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2. COMMUNIQUÉ

COMMUNIQUÉ COMPACT CITIES: ADOPTING AND IMPLEMENTING DIVERSIFIED AND EQUITABLE URBAN DENSIFICATION STRATEGIES

Seville, Spain, 18-24 March 2017

Background: On the 23rd and 24th of March 2017, 22 experts in urban development from 18 countries from governments, international organizations, and academia gathered in Seville to discuss approaches to the management of urban transformation. The event included urban planners, economists, social workers, and legal experts. They discussed this in the framework of the implementation of the New Urban Agenda and in particular the paragraph 52:

52. We commit ourselves to promoting the development of urban spatial frameworks, including urban planning and design instruments that support sustainable management and use of resources, increased land productivity, compactness and density, pedestrian and mixed-use, through flexible and planned urban extension strategies as appropriate, to trigger economic growth and agglomeration, strengthen food system planning, and enhance resource efficiency, urban resilience, and environmental sustainability.

Considering cities in developed countries, in emerging countries, and in less developed countries, both large and small, experts agreed that there is a need to improve the efficiency in the use of existing urban space within urban areas, as a key complementary strategy to Planned Cities Development. They also considered that well-managed urban transformations have the potential to increase the quality of urban life, urban productivity and inclusion, as well as to direct a share of the new urban population within expanding cities into green areas. They noted the following relevant global urban trends:

- The fast growth of urban population, particularly in Asian and African developing countries, and in particular in intermediate size cities.
- The fact that urban areas have expanded disproportionately even when population is not growing with an increase of the land consumption per capita.
- The changes in distribution of population within cities and across territories, in the use of space for residential, economic and other activities (which may include also the increase of housing standards), and in the socio-spatial and demographic profile of urban families, all factors which impact population density.

These trends, if left unchecked, will continue to be a threat to sustainability, economic and social inclusion, higher risk related to climate change and social tensions, and competition and inefficiency of cities. Processes of urban transformation and compactification for scarce prime space would result in population exodus, while denying urban cores might lose population.

This situation requires a deliberate urban planning and management effort, which must scale up experiences and insights and needs to be supported by robust design, financial and regulatory approaches and tools. A proactive urban planning approach and comprehensive urban transformation programmes that improve urban transformation and densification processes in a way that increases overall urban performance and quality, ensures social cohesion and is efficient in the use of space and other resources. The group agreed on some basic principles and messages that are summarized here:

1. BENEFITS OF DENSIFICATION

- Densification has the potential to deliver development benefits—however, it is not an end by itself and needs to be explicitly linked to development objectives and vision at local level. Should also consider that densification, just as other urban transformations, requires specific attention to consequences and changes to population and social environment that might generate in each context. Densification can counter tendency to sprawl and reduce numerous externalities of urbanization while leveraging its positive dimensions. In particular, densification can be an opportunity to increase urban quality, inclusion and environmental and economic sustainability in cities of developed, developing or emerging countries.

- Well-designed densification and compact development can be an important strategy to support urbanization. For example, densification and compact development with adequate activities mix, population density and public space is important for large and small cities alike. Similarly, and particularly in developed countries, and in the longer term, also in developing countries.

- Strategies based on the use of existing empty spaces within the city for new developments (planned RHOs) shall be prioritized as much as possible in relation to city extensions.

2. DEFINITIONS AND ANALYSIS

- Densification does not
correspond to construction, the overall size and occupancy of existing stock, the transformation in demographic need to be also considered. Also, density in terms of number of peoples or economic activities quantifies. Density of activities needs also to be considered. A balance of the two is needed for density to create benefits. Defining density in both spatial and economic terms will help in bridging the understanding and linking spatial and economic strategies better.

- Density needs to be understood and defined through multi-dimensional indices which should include the number of people, number of buildings, parks, and the built-form, as well as functional area per person. In its qualification, it is important to consider the size of the city and access to nature. The type of activities and the density of jobs are a key correlate of population density intensity.

- In many cities, design conditions and opportunities (and blockages) need to be analyzed and understood in the local context of social, spatial, economic dynamics.

3. DENSIFICATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS

- Densification happens spontaneously in many contexts, both on private and on public land, as a consequence of processes of development (density with growth) or as a result of density change without growth, leading to overcrowding. Also, density can be a demand from the market or a policy objective, or can be an outcome of spatial and economic decisions. Such processes need to be guided and qualified in order to improve outcomes and lessons need to be understood to identify mechanisms to spur, guide and manage densification processes and density.

- Outliers for densification are those that are not firmly encapsulated and densification strategies may use a role of approaches. UN Habitat, United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD), and Regional Bank Group for Development and Social Protection (RBGS) on “The Role of Intermediate Cities in Strengthening Urban-Rural Linkages Towards the New Urban Agenda”.

- Densification strategies and interventions are more effective if linked within a city-wide (and metropolitan-regional) overall strategy and plan and not undertaken ad-hoc. They should be part of a comprehensive housing policy that takes into account housing needs, tenure requirements and localities, in order to prevent social segregation, gentrification and exclusion.

- Design, finance and regulatory tools can provide the appropriate implementation tools for different types of interventions. The specific tools will be combined depending on the parameters and goals and specific outcome desired and strategies should be assessed for impact on social, environmental and economic dimensions, while incorporating mitigating factors where needed.

- Of particular concern is the apparent contradiction between the collective long-term interest and the short-term individual maximization of many. The value of the middle class is rising to a large extent urban sprawl, with the alliance of the real estate sector preference for greenfield development. Well designed and managed density, with clear identification and charge of responsibilities would be needed to shift such preferences. In addition, the control of planning rights and licensing is of huge relevance in order to uphold public interest.

4. DESIGN

- The density patterns in each context may vary. The interaction...
of the desirable dimensions of compact cities, where density, mixed use, and the amount and layout of public space and the social mix need to be developed and planned together as they are mutually reinforcing and dependent.

- **Density** is measured in different ways and is debated and appreciated differently in different contexts. Density comes in different forms and produces different urban effects according to different urban contexts. The understanding of the benefits and limitations of the most profitable density in every specific situation is critical.

- Densification processes should consider the importance of public space and streets, connectivity at city and regional levels, mixed-use, social diversity, and integration. The vertical and horizontal options for density are to be considered, where increasing the building height on the increased surface ofplots is possible outcomes. These elements will also influence the metric adopted to measure density.

- Topography and landforms, efficiency in providing infrastructures, services and facilities, and factors that should be taken into account in urban planning: Density of street patterns, in order to accommodate different needs and densities can be created in many urban contexts. Infrastructure provision, and maintenance of the same are critical requirements to viable densification and need to be factored in from the onset, during design stages (reduce the costs through design).

- Public space and how it is designed is a critical condition for densification. Public space plays a key role in making density work and in particular the streets layout, with its implication to economy and connectivity, and more generally, the layout, treatment, uses and management of the ground floor and of the links between public and private space is critical for street vitality and walkability, and is also important to facilitate the ‘ownership’ of different spaces of the city, with direct implications to both maintenance and the ‘right’ to live in the city. Role of urban design is to regulate these relations between uses and property.

- Density is also related to plot and block layout. Smaller plots support more affordability diversity in real estate, and can allow for the participation of different actors in the densification process. Selection of urban patterns, plot and block layout and regulations are factors that can increase flexibility in the process of densification, responding to possible changes in the urban social, economic context. Mixed use within buildings can increase walkability, reduce use of cars and in general help densification processes.

- Social diversity is important for densification processes to remain inclusive. Social mix is the result of specific policies and measures to counter segregation and separation. It increases the proximity and opportunities for exchange and reduces transaction costs, including mobility. It is essential to carefully consider affordability when promoting densification.

### 5. Urban Finance

- The economic contexts and dynamics driving the financial options. Densification is a fast-growing economy and it is evident that economic restructuring, and informal processes also need specific attention. High income cities and low income cities may require different approaches. Looking at the economic and financial opportunities for and constraints to densification is fundamental. Because densification is closely linked to economic activities and value creation at neighborhood, city and regional levels.

- Densification is associated to higher land value. However, future tracts of densification are not necessarily equalized, reallocated, and capitalized in specific cases. Densification is often associated with densification.

- Infill and densification may be more complex and costly than expansion of greenfield. Densification may take place in old districts where the whole infrastructure system will need to be upgraded and many landowners are involved. Therefore, not only all project and lands cost need to be calculated, but also needs to be developed and put in place to support the viability of such operations.

- One benefit of density and costs/risks, across different actors, and across different scales, both direct and indirect need to be taken into account over the short and long term for analyzing project financing, taking into account that densification processes are required also improved public services, infrastructure and overall management of the interactions between private and public space. Financing densification is a complex process, and it is clear that it needs to be done much more efficiently. Addressing maintenance costs is key.

- Transparency in the decisions, through participatory elements is needed to identify and select financial alternatives that are more efficient since costs and time are involved that affect the mobility of requirements. In order to improve transparency it is necessary to disclose available information on the financing of new infrastructure. In general, it would be important to have clear and unambiguous budget approval to ensure such transparency.

- It is necessary to provide training and finance for city leaders so they are able to design complex financial instruments such as land value sharing, incremental taxes, prepayment levies, building rights, and these tools need to be considered. They also need to be aware of the long-term implications of accessing debt.
For instance, work on financial sustainability in cities is allowing local governments to have sufficient in order to provide housing finance, basic services and other necessary social programmes.

- Also the impact of densification on the provision of public utilities, infrastructure, and spaces can be assessed when using a cost-benefit analysis, which takes into account both positive and negative effects. This is important because densification can often result in higher costs and reduced public access to services.

- Many possible tools and combinations of tools to finance densification need to be considered, with clear understanding of the different benefits in terms of efficiency and inclusion. Different situations will require different tools. A glossary of possible instruments should be developed.

- Experience of negotiation and involvement of residents is important and different mechanisms for compensating or involving the external community are in place. Diversified modalities of compensation and inclusion can be implemented and include, for example, financial incentives, social policies, and community involvement.

- The participation of individuals and small actors in the densification process is not always possible and this exacerbates phenomena of exclusion, exploitation, and inequality. Incorporation of schemes of land value finance in neighbourhoods may be useful. The participation of private finance at the level of the household depends on the capacity to pay and the need to be housed (through mortgage finance).

- Legal frameworks that enable private investment in public and local infrastructure to recover investment and distribute risks in case of uncertainties and that allow for proper and design of local infrastructure funds create the basis for solid municipal finance.

- Private sector must be able to recover investments and have a clear notion of risks in case of uncertainties to provide an incentive to invest. A legal framework that is realistic and applicable must be in place to make possible private investment in public and local infrastructure.

- Some of the desirable qualities of density need specific financial feasibility intentions: for instance the social mix can last only if it is ensured through public housing innovation and through government or public financing, however, there is a high potential of incorporation of public housing in all developments and in interventions in particular through regulatory and financing mechanisms. Redevelopment of low-income neighborhoods would require substantial public investment/lending, and these financial schemes must be explored with economic principles in mind for cross subsidies, each value with participatory approaches.

6. LEGAL

- Policy coherence: Often policy and legislative frameworks lack coherence and even in cities and countries where densification policies are in place, land use regulations, planning tools, taxation, and infrastructure investments are not coordinated and instead of facilitate densification pose barriers to densification to happen. This consistency is especially important in regulatory infrastructure investments and taxes are often designed at different level of government and for different purpose while all these tools should aim towards the same objective.

- Effective legislation: National legislation should create an adequate toolbox to support densification strategies and expansion cities to choose the most appropriate legal strategy to support densification. Every legal strategy to support densification should be driven by the country's concrete, social and administrative needs and regulations should consider local conditions such as income, economic base and cultural and social context and be adequate to existing capacities and resources.

- Regulatory barriers to densification: Regulatory frameworks should be reviewed to identify regulatory barriers to densification, including minimum dwelling unit and plot size, maximum building height and plot coverage, maximum land in residential use, and maximum density, land subdivision regulations, as well as building codes, setbacks, street width, parking requirements, and housing condumium rules to manage and maintain multi-ownership condumium buildings.

- Preventing gentrification: Besides linking with a housing policy clear targets for affordable housing and inclusionary outcomes should be present in every intervention. Appropriate requirements such as minimum % of affordable housing and the need to provide rental options for existing population should be introduced. Social housing instruments should be conducted before implementing any densification initiatives to identify and analyse the social impacts of a proposed intervention on communities.

- Implementing density

- Urban planning for densification should be implemented by finding a balance between providing incentives, determining obligations and responsibilities for landlords (compulsory development), buildings and occupancy limits and via negotiated agreements.

- Land-use regulations should aim to promote social but have to provide sufficient space to construct housing for growing populations, otherwise land and housing losses.
- The implementation of redevelopment and densification projects requires the existence of functioning land management tools to realign land prices and to facilitate the joint redevelopment of urban plots (with fractional properties), management of the process and distribute fairly the burdens and benefits of the intervention (public, private and PPP).

- Densification and land markets

  - Planning for densification should consider existing market forces and the effects that densification can have on the land, property and rental markets. It should be aligned to a citywide urban land management strategy to avoid distortions in land and property markets.

  - Measures to prevent speculation should be adopted, including the taxation of empty buildings and empty serviced plots.

- Need to reinforce the social role of land and property (in some countries).

7. ENABLING

The group also highlighted 4 areas of concern to enable adequate densification:

- The overall system of planning which in terms of structure, capacity and flexibility need to be reviewed in a systematic way in order to address blockages and inefficiencies.

- The overall capacity of different actors to understand identity and its mechanisms and advantages, take some risk and negotiate within the process. This is valid for the residents and in general the public, which need to engage in the process with clarity on its stakes, the private sector which needs to expand its understanding of social responsibility, local government and decision makers need in particular to have access to adequate information and training, particularly on financing strategies. Universities also need to update training offer to demand for professionals.

- The availability and access of tools and examples for professionals through adequate capacity development and university education. The availability of tools and examples of relevant experiences is also critical to expand understanding and familiarity with tools to support the public good.

- The awareness on benefits and costs of densification and sprawl need to be increased and there is a role for communication media and information in the public discourse around these themes and in influencing individual and group choices and preferences.
3. BACKGROUND

Increasingly, cities are forfeiting many of the benefits that agglomeration has to offer. Studies of urban land expansion have shown that over the last two decades most cities in the world have become less dense rather than more and are wasting their potential in ways that generate sprawl, congestion and segregation. These patterns are making cities less pleasant and equitable places in which to live.

Urban-reduced densities are of particular concern in countries with high rates of urban population growth, where such trends imply huge consumption of land and resources. It is estimated that they will triple in land size if current trends continue, so that by 2030 they will have absorbed 1.6 billion new people. Despite slower population growth, cities in industrialized countries are likely to see a 2.5 times growth in city-land areas when compared to their developing country counterparts over the same period due to a more rapid decline in average densities.

This situation is of major concern in countries already marred by a large backlog of services, prevalence of slums and weak institutional capacities, as low density settlements make it costly and inefficient to provide services and infrastructure, commuting becomes a huge burden on residents in terms of time and cost, and valuable natural resources are used with low productivity.

The New Urban Agenda identifies clearly the issue of density and compactness, as well as the tool of Planned City Infill, as key elements for the implementation of sustainable urbanization. UN-Habitat, in its renewed strategy to support compact, connected and inclusive cities, has highlighted Planned Cities Infills as the complementary approach to Planned City Extensions, and of particular relevance to cities undergoing rapid transformation processes, where existing urban patterns and new population dynamics demand more efficient land uses and focused attention to equity in development and quality of life.

