



# Intercultural Place-Making

A Discussion Paper by Phil Wood

In preparation for the Symposium at Università Iuav di Venezia, 21/22 June 2012

and Programme of the Symposium

On more than one occasion I have spoken to professional planners and architects who consider themselves to have an important role to play in their respective cities. When I have asked them how they think about the growing diversity of their city and how it affects the way they do their job, I often get one of two answers. One of them goes something like this: "It doesn't. Diversity is not my business. The city employs experts to deal with that kind of thing". Or: "diversity is troublesome, messy and potentially chaotic and through planning we can tame it".

In my experience, these are not negligent or prejudiced individuals. They are good professionals who in general hold quite liberal views on society. The fact that we are convening a Symposium, and you are reading this, means that there are many of us who believe diversity is very much a part of the city, and the business of people in the place-making professions. So why does it remain a respectable position for many others to hold that diversity is a problem or a non-issue?

Understanding these mentalities and finding ways of changing them through offering practical and more effective alternatives should be the aim of this Symposium.

## Big ideas

In addressing a professional field which has been a largely male preserve in the past, let's begin with looking to two influential women for fresh ideas. **Jane Jacobs** argued that urban planning (and by extension architecture, urban design etc) was founded upon five pillars of planning wisdom:

- Planning is concerned with making public/political decisions more rational
- Planning is most effective when it is comprehensive... integrative, co-ordinative, and hierarchical.
- Planning knowledge and expertise are grounded in positive science, with its propensity for quantitative modelling and analysis
- Planning is a project of state-directed futures
- Planners are gender and race-neutral and operate in the public interest

This mentality, she said, had produced an understanding of the city as a mechanism, and planners had an understanding of themselves as technocrats whose role was to make the machine run ever faster, cheaper and more efficiently. This was putting the city at the service of business and the car, but was slowly strangling it as a place of personal growth and social interaction. Jacobs posed an alternative concept of cities as living beings and ecosystems and that, over time, buildings, streets and neighborhoods function as dynamic organisms, changing in response to how people interact

with them. Each element of a city – sidewalks, parks, neighbourhoods, government, economy – need to function together synergistically, in the same manner as the natural ecosystem.

*“Intricate minglings of different uses in cities are not a form of chaos. On the contrary, they represent a complex and highly developed form of order.”*

*“Vital cities have marvelous innate abilities for understanding, communicating, contriving, and inventing what is required to combat their difficulties... Lively, diverse, intense cities contain the seeds of their own regeneration, with energy enough to carry over for problems and needs outside themselves.”*

Jacobs was one of the first to advocate “mixed-use” urban development. Cities depend on a diversity of buildings, residences, businesses and other non-residential uses, as well as people of different ages using areas at different times of day, in different ways, to create community vitality. Indeed, cities needed to be “organic, spontaneous, and untidy,” in order to create the conditions for future economic and urban development. Ergo a new kind of planner and planning was needed to facilitate this.

The Australian **Leonie Sandercock** takes up the story from here. It’s time to demolish the pillars of modernist planning wisdom and replace them with new concepts of social justice, citizenship, community, and multiple publics. She says the goal of planning should be not so much to create a document called a plan as to generate a political process (which may involve plans, policies and programmes) but requires a very different style – a familiarity with the lifeways of the community, a new kind of cultural as well as political and economic literacy. She calls for a new planning paradigm (to create what she calls ‘cosmopolis’ and I call the Intercultural City) incorporating:

*“an expanded language of planning which includes a focus on the city of memory, the city of desire, the city of the spirit; and for an epistemology of multiplicity which includes ‘ways of knowing’ in addition to the scientific and technical knowledge which has been the profession’s bread and butter; and for a transformative politics of difference”.*

