
Future

There is an acute need to reinvent urban design and place-making practices in the 21st century. To successfully do so would radically improve human development and well-being, and assist economic growth and political stability. It would reduce the inequality of entire nations, help to provide wider education and health care, significantly lower the world's ecological footprint and heighten our multiple civilisations' commitment to more sustainable living.

The next generation of innovative decision-makers will need to find ways to counter the acquiescence of Brad Pitt's heroic character Wardaddy in the World War II war movie *Fury*, when he says 'ideals are peaceful but history is violent'. A lot is at stake. As the Stories in this book (from page 107) demonstrate, the responsibility is not to be taken lightly. The rising generation can, through their small and steady steps, increase the impact of their distributed micro-strategies, but also try to find the means to scale these up. Such endeavours should be far more commonly an integral part of top-down placemaking, not as a sop to communities as is too often the case with public consultation processes, but to genuinely spread the benefits of plans and frameworks through the use of more experimental urbanist strategies that help to build local assets.

By such means incremental innovation will be spurred, embracing a new approach to and a practical philosophy

Architect and co-founder of Elemental Alejandro Aravena meets residents of Calama, Chile, to discuss the masterplan proposed by Elemental and Tironi, 2012- (page 164).



RS

of urbanism: a practice that encompasses ‘ad-hocism’ and DIY, one in which everyone has a say and a stake, that relies less on accreditation, status, or intellectualism for the sake of it, and far more on direct involvement. Taking such an active stance towards placemaking calls for a thorough evaluation of the pros and cons of different participatory strategies, and of the tools and methods available to be shared.

It is essential to understand that there are consequences to letting inefficiencies cripple the pressing development imperatives for more balanced cities, and that we must take a pragmatic stance towards the range of opportunities at all scales that technology and an open society afford. Short-termism, partisan policymaking and insensitive mega-planning need to be seen for the inadequate sticking-plaster solutions they are. In order to forcefully drive further attention and resources towards the support of social and natural capital, it needs to be noted how divisive land use strategies can be, leading to the drastic neglect of the importance of the public realm.

In this book we investigate localist tactics that boost dormant or damaged community cycles which, by empowering networks and by activating material and intangible resources and assets, support social capital. To make cities more resilient and to future-proof neighbourhoods, new ways are needed for city dwellers and professionals alike to become more engaged in the challenges, tasks and responsibilities of placemaking. With time and patience, these will establish common ground between all stakeholders in different places.

Placemaking management roles have traditionally been exercised by local authorities and other administrative agencies and their contracted architects and urbanists. The reinvention of not just architecture, urban design and planning but also local government in response to what one might see as an age of austerity in the aftermath of the global financial crisis, is also a fascinating story of emerging innovation, more informal in methods than ever before. Those

local governments which work with pioneering groups in communities, making the most of fewer resources, helping to facilitate active involvement by their constituents, promoting social inclusion, well-being and future-proofing, deserve a book in their own right. These priorities are at the heart of the Bloomberg Philanthropies’ Mayors Challenge, for example, and the ongoing work with local government, through such initiatives as La 27e Région (see page 256), is propelling new knowledge whose significance we continue to explore.¹

The crisis of place, in which the land of the public realm is sold as a commodity in the interests of untrammelled ‘growth’, is not a new phenomenon, but as urbanisation increases pace, the pressures to adopt new methods become stronger. Concepts for the adaptation of the commons as a sustainable human habitat are also not new kids on the block, as this book explains, but have been tested out with varying degrees of success over decades. However the compromising, polarising changes emerging through the narrow goals of growth mean that adaptive planning is required more than ever before.

Today the urban population accounts for 54% of the total global population.² Cities account for some 70% of the global GDP – a wealth concentrated in a voracious minority of city-dwellers. It is estimated that between 2010 and 2013, 200,000 people per day became new urban





One of the biggest challenges ahead is to bridge the polarising divide between the mega-wealthy and the extremely poor in both horizontally and vertically sprawling megacities

residents – 91% of them in developing countries.³ Many of these new arrivals end up in informal conditions on degraded or marginal land, ill-served by infrastructure and in areas of flood zones, or with vertiginous hills or swamps. In 2013 the UN World Economic and Social Survey estimated that the 1 billion people living in slums would soon increase to 3 billion if rapid urbanisation was not addressed.⁴ One of the biggest challenges ahead is to bridge the polarising divide between the mega-wealthy and the extremely poor in both horizontally and vertically sprawling megacities.

