability, and plannability. The paper concludes that the CA has a novel, complementary value to social sustainability's evaluation because it unravels the specifics about the different dimensions of social sustainability, and spotlights the conflicts that occur between them when it is operationalized in practice.

### **The commodification of public real estate assets. The privatisation of former military land in Spain between 1984 and 2021**

Federico Camerin (Universidad UVA de Valladolid and Universidad UPM de Madrid-GIAU+S)

This paper examines the regeneration of former military sites in Spain as a valuable example of the tendency to commodify public assets to figure out two main dynamics that hinder the operationalisation of the 'Just City'. First, the evolution of the alienation policies of military sites from the late 20th century has followed the general trend of neoliberal restructuring of the public bodies, i.e. to wipe the public debt through the selling of these assets in the real estate market. Second, ancient military sites are high-consuming public land so they may boost relevant urban regeneration processes of deprived neighbourhoods and long-term local prosperity and well-being. Nevertheless, the alienation policies have searched for immediate economic benefits for central government and the military. These reasons underline the need to provide an update

examination of the Spanish case, which is apparently understudied in comparison with the emerging international research in the field of urban studies on the regeneration of former military sites, mostly in France, Italy and UK.

I provide a multidisciplinary approach on the basis of four sections. First, the international literature review on the regeneration of former military sites and the research gaps in terms of just city. Second, the categorisation of the Spanish legislation on the disposal of Defence assets from the mid-1980s until today to highlight the main regulatory mechanism for the alienation of military sites. Third, the analysis of the results of the alienation policies both in terms of financial gains and the new functions assigned to the former military land. Eventually, I propose a case study analysis on the current Chamberí and Campamento Urban Regeneration Operations carried out on the ashes of two former military sites in Madrid to compare their regeneration and understand whether they may provide the Just City features for a more inclusive, accessible, liveable, and socially sustainable city. This analysis relies on specific fieldwork, interviews and archival research carried out in Madrid during 2021.

## SESSION 6

Friday, February 25 – 11.30 – 13.00 (CET)

**Moderator:** Roberto Rocco (Delft University of Technology)

### **Lessons from struggles: an analytical reflection on three studies for operationalizing the just city**

Arend Jonkman - Boram Kimhur - Céline Janssen (Delft University of Technology)

In the recent decades, ideas of the just city have inspired numerous scholars in the urban field. When using the related theories and concepts for practical research, however, researchers soon face questions on how to operationalize such broad and abstract ideas. What methodological procedures should be followed? And how to make a study rigorous enough to avoid criticisms on its subjective value-laden choices? Many studies have explored application ideas, but often remain at incomplete answers to those questions. Although scholars gain many insights during the research process about specific challenges for operationalization and how these can be overcome, such insights are usually not shared with others. Accumulation of research experiences in social justice theory can improve our understanding of possible and necessary steps for operationalising the just city ideas. In this paper, we present an analytical reflection of our three different studies in which we applied the capability ideas of justice and distributive justice for researching housing justice and urban social sustainability. We carried a series of interactive dialogues and reflection assignments to jointly discover the critical steps, considerations and questions for operationalization. Our results show that there are seven constitutive elements to consider when designing an operationalization for social justice theories. Per element, we use our previous studies as cases to illustrate what normative choices we made with which justification methods. We show that all elements are subject to various value-laden choices that require justification, even while they sometimes look as technical choices. Based on our analytical review, we argue that the primary question regarding operationalization needs to focus on what to operationalize, rather than how to operationalize. The question of 'how' leads researchers to seek for an ideal formula, while methodologies of operationalization are formed differently depending on the research goals and purpose of using a justice theory.

### **Operationalizing the capability approach to assessing housing inequality: The measurement of multidimensional disadvantages in the housing process**

Boram Kimhur (Delft University of Technology)

In the just city discussion, applying the capability ideas of justice is relatively new. It is yet challenging to answer the question of how to transform its philosophical ideas into practical use for urban policy. With a focus on the housing domain, this paper presents an exploratory operationalization of the capability ideas for evaluating inequalities. The paper proposes a measurement approach that reflects the concerns about freedom of choice, among the multiple tenets of capability justice. It suggests analysing what conditions would constrain or expand a person's choices in the housing process, and measuring disadvantages in those conditions. Higher degrees of disadvantages in such conditions mean, a person faces more constraints in their housing decisions (i.e. having lower housing capability) and is more likely to be forced to choose a housing path they do not value. The kinds of conditions that affect the extent of housing choices and freedoms are undoubtedly multidimensional. For a case measurement, the paper defines their dimensions through theoretical reasoning, and designs indicators that conceptually best align to each dimension. Once the disadvantaged individuals are identified in each indicator, the information is aggregated to produce an index. Using the Netherlands data from the DNB Household Survey in 2017 and National Statistics, the paper illustrates how a measurement of multidimensional disadvantages in the housing process can be done, and what kind of policy implications we may gain from the measures. Results for the Netherlands show that this

measurement approach can contribute to improving understanding of housing inequality because it produces a different provincial performance ranking than the conventional measures of housing deprivations and inequality, and informs about who is more likely to be entrapped in the current housing situations at which degree. The paper concludes with implications for policy application and future research.