This EGM has been the first opportunity after the adoption of the New Urban Agenda to revisit these concepts, the experiences of cities and other actors, and work towards a common understanding across regions and urban conditions of densification policies, strategies, and tools in the context of Urban Redevelopment and Infill, and of their implications for successful practices and for improving sustainability of cities.

3.1 EXPERTS GROUP MEETING (EGM): A TOOL TO DEEPEN THE PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE DYNAMICS OF THE CITY

Urban Development experts met in October 2014 in Zapopan, Mexico, with the objective of increasing the understanding of densification policies, strategies, tools, in the context of Urban Redevelopment and Infill and of their implications for successful in improving sustainability of cities. The EGM Planning Denser Cities in the XXI Century was organized by UN-Habitat with the support of the Municipal Government of Zapopan.

The participants, from their experience and using successful examples in Latin America and other parts of the world, recommended the promotion of denser cities which integrate natural and urban ecosystems of the city and its agglomeration, without leaving aside principles such as solidarity towards the public, the integration of new technologies that allows citizen participation, and the application of strategies with flexible and adaptive planning regulations and instruments for the real needs of urbanization in specific cities. The EGM highlighted the importance of having new financial models and the stimulation of co-responsibility and collaboration in the development of cities, as well as the importance of the implementation stage for the success of plans and projects.
Later on, in November 2015, experts from all over the world gathered in Mexico City to discuss Urban Regeneration, providing technical advice for the design of the legal, economic and urban planning framework to enhance urban management and enabling the implementation of tools that specially contribute to the urban renewal of the City of Mexico. The EGM aligned with the agenda Focusing in Planned City Intensification / Densification of previous EGMs organized by UN-Habitat in collaboration with the Agricultural, Territorial and Urban Secretariat (SEDATU).

In December 2016, another EGM took place in Sao Paulo, Brazil. The EGM approached the interface between urban planning and economic dynamics as a tool for proper implementation through strategic management, as well as a way towards an integrated territorial development. It discusses how to promote local economic development through urban transformation, regeneration and planning at the city scale, linking investment planning and city strategies, and providing urban planning with frameworks to guide infrastructure development. Specifically, the main discussion was the particular case of Urban Intervention Project Arco Tamanduatei regarding the urban regeneration and densification processes and housing developments in Sao Paulo and Brazil.

UN-Habitat has also addressed the issue of urban transformation and efficiency of land use through its collaboration with the City of Johannesburg. The lessons learned and tools gathered in all these meetings and projects contribute to the ongoing discussions on the context of the recently approved New Urban Agenda after Habitat III, particularly on the following areas: Urban Frameworks, Spatial Development and Urban Economy.

FOCUS

UN-Habitat has identified Planned City Infill, Redevelopment and Densification as a critical area of focus in the global urban development agenda, and is working to proactively identify, analyze and disseminate local and national approaches that address these trends and leverage density for local development and prosperity. A number of UN-Habitat publications reflect on the relevance of density and densification for urban development1 and point to the benefits that would accrue by addressing it through adequate national and local policy and planning intervention.

It is UN-Habitat’s experience that such interventions can support the development of quality density in a diversity of urban settings, and at scale when they are guided by solid urban planning instruments, based on realistic financial strategies and firmly anchored in policy


and legal frameworks,. They demonstrate that urban planning can provide adequate land use for public spaces and streets, organized in an urban structure that minimizes transport, service delivery costs and transaction costs for the urban economy, optimizes the use of urban land, and supports the protection and organization of urban open spaces.

These strategies include densification, redevelopment of the city, and they also provide conditions for effective slum upgrading, layout of new areas with higher densities, brownfield development, building conversions, and urban mobility efficient development.

The topic of the EGM Planning Compact Cities: Exploring the possibilities and limits of densification are different urban realities such as inefficient cities with obsolete urban patterns that are interested in guided densification processes (which will require changes in regulation, provision or restructuration of public space, increased connectivity, etc.); cities with brownfields (in processes of economic transformation for instance), that can be redeveloped for increased density in the core urban area or in the first urban crown; and finally cities that would like to increase densities in peripheral areas.

However, urban densification processes, especially those proposed in degraded areas, can generate undesirable effects such as gentrification or unreasonable increases in land prices.

These undesirable effects suggest that although densification as a general concept represents a valid and desirable option, there are some limitations to its application, which can lead to establishing good practices in this type of urban operations.

3.2 ALIGNEMENT WITH GLOBAL AGENDAS

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

The sustainable development of cities is understood in at least three dimensions: environmental, social and economic, as can be seen from the Sustainable Development Goals’ (SDGs) Goal 11: “Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”. In particular:

11.3: By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries.

11.6: By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management.

11.7: By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities.

Urban regeneration, especially in those cases where it is linked to densification strategies, represents an opportunity to significantly improve these three dimensions, since regeneration projects allow to optimize land use and mobility, and reorder the social composition of areas within the city, generating public spaces and public amenities, boosting the economy, local production and consumption, and employment.

NEW URBAN AGENDA KEY REFERENCES

The New Urban Agenda directly refers to urban renewal and city infill / densification as appropriate strategies that drive to development of more sustainable, integrated and prosperous cities with the power of helping to end poverty, exclusion and inequalities. Some relevant related paragraphs are:

Paragraph 51. We commit ourselves to promoting the development of urban spatial frameworks, including urban planning and design instruments that support sustainable management and use of natural resources and land, appropriate compactness and density, polycentrism and mixed uses, through infill or planned urban extension strategies as applicable, to trigger economies of scale and agglomeration, strengthen food system planning, and enhance resource efficiency, urban resilience and environmental sustainability.
Paragraph 52. We encourage spatial development strategies that take into account, as appropriate, the need to guide urban extension prioritizing urban renewal by planning for the provision of accessible and well-connected infrastructure and services, sustainable population densities, and compact design and integration of new neighborhoods into the urban fabric, preventing urban sprawl and marginalization.

Paragraph 97. We will promote planned urban extensions and infill, prioritizing renewal, regeneration and retrofitting of urban areas, as appropriate, including upgrading slums and informal settlements; providing high-quality buildings and public spaces; promoting integrated and participatory approaches involving all relevant stakeholders and inhabitants; and avoiding spatial and socioeconomic segregation and gentrification, while preserving cultural heritage and preventing and containing urban sprawl.

Paragraph 106. We will promote housing policies based on the principles of social inclusion, economic effectiveness, and environmental protection. We will support the effective use of public resources for affordable and sustainable housing, including land in central and consolidated areas of cities with adequate infrastructure, and encourage mixed-income development to promote social inclusion and cohesion.

Paragraph 112. We will promote the implementation of sustainable urban development programmes with housing and people’s needs at the center of the strategy, prioritizing well-located and well-distributed housing schemes in order to avoid peripheral and isolated mass housing developments detached from urban systems, regardless of the social and economic segment for which they are developed and providing solutions for low income groups’ housing needs.

## 4. INTRODUCTION

The EGM gathered 30 international and local experts working on issues of densification from different perspectives (physical, financial and legal). See Annex 1 for full list of experts and participants.

### 4.1 PURPOSE

This EGM aimed to define the possibilities and limits of applying densification as a tool for urban transformation, and, from this definition, jointly establish good practices for avoiding some undesired effects.

The overarching objective of this Experts Group Meeting is to increase understanding of densification policies, strategies and tools in the context of Urban Redevelopment and Infill, and of their implications for successful practices and
for improving the sustainability of cities.

The meeting gathered urban decision makers who have responsibilities for policy formulation on urban redevelopment and densification at city and national level, experienced urban redevelopment and densification practitioners, and researchers on the topic. It unites international and local participants working on the issues of compact cities and densification.

4.2 ISSUE AREAS

This EGM discussed the possibilities and limitations of urban densification from three different, deeply linked perspectives:

*From the physical / environmental perspective:*

Densification represents an opportunity to carry out complex urban restructuring projects. Beyond the previously mentioned advantages, densification is a fundamental tool for governments to obtain the required land to improve existing conditions in the city, through either new infrastructure, new public spaces and / or new urban equipment.

*From the financial / economic perspective:*

Densification of urban areas is widely used to generate added value for the city. In most cases, the possibility of increasing the volumes of construction or inhabitants that can inhabit a determined plot, leads to an increase of the value of that plot; if the urban operation is also accompanied by improvements in the physical conditions of the environment, this value increase can become proportionally higher than the increase in density.

*From the legal / governance perspective:*

Although urban densification operations are normally promoted and developed at the city level, generally the mechanisms that allow the appropriation of part of the generated value are usually derived from legal frameworks established at the national level. This situation means that in some cases the process of densification (and particularly some of its benefits) can become very complex from the point of view of its implementation, even in cases where there is an agreement between stakeholders.

While identifying the different dimensions to structure the discussion, the general reflection of the meeting should also revolve around the possibilities of integration and creation of synergies between these dimensions within the complexity of construction and management of the contemporary city.

4.3 METHODOLOGY

The EGM lasted two full days with the deployment of the following sessions:

**THREE PANEL SESSIONS** focused on the three perspectives of densification (physical-environmental, economic/ financial, legal/governance) identified by UN-Habitat.

**TWO DISCUSSION SESSIONS** that centered on the possibilities for integrative approaches.

**ONE PLENARY DISCUSSION** with conclusions of the two EGM days.

4.4 OUTCOME

Communiqué with key issues and recommendations of key issues related to Densification.

5. INTRODUCTION AND OPENING SESSION

Carmen Sánchez-Miranda opened the EGM expressing UN-Habitat gratitude to the authorities of the Andalusian board and introduced Dr. Joan Clos, Executive Director, United Nations Human Settlements Programme and Under Secretary General video message.

In that message, Joan Clos pointed that densification is, after Habitat III, one of the main drivers of thinking in changing the way we do urbanization. He also commented that Andalusia is a model of urbanization with quite unique peculiarities in the world scenario, as Andalusia grew out of a rural economy that created big cities.
Joan Clos also remarked that Seville is a compact city that has traditionally deployed links with rural areas, being an example of modern issues like rural-urban linkages or food security.

UN-Habitat Executive Director also stated that for the XXI century, Seville should take advantage of this lessons learned and of these peculiarities to enrich the conversation and the debate. Compactness itself is very important in order to diminish cost of mobility, as the sprawl of the cities demands a great demand of mobility that at the end generates a negative impact on climate change. In that sense, Joan Clos said that there are many reasons to support a well designed compactness that can provide quality of life and help to diminish the per capita cost of urban services.

Joan Clos ended his statement with the desire that the conversation generated during the two days of the EGM would provide new insights of how to address the big issues of urbanization in the forthcoming years.

**María José Sánchez Rubio**, Councillor for Equality and Social Welfare of the Government of Andalusia and President of AACID remarked that we have been checking how the cities are no longer spaces for integration and opportunities to become, all too often, in places that foster social and economic exclusion and spatial segregation.

In her intervention she reiterated the concern about the need of eradicating poverty and hunger in all its forms and dimensions, thus sharing the global commitment to reorient the current model of planning, design and development of cities to turn them into generators of prosperity and social stability, without harming the environment.

Before concluding, Sánchez Rubio called for a transformation of the current model of urbanization which is characterized by a low density that entails high costs of sustainability and greater segregation and inequality. The result is an inefficient use of infrastructure and waste of land, energy and water, with social and environmental costs in the increase.

Finally, she invited everyone to assume a commitment and to bet on strategies that avoid spatial and socioeconomical segregation, promoting equality and at the same time preserving the natural and cultural heritage.

**Juan Espadas**, Mayor of Seville considered that the case of Andalusia is a good example of
balance and territorial management, having a good network of medium-size cities that has maintained a good level of conservation of natural spaces while embracing development of urban territory. In this context, he pointed that Seville is embarked on the revision and update of the strategic plan of city at 2030, the horizon that marks the international Urban Agenda.

He also remarked that Sevilla’s model is trying to follow the route of the strategic intelligent expertise that the Board of Andalucia is developing along with the European Union recommendations, improving the bet of Seville metropolitan area for productive sectors linked to innovation from different areas, such as tourism.

The share of planned areas has decreased, and informality and lack of planning is higher in cities with low GDP. The amount of area these growing cities are occupying is less and less planned, impeding a later development of capacities, resources or ways of dealing with new situations. It is taking from other land resources: the global trends of reduction of density is quite strong, so the call to find a way to see how to counter this trend is important.

We also know that this is reducing the value of city, having ant on the quality of life, towards a peripheral (mono-functional and standardised) expansion and central decay, with problems of sufficiency and sustainability. We also have segregation with density, connected to quality. Cities that are not well-structured end up accommodating a lot of people in some areas in disorganised density, which is a loss of opportunity and very low-quality based housing facilities.

This also leads to congestion, skyrocketing energy consumption and the pushing a way of agricultural land, making for a more expensive, further away food production system.

Urbanization has been occurring largely as a spontaneous and weakly regulated phenomenon, especially in developing countries. Without Planned City Extension measures we risk to achieve compounded informal proliferation and its consequences—to name a few: uncoordinated investments, land ownership blockages, loss of development potential, loss of local assets, high cost of providing basic services, and high costs of land in the future.

If we do not plan for organised city extension and densification processes, there
will be further social, economic and environmental negative consequences.

From the social side: socioeconomic segregation, mobility and transport breakdown, lack of access to energy and clean water, lack of public health and increased safety risks. From the economic point of view, there will be a loss of economies of urbanisation, loss of agglomeration benefits and loss of job opportunities (especially for the youth). Finally, and from an environmental perspective, the urban sprawl will induce stress on land and resources, geographic vulnerability, and loss of biodiversity and the vital system functions it supports.

In many cities, the capacity to deal with and prepare for these issues and these phenomena is not there. We should move towards a different understanding and pattern of urban growth towards integration, addressing congestion, inequalities, and the ecosystem.

There is consensus that this is a worthwhile route of investigation that comes from the NUA and from the SDGs. This consensus addresses the challenges of moving from urban sprawl towards compactness, from segregation to integration, and addressing congestion through better connectivity.

The New Urban Agenda sets guiding principles for the cities, offering three main tools for working towards sustainable cities: leave no one behind, urban prosperity, and environmental sustainability. The components in charge of acting upon these principles are the national urban policies, rules and regulations, territorial planning and design, and municipal finance. Finally, there are seven levers, which is where the experts come in: planning city extensions, planning city infills, land readjustment, public space planning and regulations, putting housing at the centre of the discussion as well as the access to basic services and setting a global monitoring framework.

This has created a new paradigm; long-term and integrated urban and territorial planning and design to optimize the spatial dimension of the urban form and to deliver the positive outcomes of urbanization.

This EGM focuses on Planned City Infill and urban transformation, moving back to the basics in urban planning and management.

Setting this strategy promotes compact communities with increased urban densities, service and public space provision. We need to expand the cities in a more dense way. This discussion will start from the 5 principles for Sustainable Neighbourhoods. If agreement exists on some qualities of the urban form, a better compact city can be designed.

Finally, Laura Petrella stated that the approach employed will be the 3 pronged approach, regulations, design, and finance. They need to work together to be able to leverage these three points to make things happen, and to make things happen in the right way.

The Outcomes expected are that cities turn more competitive, productive, inclusive, liveable, healthy, resilient, stable and
sustainable. This is asking quite a lot, but a dense city needs to be all these things to contribute for a good quality of life.

Petrella also stated that UN-Habitat refers to the 5 KEY ELEMENTS OF Sustainable Neighbourhoods, with a proposal of what should be done.