In the face of these challenges, clear-headed, resilient, socially equitable and collaborative placemaking contributes impetus. The work of courageous practitioners and activists deserves to be prioritised, put under the spotlight, legislated and campaigned for more heavily. The volatility in global economics and the focus on the shortest-term return on investment, geopolitical instability and the prevalence of insulated tax havens for the wealthy have meant that participatory placemaking is adopting two main profiles, each of which must be incubated further.

First, those working in participatory placemaking have sought to influence local conditions, practices, networks and platforms in order to help local people feel empowered in taking an active, creative role in the transformation of their living environments, despite residual scepticism and the prevalence of older legislative and behavioural barriers to change. That means speaking out, and having the confidence to do so, knowing that there is a kinship and an open society that will be responsive.

Secondly, as with any innovation, the task is also to consider tactics for scaling up such hands-on practices so that participatory placemaking becomes a more widely accepted and adopted part of urban design and planning – both of which have traditionally been characterised by top-down modes of operation.



After extensive consultation in 2012, the residents of Calama, Chile, were given the opportunity to vote for the plan proposed by Elemental and Tironi (see page 164).

Evidence that this is possible is underlined by the reality that, in other fields, millions of people can be positively impacted by the incremental effects of thoughtful micro-scale projects.

One example is the VerBien (See Better to Learn Better) scheme by the designers fuseproject: the free eyeglasses programme, operated in partnership with the Mexican government and Augen Optics, offers a collection of customisable and iconic corrective eyewear that is specifically designed for children and teenagers. The power of that potential calls for greater attention to new methods, narratives, tools and ways of reorganising relationships between the public and private sectors. It is the challenges of funding participatory placemaking that present the greatest obstacle to its expansion as a practice. Backing calls for great understanding and support by decision-makers.

We consider participatory placemaking to be an emerging science, in that it is based on theories. Not fly-by-night ideas or hunches, not fanciful marketing strategies, but socially driven theories that have been tested out – and in a number of cases formally adopted in pilot schemes – in challenging conditions, and that demonstrate community innovation and cohesiveness.

Pilot schemes are likely to be shifting towards an ‘Internet of Things’ model (see Wiki Culture, page 34), using open data, gamification or voting to encourage engagement by members of the community; they may also hopefully bring ‘prototyping’ into the new lexicon of local government in a way that has lasting effects, drawing on local resources. They may have a more loose-fit character to them, but they are focused on building place capital (see page 105), irrespective of the institutional, financial and psychological barriers to change perceivable in a particular location. This holistic quality, including the sense of ownership by those involved, results from the iterative effects of a limited number of problem-solving strategies for placemaking that have been defined and applied to a wide range of circumstances – and can be again in the future.

The 43 Stories at the heart of this book, along with further examples more briefly referred to throughout, represent some of the evidence we built up during the course of our research. This evidence has helped us to organise knowledge about participatory placemaking in its various forms, as it has been applied in different contexts over the past few years. These narratives about activities in the UK and Europe, the USA, South America, Africa, India and elsewhere in the Far East, across both formal and informal contexts, as extensive and varied as they seem, are together just the first chapter in the unfolding story of participatory placemaking in the 21st century.

As more information is gathered, any of the practices and theories outlined in this book is open to improvement or modification. This process, if critically



Participatory placemaking is based on socially driven theories that have been tested out in projects demonstrating community innovation and cohesiveness



Cover of Camilo Calderon's PhD thesis *Politicising Participation: Towards a New Theoretical Approach to Participation in the Planning and Design of Public Spaces* (2013).

documented as it needs to be, will continue to strengthen the foundation for furthering the scientific knowledge about participatory placemaking and for putting the information gathered to practical use, that will help to bring about further positive change.

The systematic study of the structure and behaviour of participatory placemaking through observation and experiment is still at an early stage, and rigour needs to accompany passionate enquiry at every step of the way. The architect and urban and regional planner Camilo Calderon, in his PhD thesis, *Politicising Participation*, for example, valuably examined the gap between the theory and the practice of participation in placemaking.⁵

Calderon's research findings showed that 'although participatory processes can have highly beneficial results', this is dependent on the 'social, political and economic processes and dynamics of the context' in question. The challenges arise in the yawning gulf between the status quo – a locality's resources and the means of access to them, regulations and other procedures in place, and specific cultural identities of civil organisations – and citizens and groups wishing to engage in participatory placemaking. These make creative decision-making a particularly uphill task.