### **Adaptability, Responsibility and Care: operationalizing just planning**

Yael Savaya – Nurit Alfasi (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)

Urban environments are usually planned and built by a narrow class of stakeholders and professionals operating in hierarchical planning systems. These dynamics negate the city's perception as an organic entity, emerging from below, embodying the potential of interactions between actors and the display of creativity, diversity, and reciprocity. The image of the just city as a "model of spatial relations based on equity" (Fainstein, 2000, 451) leads us to integrate the theoretical frameworks of Complexity, Responsibility and Ethics of Care. To our claim, the combination of the three offers a triptych that complements a whole, with each component stressing a unique and necessary aspect of planning built environments.

Thus, complexity theory admits the importance of emergence, self-organization, open-ended system due to urban dynamics, which entails constant economic, cultural, and political change. The duration of the planning and building process and the various organizational states regarding ownership, use, and control of urban elements call for adding Akbar's (1988) responsibility model to this framework. Finally, we suggest adding to that mosaic Ethics of Care (Tronto, 1993), highlighting values such as attentiveness for needs and responsiveness to cultural, ethnic, and gender contexts. Ethics of Care acknowledges our born inter-subjectivity state and the reciprocity embedded in social entities such as families, neighborhoods, and cities.

The three theories are interwoven by principles of bottom-up, emergence, relation-based, and responsiveness dynamics. The combined outline provides a prism for evaluating the performance of planning cultures and a starting point for articulating the just planning framework.

### **Kindness in planning and the need for explicit reflection**

Vanoutrive Thomas (University of Antwerp)

A recent contribution in Planning Theory discussed kindness in planning, and the challenges related to empathy, responsibility, action and motivation. We agree that attempts to be kind and to help others can result in the stigmatising, shaming, and blaming of these others. Moreover, the one who attempts to help might emphasise the other's dependency. Concrete examples of such and similar risks can be found in particular in planning initiatives directed towards groups that are considered vulnerable. This lead to the conclusion that acts of kindness cannot be explicitly named as such. The reason is that explicitly stating that you performed a kind act will shift the focus to your virtue. Hence, being kind and making this explicit may end up in self-congratulatory arrogance. However, this conclusion seems to imply that an explicit reflection on the kindness of acts undermines the kind nature of an act. This contribution explores how explicit reflection on kind deeds is possible without being self-undermining. As a first step, plural subject theory is mobilised to ensure that an act of help is not seen as a transaction between two individuals but as something that results from a joint commitment. Such a commitment cannot be reduced to the sum of something situated at the individual level. Second, attention is paid to the role of reflection. It is argued that explicit reflection is needed to make kindness morally relevant. From this follows the hypothesis that kindness should be named in order to generate ethical reflection. Finally, the risks associated with attempts to be kind are discussed in light of this hypothesis.

## SESSION 7

Friday, February 25 – 14.00 -15.15 (CET)

**Moderator:** Claudia Basta (PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency)

### **Capacity building on spatial justice through public space provision: the UN-Habitat and NAHNOO in Lebanon**

Christine Mady (Notre Dame University) - Ceren Sezer (RWTH Aachen University)

The recent research has argued that spatial justice is practised through place-based approaches which support local communities to achieve their capacities and visions in their environment. Public spaces provide a ground to develop and test place-based strategies and provide empirical evidence to assess whether the urban processes have spatially just or unjust outcomes. Platforms, such as non-governmental organisations, which commit to public space provision by mobilising diverse communities, may potentially facilitate spatial justice. This paper develops a conceptual and analytical framework to assess to which extent non-governmental organisations can promote spatial justice through public space provision. It focuses on the work of an international and a local organisation, UN-Habitat and Nahnoo, in two public spaces projects in Beirut, Lebanon. Difference in international and local operations of the selected organisations have provided a rich study ground in an economically and socially conflicted context in Lebanon. Analysis in this paper consists of two thematic perspectives: the quality of public spaces and project realisation and post-implementation processes. The findings suggest that the local organisation achieves capacity building on spatial justice as its work is activism-oriented and closely embedded in local community networks. International organisation's work is rather limited in this aspect. Further case studies in various geographical and political contexts are necessary to test how widely the framework in this paper can be useful.