*“Without discarding these scientific and technical ways of knowing, we need to acknowledge, as well, the many other ways of knowing that exist; to understand their importance to culturally diverse populations; and to discern which ways of knowing are most useful in what circumstance. Such an epistemology of multiplicity for planning would consist of at least six different ways of knowing in addition to what is usually taught in planning schools: knowing through dialogue; from experience; through gaining local knowledge of the specific and concrete; through learning to read symbolic, non-verbal evidence; through contemplation; and through action planning”.*

We should touch on two other important thinkers. **William H Whyte** spent thousands of hours observing and filming city streets and came to the conclusion that the social life in public spaces contributes fundamentally to the quality of life of individuals and society. He suggested that we have a moral responsibility to create physical places that facilitate civic engagement and community interaction. Whyte advocated for a new way of designing public spaces – one that was bottom-up, not top-down. Using his approach, design should start with a thorough understanding of the way people use spaces, and the way they would like to use them. People vote with their feet – they use spaces that are easy to use, that are comfortable – and they don’t use the spaces that are not.

Through observation and by talking to people, we can learn a great deal about what people want in public spaces and can put this knowledge to work in creating places that shape liveable

communities. We should therefore enter spaces without theoretical or aesthetical biases, and “look hard, with a clean, clear mind, and then look again – and believe what you see.”

Whyte was also a man for the witty and apt one-liner:

*“What attracts people most, it would appear, is other people.”*

*“It is difficult to design a space that will not attract people. What is remarkable is how often this has been accomplished.”*

*“The human backside is a dimension architects seem to have forgotten.”*

*“So-called ‘undesirables’ are not the problem. It is the measures taken to combat them that is the problem?”*

Finally we can learn from **Jan Gehl**, a man perhaps most famous for designing the car out of Copenhagen (and subsequently many other places), but who has many things to say about public life and diversity. ‘Life between buildings’ has been his major focus of study and work. He says that by starting with public life and the areas in which it takes place, building design becomes a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. Gehl emphasizes that life between buildings is a dimension of architecture that deserves more careful treatment. It is where social interaction and perception, urban recreation, and the sensory experience of city life take place. Life between buildings comprises the entire spectrum of human activities in public space, and so these are vital areas the place-making professions must make as a priority – rather than leave as an after-thought. Jan Gehl says:

*“First life, then spaces, then buildings – the other way around never works.”*

*“In a Society becoming steadily more privatized with private homes, cars, computers, offices and shopping centers, the public component of our lives is disappearing. It is more and more important to make the cities inviting, so we can meet our fellow citizens face to face and experience directly through our senses. Public life in good quality public spaces is an important part of a democratic life and a full life.”*

## Alternative models

In the Council of Europe/European Commission’s Intercultural Cities project, we have tried to ground our new conception of the city in ideas like these. But we have also sought to give a context by exploring the various other ways in which cities might be, and are, managed. Europe and North America over the last 50 years have experimented with various policy models (and we should not overlook the likelihood that different approaches may well exist contemporaneously and side by side in different policy fields or departmental silos in the same city). For simplicity and clarity we have identified three dominant models: the Guest Worker model, Assimilation and Multiculturalism.

Let’s try and understand these approaches by imagining how they would impact upon the policies and practices of the place-making professions.

- *Guest Worker City*

In such a city the migrant is considered a useful but only temporary resident. There is no assumption that they will adopt permanent citizenship or adapt to local cultures, or propagate their own. The two considerations for planners is where they should be housed

and how they should be conveyed to and from the place of work as efficiently and as unobtrusively as possible. This tends to lead to segregated urban forms as we would have seen in cities such as Birmingham, Essen or Rotterdam in the '60s and '70s, or apartheid Johannesburg in the '80s. Sadly, this approach to migrant policy and urban morphology is not historic but is still very much alive in the booming cities of the Persian Gulf, exemplified by the treatment of Indian construction workers in Dubai. In terms of the design and usage of public space, you might find in this city that migrants were discouraged (or at least not encouraged) from using it, leading to the emergence of unofficial spaces.