In that sense, we should be able to think what the appropriate density is for a neighbourhood: the adequate space for streets and public space in an efficient street network.

**Appropriate density** / density cost in terms of land, what is the cost of living. For example, a density of at least 15,000 people per km²; this means 150 inch/ha or 61 inch/acre.

**Convenient land for the street network:** the access to basic services and connectivity between neighbourhoods. For example the street area should be at least 30% of the land, and connectivity should be defined as x km/ km² of street length or x crossing per km of street.

**Mixed Land uses:** a compact city should bring together different uses and functions in order to increase productivity and interaction. For instance, at least 40% of floor space is for economic uses.

**Social Mix:** a very complex issue with different contexts and experiences in trying to mix social groups, but which can be measured, for example, with the difference in price of housing within the area.

**Limiting specialisation in big scale:** for example the limited land use specializations: zoning (specialized) covering less than 10% of the area

Moving from the principles to the 3 Enabling Components: these components need to be integrated to enable us to use urban forms to generate value, and using that value through rules and regulation to extract it, redistribute it, and establish a sort of “virtuous cycle” in urbanisation that manages value and attracts investment.

**Rules and Regulations:** good urban planning requires the rule of law: many countries/cities lack the legal infrastructure to regulate city growth. There is land-grabbing and an abuse of the public space for private interests. There is no clarity on the buildability right vis-à-vis the property right, no tool for controlling urban development or creating revenue and trade in plot development with quality outcomes.

**Urban design:** good urban planning requires good design, meaning that there needs to be a coherent implementation matrix; the public space layout, the street pattern, the block typology, the plot typology... Their capacity to evolve, to support density, to adapt, their relationship and equilibrium with natural spaces.

**The financial plan:** good urban planning requires a solid financial plan. We need to organise the land, the acquisition of the public land is dependent on the rigidity of the property system. There needs to be a land readjustment and an investment in basic services and infrastructure as well as in the maintenance of the public realm and public services. This implementation matrix needs budgeting and a leveled relationship between incomes and expenditures.

**Context matters.** There are various mechanisms that in some contexts they might be obvious, but in others, the differences in GDPs, number of planners that can be deployed, the types of urban planners where we want to increase densities or expand the city make it difficult to see or apply the plans towards urban development. We might need more general regulations to create value and improve the urban fabric, with tools that help govern this transformation without disrupting other opportunities. The opportunities and challenges in slums and suburbs are not the same that those in expansion areas or in consolidated city centers. For example, the priority of increasing density in consolidated cities is that densification needs better assessment and improvement of public spaces, a design to manage density and plan of mobility (public transport), infrastructure...
carrying capacity and better planning and management. In badly or not planned cities, slums need localized densification to reconquer public space, to open up and restructure the street grid while preserving density and improving quality. Suburbs require an intensification of its activities and uses through infill and resizing of open spaces and the improvement of connectivity with a reduction of car dependency.

6. THEMATIC SESSIONS

6.1 PANEL 1: THE PHYSICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL PERSPECTIVE OF DENSIFICATION

6.1.1 BACKGROUND

Densification represents an opportunity to carry out complex urban restructuring projects. Beyond the previously mentioned advantages, densification is a fundamental tool for governments to obtain the required land to improve existing conditions in the city, through either new infrastructure, new public space and / or new urban equipment. Likewise, the densification of areas within the city appears as an opportunity to accommodate part of the population growth.

However, from the physical perspective, densification obviously presents some limitations, derived from cultural aspects (density is not equally understood in Hong Kong, Seville or Luanda), or the physical characteristics existing in the cities (such as amount of open space, connectivity with the surrounding territory, among others).

6.1.2 MAIN ISSUES ADDRESSED

Under what conditions is densification a more useful tool? And under what conditions is densification not a good practice?

What international examples can we take to establish the limits of densification in physical terms?

As such, we need to guide transformation and densification in different contexts, enhance benefits and mitigate problems of densification, and support the long-term management of increased density. The expected outcome is to create cities that are competitive, productive, inclusive, liveable, healthy, resilient, stable and sustainable.

How to preserve/restore urban ecosystem services?

What are some valid indicators of density applicable to urban densification projects?

How does the way of life in different societies affect the definition of adequate densities?

What densification possibilities do cities with medium and high densities offer?

Is it convenient to carry out urban transformation operations by densifying plots without the need to include new inhabitants in some areas?

Is it possible and convenient to carry out cross-densification operations between two different areas of the city?

What urban management tools are applicable in cases of densification?

How to carry out densification processes (medium and long term) in areas currently inhabited?

Is it possible and desirable to carry out densification processes in areas of informal settlements?

6.1.3 KEY OUTCOME MESSAGES

Densification comes in different forms, and understanding the benefits and qualities of most preferable density in a specific situation is critical.

This should consider the importance of public space and connectivity, mixed use, social and generation diversity and metrics of density. Vertical and horizontal options....
Density is measured with different metrics and it is defined and appreciated differently in different contexts.

Public space and how it is designed in relation to private space is critical condition for densification where public space plays a key role in making density work.

Infrastructure/services provision, and maintenance of the same are critical requirement for viable densification and need to be factored in from the onset, through design choices (reduce the costs through design).

Mixed use within building and review of the Standard vs design (land based).

Avoid extensions already implicit Planning City Extensions.

Moderator Salvatore Fundarò, member of Urban Planning and Design Lab at UN-Habitat described the objective of this session was to understand how we have to achieve densification, the compactness and inclusiveness of the city, the preservation of agricultural land, the reduction of energy consumption and car dependency and preparedness for future challenges. The NUA made specific mention to these issues.

He proposed as issues to discuss shortcomings of densification, how densification be made in different contexts, the role of the public space, of the street, in building densification and the social mix for densification. He also suggested to engage with how to improve and manage the relation between the city and the rural areas in already very dense cities, how to balance the megalopolies and the villages.

He introduced that the reshaping of this balance would be tackled by Luca D’Acci from a more academic and theoretical point of view. Moreover, he asked the speakers to consider how to bring densification to the top of the urban agenda, as it is not a priority or an attractive issue for many people living in low densification areas. The cultural situation of these countries affects densification and the evolution of the city, as Shifu Wang would discuss afterwards, affect urbanisation and urban renewal. Wang would also discuss the indicators in the global context to measure densification.

Speaker Luca D’Acci introduced a new, provocative model on densification.

He started off by pointing out that in New York about 23% of land is reserved to car parking lots when only an overall of 4% of our time is spent in the car, 96% of the time it is parked.
This means that 23% of city space is 96% of the time virtually unused holding cars, which account for over half of the emissions from the transportation sector.

Focusing on this issue, D’Acci described the economic costs of car congestion in cities, with the total costs of motorised transport in Beijing being between 7.6-16% of GDP, including air pollution and congestion. Health costs related to pollution is of 6% of GDP in cities in developing countries, where over 80% of which can be attributed to vehicle emissions. Additionally, urban road accidents in developing country cities alone cost 2% of GDP. Finally, D’Acci portrayed how the social costs of road transport in OECD countries increase as users travel on foot, by bike, by bus, and by private transport, the difference between the last two being considerable.

He linked congestion with urban sprawl, where the differences in costs between cities of similar population size and wealth were noticeable when comparing their transit-oriented versus car-oriented transport policies. After mentioning the examples of Singapore and Houston, D’Acci concluded that compact, connected urban development could reduce global infrastructure requirements by more than $3 trillion in 15 years (2015-2030).

He explained that small, multifunctional cities are provided by various methods of transportation more user and environmentally friendly. The quality of life is better than that in megacities. D’Acci explained that the current typology of cities in several cases generate urban heat islands, pollution, greenhouse effects, urban sprawl, depression, waste of time, illness, water waste, nature degradation and no nature contact.

He proposed that cities could improve through “isobenefit urbanism”, whereby urban form and size (dimension and shape) is in bit interconnection with compact, small-medium size units (big cities emit more CO2 emissions than small-medium sized units); urban structure (what and how cities are built within) becomes that of a multicentric city with multifunctional neighbourhoods; and in which this urban form and urban structure welcomes the presence of nature within urbanity.

The idea is not to separate the natural and the urban areas, but combine them. Within walking distance (2-3 km), citizens should be able to reach a green area, as well as ordinary daily points such as shops, job locations, and other common services.

Speaker Jeffrey Shumaker, now in the private sector but with a strong experience in New York City Council as Chief for Urban Design in NYC, explained how theory can clash with the reality of the management on a city.

He started by showing that New York density comes in all shapes and sizes, from the typical skyscraper image to a small coastal community. To control urban development and density, he said, one needs good city planning: a framework to govern growth, with sufficient public space. With the example of NYC, he portrayed how city planning changes over time depending on the developer’s plans for the city in different time-periods.

For example, in 1857 Central Park was designed, seeing the need for public space which had not been foreseen earlier on. After 1916, cities changed, and notions of what is good density also changed. Last year 2016, the
city approved a mayor rewriting in zoning, the first since 1961. The cities make mistakes, and updates are needed.

He said that there is a fundamental connection between development, density, and public space.

Last month in February, NY City Council added another layer of guidance, looking at equity through appreciating that different neighbourhoods host different kinds of people, not all want to live the same way, and so the physical form needs to adapt to the needs and preferences of its users. By introducing the city’s first ever urban design principles, of an aspirational nature and that can apply equally to Midtown Manhattan and Staten Island.

These principles focus on the understanding of four concepts: a sense of ‘place’ as something that good urban design both creates and reinforces. Good urban design is open and accessible to everyone, creating ‘equity,’ and it is ‘detail-oriented.’ Finally, good urban design makes people feel good, giving ‘comfort’.

Shumaker offered three case studies: the first on infill strategies for social housing in a housing community called St. Nick in Harlem that used to follow the city grid, then it was reorganised for a better use of public space. At the time, in the 1940s, the neighbourhood was a vibrant mix of apartments, row houses, shops and churches, but Robert Moses applied the idea, fashionable at the time and in many ways anti-density, where efficiency is preferred and city planners made changes towards it (Le Corbusier’s vision). Many of these housing initiatives reduced urban density and maximised light and air. St. Nicholas houses today are not too different from Le Corbusier’s vision, which became popular throughout NY. Shumaker posed the question of how to add density and better connect existing and future residents, rethinking the form of this community; bringing back the human scale while maintaining and making useable park space. In his example of good practice, they worked with a number of stakeholders and talked to the community, and they noticed that different results are achieved when engaging the community. Urban planners like Robert Moses might have just added another tower, but creative infill solutions such as those proposed by Jane Jacobs, which include the same number of units but in a different layout give very different outcomes.

Shumaker showcased another example of how community input engagement participation allows planners to figure out what a neighbourhood should be. Looking at another public housing community, this time in Brooklyn, in a neighborhood that was badly damaged by Superstorm Sandy, as much of the housing sits on landfill. A proposal consisted on elevating electricity utilities and diversifying them so that in case of flood if one lost electricity it could draw from somewhere else. They worked closely with landscape architects and the concept of Lily Pads where the central spaces remain out of harm’s way even during disasters. More amenities aside from utilities like parks and other public spaces were designed in utility pods that could also be personalised according to the community’s liking, giving variety and enriching the neighbourhood. The result was an innovative approach combining much-needed community public space while being more resilient to future storms.

The last example happens to be one of our densest neighborhoods in the city: East Midtown, the 70 or so blocks around Grand Central Station: office space, NYC financial core and Regional Transit Hub where the average building age is 70 years. The area has low quality office space and inadequate public realm. A plan has been introduced to add density with the use of density bonus to invest in the public realm – making an explicit link between greater density and neighborhood improvements such as new public space, improved transit, better streets, etc. Community engagement proved to be again key through visualisation sessions with users, particularly since it is an important transportation gateway, around Central Station. As they are adding development, the idea is that development agents need to give back to the community. For example, looking to add more space for pedestrian use that is not properly utilised for car traffic anyway.
Shumaker also showed the project of One Vanderbilt, wanting to apply how architecture can support life at the surface, in contact with the street and pedestrians. Showing the multiple layers of improvement in the public realm that can be paid for by the new development. The building will be finished in 2020.

Shumaker’s final lesson was that not all density is created equal, and is up to the public and private sectors, working together with the community, to create the best possible outcome.

Salvatore Fundarò questioned if other cities not as intellectually or economically capable as Manhattan could also achieve similar project proposals and outcomes, and if there is a link between gentrification and densification.

Speaker Shifu Wang combining the academic and private profession, he offered some cases on urban density in China. It is well known that there is a very unequal population density in China, where the coastal urban population density is higher than in the inland areas, as well as more developed. In contrast with Manhattan, which was much more crowded in the early 1900s than today, China’s cities have become denser.

China preferred density has historically, the word crowded means prosperous, as the example of Dongjiq city shows: the outer region (where civilians resided) was the less dense, inner city (army and family) became more crowded and the Royal City was the most dense. From some ancient books, we know that the street had become too narrow and crowded, and the house supply was tight, since some government officers who had been working for over forty years could not afford a private house. A kind of anti-urbanisation or pro-rural policy was in place.

Wang made a link between ideology and practice in urban settings, with examples of same densification but very different layout and quality of life. For example, Shipai Village in Guangzhou shows a village-like housing structure within the city, in which the modern city had grown around the village. In Shipai, an informal bottom-up process of densification has taken place. Nevertheless, comparing Shipai Village in Guangzhou and Kin Ming Estate in Hong Kong, it is apparent that similar density but different built environments have led to different life styles.

Densification can be seen as a socioeconomic process of urban redevelopment in which there is a reconfiguration of land use: the market value of the city centre today is much higher than it was before urban development. This generates a collusion between the government’s decision to develop and citizen lifestyle. Citizens are forced to sell their houses to the government so it can build new buildings that agree to the current demands of the market. From the social capital point of view, when a reconstructed urban village where building area per capita is increased but density is decreased, the city is not improving. Urban development is an economic and technical force that leads to a change in lifestyle and social structure.

If we put all together, we could find the economic and technical force, that the implementation could change the way of life. Chang’s idea is that density needs to be closely related to cultural dreams. In China, they like to be crowded. They show prosperity and happiness through density.

Density, economy and technology might be constraints, but the social expectations need to be taken into account. Density is a relative concept that the local people prefer or tolerate within the place, and so is densification. Technology and the economy may be the constraints or limitations, but more
densification is the social process of inclusive attributes in China.

Fundaró pointed out that in China density is seen under a positive light in urban areas, a concept that is not shared elsewhere.

Respondent Saswata Bandyopadhyay agreed with the speakers that we need compact cities, but raised questions as to how can they be operationalised, how to achieve them, what tools, experiences and knowledge we need to bring in.

He called for a deconstruction of the notion of density. The dwelling and density need to be related. When looking at compact cities, he noted that we need to look at how density is reflecting in the sprawl of the city, how it changed overtime. Drawing from the speakers’ presentations, he highlighted that some cities have grown although the population growth has been slower. Two urban planners have created a large sprawl independent of the actual urban population growth, responding to their personal aspirations as urban planners and how urban planners perceive density.

He also pointed out to the case of overcrowding, for example in Mumbai. There are specific cases where density is directly related to household size. Most housing facilities in South Asia hold more people than in cities elsewhere. Asides from overcrowding, we need to look into infill programmes, Bandyopadhyay added. Cities provide 65% to the GDP, important economic handlers in the country. He defended that density needs to be related to job opportunity and economic opportunities. This is why Bandyopadhyay noted three issues that need to be looked into in redevelopment programmes: infill, redevelopment, and planned extensions. In India, he continued, a flexible plan that can be adjusted as it moves along is needed. The three approaches to redevelopment are retrofitting.