### **Towards a fair-shared city: Questioning the socio-spatial marginalization of children and teens in public spaces**

Garyfallia Katsavounidou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)

In 1989 the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN 1989) officially recognised children as users of the city, establishing their right to play, to gather and organize their own activities and to participate in the decision-making processes in all matters affecting them (Khan et al 2021). However, during past decades, there is a noticeable erosion of everyday freedoms of children living in cities, in terms of both their independent mobility –freedom to roam about in the vicinity of their homes– and affordances for play and gathering with peers, in open spaces outside the perimeter of the typical playground (Gill 2021).

Although the concept of fair-shared city is predominantly associated with gender mainstreaming in city planning and design (Roberts 2013), it is also used to operationalize the premise of a city that offers a fair share to everyone, that provides opportunities to all divergent user groups to be present and to enjoy public space (Sidorova et al 2016). In this paper I place the question of how to fairly include children and youth in cities in this wider context of fair-shared city, as a way of de-marginalising childhood from essentialist views and of subverting the notion of “children's spaces” as a separate category of public amenities. Strategic plans that promote urban children's wellbeing, urban planning interventions that ensure children can enjoy independent active mobility, and design practices that provide activities and opportunities for children and teens in public spaces outside the typical, often fenced, sports park or playground, are crucial components of designing just cities and an ethical obligation of planners and designers. The paper presents an overview of empirical cases of historic and recent strategies and practices that promote the rights of children and teens as equal citizens and users of the city.

## **Serious Gaming as a Method to Facilitate Just Planning Under Pressure**

Claudia Rot (Wageningen University and Research)

Land scarcity in a densely-populated country like the Netherlands confronts spatial planners with a crucial decision: for whom and what should the land use be, and how to ensure a more “just” distribution of burdens and benefits? This leads to the following research question: How can justice be expressed and used more deliberately in spatial planning processes and outcomes? Currently, spatial planning for the renewable energy transition faces such dilemmas. To fulfil the so-called Dutch Regional Energy Strategies (RES) goals, it needs to include a variety of stakeholders – including national, regional and municipal authorities, citizens, energy companies – and it requires a substantial land area. This research aims to employ serious gaming as a method for collaborative and just planning of energy transition in the Netherlands. To do so, it first connects three concepts of justice: utilitarianism, libertarianism, and egalitarianism, to their implications for procedural aspects of spatial planning and the distribution of burdens and benefits spatial plans’ outcomes. Additionally, the stakeholders involved in the RES and their scopes of action will be identified. Subsequently, the conceptual framework and the institutional framework of the RES will be used to design a multi-actor serious game. Ultimately, the study reflects on the use of serious games for the facilitation of just planning and on how this method can contribute to operationalizing concepts of justice. The goal of this research is to create an understanding of what concepts of justice translate into in spatial planning to improve mutual understanding among stakeholders and to facilitate more just spatial planning procedures and outcomes.



## SESSION 8

Friday, February 25 – 15.45 -17.30 (CET)

**Moderator:** Arend Jonkman (Delft University of Technology)

### **Access to green, but the result is green gentrification: how we can avoid negative trade-offs within a just city idea**

Thomas Thaler (University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences)

The question about spatial (in)justice became more prominent in managing the current pandemic. The current debate often focuses on the unequally distributed access to urban public green and blue spaces, such as parks, green roofs and facades, trees along streets and foot lanes, hedges instead of fences, rivers, canals, and ponds, and the need of citizens to access them across the globe. The re-generating and re-naturing urban areas play a crucial aspect in times of the current SARS Covid-19 pandemic. In particular, urban areas included various conflicts between lack of public and private-owned green areas. The city of Vienna (Austria) – as an extreme example – have been various conflicts during the pandemic; such as the closure of national-owned public parks during of the first months of the pandemic or the lack of green spaces in low-income quarters. This presentation reflects the past, ongoing and future debate about the access of green spaces within the City of Vienna to answer following questions: what are the current short- and long-term perspectives of the city and what is the strategic plan for the future to improve the access to the green; especially in post-covid city. Additionally, I would like to reflect on the unintended outcomes, such as the implementation of green and blue spaces acting as a trigger for gentrification processes and how the city is planning to overcome this challenge. The paper present different ideas and concepts of justice and just city on the example of green spaces in urban areas. Further, we present various indicators and measures to measure justice and potential negative trade-offs.