The 'wiki culture' at the heart of good placemaking, with its ethos of shared responsibility and collective envisioning and implementation (see page 34), does not mean that quality management is no longer necessary or can be taken for granted. On the contrary, this role falls to a moderator, whether self-appointed or commissioned, to ensure that high-quality participatory strategies and results are upheld in a transparent fashion. This person can of course be contested and challenged while also being helped and supported by the process.

One sterling quality of participatory placemaking that is of incalculable depth, giving many dimensions to its value, is its great embrace of the non-professional. No longer subject to the traditional polarity between experts

and those without their formal specialist training, placemaking's collaborators – professionals working alongside community members, who may include people with specialist knowledge and skills of many different kinds across the arts, sciences and management – enjoy a symbiotic relationship. This new equilibrium of knowledge transfer is further enabled through new technologies, platforms and networks.

The 'local person' is therefore certainly not reducible to a single type or an abstract group, as urban planning's agendas of the past were based on, but exists as part of a multitude of different individuals. Each has his or her own specialisms, priorities and needs. Community groups also encompass a myriad of ages, backgrounds and circumstances. These diverse individuals must also not be confused with 'the amateur'. When members of communities take part in conversations, and in the planning and making of a place, a project becomes a process of sharing of existing wisdom of a place that enables knowledge to be culled from very many diverse sources.

Such a practice may well have been enacted more widely by pre-industrial societies, and contemporary forces exist that unfairly negate or push aside the potential of such elements of place capital. Today, when there is scope to do so, and the imperatives are growing, such a rich, narrative-based approach makes great sense because there are many values and goals at stake. Participatory placemaking enables a multi-modal geography of meaning through a cross-pollination, one that fertilises the processes, rather than limiting the creation of places to standardised procedures.

To centre on the concerns and needs of the 90%, who are increasingly located in cities and peri-urban areas, but also, in the case of endangered minorities, increasingly displaced from their native lands (as Paul Virilio critically chronicles in his book with Raymond Depardon, *Native Land*), means that the tasks of participatory placemaking have to be about finding, preserving and deploying the appropriate resources in all their diversity.⁶ Very many of these resources already exist locally, even if they are in a latent or disregarded form. That is especially the case when most of the more traditional urban design models do not prioritise serving the world in such a way.

Some agencies are working along the right lines in evolving localised, neighbourhood planning tools for capacity building, favouring open-sourcing, peer-to-peer, DIY, transparency and ease of relational modelling. They may place focus on traditional building techniques, a field upheld by the creativity of many architects featured in the Stories section of this book, including Anna Heringer (page 180), Kéré Architecture (page 188), Studio Mumbai (page 260), MASS Design Group (page 208), TYIN (page 262) and WORKSHOP (page 282). Not many agencies do

both. One that does is the Sustasis Foundation, founded in 2007 by Michael Mehaffy, author and sustainable urban development practitioner, and which has as board member Ward Cunningham, who programmed the software for the first wiki, WikiWikiWeb (in 1994) and was a pioneer in software design patterns. The foundation has recently devised Federated Wiki, new open-source scenario-modelling tools.

Sustasis hosts the American chapter of the International Network for Traditional Building, Architecture and Urbanism (INTBAU), a UK charity dedicated to the study, protection and regeneration of resilient local neighbourhoods and buildings around the world. INTBAU's 18 international chapters unite some



In Dewsbury, Yorkshire, the participatory arts group Encounters took over a disused shop for its 2010 Ambition and Aspiration project for developing the town centre (for Kirklees Borough Council). The project attracted 4,000 people who brought memories of the past and ideas for the future of Dewsbury.

4,000 members, active as practitioners around the world. They work in such contexts as Haiti, for the rebuilding of areas devastated by the 2010 earthquake, Cuba, Romania and other developing countries, where they advocate for locally abundant materials to be used rather than reinforced concrete, for example. As Mehaffy's co-author on *Design for a Living Planet*, the mathematician, design theorist and consultant Nikos Salingaros says, 'traditions are incorrectly dismissed as something "old-fashioned" and unnecessary, but in fact they are sophisticated forms of collective intelligence. They give us important solutions for today's critical problems, like finding more ecological and sustainable ways of settlement.'

