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INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

• FRAMEWORK, INNOVATION IN PLANNING & QUALITY OF LIFE:

• Globalization is determines the contemporary human experience
• Cities play a crucial node role in the world´s globalization process
• The 1970s industrial decline lead to the appearance of desolating environmental, social and economic effects in industrial based European cities
• Nowadays, the principal concern of cities is to provide outstanding living spaces characterized by their quality of life
• Urban sustainable development emerges as the paradigmatic ground defining cities´ planning strategies towards the attainment of the cited goal
• Cities characterized by a strong industrial past are forced to innovate in their planning strategies in order to release sustainable urban regeneration processes

Freedman et al. 2013; Päun 2010; Rotmans & Van Asselt 2000; Waibel & Schröder 2011; Younger 2011
INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

• TOPIC: The role of innovation within the planning strategies adopted for the transformation of the industrial cities in reconversion process

• OBJECTIVES: To investigate the relevance of innovation as a catalyst for the success of the planning strategies settled in the cities of Bilbao and Bristol to accomplish the pursued post-industrial transformation

• QUESTION: Does innovativeness define the outcomes of the planning strategies set up in industrial nature cities in order to shift their dynamic?

• HYPOTHESIS: Innovativeness in planning strategies leads to achieve successful results on the urban reinvention process of the cities defined by an industrial nature past

• JUSTIFICATION: Set up theoretical and methodological pillars for further research on the topic
INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

- DEFINING INNOVATION IN PLANNING:
  - Planning process, agenda and communication
  - I) Participation and collaborative essence
  - II) Importance of grass-root demands and conflicts to shift the planning approach
  - III) Diversity and representativeness of involved stakeholders
  - IV) Background diversity of planners and planning crews
  - V) Auto-critical spirit & Auto-assessment methods
  - VI) Inward feedback practices
  - VII) Networking and outer learning expertise
  - VIII) Incorporation of ICTs
  - IX) Multi-scalar conception & Comprehensiveness
  - X) Strategic approach

Abukhater 2009; Burby 2003; Healey 2006; Moulaert et al. 2007
### INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

**DEFINING SUSTAINABLE URBAN REINVENTION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental sustainability &amp; Climate change</th>
<th>Social equity &amp; innovation</th>
<th>Creative &amp; knowledge economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I) Climate change</td>
<td>VIII) Demography</td>
<td>XVI) Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II) Accessibility, mobility &amp; transports</td>
<td>IX) Culture</td>
<td>XVII) Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III) Land use &amp; Compact city</td>
<td>X) Urban amenities</td>
<td>XVIII) Networks &amp; Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV) Green infrastructures</td>
<td>XI) Education</td>
<td>XIX) Knowledge transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V) Ecology &amp; Biodiversity</td>
<td>XII) Housing</td>
<td>XX) Attractiveness, Creativity &amp; Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI) Pollution</td>
<td>XIII) Welfare &amp; Health</td>
<td>XXI) Entrepreneurship &amp; Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII) Energy &amp; Resource management</td>
<td>XIV) Social insertion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV) ICTs &amp; Access to information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpopi et al. 2011; AlQahtany 2013; Drewe et al. 2008; Eizaguirre 2011; Landry 2006; Begg 2002; Wolf 2009
METHODOLOGY

• STUDY CASES: BILBAO & BRISTOL
• Similar size in terms of population
• Industrial nature and post-industrialization challenges
• Geostrategic location as Atlantic gateways
• Shared geopolitical features as 2nd level administrative and political decision-making nodes
• Similar commitment to developing urban regeneration strategies
METHODOLOGY

• PROPOSAL, STRUCTURE & PROCEDURE:
  • Comparative analysis entailing a dynamic time scope
    • Double matrix method
  • Linking Innovation in planning vs. Sustainable performance of cities (columns), which should match for each study case (rows) (Dente & Coletti 2010)
    • Appraisal of cities´ post-industrial and sustainable performance
  • Combination of the 21 key parameters defining sustainable urban regeneration and the strategic axis or objectives collected into the analysed sample of planning documents
  • Creation of a general single list of criteria gathering key parameters and strategic aims
  • Establishment of indicators (qualitative & quantitative) to measure each of the disposed criteria
  • Consistency ranking of criteria and cities performance based on Sandström´s (2002) work, producing a value ranking *The claims are not put into practice; **The claims are partially carried out; ***The claims are fully accomplished
METHODOLOGY