The expert also pointed that in South Asia there are two paradigms emerging: Cities are trying to expand and control land, and other cities are having high density problems. In medium and high density, How does densification and redevelopment occur? What value does redevelopment to densification and urban planning provide? – The cities that are
expanding how do you embed them within urban planning system? He pointed out an example of an area of Mumbai, where gentrification is providing more green spaces, more transportation, more public spaces – but it is also pushing one economic group out while bringing another one in. With this, Bandyopadhyay pointed out the need to look at the challenges that come with reurbanisation. The issue of inclusion and gentrification needs to be addressed. There is also evidence that we need to build, when redensifying, the challenges, and the disaster and risk management capacity of city planning – most cities have low capacity to manage emergencies and disasters.

Finally, the expert concluded that there is density and intensity: how density reflects on the street. You may have a large density building but then the streets are empty. You need the both of them.

6.1.4 DEBATE

Matthias Nohn asked Shifu about the social value of reconstruction with resettlements, seeing how density declined after redevelopment, and if intensity also diminished, and if there is a case of mixed development and compromise where the public space is kept. Shifu replied that part of the land is sold to the market to cover the resettlement costs and part of the lot is kept for the future redevelopment plans to gain long-term revenue. On the public space, he added that the public physical environment is improved, although they rebuild everything and keep little from the past buildings. Nevertheless, Shifu believed that while the physical environment improves, the social aspect does not improve as much.

Salvatore joined in and asked about these newly rebuilt neighbourhoods, where gentrification is ongoing, moving to these improved areas. He inquired if people were staying in the villages or moving, if there are examples of redevelopment maintaining parts of the village and introducing new density, or if there were only two ways of implementing densification in China: destroying and rebuilding everything, or intensifying the already existing patterns.

Shifu said that every kind of reconstruction is mixed, but in China land-ownership is complicated for institutional reasons. He added that the renting price is much higher after reconstruction, and so that the new tenant in expropriated land is wealthier and pays three times more for rent than in the original plan.

Qiu Aijun added that there are different perspectives to everything, and that in China the institutional and regional governments have the power and capacity to build in larger cities, but in small cities it is different, the rural communities have more power. Shifu agreed, explaining that from north to south, the power relations are very different. In the South, the villagers are very strong and can oppose the government.

Javier Huesa asked Shumaker, drawing from the example of redevelopment in St. Nicholas,
and considering the cases found in Seville, whether the public housing originally private or public and where did the funding come from. Shumaker replied that in NYC they don’t build public housing anymore, no money comes from the federal level – it has to come from private investment input. He went on explaining that it usually is a mixed income development but funded by private developers. Sometimes it is 100% affordable, but there are different ways of affordable – for some, affordable might still be unaffordable. This reflects the importance of zoning and development control. For them, 35-40% of new housing needs to be affordable for us, but only when they upzone, giving additional rights to develop and in exchange getting back some affordable units and having a social mix within the neighbourhood. Javier Huesa asked what was the redevelopment like, since in the 1950s it was a demolition process, and he was unclear on how was the impact on the population managed. Shumaker answered that redevelopment in NYC is never through demolition at present, because it is very expensive politically and economically. Often, there is a narrowing of the street to a more human space.

Alfredo Garay posed the question of when is it little or too much densification. It seems that the fewer inhabitants per hectare, the more the space is inefficiently used. But then, where is the point where we consider there is overcrowding? We would need to consider the number of squared metres built in a parcel. When we talk about density, how many people are we considering live per housing? Usually we consider four people, as we observe that gentrification also means fewer members per family, reducing the density within the same space. It depends on cultural patterns and the dream of the collectivity. There are many ways of living the city, there are many city dreams, the dreams of the middle-income groups. But most people cannot fulfill this dream, like the American dream that expanded all over the world in the suburbs. This cultural debate should perhaps be promoted in the popular sectors.

Gianluca Crispi chipped in saying that most of the urban growth will happen in Africa over the next 20 years, cities that because of cultural and economic needs they have to grow in a compact manner even though their current needs and priorities might be different. Addressing Shumaker, he asked what can be learnt from the example of NYC, if the urban pattern be designed in a way to accommodate increasing density over the following years. Jeffrey replied that the American dream has changed with the younger generation, they want a more European lifestyle with walkable communities, where there are lots of diverse activities, amenities and spaces, with more intensity within that density. In NY the most dense neighbourhoods are the most valued. He conceded to Gianluca that there is a growing need of creating a framework that is flexible enough, where density is linked to the public space.

D’Acci in response to Garay, he added that density is not just a question of numbers, but also of how is this density achieved. If you divided the whole land between 7 billion people, we would have 100m² for each. It seems that according to world surveys, 44% of respondents indicated that the ideal places for living were small towns or villages. A lot of indicators show that life satisfaction is higher in small towns than in the cities in developing countries. This is happening thanks to teleworking, new technologies that allow us to work from home, so not everyone will be forced to move to the megacities for work.

Bandyopadhyay, adding to Shifu Wang’s intervention, pointed out that there is a cultural density, each country has its own history. Density and its applications are different depending on the context. What is the objective in which place for what density? Different values of density, we should look at the implications in energy consumption, transportation costs, urban sprawl, etc. He suggested the creation of a platform where experts could share their experiences as there is a big gap between rhetoric and reality of which more urban developed cities could provide experience to southern, less urban developed cities.
Sara Hoeftlich went back to D’Acci’s presentation and highlighted the city regulations to limit pollution and control traffic such as those in Barcelona or Madrid, emphasizing the ongoing dependency on oil and car transportation, which with densification, generates a lot of congestion and pollution. She asked Shifu Wang experts if they had solutions or proposals on regulating the use of cars in Chinese cities. Wang added that car-pooling is very popular in tier 1 cities in China, but as for the rest, it is hard to deal with the community in densification, and the tendency in China is to demolish. He accepted that it might not be very democratic, but many people need to be organised and be provided with the opportunity to achieve better lifestyles. Still, he admitted that China has to slow down to learn how to make agreements with population, learning from NYC.

Marco Kamiya joined in by asking what kind of housing and access to jobs do people want. Density is mostly economic density, but we also have in the developing cities overcrowding, sometimes used as a synonym to density, which is something that might have to be redefined. In some African cities people don’t want to commute two or more hours to get to work and so prefer to live in slums. We have to design principles of urban planning linked to economic income. We can learn a lot from NY and China, and see how their methods can be adapted to other cases.

Laura Petrella reacted to Kamiya’s comment by saying that this session centered around extremes issues, with very refined mechanisms and data, but one aspect this EGM had to deal with was with small and medium cities in many developing countries where they need to plan density even if they cannot plan it now. In that sense, she called for a more holistic, exportable approach in future discussion.

6.2 PANEL 2: THE ECONOMIC/FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE OF DENSIFICATION

6.2.1 BACKGROUND
Densification of urban areas widely takes place to generate added value to the city. In most cases, the possibility of increasing the volumes of construction or inhabitants that can inhabit a determined plot leads to an increase of the value of that plot; if the urban operation is also accompanied by improvements in the physical conditions of the environment, this value increase can become proportionally higher than the increase in density.

However, not all existing legal frameworks allow taking advantage of this added value to benefit the whole population – In the neighborhood or in the city. Moreover, even under legal frameworks that allow it, not all urban operations are capable of obtaining a fair proportion of that increase in value.

6.2.2 MAIN ISSUES ADDRESSED
What are the economic conditions required to get value from density?

What urban management tools make possible to take better advantage of the increase in value generated by urban densification operations?

Density doesn’t mean automatically economic positive spillovers of agglomerations, so in what context density provides efficiency and increase urban productivity?

Is it possible to think of some kind of progressive value capture?

Is it desirable to distribute the added value in one area of the city to other parts of the city?

What should be the role of the private investor in urban densification operations?

Is it possible and desirable to reverse part of the value captured in the generation of new economic activity in a densified area?
What are the best practices of using tax incentives to promote densification?

6.2.3 KEY OUTCOME MESSAGES

New methodologies for budget approvals are necessary. Implementing participatory schemes is needed to identify and select financial alternatives that are more efficient since costs and time are involved that affect the modality of repayment.

In order to improve transparency it is necessary to make available information on the financing of new infrastructure.

A legal framework that is realistic and applicable must be in place to make possible private investment in public and local infrastructure. Private sector must be able to recover investment and have a clear notion of risks in case of eventualities to provide an incentive to invest.

It is necessary to provide training on finance for city leaders so they are able to design complex financial instruments such as land value sharing, incremental taxes, betterment levies, building rights, and those need to be contextualized.

Redevelopment of low-income neighbourhood would require substantial public investment/subsidy, and those financial schemes must be explored – diversify this.

Long term sustainability of running operation costs elsewhere.

Marco Kamiya, Coordinator of Urban Economy and Finance Branch, Urban Economy and Municipal Finance Unit at UN-Habitat, started the session commenting that the literature on urban densification is also very rich in the field of residential density, since the seminal work carried by Newman and Kenworthy in the late 80s. Dozens of studies show that residential density impacts very significantly on energy consumptions per capita for transportation. A manual for city leaders is the publication ‘Economic Foundations of Sustainable Urbanization’ released by UN-Habitat and the Urban Morphology and Complex Institute Paris.

He reviewed the already mentioned UN-Habitat’s Principles of Urban Planning, and explained that density in planning refers to the number of people inhabiting a given urbanized area, which is related with floor area ratio, residential dwellings per area, and population density. He also explained that density in Economics refers to agglomerations and its positive externalities that increase productivity. More people make easier to have specialization, diversity and facilitates production of goods and service. The differences are that planning defines density as a principle, but in Economics density is defined by models. Planning the spatial dimension is implicit and known, whereas in Economics the space is regional and its constraints not necessarily implicit.

Kamiya went through the main implications of economic approach to density: density has costs to municipalities, who have to pay for basic services, housing, police, healthcare, education, costs of informality… But it also has benefits, although to obtain these cities need connectivity, lower operational costs of infrastructure for firms and households to trigger economies of scale. This explains how and why slums and business and residential districts coexist, or in other words slum and formal urban areas.
What are the economic conditions required to get value from density?

In what context density provides efficiency and increase urban productivity?

What is the role of the private investor in urban densification operations?

Is it possible to reverse value captured in the generation of new economic activity in a densified area?

What are the best practices of using tax incentives to promote densification?

Joo-Ho Rhim started out by offering some background on the causes of declining cities: Public-driven suburban development, changes in industrial structure and weakening regional economy, land low growth, low fertility and aging trend. He addressed the need for a policy shift on urban regeneration to adapt low economic growth, to strengthen competency of local communities, to create synergies by cooperation and integration of independent projects.

He displayed the types of urbanization projects, started in 2014, on neighborhood regeneration, downtown-based, economy-based utilization of national housing and urban fund for UR projects, and advocated for more flexible land-use in “Minimal Location Regulation Area”. The decline of the old town, with population decreasing, led to proposals of complex theme park town. Similar to some Chinese renovation plans, some historical buildings where to be kept or relocated, while others were to be reconstructed for renovation or refurbishment. New proposals show public facilities concentrated around the Children’s Hall and the rooftop plaza. To vitalise downtown streets, apartments and retail towers are on the east side, close to transport stations.

Rhim then moved on to the financing plan: area designated as UR leading area, basic agreement on UR project, budget approval, dormitory construction understanding. public hearing about draft development plan, implementation agreement, public recruitment of private partner, building permit, presale of apartments and retail units, completion, residential and commercial complex, business completion.

Implications and lessons drawn from the first infill development project supported by UHF under the new urban regeneration policies were the following: an effective use of public land can revitalize declining downtown, and a feasible plan to achieve balanced combination of public value and private profitability can be achieved. Sharing profits and risks among partners is more secure, and giving a leading role to the local government, in cooperation with central government, is preferred as a specialized and responsible public institution acting as developer who can manage whole procedures. It is important to know how to build partnerships early at initial planning stage.

Kamiya summarised the conditions to good finance as portrayed by Rhim: property market is 100% formal, property rights are in place, technical expertise in the municipality is high.

Matthias Nohn started by highlighting that the preconditions for success in urban financing are investment security, technical assistance, financial access, and adequate targeting. He used primarily the case study of Ciudad Bachue in Colombia, a complete settlement with all services, following the “Cities inside the City” 1975 policy. It was designed to allow for incremental housing typologies; the infrastructure strong enough to support an expansion above roof level. It consisted on a provision of row houses and multi-story
buildings which could be built upon. It is one of the few projects that provides multi-story buildings designed for expansion, to address the land, housing, infrastructure, transportation and employment conundrum: improve capability to access more central location through demand-led densification.

Studies on the number of family members and investment from families into the houses and their upgrading show that these grew exponentially as the years passed and the families grew and could use their private savings towards the expansion. It proved to be a way of empowering families to invest in their living. While from a legal point of view this settlement provided legal challenges since they also built unplanned expansions, from an economic point of view it is a success because it improved land use efficiency because it allowed to improve land use of underutilised space.

One of the key conclusions is that multi-storage incremental housing can be viable economically and financially, because it combines two advantages: multi-story housing to pool the land cost amongst a larger number of units, and to keep the initial construction costs low by differing some of the investments into the future. The question is how can this be applied universally. Can the principles (for dense planned city expansion) be applied for inclusive inner-city densification?

An example of a different sociocultural context in Egypt, Helwan Worker’s Settlement: Many modern housing developments have unclear property rights / maintenance concept for thus-underutilized semi-public open space between apartment blocks. Often these spaces are informally appropriated (see next case). In this case, the city supports the extension with a “barefoot” public planner. The development is entirely private driven, both concerning construction and finance Densification in Egypt, Densification through expansion of public rental walk-ups.

And so, clear rules for incremental expansion, possibly combined with a frame for structural safety as seen in the case of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, are needed. Informal expansions that were illegal led to legal challenges in the municipality, which solved it by creating a supportive legal environment that allows for the regulation of house expansions.

Urban Infill typologies in Germany: framed under the theme “More City within The City”, urban densification accounts for 90 percent of new residential development in Hamburg, Germany. Germany differentiates six approaches to densification: Vertical extension, Horizontal extension, Infill between buildings, Courtyard development, Restructuring of parking spaces, commercial/manufacturing or gardens can accommodate new urban uses; and conversion of unused buildings, such as former military buildings or building yards, are redeveloped.

Concluding remarks: multistory incremental housing is useful for socioeconomic inclusion, an governments can act as enablers, but not necessarily as providers, for demand-driven grass-roots densification, which can be financed through the demand side, part of the solution is to establish a long-term and sustainable cash flows. Access to finance at the demand side could be tied to delineated area to avoid sprawl.

Kamiya argued that the projects mentioned by Matthias are exceptions that survived and
thrive[d]ed because the state financed them or they had the backing of international organisations.

Ellen Bassett, respondent in the panel, reflected that presentations were about regeneration, housing provision and densification. South Korea was doing a top-down approach, and the cases in Bogota and Egypt had a more bottom-up approach. US does not want to densify, it’s a dirty word (except in NY). Land is privately owned and the state is a federal state where the local authorities have little to gain from proposing densification processes since the mentality is that there is a lot of usable urban land and no urgent need for densification.

The US is marked by a rigid legal framework due to the property rights structure, and it is a market economy and in very few instances the governments mandates densification. For densification, incentive measures are needed, such as the tax system. Densification policies have different scales and political agendas, that work in a zero-sum approach where either densification is set as a general framework or not at all.