Moreover, there is considerable interest in the future commitments and legacies of design practitioners who have been veterans of disaster relief, having battled a proliferation of crises around the world in recent years. Their swelling numbers include student groups such as Operation Resilient Long Island (page 196), a group of NYIT architects in the Institute's innovation programme led by Frank Mruk, associate dean at the School of Architecture and Design. They take fast, preventative action to mitigate the effects of disaster, but also to adapt environments, through the building of resilience in inhabited areas everywhere with various degrees of precariousness.

Patrick Mwaura, headmaster of Uaso Nyiro Primary/Waterbank School, Laikipia, Kenya, demonstrates PITCHAfrica's Rainchute rain harvesters made from decommissioned military parachutes (2012).



To create credible and feasible liveable cities, personal memories and cultural histories and visions are needed as part of placemaking, so that those taking part in processes feel that they belong



Both the scale of these activities and the need for them have led to a shift in preferred terminology, away from the woolly, tired word ‘sustainable’, which is used as a smokescreen for all manner of aspirational commercial development, and towards the terms ‘resilient city’ and ‘resilient landscape’. To achieve resiliency through urban design and planning calls for what David Orr, professor of environmental studies and politics at Oberlin College, Ohio, describes as ‘whole systems thinking’ and ‘full-spectrum sustainability’, encompassing social and economic activities including food production and jobs creation as well as the active, incremental application and germination of environmental wisdom.⁸

Furthermore, in order to create credible and feasible liveable cities, what is needed is an approach to placemaking that engages personal memories, cultural histories and visions in such a way that those taking part feel they belong. If participatory placemaking is to be effective, it must foster a politics of belonging, and from this support of local democracy, a foundation of spaces of belonging can grow. Such a stance matches the newer approach to placemaking that leads away from normative, context-less, standardised procedures and methods. As Calderon advocates, it allows for ‘discussions of difference, conflicts and power at [placemaking’s] very centre’, and for ‘context-based theorisation’ and ‘the transferability of knowledge and experiences among different contexts’. Among the work that exemplifies this approach is that of ItoI Agency of Engagement (page 192), PITCHAfrica (page 228) and Kéré Architecture (page 188) and the bringing about of the Proyecto Urbano Integral for Medellín, Colombia (see Alejandro Echeverri, page 142).

This vision of placemaking complements the pattern language approach promoted by the architect Christopher Alexander and his colleagues in the 1970s as part of multiscale urban design and planning; in a nutshell, they argued that all elements of the man-made landscape were fundamentally orders of relationships. The apparent separation of elements was – and is – an illusion. The failure to perceive that web of relationships was part of the problem behind developments leading to a denuded public realm. Pattern language, with patterns based on psychological needs, can be used in unique individual ways that are pertinent to the specific context and aspire to an ‘aliveness’;⁹ its use supports, rather than disrupts, a set of multi-sensory and symbolic connections.

Activism and vigilance are needed to ensure that such valuable, relational visions are not buried as urban development marches forward. The definition of ‘activism’ that interests us most, as the driver of participatory placemaking’s future, is activity that creates new social behaviours through new sustainable design frameworks intentionally developed as examples, in the hope that others will follow. In his book *Blessed Unrest*, the environmentalist and entrepreneur Paul Hawken estimated the number of non-profit, non-governmental groups working towards ecological restitution and social justice across the globe, organising from the ground up, at 1 million or more, ‘involving tens of millions of people dedicated to change’.¹⁰ His book, written in the first decade of the 21st century, included a taxonomic guide to the widespread projects being developed by these people. ‘The very word movement is too small to describe it’, but ‘[the movement] has deep and ancient roots’, he said, speaking at the Bioneers conference in 2006. It ‘has no name’.¹¹

How have those numbers swelled since Hawken wrote his book? It is impossible to say, as no one seems to be keeping consistent tabs on the question across the globe, but certainly the scope for expansion is huge. As regards today’s breed of resilience activists, Hawken’s more recent personal assessment of the chief climate actors today is that they are mostly ‘technology-driven’ and



‘almost all top-down’. This is one motivation for his next book, *Project Draw-down* (at the time of writing, to be published in 2015), that ‘will encompass a broader set of solutions and include those that can be carried out by individuals, communities, building owners, companies and local governments’.¹²

Echoing Hawken’s environmentalism, Pope Francis, as widely reported by the media, has recently argued for an ethical economic system that supports human equality and ecology, warning of the dangers of the Anthropocene era.¹³ ‘Socio-environmental processes are not self-correcting’, said the Vatican’s Sustainable Humanity Academy group. ‘Market forces alone, bereft of ethics and collective action, cannot solve the intertwined crises of poverty, exclusion, and the environment. However, the failure of the market has been accompanied by the failure of institutions, which have not always aimed at the common good.’ In strengthening communities, ‘we have the innovative and technological capability to be good stewards of creation.’¹⁴