• PROPOSAL, STRUCTURE & PROCEDURE:
  • Appraisal of cities’ planning innovativeness
  • Consistency analysis for each of the parameters regarding the planning agenda
  • Based on Sandström’s (2002) proposal, producing three-faced value ranking for each city concerning the comprehensiveness (consistency among plans and during time); the strategic approach; and discussion level of key topics
  • Questionnaire issued to 4 planning stakeholders of each case, ranking the 10 parameters regarding innovation in planning process, agenda and communication according to the three-vertex value method ***Significant; **Regular; *Scarce, entailing the current situation and the evolution from 1990s onwards
  • Inclusion of the 2 parameters regarding planning agenda to balance the reliability of the questionnaires
  • Ranking of criteria and cities planning innovation through the same score system *Scarce; **Regular; ***Significant

• Analysis of main features of planning documents
# FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

## APPRAISAL OF INNOVATIVENESS IN PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bristol</th>
<th>Bilbao</th>
<th>Bristol</th>
<th>Bilbao</th>
<th>Bristol</th>
<th>Bilbao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation and collaborative essence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of grass-root demands and conflicts to shift the planning approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and representativeness of involved stakeholders</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background diversity of planners and planning crews</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-critical spirit &amp; Auto-assessment methods</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inward feedback practices</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking and outer learning expertise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of ICTs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-scalar conception &amp; Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic approach</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness in planning strategy</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bristol ranks higher than Bilbao
- None of them exhibits outstanding levels of innovation
- Limited evolution in the incorporation of innovation
- Community’s engagement and inclusion of social demands as major differences
- Reduced auto-critical spirit
- Differences regarding the planning agenda

Source: Self-made
FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

- APPRAISAL OF CITIES’ SUSTAINABLE PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bristol</th>
<th>Bilbao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development and engagement of local community</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact urban development and mixture of uses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of accessibility patterns and transportation systems</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of open and green infrastructure</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelioration of waste and resources management’s sustainability</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of urban pollution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dive into the process of urban regeneration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade and enlarge housing opportunities</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance welfare and healthcare provision</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost education provision and high-quality education standards</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote an integrative and cohesive society</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the cultural and leisure supply</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise city’s attractiveness</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of jobs and employment</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster entrepreneurship and SMEs and proximity businesses</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensify expertise in creativity, knowledge, R+D+I and ICTs</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen networking and international visibility</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score of cities post-industrial performance</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Self-made

- Bristol ranks higher than Bilbao (lower than the prior dimension)
- Both cities below their optimal expectations
- Bristol scores accurately regarding social and mainly economic vectors (consequence of the holistic approach)
- Bilbao constraints its best records to the aspects conceived as strategic (consequence of the lack of consistency between plans and topics)
FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

• DOUBLE MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Innovativeness in planning</th>
<th>Sustainable performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilbao</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Bristol shows a greater planning innovation and success in sustainable regeneration
• Both cities are moving forward but without excellent success rates
• Excessive reliance on the *New Urban Politics* urban development model
  • Neoliberal market-oriented vision (Prevalence of economic vector over the rest)
  • Social drawbacks as consequence (housing shortages, elites vs. popular classes…)
• Bristol: comprehensive strategy and dynamic planning (adaptability & resilience)
  • Social parameters as priority challenges to tackle
  • Bet on citizens´ entrepreneurship and creative initiatives as strategy
• Bilbao: misconnected planning vision and chaotic practice
  • Undue reliance on physical amelioration and the Guggenheim effect
  • Excessive focus on the economic prism
• Community´s decision-making capability as main divergence between cases

Brenner & Theodore 2002; Harvey 2008; Krueger & Buckingham 2012
CONCLUSION

• It is crucial to acquire proactive attitudes in order to shift decadent urban dynamics
• Reinvention of cities is defined by their capacity to adopt sustainable development avenues, enhancing citizens’ quality of life
• Success on sustainable urban regeneration is tightly connected to the capacity of cities to adopt innovative planning strategies
• Community’s engagement as decision-making player is a transcendental matter
• The more innovatively cities plan the more resilient they are
• Disposal of a particular vision of urban sustainable development
• Provision of a simple, effective and replicable comparative method
• The study enables a strong basement for further research on the topic
• Enhancement of the scoring amplitude to increase legibility and representativeness
• Enlargement of the array of indicators to assess sustainable performance
• Increase of the sample and representativeness of questionnaires
• Adoption of an in-depth metropolitan scale research
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