José Antonio García from the Municipality of Córdoba was the second respondent. He talked from the finance perspective from the point of view of the local administration. He talked about his personal experience in the Government of Andalusia during the economic recession, his worry being how to get that funding for projects. The array of funding options will determine whether we can build one unit, or five. If we have several different funding models, choosing the wrong one means that the country will pay for that mistake more money than it ought.

In this sense, and alluding to the two presentations, he said that the structure of the legal framework should be studied, as taxation laws might affect the financing. Not just the intrinsic financial costs and the external costs. We should also study the impact the project is going to have on health, on transport, acoustic pollution, etc. All of this is going to be translated into costs for the administration, so it would be necessary to include this funding on the model of citizen participation. We should invite the citizens to say what, how and where to do it, and how to finance it. Are we going to pay it ourselves, or our children and grandchildren? Therefore, the type of model and the external costs have to be assessed in all projects to know what will be the surplus or extra costs, because on the externalities of public administration there can be positive and negative costs, and this should be taken into account not aside from the strictly financial calculations.
6.2.4 DEBATE

Catalina Rodríguez, private consultant from Bogotá, commented on Matthias’ presentation, pointing out how the initial infrastructure was delivered but there was no technical support given for future expansion plans, therefore creating structural problems in these extensions. Regarding public spaces such as the asphalt and streets became extra costs, and in 2003 the Administration had to reach an agreement on public grounds, with an effort on structural reinforcement and façade work. This plan is very interesting but needs technical support throughout the process.

Saswata Bandyopadhyay dwelt on the aspect of redevelopment in slum areas in India, led by private actors and backed by the state through the viability gap funding, the land pulling and readjustment schemes, and the operation and maintenance of public spaces with a model whereby part of the public part is rented by private sector agencies.

Alfredo Garay recalled an issue, treated in different ways in the presentations. Le Courbousier made disappear the previous layout of the plots, but in the public mentality that matrix remained. In Colombia, when public housing is made, the plot disappears. What is the space allocated to members of the same family, horizontal property condominium, and what is the space for the public?. It is not very well defined in property documents, which has consequences in organising the financing for maintenance and renovation. Collective forms of urban organisation does not always answer or reflect what the market wants.

Johoo- Rhim added that for city planners there is also the question of how to best divide a plot.

Matthias Nohn pointed that the scale of the projects he mentioned had a strong focus on cost-recovery, which created certain issues: either the construction process is very slow or the quality of the infrastructure is low. This is why the construction was phased out, to make it more affordable and adaptable depending on capacity and needs. These sites also generated transport and connectivity issues as they were built just outside the city. It is true that the settlement had some issues, undoubtedly technical assistance throughout the extension processes would have been better. Arguably, they are still better than in completely informal urban development, so taking into account this context, the overall result is favourable. On the maintenance of the public space, he agreed that the coverage of these costs is unclear, but this does not discredit the concept, it just points out to certain gaps that should indeed be covered.
Laura Petrella concluded by asking about the restability of the investment, brought up in the Korean case. In Kenya, the rentability requested is extremely high, and so redevelopment is seen more risky. There is a lot in relation to finance related to culture and politics, which is a bit surprising in our way of thinking, as we assume that money will just go where the best investment is.

Sara Hoeflich pointed that, concerning financing, we should also learn from the lessons in financing for governments. Municipalities should have access to finance, but on the other side, she questioned their capacity to select and not get into the first trap promising financing. We need some guidance on sources and back-ups. For example in Spain, looking back, the housing boom now is being paid by the citizens and it has had a huge impact in policy, with many cities now struggling with finding a way to sustain their own urbanisation development processes. Taking advantages of boom times is really important to leave the boom time without any debts. In Spain, only the city of Bilbao is the city without debt because they paid all back during the real estate boom.

6.3 PANEL 3: THE LEGAL/GOVERNANCE PERSPECTIVE OF DENSIFICATION

6.3.1 BACKGROUND

Although urban densification operations are normally promoted and developed at the city level, the mechanisms that allow the appropriation of part of the value generated are usually derived from legal frameworks established at the national level. This situation means that in some cases the process of densification (and particularly some of its benefits) can become very complex from the point of view of its implementation, even in cases where there is an agreement between stakeholders.

However, many city governments have been able to develop innovative urban management tools that, adapted to higher legal frameworks, allow these operations to be carried out.

6.3.2 MAIN ISSUES ADDRESSED

Which urban management tools are most suitable for carrying out densification operations? Which of these tools can only depend on the level of government of the city? In what situations is it necessary to have legal frameworks at other levels of government?

What urban management tools can operate as permanent mechanisms that encourage densification of cities or discourage the use of densities that are smaller than desired?

Which regulatory barriers exist for higher densities or urban renewal/slum upgrading projects?

Which enabling legislation and regulatory incentives can support densification efforts?

Increases in values deriving from urban renewal project often lead to gentrification and
economic evictions of residents. Which approaches and tools can be put in place to minimize this risk?

Which land management and development mechanisms can facilitate the reshaping of land parcels and change the land tenure situation?

How can the financing of the infrastructure and redevelopment derive from the equitable sharing of burden and benefits of the regeneration project?

Planning for density require the collaboration and participation of residents, land owners and investors. What’s the right balance between residents participation and the physical shape envisioned by the city and how can planning legislation influence the physical outcome of private lead projects?

6.3.3 KEY OUTCOME MESSAGES

LEGAL

Policy coherence

Often policy and legislative frameworks lack coherence and even in cities and countries where densification policies are in place, land use regulations, planning tools, taxation and infrastructure investments are not coordinated and instead of facilitate densification pose barriers to densification to happen. This consistency is very rare as regulations, infrastructure investments and taxes are often designed at different level of government and for different purpose while all these tools should aim towards the same objectives.

Effective legislation

Every legal strategy to support densification should be driven by the country/city specific issues and conditions. Laws and regulations should consider local conditions such as income, economic base, and cultural and social contexts and be adequate to existing capacities and resources.

Regulatory barriers to densification

Regulatory frameworks should be reviewed to identify regulatory barriers to densification. Including minimum dwelling unit and plot size, maximum building height and plot coverage, maximum land in residential use, and maximum density, land subdivision regulations, as well as building codes, setbacks, street width, parking requirements and condominium laws to manage and maintain multi-ownership condominium buildings.

Preventing gentrification

Densification initiatives can create social segregation, gentrification and exclusion. They should be part of national and municipal housing policies that take into account housing needs, tenure requirements and locations.

Clear targets for affordable housing and inclusionary outcomes should be present in every intervention. Appropriate requirements such as minimum % of affordable housing and the need to provide rental options for existing population should be introduced. Social impact assessments should be conducted before implementing any densification initiative. They are useful instruments to identify and analyse the social impacts of a proposed project, programme or plan on social groups within a community or on an entire community.

Implementing density

Urban Planning for densification should be implemented by finding a balance between providing incentives, determining obligations and responsibilities for landowners, (compulsory development, building and occupancy orders) and via negotiated agreements.

Land use regulations should aim to prevent sprawl but have to provide sufficient space to construct housing for growing populations otherwise land and housing costs rise.

The implementation of redevelopment and densification projects require the existence of functioning land management tools to readjust land parcels and to facilitate the joint redevelopment of urban in fills (with fractionated properties), management of the process and distribute fairly the burdens and benefits of the intervention (public, private and PPP).
Densification and Land markets

Planning for densification should consider existing market forces and the effects that densification can have on the land, property and rental markets. It should be aligned to a citywide urban land management strategy to avoid distortions in land and property markets.

Measures to prevent speculation should be adopted, including the taxation of empty buildings and empty serviced plots.

Need to reinforce the social role of land and property (in some countries).

GOVERNANCE

Densification strategies should have a metropolitan scale and be based on metropolitan institutional arrangements.

Effective mechanisms for residents’ (including tenants) participation need to be developed in order to strike a balance between community interests and the realization of the public interest.

Stakeholder involvement needs to be organized systematically and configured as critical success factor for densification.

National legislation should create an adequate toolbox to support densification strategies and empower cities to choose the most appropriate legal strategy to support densification.

Moderator Gianluca Crispi, Legal Officer in the Urban land, Legislation and Governance Branch, Urban legislation Unit at UN-Habitat started the panel by centering the content of how regulatory framework has a great role to play supporting densification strategies, specially in terms of regulating how private property can be used and developed to embrace densification.

He emphasized two aspects: the first one is that the physical shape of the city is not only the consequence of the government intervention. There is another actor: the market. In market economies, market force, which is the demand for building space in given locations, determines increasing land prices in terms of shaping cities.

If land prices are low because there is no demand, densification is not going to be viable. This is one of the contradictions we can have in cities where we want to assure affordable housing and create densification strategies because they are based on opposite strategies.

As a second aspect Crispi mentioned that every legal strategy to support densification needs to be counted specifically and driven by local context and situation. It should take into consideration local conditions such as income, economic base, economic infrastructure, cultural preferences and social context.

Edesio Fernandes, first speaker of the panel, commented on his presentation that there are plenty of combined arguments in the densification proposals for compact cities: urban planning logic; socioenvironmental impact; socioeconomic implications and, of course, fiscal costs. All the previous along with maximisation of use of infrastructure, services and facilities; the promotion of economic development; the protection of cultural heritage and the need to provide housing options.

Fernandes pointed that there is a whole new discussion on territorial organisation, land markets, and city management to achieve the need of more integrated, efficient, rational, sustainable, just cities.
Most of the discussion so far has involved urban planning and environmental conservation policies and strategies; vertical and horizontal development and/or construction; urban design models; different technical formulas and architectural solutions but the less discussed dimension has been the legal principles necessary to support densification policies.

He said that, specifically, there is a lack of critical discussion on land rights and on the possibilities of state intervention in the domain of property ownership and also a lack of clearer information on understanding land structure.

Fernandes also stated that it is critical to establish legal and governance conditions necessary for densification policies to promote intended results.

One lesson learned is that densification is not an automatic solution to current urban problems and may end up reinforcing long existing patterns of social exclusion, spatial segregation, distortions in land markets, informal development, as well as environmental impact if it is promoted in isolation, outside of a clearly defined and tightly articulated urban land governance framework.

The expert questioned himself what kind of planning is needed beyond traditional regulatory planning: what can be done, where, when, how and by whom.

He expressed the need of a more proactive regulatory planning with land structure and with better understanding of impact on formation of land, property and rental prices; a fair distribution of costs and benefits of urban development (as opposed to socialisation of costs and privatisation of benefits) and a legal power to put the emphasis on negotiation as a crucial point.

Edesio Fernandes also listed some proposals of legal questions to be explored like a mix of both private and public land and property; incentives as well as coercion; progressive taxation; extrafiscal expropriation with public bonds and eminent domain for public interest.

In that sense he also suggested to reduced adverse possession periods; to rethink planning criteria and requirements (plot sizes) and paying attention to the importance and limits of land readjustment.

But above all, he talked about the need to articulate densification policies with broader master plans and zoning schemes for the articulation of intended goals: social housing, affordable housing, regularisation of informal settlements, environmental protection, economic development, among others.

He also said that densification cannot be left to market forces alone and governance is the key with intergovernmental articulation; social control; participation in decision-making and design; creation of value capture mechanisms and transparency so that the conditions are given for the Right to the City.

Qiu Aijun, exposed on her presentation the need of Chinese cities to be redeveloped after the country has experienced the largest scale urbanization process along with the fastest city construction process in the world history.

She mentioned that the current level of urbanization has raised 38% compared with that in 1978 and there are 770 million people living in cities in China, which is more than the total population of Europe.

The fact is that there is a lack of land to be developed, so the re-development of space is an increasing trend in the Asian country.
Aijun pointed that the way to finance that interventions is with government leasing the land to developer and there are already some examples of cooperation development between government and local villages with examples like the Economic and Social Development Plan of Yangzhou County.

To Qiu Aijun, densification as a way to redevelop Chinese cities has not been taken seriously by local government. In that sense she noted that planning integration is missing and there is a need to develop effective mechanism for individual participation.

The expert also stated that the developments should be transport oriented under multi-planning integration to finish her presentation saying that under a smart city approach, individuals could become more active and benefit of the re-development of cities.

In that line the expert said that we speak about inclusive and sustainable cities but it doesn’t exist nor a frame controller that allows to meet those objectives, nor the incentives to meet the aspirations that we have as society.

In Chile we are very abreast of current trends in urbanization and urban planning, but on the other hand, we have some land use regulations that are the opposite. In Antofagasta, there is a large consensus by densification. With the rise in the value of the land, the more profitable projects have been those of densification in detriment of the extension ones. In Antofagasta, the rules for peripheral densification and for the center of the city are the same and that generates congestion, environmental problems and lack of public space.

Andrés Letelier reacted to the presentations of Fernandes and Aijun insisting on basic issues for those who are engaged in planning and urban design but, according to him, are not well known by those with whom it is necessary to reach agreements to build better cities.

For that purpose, Letelier said, there is a number of basic instruments, as having a strategic and integrated approach and as creating urban plans that meet the proposed objectives.

Letelier said that in Asia the densification processes has been developed with the inspiration of the western models but there are densification patterns more traditional and more sustainable like the ones in Japon. Nagoya, for instance, has built a densification strategy much more homogeneous with patterns of blocks in which in the same district coexist streets with a wide range and diversity of transportation and a high pedestrian permeability.

The Chilean expert insisted in the the need to implement these plans not only to general macro-level, but that the objectives, indicators and targets are also be.
Andrés Letelier went on to say that in a city there are different realities. The city cannot be regarded from a generic perspective and it is necessary to look at how to improve the conditions and quality of life in different parts of the territory.

Specifically, it is very important that the urban renewal projects are very detailed to comply with these basic principles that lead to good urban design.

The expert pointed out that in Santiago de Chile there were very successful and ambitious policies in terms of repopulating the city centre, reversing a historical trend of depopulation in the last 20 years. However, the quality of the densification is precarious. A historic block with much pedestrian activity was broken and replaced by towers over 25 floors and inactive façades. They were, therefore, successful policies in terms of densification but harmful to the urban space.

Another vital point for Letelier is the need for governance with clear distribution of responsibilities. At this point there are many collaborative public-private approaches and the challenge is to ensure that governance is inclusive and is based not only in design and implementation.

In that vein, Letelier enumerated examples in Scandinavian cities that engage citizens in urban interventions promoting environmentally sustainable lifestyles and new ways to manage goods and services.

With regard to funding, projects have to be considered in its real value, that it does not end with construction, but also with the operation of the projects. For the architect, it is very important that these public associations and private citizens serve to prototype new ways of operating. In Antofagasta several projects are underway to reduce the cost of water, improve the quality of the soil and reduce electricity costs in public spaces with initiatives such as cut at least half the cost of water by recycling of greywater, and also, through an active recycling to use compost in the generation of a new soil.

Andrés Letelier also insisted on prototyping new forms of property: build projects of homeownership; promote new forms of lease; evaluate interesting experiences in Vancouver as a temporary housing program for the homeless, for example. Letelier concluded by saying that we need to take this seriously, so prototypes end up becoming law.

Javier Huesa began its intervention pointing out that in Spain the governance and legal frameworks are very defined. There is a National-country level legislation; a regional one - which in turn have ordinances of the territory legislation - and a local legal framework consolidated in a General Plan.

The current legal framework of Seville comes from 2006, after a revision in 2000 and with a previous precedent dated in 1987: two plans in 20 years. In the current legal framework, citizen participation was important and effective.

Huesa lamented that years of global crisis have not been used to rethink and do a reflexion in order to avoid the mistakes of the past.