The identity of participatory placemaking in the coming years will be closely allied to the forms democracy takes in the future. In the UK, for example, this relates to the way localism, regionalism and devolution develop. The economist Mauro Bonaiuti is among the many people who believe that exponential change will bring new patterns. In his book *The Great Transition*, he maintains that ‘when the framework changes, as the sciences of complexity teach us, there will be other forms of economic and social organisation more suited to the new situation’. Bonaiuti’s argument is that these new forms of organisation are particularly likely to come into being amidst ‘global crisis, or even stagnant growth’, and that ‘cooperation among decentralised, smaller

scale economic organisations, will offer greater chances of success. These organisations can lead the system towards conditions of ecological sustainability, more social equity and, by involving citizens and territories, even increase the level of democracy.’¹⁵

Where does that leave the figures proudly holding aloft their badges of ‘smart city’ top-down proficiency: the property developers? As brokers between big and smaller interests, their identity is called into question. Pioneering non-profit bodies such as the US-based Make It Right, which operated in New Orleans’ 9th Ward after Hurricane Katrina in 2005, prototypes alternative models of housing development in tandem with community support in ways that can be applied in other cities. However socially impactful its work is, using truly ambitious design, there remains the question of how community cohesion is supported through greater focus on public realm strategies. But, as Oliver Wainwright, architectural correspondent to *The Guardian* newspaper, has written, flouting the affordable quotas laid down by local authorities has become the new norm by property developers.¹⁶ This has to change, through new models of land use, new land trusts, and a bridging of the gap in trust and amenity to

match growing expectations by city dwellers.

Participatory processes are a long-term sustainable means to upgrade deprived neighbourhoods. They focus on improving the allocation of resources and making plans, and bringing about better, more socially equitable cycles of programmes and policies, with occupants seen as ‘genuine development partners and agents’.¹⁷ They still need further financial backing, as crowd-funding and philanthropism are not yet sufficient sources in their own right.

Pope Francis greets the pilgrims during his weekly general audience at St Peter’s Square at the Vatican, Rome, 22 October 2014.



One of the participatory workshops staged by Ecosistema Urbano (page 160), 2015, in the Chacarita informal neighbourhood, Asunción, Paraguay, part of its revitalisation masterplan for the historical centre.



The identity of participatory placemaking in the coming years will be closely allied to the forms democracy takes in the future. In the UK, for example, this relates to the way localism, regionalism and devolution develop

The unexpected bankruptcy announced in early 2015 of Architecture for Humanity (AfH; page 108), widely acknowledged as the leading global humanitarian design organisation, might be attributable to naivety or recent miscalculation in tactics by management. But AfH's demise is more likely to have been brought about by a scissor effect between growing operational costs and diminishing financial support and interest from funding bodies.

Inevitably, over the past decade a variety of competing organisations have popped up to intervene in the landscape once dominated by AfH and other pioneers. They often have alternative financial and operational models to the grant- and sponsor-based AfH model; some, such as IDEO.org, are divisions of successful studios and design groups, acting on a pro bono basis.

While participatory placemaking is fully endorsed by many international donor agencies including the World Bank, the United Nations and UN-Habitat, it needs more bodies and generous philanthropists to enter the fray. To heighten awareness of the processes and issues that need support, it would be useful to fashion a repository of knowledge in the manner of appropedia, an online platform for sharing knowledge about collaborative solutions in sustainability, appropriate technology and poverty reduction.¹⁸

While participatory placemaking does not need a union of any kind, it could do with breaking free from the burdens of its identity as a charitable practice in order to evolve further as a professional practice, one in which self-reliant social enterprise replaces the traditional donor models. That, however, is dependent on the acceptance of participatory placemaking by clients and communities – and, as Rory Sutherland, vice chairman of the advertising agency Ogilvy Group, explained in his popular 2009 TED talk, perhaps also on an association of participatory placemakers that tracks and assesses the intangible values of work carried out, as was done in the fields of marketing and reputation assessments.¹⁹

As a number of the Stories in the following pages demonstrate, helping with problems in local ‘backyards’, rather than more widely, makes it easier to argue for funding for projects either started with, or servicing a local group. On the other hand, the capacity to work across cultural boundaries is demonstrated by the work of MASS Design Group (page 208), PITCHAfrica (page 228), Urban-Think Tank (page 226), TYIN (page 262), WORKSHOP (page 282), Ecosistema Urbano (page 160), SENSEable City Laboratory (page 212), Anna Heringer (page 180) and SERA Architects (page 242). There are a few exceptions transcending this dual profile orientation of participatory placemaking, and the particular genesis of each project is unique. However, extraordinary tenacity is called for if placemakers are to implement sustainable systemic thinking with greater value, extending beyond institutional norms.