- *Assimilation City*

In such a jurisdiction the assumption is that a foreigner has the possibility to be more than a temporary economic unit and can become a fully-fledged citizen. But this can only be on condition that the migrant adopts the cultural norms of the majority and relinquishes those aspects of their own culture that do not match these. There is no expectation that the urban morphology or design aesthetic of the city should be influenced in any way by the newcomer. However, this does not mean that the city is ignorant or neglectful of other cultures in the world. Therefore you have the paradox of Paris – a city with one of the largest Muslim populations in Europe but with hardly any purpose-built mosques and, with a recent ban on the holding of open-air prayers a profound mismatch between supply and demand. On the other hand Paris is home to the magnificent L'Institut du Monde Arabe, a grand project of the 1980s built to express the French government's admiration for and solidarity with the culture of the Arab world (but only on condition that it stays there!) In reality too, we can see in many French cities that assimilation does not preclude the emergence of ethnic segregation between the high value historic centres and the low value banlieues.

- *Multiculturalist City*

In such a city the migrant was welcomed to enter into citizenship with no requirement to abandon their own culture. On the contrary there would often be official encouragement, or at least a blind eye, to the maintenance and propagation of distinctive cultural norms and behaviours. In urban planning and design terms this is best exemplified by the emergence of ethnic quarters or enclaves, such as Brick Lane in London (where three successive waves of migrants have modelled the space and one celebrated building has successively been used as a church, a synagogue and a mosque) or Toronto which has five Chinatowns, two Little Italys, a Little India, a Little Poland and a Korea town. Beyond the exotica of the shop fronts and places of worship there will also be less visible activities going on in residential areas with homes being adapted to accommodate large extended families, households with male/female separation etc.

It is our task within the Symposium to explore how things might be different in an Intercultural City, but here are some suggestions and provocations.

## **City-making through an intercultural lens**

The built city is the most complicated cultural artefact humankind has invented. Cultural preferences and priorities are etched into the mindscape of the professional urban experts who determine what the physical fabric of our cities looks like: engineers, surveyors, masterplanners, architects, urban designers, cost accountants, project managers, developers do not make decisions that are value free and neutral. What, at first sight, looks like merely technique and technical processes – whether a building will stand up, whether traffic can flow, what uses should be brought together – are shaped by value judgements. The look, feel and structure of the places that planners encourage, help design and promote reflect their assumptions about what they think is right and appropriate.

This is etched into codes, rules and guidelines. Even the aesthetic priorities people choose themselves have their cultural histories. It is inevitable, therefore, that planners and designers apply their own cultural filters to their professional work, cultural filters based on their upbringing and experience through life experience. Without a policy mechanism that requires the gaining of cultural literacy the professions will remain locked in a very narrow understanding of culture and the built environment.

At a more fundamental level the city is built to respond to landscape, weather, location, available materials, the function the city seeks to play, exploitable resources, the talents it can develop and attract, and how it makes its living; and the interplay of these continues through time. At each point the choices the culture makes about what is important, valued and what seems right to them can be seen in the physical fabric.

More interestingly we might ask, how do social values play themselves out? What should be public and what private, and how do we signal this? In our different cultures do we promenade and hang about in public spaces or are we more reserved? For some, ambling in public places is an intrinsic part of life; for others such socializing takes place in greater privacy at home or in a club. In some cultures women are confined to the domestic realm; in others their role is more public. Do we hide behind net curtains or, rather like the Calvinist inspired Dutch, is private life displayed through large windows because you have nothing to hide? What is our view of learning? The older libraries projected themselves as temples of knowledge where you, the learner, entered humbly and with respect to explore a prescribed, given canon of knowledge. Today, by contrast, with our goal to democratize knowledge we look for a more open, transparent and welcoming feel. So the look of libraries is different.