He also said that, equally, the City Council of Seville has created a follow-up of the own Planning Committee where, basically, the line to follow is a reprogramming of the plan and a definition of the model of financing the infrastructure.
In the case of Seville, densification in the General Plan is limited. There are historical protected areas in which the limitation is due to the protection of a typological element.

City Hall is now in the process of definition of a sustainable mobility project and in terms of management, Sevilla is dealing with aspects of the urban requalification from a pedestrian point of view: mobility, universal accessibility and elements of the urban landscape.

6.3.4 DEBATE

Catherine Stone mentioned the case of South Africa, by saying that planning and decision making are not just political, but watching how plans are kept and implemented it can be said that they are ultimately in hands of political decision. She noted that on despite of the plans, policies and of every significant regulation, there are still proposals outside urban agencies. The question from a Governance perspective is who do we want to regulate? Stone continued mentioning the need to regulate the decisions makers as much as the proponents of development and how the answers are different on how we regulate. She added the case of Cape Town, with no space for negotiation because the developer meets the negotiator.

She exposed the case of South Africa, adding that they have great plans, a lot of regulation, but in fact they don’t enforce it, and don’t have the capacity, having good reasons to enforce the regulations.

She concluded adding that the struggle for community participation is crucial but also becomes the vehicle for resistance, as much community participation is more likely to preserve open space for people and resisting inclusive densification.

Sara Hoeflich, appointed the big need to take regulations and how it is the only way to really control the market. The only entity that can protect public interest is the Government and the local politicians (the head of Government), having democratic mechanisms. It is a chance for making a community aware of the need of regulations and for a legal and protective environment for planning and densification.

She finished by saying that speculation is one of the major problems of densification and it is very important to see the opportunity of densification versus urban growth.

Jaromir Hainc, highlighted the remark of Catherine Stone and started saying that it is very interesting how to establish a public interest. He continued pointing the importance on how we decide to extend and on what and how can we reduce the rights of people because globalizing can be more and more complex.

Alfredo Garay, remarked that in urbanism there are many laws, which makes a normative framework very interesting but that they are difficult to apply. Then, he presented his point of view saying that sometimes the problems are in the legality with a tendency to generate laws subtracted from the Scandinavian countries with highly evolved laws and applies them in realities where informality is very large and there will be difficulties to implement them.
He continued mentioning that a complementary part of the legal framework is how it is the institutional device provided to implement them (institutions, instruments and procedures).

Next, he ended telling that the application of a law must be generated in an effective institutional system.

Edesio Fernandes, began exposing the problem that arises with the technical criteria, the procedures and the mechanisms. He continued exhibiting that a planned system is something conceptual and is based on a given notion and the possibility for the State to intervene in the domain property rights when there is not a solid legal culture enabling that. Next, he set the example of Brazil, where usually the word invasion or usurpation is not used, talking instead of occupation.

He added, that there has been a cultural change among the people, to understand the processes of property and land but all of these requires a legal coach, in many cases the decisions taken in conflicts by the judges go back to the old legislation (from civil codes, property rights...)

He ended with the example of South Africa and the need to invest on housing policy and reinforce the parts of segregation and exclusion. He concluded that there is a real need for changes in the cities and to have a real control of who have the power of the city, who pays for urban development and how. Finally he ended up pointing the need to face all these issues, meanwhile we will continue repeating the same processes of exclusion and segregation.

Qui Aijun, emphasized Catherine Stone’s question: who do we want to regulate? Nowadays, the government, the mayors and the leaders have to follow the rules and the regulations. She added that in her opinion the regulations must be followed by the people, especially for the planning. This is so because if the leaders don’t follow the plan then how we can make the plan become a reality. There are two things, the institutional and the instrumental part. She exposed by saying that in her own country, China, there are a lot of laws and plans, but the real challenge is how to implement these laws. She continued saying that it is the time globally for the experts to give more suggestions to the institutions. She concluded by saying that with very specific, plus practical instruments and with the help of institutions, a good plan could become a reality.

Gianluca Crispi continued exposing about the issue that in many occasions the famous good plans and good legislations do not get implemented. Every city of every country is full of good plans, good legislations that are not implemented, obviously in many occasions they are not good plans or legislations.

He emphasized Catherine Stone comment about the need of politicians to follow the plans and the link between planning and policies. He continued adding that the legitimacy of an urban plan is based on the political direction of the politicians. Planning is not purely technical, as it is often seen, it is also a political exercise, a vision for the city and it should be based on clear policies directed from politicians. This is
one of the reasons why plans are not implemented, being in many cases purely technical and not responding to a request for the politicians in the divisions that they have thought for the city.

Catherine Stone noted that politicians are participating on the plans (metropolitan plans and the local plans). She added that they approve plans and policies but they also take decisions on individual development proposals and it is not convenient for them, to stick only to their own plans.

She mentioned the importance to have consistency in decisions making. So what are the mechanisms to make sure the decisions are further on line when you are making decisions, taking and giving away lands and home rights? She added that the problem appears in the negotiation between the individuals with the developers.

6.4 DISCUSSION SESSION 1: SOCIAL ASPECTS OF DENSIFICATION

6.4.1 BACKGROUND
Processes usually are seen as an opportunity to include different social groups in urban areas where few social groups predominate. In degraded areas, where low-income sectors generally live, densification – along with improved urban conditions – represents an opportunity to incorporate higher income social groups into these neighborhoods. However, this often leads to progressive gentrification where previous residents (with fewer resources and therefore fewer choice opportunities) are displaced by new social groups. The goal of creating socially mixed neighborhoods is not met when one social group replaces another social group. Also, densification normally faces difficulties accordingly to certain cultural contexts, where the model of expanded city is accepted even as a goal for increasing social status.

6.4.2 MAIN ISSUES ADDRESSED
What are the spatial/social/economic/cultural/environmental determinants of social acceptability of densification?

How to work in countries and/or population sectors, neighborhoods where density is not socially accepted?

Can it be achieved through consensus and voluntary commitments? Where has this been implemented?

Do we need to create a global awareness/consciousness/consensus about benefits of density in order to fight sprawl and achieve the compact city?

How was social acceptability addressed in historical cases of densification and what can we learn from it?

Does specific spatial configuration make it more or less acceptable? There is a possible response from design?

Does the provision, accessibility, quality of public spaces influence the social acceptability of densification?

If densification has an impact on cultural identity, which are the possible threads that the cities will face with?

Does densification intensify social/cultural conflicts and how can this be addressed/mitigated?

6.4.3 KEY OUTCOME MESSAGES
Management of urban density is relevant in all contexts: industrialized, emerging and developing countries and also in crisis contexts.

The urban density agenda responds to a global tendency to urban sprawl.

Adequate urban density is culturally variant.

Depending on context, density that is considered acceptable varies from 100 inh/ha to 2500 inh/ha.

There is an apparent contradiction between the collective long-term interest (compactness) and
the short term individual aspiration of many (isolated house).

Density itself is not an objective. It is a mean to achieve sustainable urban development.

Compactness alone is not a sufficient criteria. Also important to consider: the size of the city; access to nature; number of dwelling per ha; size of dwellings; number of people per dwelling (or per m2) and land and construction cost.

Densification is associated to higher land value.

Financing densification as a construction process is not enough. Addressing maintenance cost is key.

There is often discrepancy between claimed political objective of density and regulatory framework.

Fédéric Saliez started the session saying that in United Nations problems are seen as opportunities to do things better. In that sense, densification is an economic opportunity but at the same time the benefits of any densification process are not distributed in an equitable way.

Densification is an opportunity to include different social classes in the same neighbourhood and increasing social cohesion and diversity in the city through the mixing of low and high income groups. Saliez asked if that is not a narrative to justify densification because it immediately arises the question of gentrification. By rising the value of land the gentrification process can be outrigged and it can actually lead to a soft/hard eviction of certain groups from a quarter.

The UN-Habitat representative, pointed that we immediately consider gentrification as a negative issue and he invited to challenge that definition. He asked what is the difference between densification and development, because maybe the problem is not gentrification itself. Maybe the point is that we don’t want to avoid it but slowing it down, which is a different question.

In high income groups gentrification can be seen as a way to strength the social mix but there is a big resistance from that groups and that option seems not to be politically realistic.

Saliez also remarked that the fact that increasing densification can increase urban public life is an interesting statement, as it involves the shift of what represents a solution (densification) to a higher objective. The counterpart is if intensity of urban public life is universally desirable and if everyone would agree with that objective.

Saliez also asked how can we make sure that densification processes lead to an increase of urban public life and if it really means a higher level of social interaction.

The environmental opportunities of densification are seen as the less discussed points. However, solutions that would be environmentally and economically “ideal” are not necessarily socially acceptable.

He also asked: what is acceptable? What are we collectively ready to agree as a model of city?

Saliez said that we also can ask ourselves which are the parameters that make densification socially attractive, compensating, for instance, densification with spatial design parameters like accessibility to high quality public spaces.

Saliez ended his intervention saying that densification is technically the answer to urban sprawl, a trend that has shown very negative effects, but that has to make us think about why people chose sprawl as spatial and social
way to organize urban life. If we fail to understand what is behind that fact we will fail to address the densification agenda.

He finally remarked that behind densification lays a contradiction: citizens understand that it involves a collective long term interest but it goes against their individual aspirations to end with a conclusion: Do we need densification policies or policies that understand and manage urban density and urban intensity?

Radomir Hainc started his intervention as first speaker of the session talking about what does it mean “Quality of life” in cities. He pointed that there are different definitions and some of them are quantitative but we also need to consider a qualitative analysis. The way the environment affects through mobility, accessibility and connectivity, to our perception of quality of life it is also important, Hainc said.

He continued defining what he considers public space: penetrations of the social movements in the city. For the expert, the social patterns are reflected in the buildings and the design of the city, that has to take into account, for instance, religious or cultural aspects of the population of a given period of time in History.

In that sense, he talked about the concept the syntax of space in which the shape of a city has a lot to see with ways of control of the society depending of the historical moment in which it has been developed.

Talking about densification, the expert said that its perception changes a lot from one place to another, and the ratio that is accepted in Beijing, for example, won’t be accepted in an European capital as Prague. He also stated that the discussion and the debate about public space and economic performance varies from one place to another.

Hainc also showed different kind of city conceptions: the traditional one, the garden city and the modernist, saying that in Europe is considered that the ideal distance between buildings is about 50 meters so that people can socialize in the streets and public spaces. In ancient cities there is a lot of public space and the citizens have very clear which are the boundaries between public and private places.

He ended saying that Eastern Europe countries can share lessons learned during the transition period after the Berlin Wall fell, in which they had to give back the private propriety taken in 1948. Hainc stated that public spaces are still being public but it will be difficult to assume their regeneration in the next 30 years.

The second speaker of the session, Sara Hoeflich, started her intervention remarking that in her organization (UCGL, a global network of cities, local and regional governments) they consider densification not as a spatial concern but as a phenomenon with multiple political implications.

The expert said that densification is a concept embedded into the Sustainable Development Goals and the people in charge of planning cities should interiorize that issue. She also
noted that there is a key aspect on the global agenda that is the right to the city: right to accessible services and right to participate and to decide. In that context, when the word densification is pronounced, a red light appears because people tends to understand that it involves gentrification and, furthermore, exclusion.

Hoeflich pointed that was something that happened in the 90’s of XX century, with plenty of evictions and people having to move to the suburbs. Now, the situation is different because evictions are not politically accepted but we also face passive evictions: people moving from the centre of the cities because they cannot afford the place they used to live.

She said that the human point of view is very important as not only high income groups refuse to mix with different class levels. Low income groups have the same behaviour when it comes to share the space with new neighbours.

In that sense, Sara Hoeflich thinks that gentrification gets a positive mixture of social classes and ages that has to be well understood.

The expert also said that in terms of planning cities is important to incorporate the time as a factor and that only the public sector can dominate that factor. The interest of private investors in densification has to be managed under a public control of densification.

As a second factor, Hoeflich mentioned culture and identity as key elements for the citizens as culture is the way to achieve an equal starting point for everyone.

In her presentation, the expert from UCLG stated that densification is about co-creation and in that co-creation it is important to have clear who are the stakeholders: citizens, local government, academy, financial investors, land owners, national and regional governments and NGOs. That way, they can be grouped by interest and contribution as in a Tamgram scheme in which each element is placed in the right space to shape a bigger picture.

Finally, she pointed that one of the lessons learnt from processes of urban renewal and slum upgrading is that citizen participation contributes to the empowerment and awareness of the development of cities.

6.4.4 DEBATE

Edesio Fernandes started offering the legal point of view. He noted that is necessary to find a balance between tourism and protection of cultural heritage in cities and asked if gentrification is the dark side of a growing sharing economy in which investors can also be the citizens themselves. He noted the difficulty to reconcile this need for preservation, densification and investment by citizens. He also stated that another problem in the horizon is the way to address neighbours conflicts in the condominiums.
Ellen Bassett wanted to comment the cases of underdeveloped areas in which there is so much hostility between people and the problems are difficult to solve.

Marco Kamiya mentioned the importance of the scale of projects of densification for social appropriation and control. He said that the social dimension involves not only housing but also services and, more important: jobs. Social policies are expensive and it has to be clear if job creation is or not part of the municipality mandate to assure that people lives near to the place of work.

Salvatore Fundarò introduced then the question of buildability rights, saying that its absence provides less finances to local governments.

Mathias Nohn reacted saying that buildability right may be an obstacle to densification and that it is more important to capture added value. He also noted that densification can be a way for paying the infrastructure you need when society is ageing.

Qiu Aijun mentioned some Beijing experiences in which low and middle income blocks were connected. The services provision from low to high income citizens through economic activities made this people know each other, leading to social cohesion.

Jeffrey Shumaker talked about the need for neighbourhood development funds. Under the fact that it is hard enough to accept new people, the expert gave the indication to make it more attractive. He also said that densification doesn’t have to be done from extreme perspectives, but from an incremental way.

Andrés Letelier insisted that for granting social cohesion people has to meet other people and that’s why public areas are important, considering the streets as shared spaces. The Chilean expert also said that densificated areas may have certain social control and access to goods and services.

Shifu Wang continued saying that each intervention in terms of densification has a social impact and this is the reason why an impact assessment tool is necessary. He noted that with that kind of tools it would be easier to predict the results and mitigate negative effects. He remarked that if in terms of environmental impact assessment we have many tools, why not to also apply social impact assessment.

Alfredo Garay intervened by saying that cities in transition follow a trend to establish unequal societies, saying that space appropriation can be positive but can also generate ghettos.

He also pointed that participation of the neighbours is important in a society that in some aspects looks at the city as an opportunity to invest and in some others as a good of use, prioritizing things that are not seen as economically rational.

Laura Petrella stated that the frontier between private and public groups is diluting as people feel belonging to private or public and talked about the need to establish a clearer analysis of how this process redistribute wealth remarking that if local authority is too weak, it is impossible to build trust. She also pointed that, for instance, in Nairobi there are lots of private assets and very few public ones, so a tool to better analyse is needed.

6.5 DISCUSSION SESSION
2: FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND DESIGN: TECHNICAL CAPACITY NEEDED FOR DENSITY AND THE COMPACT CITY

6.5.1 BACKGROUND
This session presented a discussion about proper integration between the three mentioned components that should facilitate the implementation of densification processes. Nevertheless, different capacity levels both in the private and the public sectors, as well as different considerations about the “governance” of densification processes, regularly ends in business-as-usual urban development. Considering that ideal conditions
for densification are not always the case, especially in those countries that are experiencing the biggest urban growth, densification processes could be risky in terms of accelerating social inequities, pollution and lack of adequate infrastructure. Some basic considerations and tools should be developed in these cases.