### **Do human animals in the just city kill and eat non-human animals? Revisiting the curious neglect of Rawls' theory of justice for "animals and the rest of nature"**

Ben Davy (University of Johannesburg)

The book "A Theory of Justice" by John Rawls' (1971/1999), although not written with a particular focus on urban life, is very popular in discussions of the just city (Fainstein 2010; Moroni 2020). Although social values and justice expectations have developed over the past 50 years (see, e.g., Abbey 2007; Nussbaum 2006), many just-city-authors have not bothered to update Rawlsian justice in light of this social change. Their accounts of the just city remain forever filled with the dust of the 1970s (Janis Joplin just passed away). For example, little thought is spent on how the citizens of the just city relate to animals as foodstuff. Do human animals in the just city kill and eat non-human animals? Rawls published his theory of justice at the dawn of environmental movements. Still, he did not consider environmental justice – in the sense of justice for the environment – as component of a theory of justice. In his book, "no account is given of right conduct in regard to animals and the rest of nature" (Rawls 1971/1999: 448). Is Rawls correct in saying that human approaches to "animals and the rest of nature" occur outside the realms of justice? And is, as a consequence, the just city open to (human) omnivores, carnivores, vegetarians, and vegans alike?

As part of the environmental movement, the animal rights movement has grown over the past decades. Authors like Singer (1995), Regan (2004), Nussbaum (2006: 325–407), or Korsgaard (2020) consider the disregard for justice for animals as speciesism (as dreadful as sexism or racism). The answer to the question whether human animals in the just city kill and eat non-human animals is not so much grounded in the concept of justice than in the concept of being or not being human. Spatial planning often assumes that everybody agrees on a boundary between human animals and other animals. The assumption is not only arrogant, it is false. For example,

many urban dwellers value their pets more than a homeless person. In fact, it is hard to define without doubt the boundary between human animals and other animals. A conception of justice as compassion (Davy 1997: 348–356) may help planners understand which killing/eating habits may be compatible with the just city.

### **Spatio-visual (In)justice**

Mennatullah Hendawy (TU Berlin/ UMASS Amherst/ Ain shams university)

I argue that a theory of Spatio-Visual Injustice exists in which planning visualizations provoke the perpetuation of exclusivity in planning and cities; thereby co-constructing spatio-visual injustice. Spatio-visual injustice is thus exemplified via exclusive planning visualizations, defined as the inquiry of 'who and what is made visible by whom, how, and why'. Practically, it represents the ratio of what is represented visually versus what is lived spatially and how each is mediated through planning visualizations. The main proposition of this theory is simply that what (visually) provokes, perpetuates.

It is suggested that it is not the visualizing planning per se, but rather the provocation of exclusive planning visualizations that leads different participants in the different communicative situations to perpetuate exclusivity. In this process, exclusive planning visualizations affect and change the planning process, the role of other actors, and the lived Ordinary cities. It follows, that whilst originally used as tools, exclusive visualizations become powerful participants/actors in the planning communicative situations.

### **Planning for recognition**

Eizenberg Efrat (The Technion, Israel Institute of Technology)

There are different ontologies of recognition proposed by different social theorists. Sometimes they are engaged in the debate on distribution versus recognition and claim different powers of recognition in social movements. Alternatively, they distinguish between different types of recognition that require different social mechanisms. This paper utilizes the concept of recognition to examine urban design from the socio-political perspective. It aims to illuminate principles of urban design that enhance the recognition of misrecognized groups in the city. Based on an analysis of two sites shared by Arabs and Jews in the mixed city of Haifa, Israel – one a residential high-rise complex and the other a Boulevard attractive mainly for recreation – it proposes a framework of urban space of recognition that rests upon the visual display of multiple cultures and histories as well as designing for opportunities for cross-culture learning and interaction.

### **A crisis of lost values: rediscovering the relationship between urban beauty and democracy**

Stefano Cozzolino (ILS - Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development)

The notion of beauty, which represented a significant part of Western philosophical discussion, entered a crisis during the twentieth century. This crisis is particularly evident in urban studies, where the scientific debate on what urban beauty is and how it emerges is almost absent despite beauty being a crucial aspect of citizens' everyday life. Today, most scholars consider urban beauty a trivial concern. As a result, the topic remains irredeemably elusive.

Another crisis in Western thought is the progressive shift of the concept of democracy from an essential condition for the absence of arbitrary power (and therefore freedom) to a form of plebiscitary/majoritarian democracy in which almost no restriction is placed on the government to act in favour of powerful interest groups. In planning, this metamorphosis is visible in the evolution of statutory tools (from urban codes to Euclidean zoning) and the principles of large-scale urban developments (from open-ended, incremental and complex-adaptive developments to comprehensive, all-at-once and anti-adaptive ones).

Although apparently disconnected, the crises of beauty and democracy are closely related in planning. This chapter claims that an in-depth reflection on the aesthetic principles of the

traditional city, which is still widely praised both by experts and laypeople, can allow us to rediscover the concept and value of democracy in planning. In particular, such a reflection can trigger a profound re-discussion of what urban beauty is and how it emerges, as well as provide explanations for the numerous critiques of the aesthetics of many recent large-scale developments.

However, one doubt remains: Is it possible, or even reasonable, to change current practices?