What happens then when different cultures meet and coexist in the same space? There have always been borrowings and graftings; they have been there so long we cannot see them. For centuries building styles and fashions criss-crossed Europe: English and French baroque, or German and English gothic. Exceptions apart, the architectures of Arabia, India and China are not visible in exterior design; they have influenced much more the interior. One only sees the mosque, the gurdwara, and Chinese gateway arches in Chinatowns. Can and should Europe learn from the great traditions of Arab and Indian architecture and their aesthetics?

Are the basic building blocks of the city the same when looked at through intercultural eyes? Think of street frontages, building heights, set-backs, pavement widths, turning circles, the number of windows and their size, how architects and planners deal with enclosure, privacy or sight lines. Think too of the materials used, colour, light and water. Are streets and the colour palette used different when produced interculturally? Should architects and planners structure space to reflect different cultures as they might see and use spaces in varied ways? Or should open-ended spaces be created that others can adapt to?

## **Planning Interculturally**

A few years ago in a study of the London borough of Lewisham I looked at the question of how city planners can balance the seemingly contradictory cultural priorities of differing communities and how different cultural values should be reflected in space. In surveying the built environment professionals and their national professional associations, it became clear there was great sympathy and desire to understand how different communities work. Yet the day-to-day procedures of the professional life of, say, the engineer or planner did not predispose them to understand the details of how diverse communities think about their space.

Within the local authority it is more often those dealing with issues such as social inclusion that require a better understanding of the texture of their communities. This highlighted the significant need for interdisciplinary approaches to urban planning to be developed where social inclusion and land use planning might work collaboratively rather than in isolation. Breaking down the professional boundaries and silo mentalities of organizations is one of the most significant challenges of developing a truly intercultural approach to urban development and city management.

Part of this challenge is the need for increased cultural literacy. Our report, 'Knowing Lewisham', proposed that a series of knowledge questions become part of the Listening and Learning Cycle consultation procedure of any major projects.

Our questions included:

- Do extended families share or wish to share houses?
- How well do existing houses meet the needs of community members in terms of family size, community gatherings and room layouts?
- What are the cultural, gender and generational sensitivities associated with public life that need to be understood by Council planners?
- Are young people respected and catered for in the planning and design of public space?

The importance of these knowledge questions lies in the gradual build-up of cultural literacy among the Council officers in planning and urban design. As a result of increased cultural literacy, officers are better equipped to understand cultural diversity in their communities and therefore make culturally informed decisions with an understanding of the possible impacts developments might have on existing cultural life.

Unfortunately, addressing these was generally regarded as a task best dealt with by someone else whose job gave them a better understanding of the texture of their communities.

## **A new skill set**

The implication of the response of the professionals to these questions is that professional practice needs to be reassessed. There is a need to refocus professional skills on understanding communities from a 360-degree perspective and applying a set of generic skills, behaviours and ways of thinking that are requirements for moving forward, such as inclusive visioning, team working, leadership, conflict mediation, and process and change management.

Consultation means a continuous process of informal discussion and engagement with people as opposed to formal discrete public participation required by regulation. Clearly a highly diverse cultural mix makes it impossible for individual urban professionals to accumulate an in-depth cultural knowledge of every group represented in their city. We therefore need to evolve new forms of intercultural dialogue.

We were told by Jane Jacobs 50 years ago that diversity in its many forms is the primary element of a vibrant place – diversity of business, diversity of activities and a diversity of built form creating visual stimulation. Taking street markets as an example, they often exist in unremarkable settings but their vibrancy comes through the interaction between the people and products. The most successful markets are those where there is a wide diversity of products and suppliers. Sadly, cities often seem to overlook these factors, being far more concerned with the physical form of public places. They put the responsibility on the urban designer to transform a place through cosmetic

factors such as new paving, elegant street furniture and improved lighting, when the reality is that many places are unattractive or under-performing for other reasons such as failing business, traffic domination and anti-social behaviour.

The intercultural city depends on more than a design challenge. It derives from a central notion that people are developing a shared future whereby each individual feels they have something to contribute in shaping, making and co-creating a joint endeavour. A thousand tiny transformations will create an atmosphere in public space that feels open and where all feel safe and valued.