6.5.2 MAIN ISSUES ADDRESSED
How to introduce density in countries where technical (legal/financial/building) tools are not there?

Can densification strategies be implemented in absence of facilitating legal mechanism?

Which are the basic legal elements that we need to have in a basic land/planning law or policy in order to achieve the benefits of densification and avoid the externalities?

Which are the basic financial tools that we need to have in place in the system?

It is possible densification in countries where access to bank loans is difficult/expensive?

Which are the risks of densification in countries where there is a lack/absence of one of the three aspects of urban planning (legal, finance, design)?

Absence/lack of proper legal framework?

Absence/lack of financial system?

Absence/lack of design system?

Densification does bring economies of scale and of agglomeration, but what are its externalities?

From an urban design point of view, in countries/contexts of low density culture, shall we consider densification as a progressive process?

How could be promoted density in intermediate / small cities where financial benefits are not so clear (at least in the beginning)?
know which processes we want to correct or which ones we want to strengthen.

He remarked that the city is the result of a productive process of work, therefore, every analysis of the urban phenomenon must be seen as a productive process, that articulate the city. In urban planning, it is important to know which are the factors that causes the transformation, such as the opening of a subway (that induce many people to move to that area).

Next, he discussed about the factors that intervene in the production of densification and the differences between construction companies, small construction companies and self-construction. He noted what tools are necessary to contemplate the effects for densification processes. He highlighted the different kinds of tools that intervene in the densification of the cities: the public work that generates and transforms many things; the regulations including the factor that the private sector will always have initiatives to optimize its valuation; the tax tools (help raise funding); budget tools (such as subsidy); the management tools; tools related to administration, forms of conception, the State deals with through private agreements and, finally, forms of inspection.

He concluded with the important role that municipalities have, that can help and provide with the tools to produce good diagnoses and good plans. The politicians don’t have always the fault, in many cases they carry out very bad plans based on very poorly made diagnoses, he stated.

In her speech, Catherine Stone noted that South Africa is very different comparing to the rest of Africa. Cape Town, for example, has a densification policy with a strong special planning framework but generally densification has been driven by the private sector and because of that the country has fail to see real transformation.

She remarked the real need to engage and understand for a policy perspective on the context of densification and that the plans normally are not useful or practical. On the basis of her presentation she pointed out a few lessons that can be taken out, on how are built new town ships, planning for organic density in terms of building the facilities at the same time you build the houses - otherwise you lose that land- that need to provide extensions plans and planning infrastructure.

Stone stated that in South African cities there is an aversion for density, but that’s changing: a new organic model has started, driven by the mobilization of poverty of the town ships.

She presented the issue of Municipal Finance and the programme for the progressive integration of these settlements into the City’s fiscal systems. She remarked about this issue and mentioned that Municipalities under pressure reduce grant dependence and generate more own revenues that induce the area to fall below the rating and receive free basic allowances, creating services funded by transfers from national government. All mentioned previously generates the consequence that Residential land is now private and falls outside of the subsidy provisions; highly tenanted, vacant landlords or land has changed hands outside of the formal system and generate a billing system tied to owner of land and prescribed service levels that do not anticipate this intensity of land use.
She highlighted the importance of the capacity and the ability of local government to engage in a sustained conversation from a social perspective with the communities, to open up, to understand what’s going on and to share responsibility to find the solutions, not to wait for the government to solve out the problems. All of these coupled with a technical assistance, a plan, a design and advisory services and also to look at these finance mechanisms. Importantly to come to a long term process is a very problematic thing for the Government: to link and chase the budget leading to a very unsustainable response to a problematic that needs to be sustained.

She closed talking about the relevance of engage to this complex issue and saying that this bottom up of densification process in the African context, it is really important and cannot be ignore particularly in the formal areas (are relative well located), because they’re responding to some needs that later the state is failing to keep up. She concluded her speech with a question: how can we turn this to a sustainable process reducing the pressure on the systems and the innovations?

6.5.4 DEBATE

During the debate, Saswata Bandyopadhyay outlined that the densification needs to be classified and that the land records are not there in many cities. In that sense, we need to classify these capacities because in many cities the regulations are there but the financial markets are not there. It urge and it’s very important to engage the stakeholders in densification processes where there is an intervention from the private sector (many cities are under private occupation). The stakeholder need to get engage both in the designing and densification also on the existing settlements and on the future planning extension.

Matthias Nnoh noted that’s very common to see a lack of self service provision in many cases because the settlement is not in the map. In the case of Liberia, the enterprises collect the fees, like in many other countries. How this can be lined with cultural legal peculiarities such as commune land tenure?

Luca D’acci pointed out the phrase that Alfredo mentioned: density is a behavior. He highlighted the importance to connect well the villages to middle towns to reach a kind of spread and compactness, and connect them with infrastructure. One of the solutions instead of destroying and rebuild from nothing in these megacities is using a strategy to densify. He also mentioned the importance to consider the numerous cases of ghosts villages, without any habitant that have an enormous potential for densification. Solving these problems could make that jobs could arrive to these places and all of these together may generate something similar to a megacity.

Ellen Marie Bassett started talking about technical capacity and noted that actually the planners relatively have decent training and they work in a political economy that doesn’t allow them to be effective, but they have to plan in situations of opaque ownerships and with an open political manipulation. She added that the most powerful technical capacity that we need to develop is to work with the communities and with the stakeholders. She pointed out an example of a group in Kenya called the Groot.
Sara Hoeflich: she started talking about plan settlements and raised the point of view that the situation actually it’s not so drastic (currently there is density) and exposed the example of Jane Jacobs. She noted the interesting part that has the engagement on the economy activities (smaller owners and many people producing). Next, she presented the example the case of housing in Latin America (with little infrastructure but having in many cases a service land) and compared this to an informal way of settlement of slum but at least a safe shelter to build. She continued saying that at the beggining all of these was awful, because it was the kind of conception that happens in the lands but actually there are cases of areas where many people have some minimum standards.

Next, she mentioned the fiscal issue and the problem that is presented on what to do with the informality or how to cluster this informality in the administrative mindset like in the South African administration. Then, she exposed that there are many lessons to learn from this example. She concluded that it is fundamental to reflect on what really is public investment.

Catherine Stone said that we usually forget that slums communities are also the private sector and we don’t care to include institutional support into them. This is much more significant in terms of dealing with the long term municipal system sustainability of the city. She pointed that the Government need to go there, with an open conversation with the communities, and start talking on how to partner and collaborate to figure this out.

Planners need to be capacitate with teams to have these conversations that require time and a lot of capacity and focus.

Alfredo Garay mentioning the self-constructed city and added that the middle class have the tendency to move from houses several times throughout their lives. For these sectors that live in these self-constructed cities, the roots of staying on a plot have many connotations that are important, such as they build their homes over time. So it offers them a great flexibility. Generally, in the self-construction plots we work with low densities. As a new phenomenon, when the self-construction densifies it also presents some new problems.

He added that he agrees that it’s not easy to obtain a pattern to measure the density but if it is convenient to have some typologies and distributing those typologies as the city grows.

Finally, he closed talking about a fiscal aspect about whether large houses with low population density should pay a tax that is related to the amount of meters or considering the surface that occupies.

**7. CONCLUSIONS**

**7.1 PLENARY DISCUSSION**

Laura Petrella guided the Plenary Discussion summarizing the messages extracted during the two days of the EGM.
The participants convened to participate in the elaboration of a Communiqué pointing, their remarks to the messages drafted by Petrella:

Densification has the potential to deliver development benefits – however, it is not an end by itself and needs to be explicitly linked to development objectives/vision.

It is an intervention that can counter tendency to sprawl and reduce numerous externalities of urbanization while leveraging its positive dimensions. In particular, densification can be an opportunity to increase urban quality, inclusion and environmental and economic sustainability in cities of developed and developing or emerging countries. Densification also happens spontaneously in many contexts, both on private and on public land as a result of population pressure and as economic strategy.

However, such processes need to be guided and qualified in order to ensure adequate outcomes, and lessons exists from different contexts to identify mechanism for guidance and management.

Densification does not correspond to construction and the overall use and occupancy of existing stock and the transformation in demographic need to be also considered.

In every context, density conditions and opportunities (and blockages) need to be analysed and understood in the local context of social, spatial, economic dynamics.

Options for densification are different and can be overall defined as regulatory in nature (driven by the private sector, with some form of incitation or incentive by governments) or project focused (on specific areas or blocks). In contexts of high informality, processes of densification may face specific challenges and require specific tools.

Densification strategies and interventions need to be linked within a city wide (and regional) overall strategy and plan. In order to prevent social segregation, gentrification and exclusion, they should be part of citywide housing policies that takes into account housing needs, tenure requirements and locations. They also need a metropolitan scale and be based on metropolitan institutional arrangements.

They need to be equipped with design, financial and regulatory mechanisms, and be assessed for impact on social, environmental and economic dimensions, while incorporating mitigating factors where needed. The specific tools will be combined depending on the participants and roles and specific outcome desired.

### 7.2 CLOSING

Laura Petrella thanked participants and authorities their interventions and support to make that EGM a focal point of interest.

Carmen Sánchez-Miranda Gallego, thanked the Seville City Council for being a fundamental collaborator to make this meeting a reality and thanked the commitment that the Andalusian agency has shown in all the work and activities that UN-Habitat have proposed for this meeting. Then, she introduced Néstor Fernández, Director of the Andalusian Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AACID) to close the Global Experts Meeting.

Néstor Fernández, started by thanking UN-Habitat to choose Seville to celebrate this meeting, and thanked the Seville City Council for its contribution of a magnificent setting.

He began by saying that as an international cooperation agency, they already made a strategic proposal in their plan of development for urban impact, planning and management of the cities and municipalities, working with both public institutions and NGOs. He highlighted that the conclusions of this meeting should be
transformed into actions, national regulations and be inspirational for mandates that can contribute for these cities or emerging cities, obtain responses and solutions. These actions can give hope in the future and may generate in the citizens the need to be participants and final beneficiaries, as well as generators of opinion, in order to transform their own cities.

Fernández mentioned that the level of regulation is not the same in all countries and remarked the issue of financing these policies, adding that in many cities the fiscal pressure is very low and with these resources it is almost impossible to address large infrastructures or make an urban change of high impact. He also added how the private actors that concur in these cities have the legal obligation to participate in that common good that is the management of a city in a safe, sustainable and habitable way.

The AACID director closed the meeting by thanking the participants for their work and hoping that the conclusions of the EGM Planning Compact Cities: Exploring the possibilities and limits of densification can serve to improve the public policies, both in cooperation programs as well as municipal or urban planning.
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Economics Ph.D holder; Deputy Director General and Research Fellow, China Center for Urban Development, National Development and Reform Commission, P.R.China. As a consultant, she had been team leader or main researcher for more than ten TA projects for the World Bank (WB), the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and European Commission (EU). Previously in the State Council for Restructuring Economic System, she was executive leader of projects on small town development and community support in cooperation with the UNDP and UNICEF. Her research fields cover small town development, urban development, urbanization policy and urban planning.

BANDYOPADHYAY, SASWATA
Professor specialized in Urban Infrastructure, CEPT University. (India)

He is a trained urban planner with over 22 years of Academic, Research and Professional experience. Over the past two decades, he has worked extensively in the Urban Development sector in South Asia with a focus on City Development Planning and Management of urban environment. His present research and activities focus on interdisciplinary areas of Urban Planning and design, Liveable Cities and urban resilience.

BASSETT, ELLEN MARIE
Associate Professor in Urban and Environmental Planning at the University of Virginia. (USA)

Her areas of research interest and expertise are land use planning and law, climate change planning, health and the built environment, and international development. She is particularly interested in community decision-making around land and natural resources, including understanding how different societies and cultures create institutions (like property rights systems or policies) for their management. Her current international research agenda is focused on governance and planning law reform in Kenya, a topic for which she received support from the US Fulbright program during the 2013-2014 academic years.

CRISPI, GIANLUCA
Legal Officer in the Urban Land, Legislation and Governance Branch. Urban Legislation Unit, UN Habitat.

He has more than ten years’ experience in supporting policy formulation and the review of urban planning regulatory systems. Gianluca is currently serving as Legal Officer in the Urban Legislation Unit of UN-Habitat providing legal advice to UN-Habitat’s planning projects and assisting member states and local authorities in translating urban policies into effectively implementable laws. He is currently leading the Essential Law Programme, an initiative that aims at analyzing the main constraints of practicability and enforceability of urban legislation in developing
countries.

D'ACCI, LUCA

Scholar of urban morphology at Erasmus University Rotterdam (IHS). (The Netherlands)

Before joining Erasmus University, he worked at the UFSC, UNICAMP, University of Strathclyde and Politecnico di Torino. He holds a post-PhD in Urbanism and a PhD in Economic Assessment. His research touches polycentric urban regions, spatial analysis, urban forms and structures under the angle of quality of life and sustainability.

ESPADAS, JUAN

Mayor of Seville. Seville City Council.

He is a Spanish politician, member of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party. He won the Mayor's office of Seville in 2015. Since the creation of the Ministry of the Environment, he has been the Chief of Cabinet of the Director, General Secretary of Planning of the Environmental Management Company linked to the Ministry of Environment. He was also the Director General of Prevention and Environmental Quality from 2000 to 2004.

FERNANDES, EDESIO

Member of DPU Associates (United Kingdom) and of the Teaching Faculty of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. (USA)

He is an expert on the legal dimensions of urban development, planning and management internationally. He is an expert on the legal dimensions of urban development, planning and management internationally. He is a member of DPU Associates and of the Teaching Faculty of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, and has been regularly associated with New York University, Tulane University, Institute of Urban and Housing Studies, as well as several other academic organizations. He has been associated with UN-HABITAT since the early 1990s, and has published extensively on matters of Urban Law.

FERNÁNDEZ RODRÍGUEZ, NÉSTOR

Director of Andalusian Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AACID)

With extensive experience in the area of cooperation and volunteering, Néstor Fernández was the provincial coordinator in Granada of the Andalusian Agency for Volunteering and Migratory Policies of the Board from 2002 to 2008; Technical adviser in the central services of the General Direction of the Andalusian Agency of the Volunteering from 2001 to 2002. In October 2014, he was the head of the

FUNDARÓ, SALVATORE

Architect, urban planner and designer in the Urban Planning and Design LAB, UN-Habitat.

He is an urban planner and designer with more than 15 years of experience in urban planning projects, developed both in the public and private sector. He is actually one of the senior planners at UN-Habitat’s Urban Planning and Design Branch LAB, following several urban planning projects in different developing countries. He has worked as project leader in many Spanish architectural and urban planning agencies, among others in Busquets Arquitectura y Urbanismo and Ana Coello Paisaje y Arquitectura, developing several architecture and urban planning projects in Europe, Latin America, Asia and Africa.

GARAY, ALFREDO

Holder of the chair of Urban Planning of the Faculty of Architecture of the UBA. (Argentina)

He teaches post-graduate courses in different universities in the country and Latin America and is part of the faculty of the Lincoln Institute (Boston). He has been Undersecretary of Urbanism and Housing of the Province of Buenos Aires (2004-2008) and Undersecretary of Planning of the Government of the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires (89-92) and has presided over the Corporación Antiguo Puerto Madero SA (89-92 and 2008-2016).

GARCÍA, JOSÉ ANTONIO

General Coordinator of the Treasury, Citizen Participation, Health, Consumption and Housing. Córdoba City Council.