As societies move towards more open models of collaboration, participatory placemaking will become more common. But in order to reach its full potential, practitioners will need to be able to demonstrate the value that they provide, and find a deeper capacity to fund their activities. The two go hand-in-hand, and there needs to be a step change in more decision- and policy-makers innovating and opening up to giving a mandate to newer sustainable practices to enrich the practice of placemaking.

One big difference between the arsenal of tools available to the pioneers of sustainable placemaking in the 1970s and today’s is the internet, which has become a general purpose technology on which societies are now hugely dependent. The academic and journalist John Naughton has written, ‘the network has become the nervous system of the planet’, and he acknowledges that ‘we’re also stuck with its downsides’.²⁰ However, as Jeffrey Sachs, economist and director of the Earth Institute at New York’s Columbia University, recently said, ‘all great social movements look impossible until they are inevitable’.²¹

Time will tell how far participatory placemaking – or what Ermacora calls ‘recoding’ – will become accepted, and over what timescale. Time will also reveal how precisely these practices will scale up, becoming a truly vital force behind the regeneration and recovery of places where high-quality design and governance is presently lacking, or cannot penetrate. The obstacles as they are currently perceived include lack of resources. They may also include potential resistance by repressive authorities worried that such an approach will open a Pandora’s box and liberate the energies contradicting the status quo of power structures and financial privileges.

To what extent participatory placemaking may actually become a fundamental part of societies in the short-term future is not yet known. The continuous research and development – representing a substantial body of work and success stories – this book contributes towards, helps to galvanise the necessary continuity in prototyping meaningful ways to contribute positively to the evolving open society. Whether in conflict zones, disaster relief contexts, sprawling suburbia or central business districts with their high building densities and land values, the ideals outlined in *Recoded City*

Place capital equation

can sow new seeds for a generation of citizens who face having to live their lives adapting to the rising constraints enforced by an increase in global competition for resources.

The planet’s abundance should inspire us to nurture systemic well-being rather than to – consciously or unconsciously – perpetuate the exploitative models that characterise too many urban plans. In *Recorded City* we have attempted to shed light on processes and approaches that express the richness and potential of micro-planning in order that cities may form and thrive in a more humane fashion. We hope that, in time, these will relieve some of the tensions mankind has accumulated through policies and designs that have lacked common sense and the wisdom to care.

Afterword

A number of the participatory placemaking and design projects featured in *Recorded City* are experimental in mode. Their strategies to nurture and augment place capital illuminate how best the open society’s goals, allied to this field, could constitute an advance for civilisation.

Place capital could perhaps also be formulated on the printed page as an equation that both captures and expands capacities for human development and happiness, including a vital specificity in location and the notion of replicability, which in itself has analogous behaviour to DNA. To do so helps to consider the potential leap forward that building place capital will bring, alongside the power of the natural sciences. Referring to their actual and future kinship, the cover of this book is conceptually, a cross between an X chromosome – found in both males and females of all mammals – and a night photograph of the world taken from space.

The optimum behaviour of societies is surely forthcoming by being as aligned as possible with the nano dimension of genetics. This connection limits temptations to conceive of cities as fabric dominated by bricks and mortar, encouraging more attention to be paid to the relations and soft features that truly define their habitability.

The potential to maximise place capital is reflected by the following equation, in which the amount of participation is multiplied by well-being strategies, by open society policies and by sensitive design, divided by social and natural capital*, by the Gini coefficient* and by localised GDP. Our ambition is to continue to refine our understanding of how to grow the value of places for people.



Extraordinary tenacity is called for if placemakers are to implement sustainable systemic thinking with greater value, extending beyond institutional norms

*For notes on natural capital and the Gini coefficient, see Introduction note 1 and Open Society note 2, in Endnotes starting page 307.

(Participation quotient X Well-being strategies X Open society policies X Sensitive design)

DIVIDED BY

(Social capital X Natural capital X Gini coefficient X Localised GDP)