And whilst it is important to look at the skills required by the place-making professions themselves, we should also look wider and deeper. If we are to have a community in which 'bottom-up' planning and policy-making are not just a slogan, we need ordinary citizens who are interested in their surroundings, who are well-informed, who have opinions and have the confidence to express them, and have a language with which to express themselves and communicate. Sadly, our societies and educational systems are not producing enough people like this, and so the field continues to be devolved to those people who have been selected and groomed by the system to be the next generation of experts.

## Starting early

It needs to start early. Very young people have a flexibility of mind and a spatial and cultural awareness far greater than is appreciated. In some respects youngsters are better attuned to their environment, and more comfortable with diversity, than grown-ups and it seems a process of natural aging and unnatural education practices rather narrow our focus as we mature. In my travels to various members of the Intercultural cities network I have had the privilege to visit a handful of schools where this has been recognised, and something is being done about it.

The Escuela Pública Amara Berri, in San Sebastian, Spain, is not so much a primary school as a living pedagogical laboratory. It is practically-based and student-led education, and the pupils do not follow an ordinary text book. In studying mathematics, for example, they learn the metric system by pretending to be people in charge of an imaginary shop, or the meaning of a mortgage through having to repay a loan to the bank which is run by another classmate. Nor do they have ordinary language classes, but instead they produce a newspaper every day, present and edit radio and television programmes, interact through their personal websites. The process is very co-operative whilst teachers maintain a discreet supervisory role.

The kids at this school must develop an enhanced awareness of how they interact with their real-life communities. Even more impressive was my visit to Förskolan Örnen in Botkyrka, Sweden in nearby which has 130 primary pupils, 99% of whom have Swedish as a second language. The staff treat every kid as an individual and encourage them to feel comfortable within a multi-faceted transcultural identity. Sense of place is felt to be very important to a child's identity but usually this sense of place is defined by others. Therefore kids are given cameras and invited to explore their neighbourhood and identify places that have meaning to them. They are asked to discuss what makes a place attractive or unattractive, who makes these judgements and why – all at the age of 5! Another project was even more specifically intercultural, involving a twinning exercise with an all white school in prosperous inner-city Södermalm. They collaborated on exploring each other's local environment and describing their impressions to each other. Very quickly the kids found that language was not a straightforward mode of communication as many of the Örnen kids had limited Swedish – whilst the Örnen kids were amazed to discover that most of the Södermalm kids had nothing but Swedish, whilst they are multilingual. So they had to evolve many non-verbal means of



communication, which will be essential skills for the rest of their lives in a multi-ethnic world. Making intercultural citizens and pace-makers starts early!

## **Making intercultural spaces**

In surveys I and others have done to identify popular intercultural spaces, the places mentioned with most frequency were not the highly designed or engineered public and corporate spaces but rather the spaces of day-to-day exchange such as libraries, schools, colleges, youth centres, sports clubs, specific cinemas, the hair salon, the hospital, markets and community centres. These are the spaces of interdependence and habitual engagement where (what Ash Amin calls) 'micro publics' come together and where (according to Leonie Sandercock) 'dialogue and prosaic negotiations are compulsory'. In these places, 'people from different backgrounds are thrown together in new settings which disrupt familiar patterns and create the possibility of initiating new attachments'.

Where are the cultural institutions or public spaces in your city that achieve this kind of synthesis?

## **The commodification of urban diversity**

Times change. We can now think of a growing number of cities which have not only acknowledged their diversity but have actively embraced it. The Chinatowns, Banglatowns, Little Indias are familiar but now we are seeing 'cosmopolitan quarters' and 'diversity district' being designated and branded through planning policies, distinctive design features and marketing schemes.