He was an Advisor of the Municipal Group IU LV-CA of the Seville City Council between 1995 and 1999, Coordinator of the Municipal Group IU LV-CA and he was responsible for Institutional Policy of Local Council of Seville between 1999 and 2003. He was the General Director of Urban Planning and Housing in Seville City Council between 2003 and 2007. In this position, he was the driving force behind the development and implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan in Seville and the Head of the Technical Office of Seville.

HAINC, JAROMIR

Secretary in the Office of the Metropolitan Plan at Prague Institute of Planning and Development. (Czech Republic)

He is an architect and urban planner. He is a Secretary in the Office of the Metropolitan Plan at Prague Institute of Planning and Development and is also dedicated to international cooperation (OECD, EUROCITIES, EU HORIZON 2020 project). He completed his doctorate in the field of urbanism and city planning at the Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University in Prague, where he is a researcher. During his master’s studies, he stayed at Delft Technical University
(Netherlands), where he gained insight into Dutch planning, which influenced his further application.

HOEFLICH, SARA

Director of Programs Learning and Decentralized Cooperation. The Global Network of Cities, Local and Regional Governments (UCLG). (Spain)

She has a diploma in engineering from the University of Aachen and is an architect and urban planner. She has been active in international cooperation and urban development and strategic planning for 20 years. Since 2006, she has been in charge of building knowledge and network on urban planning and management in UCLG with program focus in Africa. Currently she is responsible for the overall learning programs previously, she worked in German development cooperation GIZ in Indonesia and Colombia in the field of territorial and urban planning and management, as well as in urban design and social housing enterprises in her home town of Cologne in Germany.

HUESA, JAVIER

Head of Service of Sustainability and Urban Innovation of the Management of Urbanism, City Council of Seville. (Spain)

He currently works for the Service of Sustainability and Urban Innovation of the Management of Urbanism at the City Council of Seville.

KAMIYA, MARCO

Coordinator of Urban Economy and Finance Branch, Urban Economy and Municipal Finance Unit, UN-Habitat.

He conducts research on municipal finance, the economics of urban expansion and local infrastructure-investment policy. He occupied senior positions at CAF Development Bank of Latin America from Caracas, the Inter-American Development Bank from Washington and with PADECO Co., Ltd in Tokyo. He has published “Economic Foundations for Sustainable Urbanization: The Three Pronged Approach” with Serge Salat and Loeiz Bourdic, co-edited the “Finance for City Leaders handbook” (UN-Habitat and University College London) with Le-Yin Zhang the, and authored the Urban Economy Chapter of the World Cities Report 2016 (UN-Habitat).

LETELIER, ANDRÉS

Executive Director of CREO Antofagasta. (Chile)

He is an Architect, and has a Master in Urban Design & Planning with a wide experience in both design and urban management processes. Currently, he is Executive Director of CREO Antofagasta, a public-private initiative led by the
Regional Government, the Municipal Government of Antofagasta, private companies and civil society organizations, that has developed a city wide urban plan, with a strong focus on public space, socio-spatial integration, environmental sustainability, community participation and public-private collaboration.

NOHN, MATTHIAS

Principal, Rapid Urbanism. (Germany)

An expert for poverty reduction, he works for international agencies, foundations, think tanks and social movements, including the UN-Habitat, World Bank, GIZ, Cities Alliance and Gates Foundation. He serves as a Loeb Fellow at Harvard Graduate School of Design and as lecturer across multiple universities. Matt’s work focuses on addressing the housing, land, transportation and life-affirming employment conundrum in rapidly urbanizing cities.

PETRELLA, LAURA

Officer in Charge / Urban Planning and Design Branch Leader / City Planning, Extension and Design Unit, UN-Habitat.

Leader of the City Planning, Extension and Design Unit at UN-Habitat since 2012. She is also OIC of the Urban Planning and Design Branch. She is an architect and urban planner trained at the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia IUAV, in Italy. She has a wide range experience in urban development work, capacity development for local authorities and managing of local planning processes. The Urban Planning and Design Branch works to promote sustainable planning practice through global, regional and local initiatives. As Unit leader, Laura supervises the UN-Habitat Urban Planning LAB, the Public Space Programme as well as Capacity Development activities in Urban Planning.

RHIM, JOO-HO

Research Fellow at the Land and Housing Institute. (Korea)

Dr. Jooho Rhim has been with the Land and Housing Institute (LHI), the research arm of the Korea LH Corporation, since April 2006. From June 2007 to February 2009, he served as an expert advisor at the Central Urban Planning Committee in the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, and Transport (MoLIT). During the 11 years in the LHI, he has been participated in various research projects on planning and developing sustainable cities, and his current research interests include urban regeneration project, green urban development certification system, and urban agriculture.

RODRÍGUEZ, CATALINA

Freelance Consultant in Architecture and Urban Planning. (Colombia)
She is an architect with a wide experience in urban planning and design developed both in the public and private sector, and an independent practice in housing design and construction; she taught undergraduate and postgraduate courses at different universities in Colombia in architectural and urban design, and in urban law and planning.

SALIEZ, FRÉDÉRIC

Human Settlements Officer at UN-Habitat Brussels Liaison Office.

He is an Architect and Civil Engineer and joined UN-Habitat in 2001. His work has been notably focused on Latin American countries and the Balkans. His previous background and working experiences have enabled him to support local and national governments in policies related to urban planning, environmental protection, public spaces and cultural heritage. Throughout his career, he has been successively posted in Belgium, Portugal, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cuba, Kenya, Kosovo and Brazil.

SÁNCHEZ-MIRANDA GALLEGO, CARMEN

Head of UN-Habitat Office in Spain.

She has over fifteen years of experience in the field of development cooperation, of which ten have been dedicated to the management of programs in Latin America. Before joining UN-Habitat Office in Spain in July 2012, she has worked at the United Nations Development Programme, the Spanish Agency for Multilateral Cooperation, several private foundations such as the Club of Madrid, and various international consulting institutions. She has published several articles and reports on the analysis of development.

SÁNCHEZ, MARÍA JOSÉ


She was the Counselor for Equality, Health and Social Policies between 2013 and 2015. She has a long history in the Autonomous Administration linked to social services: Delegate of the Government of the Granada Board (2010-2013), Delegate of Social Affairs in the same province (1997-2003), and Head of the Service of Management of Social Services of the Delegation of Equality and Social Welfare. She was also the Councilor in the City of Granada (2003-2004) and Parliamentarian in the Congress of Deputies (2004-2010).

SHUMAKER, JEFFREY

Director of Urban Planning and Design at Assoc AIA. (USA)

He has dedicated almost ten years working for the City of New York, most recently serving as the Chief Urban Designer for the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP). Throughout his tenure at the City, Jeffrey has worked to ensure a high level of design quality on projects across the city and has helped shape plans for neighborhoods as diverse as Coney Island in Brooklyn, Hudson
Yards in Manhattan and Hunters Point South in Queens. Moreover, he has worked on the implementation of many city-wide initiatives resulting from PlaNYC, and now OneNYC, with the goal of creating a more equitable, sustainable and livable NYC.

STONE, CATHERINE
Independent Specialist. (South Africa)

An expert in urban strategy & policy, urban spatial planning, local government and urban regeneration in the developing city context. She led a team of 90 urban professionals responsible for Cape Town’s forward spatial planning and urban design policies, the Mayor’s Urban Regeneration Programme, building public spaces as part of the City’s Quality Public Space Programme and packaging a series of programmes and projects aimed at facilitating transit-oriented development in priority investment corridors of the Cape Town.

WANG, SHIFU
Professor and Head of Urban Planning Department at South China University of Technology. (China)

His research and teaching areas include urbanization study and urban design, mainly focus on the theory and method of planning practice. He authored the book: Implementation Oriented Urban Design (2005, in Chinese). Shifu works as a city planner and urban designer on projects including different scale of strategy or physical planning. He also serves as the planning committee member of the municipalities of Guangzhou, Foshan and Fuzhou. Shifu is a member of National Steering Council of Planning Education in China, and also a member of National Assessment Council of Planning Education.
9. ANNEX 2 FINAL PROGRAMME

8:45-9:15   Registration

9:15-10:15  Welcoming and opening remarks

Carmen Sánchez-Miranda Gallego, Head of UN-Habitat Spain Office.

*Video message*: Joan Clos, Executive Director, United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) and Under Secretary General, United Nations.


Juan Espadas, Mayor of Seville.

*Participants’ introduction round*

10:15-10:45  Introduction

Laura Petrella, "The three legged approach, considerations on densification". Officer in Charge / Urban Planning and Design Branch Leader / City Planning, Extension and Design Unit, UN-Habitat.

10:45-11:00  Break

11:00-13:00  Panel 1: The Physical/Environmental Perspective of Densification.

*Moderator*: Salvatore Fundaro, Urban Planning and Design LAB, UN-Habitat.

*Speakers:*

Luca D’Acci, "Isobenefit Urbanism and the Punctiform City". Scholar of urban morphology at Erasmus, University Rotterdam (IHS) (The Netherlands).

Shumaker, Jeffrey, “The Possibilities + Limits of Densification”. Director of Urban Planning and Design at Assoc AIA. (USA).

Shifu Wang, "Urban Density Transformation in China: observation from selective cases". Professor and Head of Urban Planning Department, South China University of Technology (China).

*Respondents:*

Saswata Bandyopadhyay, Professor specialized in Urban Infrastructure, CEPT University (India).

*Debate*

13:00-13:15  Group Photo

13:15-15:00  Lunch Break
15:00-16:30  Panel 2: The Economic/Financial Perspective of Densification

Moderator: Marco Kamiya, Coordinator of Urban Economy and Finance Branch, Urban Economy and Municipal Finance Unit, UN-Habitat.

Speakers:


Joo-ho Rhim, “Urban Regeneration and Infill Development in Korea: Cheonan Dongnam-Gu(Borough) Office Redevelopment Case”. Research Fellow at the Land and Housing Institute (Korea).

Respondents:

Ellen Marie Bassett, Associate Professor in Urban and Environmental Planning, University of Virginia (USA).

José Antonio García, General Coordinator of the Treasury, Citizen Participation, Health, Consumption and Housing, Córdoba City Council (Spain).

Debate

16:30-16:35  Break

16:35-18:00  Panel 3: The Legal/Governance Perspective of Densification

Moderator: Gianluca Crispi, Legal Officer in the Urban Land, Legislation and Governance Branch, Urban Legislation Unit. UN-Habitat.

Speakers:

Edesio Fernandes, “The Legal/Governance perspective of densification”. Member of DPU Associates and of the Teaching Faculty of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy (USA).

Qiu Aijun, “On China’s Urban Regeneration”. Senior Research Fellow, Deputy Director General, China Centre for Urban Development, National Development and Reform Commission Vice Mayor, Deyang City (China).

Respondents:

Andrés Letelier, Executive Director of CREO Antofagasta (Chile).

Javier Huesa, Deputy Director of Urban Sustainability and Innovation. Urbanism Department. Seville City Council.

Debate

Leisure time activities

19:00-20:30  Walking tour (optional).

20:30-22:00  Welcoming cocktail at Reales Alcázares (optional)
9:00-10:45 Discussion session 1: Social aspects of densification.

Moderator: Frédéric Saliez, Human Settlements Officer at UN-Habitat Brussels Liaison Office.

Speakers:

Jaromir Hainc, “Quality of life: spatial consequences and standards”. Secretary in the Office of the Metropolitan Plan, Prague Institute of Planning and Development (Czech Republic).

Sara Hoeflich, “Involving stakeholders: is there a limit?”. Director of Programs Learning and Decentralized Cooperation, The Global Network of Cities, Local and Regional Governments (UCLG).

Discussion

10:45-11:15 Break

11:15-13:00 Discussion session 2: Financial, legal and design: Technical capacity needed for density and the compact city.

Moderator: Salvatore Fundaro, Urban Planning and Design LAB, UN-Habitat.

Speakers:

Alfredo Garay, “Estrategias de intensificación en las áreas metropolitanas”. Holder of the chair of Urban Planning of the Faculty of Architecture of the UBA (Argentina).

Catherine Stone, “How do we harness informal densification processes more constructively to create better settlements?” Independent Specialist (South Africa).

Discussion

13:00-15:00 Lunch Break

15:00-16:15 Plenary discussion and conclusions

Laura Petrella, Officer in Charge / Urban Planning and Design Branch Leader / City Planning, Extension and Design Unit, UN-Habitat.

16.15-16.30 Way Forward and Closing

Laura Petrella, Officer in Charge / Urban Planning and Design Branch Leader / City Planning, Extension and Design Unit, UN-Habitat. Carmen Sánchez-Miranda Gallego, Head of Office UN-Habitat Spain.

Néstor Fernández Rodríguez, Director of Andalusian Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AACID). (Spain)
10. ANNEX 3 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

URBAN REGENERATION

A compendium of best international practices.

UN-Habitat /Lab

Urban Planning and Design

https://www.dropbox.com/s/l5i5ntzpxyf42n/Booklet%20all%20case%20studies%202016.11..pdf?dl=0

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW URBAN AGENDA (Spanish)

EGM celebrated in Hidalgo, México July 2016

https://www.dropbox.com/s/g6hxlcn4pch69d/160721_BackgroundReporte%20EGM%20Hidalgo%20Final.doc?dl=0

URBAN REGENERATION IN MEXICO CITY (Spanish)

EGM celebrated in Ciudad de México, October 2015

Executive Report

https://www.dropbox.com/s/ozs88tgtr5pfilk/160226_EGM%20Informe%20Ej%20JT.pdf?dl=0

URBAN REGENERATION IN MEXICO CITY (Spanish)

EGM celebrated in Ciudad de México, October 2015

Fina Report

https://www.dropbox.com/s/ehvz6vc7wrpaavi/151217_EGM%20Informe%20Ejecutivo%20Borrador%20Final.pdf?dl=0

LEVERAGING DENSITY URBAN PATTERNS FOR A GREEN ECONOMY

http://unhabitat.org/books/leveraging-density-urban-patterns-for-a-green-economy/

HOUSING IN THE CENTRE OF THE NEW URBAN AGENDA

https://unhabitat.org/housing-at-the-centre-of-the-new-urban-agenda/

WORLD CITIES REPORT 2016: URBANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT – EMERGING FUTURES

https://unhabitat.org/books/world-cities-report/

ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE URBANIZATION. A STUDY ON THREE PRONGED APPROACH: PLANNED CITY EXTENSIONS LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND MUNICIPAL FINANCE

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/
http://unhabitat.org
http://nua.unhabitat.org/
https://habitat3.org/

United Nations Human Settlements Programme
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
P.O. Box 30030, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: (+254) 20 7621234
infohabitat@unhabitat.org
http://unhabitat.org/

Oficina de ONU-Habitat en España
Paseo de la Castellana 67 - 28071 Madrid
Despachos B609/B611/B613
Tel. +34 915978386
spain@onuhabitat.org
http://es.unhabitat.org/

UN-HABITAT
FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE
UN-HABITAT HEADQUARTERS

United Nations Human Settlements Programme
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
P.O. Box 30030, 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel (+254) 207621234

infohabitat@unhabitat.org
www.facebook.com/UNHABITAT
twitter.com/UNHABITAT
www.youtube.com/user/unhabitatglobal

UN-HABITAT OFFICE IN SPAIN

Paseo de la Castellana 67
C.P. 28071
Madrid, España
Tel (+34) 915978386

spain@onuhabitat.org
skype: onuhabitat.spain