It's difficult to argue against this – but I'll have a go anyway. Do these developments actually tell us that the city is experiencing a free flow of social, cultural and economic exchange between people of widely different backgrounds? Or does it simply say that someone has been very smart by turning diversity from a threat into a highly lucrative commodity and business opportunity? Does the fact that Istanbul is currently seeing the opening of a flush of Greek-themed tavernas suggest there is general improvement in the relations between Greeks and Turks, or that a particular brand has moved imperceptibly from being toxic to being exotic and attractive. Does the celebration of Chinese new year or the holding of tropical street festivals in Istanbul suggest Turkish culture is opening up to the world in a significant way. Maybe, but we should also ask the question which cultures are not being commodified and celebrated in public space?

## **The political economy of urban diversity**

This should remind us that there is always a political economy and a power relationship underlying diversity and place-making in the city. What determines that some minority cultures will always be portrayed as benign and permeable whilst others are seen as closed or threatening and others simply as bland and featureless? How is it decided, in tolerant Switzerland for example, that synagogues, Serbian orthodox churches and Sikh gurdwaras are OK but mosques with minarets are an unacceptable addition to the skyline?

Who decides what level of diversity is acceptable and what level of enforcement is necessary to keep it that way. City elites will have a clear idea of what they find acceptable and this will become a powerful influence upon policy and practice. But increasingly we must ask whether it is feasible for any elite to impose a framework on the messy, organic and constantly evolving modern city. In some cities (particularly in southern Europe) there never was a time when the local state and planning profession was strong enough to impose its will, and even in more effectively regulated jurisdictions, one now senses that there is process of negotiation and contestation underway. It is a basic principle



of the Intercultural Cities that in a world of intensifying difference, disagreement between contending views of the city is inevitable and that conflict is an ever-present possibility.

To the technocratic urban planner this is a nightmare to be avoided or concealed at all costs. But to an intercultural place-maker this could be an opportunity. Skilled in the art of cultural literacy and mediation, such a professional recognises conflict management as the chance to engage in dialogue and to discover, through the process of negotiation, a new area of agreement or even co-operation which enhances everyone's life.

## Final thoughts

No one can argue that the world of urban planning and place-making is not dynamic and open to new ideas and opportunities. During the recent economic boom years we have seen a blossoming of ambitious and visionary schemes making the most of advances in materials, techniques and communications technologies and of new aesthetics. We have even seen some regard paid to the insights of people like Jacobs and Whyte. With the credit crunch has come a radical cut-back in work for 'starchitects' and fewer major developments, but professionals have thrown themselves into new challenges of creating stylish and functional places within austerity budgets, leading to a flourishing of creativity. The tactical or guerrilla urbanism movement is challenging the state, commerce and public apathy by bringing life back to dead and dying spaces. Place-making is also embracing the ecological movement seeking new ways to do much more with fewer resources and environmental impact.

This is all very well, but who's giving any thought to diversity? It remains, some argue, a Cinderella arm of the place-making professions. Unfashionable and unsexy, starved of resources and not the kind of area that many aspiring and ambitious young professional would choose to make their metier. For every one David Adjaye (who has defined his career by designing spaces that come from and respond to cultural diversity) there are maybe 50 who would either choose to avoid diversity issues or who are even unaware of them.

Making the case will not be easy. It's not good enough simply to say the city needs to respond to the growing realities of migration. Indeed there is a danger here of creating a false duality between the city of the migrant and the non-migrant. Interculturality acknowledges all forms of human diversity and the need to take account of all of them in our urban policies and place-making practices, but politics and media opinion finds it much easier to portray the world in black and white, good and bad. But this is our task.

## References

- Ash Amin (2002) *Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living With Diversity*
- Richard Brecknock (2006) *More Than Just a Bridge: Planning and Designing Culturally*
- Jan Gehl (1987) *Life Between Buildings*
- Jane Jacobs (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*.
- Leonie Sandercock (1998) *Towards Cosmopolis*
- William H Whyte (1980) *The Social Life of Small Urban Places*.
- Phil Wood & Charles Landry (2008) *The Intercultural City: Planning for Diversity Advantage*

## Questions

These are some of the questions we might explore in the Symposium, though you may choose to raise others:

- How should place-makers gather knowledge on their human environment?
- How can they establish a dialogue with different kinds of people?
- How to move from passive participation and consultation to engagement and co-creation?
- How can place-makers start to see the city through the eyes of its citizens?
- How do planners get to know and understand their diverse communities?
- How do they engage and interact?
- How to develop cross-cultural literacy?
- How to manage horizontal and vertical conflicts of interest?
- How make plans that are dynamic not static?
- How should new public, commercial and residential buildings take account of different lifestyles and cultural practices?
- To what extent should buildings be generic or specific to the dominant user?
- How can people become involved in designing the spaces/appliances they use?
- How can facility managers overcome the mistakes of the past and adapt spaces to be intercultural?
- Even if a space was designed and built to be intercultural how to ensure it stays that way?
- How can mainstream education prepare people to be informed citizens who are active in their urban environment?
- How to cultivate young peoples' sensibilities/intelligence beyond the numeric and linguistic?
- How to prepare aspiring place-making professionals to function in a world of cultural complexity?
- How to stand back from focussing solely on migrants and make cities work for us all in all our diversity?
- What types of spaces work best?
- Under what condition will diversity attract good investment into public space?
- How measure the intensity diversity and interactivity in space, and to evaluate its impact?
- What can we learn from children about communication?
- Should education be doing more to sensitize/sensualise us to our social and physical surroundings
- How should the standard curriculum be changed to introduce a more active and critical understanding of place-making and diversity?
- How can education and professional development in the place-making professions be improved?

## Programme

<b>Wednesday 20 June</b>		
18.30	Welcome Reception at the Office of the Council of Europe, Piazza San Marco	Alberto D'Alessandro, Council of Europe
19.30	Dinner at a restaurant <i>Osteria Mocenigo da Guido e Luca</i>	
<b>Thursday 21 June</b>		
	<b>Venue: IUAV, Palazzo Badoer, San Polo 2468</b>	
09.00	Registration	
<b>Lecture theatre</b>		
09.30	Welcome	Prof Marcello Balbo, Università Iuav di Venezia Irena Guidikova, Council of Europe Laura Cassio – European Commission
09.50	Introduction of participants	
10.15	Plenary speech	Phil Wood, Urban Therapist, UK
10.45	Break	
<b>Garden Room</b>		
	<i>Session 1: Urban Planning process in Cities of Diversity</i>	
11.15	Academic perspective	Prof Sandeep Agrawal, Ryerson University, Canada
11.45	Practitioner perspective	Dr Marc Glaudemans, Stadlab, NL
12.15	Small group discussions	
12.45	Plenary feedback	
13.15	Lunch	
<b>Garden Room</b>		
	<i>Session 2: Designing Intercultural Public Spaces and Places</i>	
14.30	Academic perspective	Prof Dean Saitta, Denver University, US
15.00	Practitioner perspective	Peter Kercher, Design for All Europe, Italy
15.30	Coffee	
16.00	Small group discussion	
16.30	Plenary feedback	
17.00	Close	
20.00	Dinner at a restaurant <i>Ostaria al Vecio Pozzo</i>	
<b>Friday 22 June</b>		
<b>Garden Room</b>		
	<i>Session 3: Managing Intercultural Spaces and Places</i>	
09.30	Academic perspective	Dr Noha Nasser, University of Greenwich, UK
10.00	Practitioner perspective	Jordana Malik – Renewal property development company, UK
10.30	Small group discussions	
11.00	Coffee	
<b>Lecture theatre</b>		
11.30	Plenary feedback	
	Closing session	
12.00	Emerging themes and perspectives	Prof Marcello Balbo, UNESCO Chair in spatial and social inclusion of international migrants
12.30	Discussion	
12.45	Closing remarks	Irena Guidikova & Phil Wood
1.00	Lunch	
	Departure	

