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Introduction

- New Urbanism has valuable ideas to offer to neighborhood planning and design.
- To be seriously relevant for diverse urban neighborhoods, it must be applied carefully. This article provide initial ideas about how New Urbanism concept and might be applied in Bandung context.
- The transformation of residential neighborhood due to fly-over-road
Overview of Bandung and the construction of fly-over-road

- Bandung as one of metropolitan cities
- Total population of Bandung more than 2.25 million, plus sub-urban to a total more than 5.5 million people
- One of major problems in Bandung is on transportation sector, caused by high portion of demand to center city-destination, as well as limited street network supplies
- The high of “domestic” tourists during weekends
- Migration flow to find for occupation and education
Bandung transportation policy

- The formation of “ring road” network pattern
- The integration of inner circle street network can be achieved if it is developed and connected with Pasteur-Cikapayang-Surapati fly over.
The Transformation of Residential Neighborhood due to Fly-over-road

- Transformation is defined as a basic change or a shift from one condition to another.
- Transportation planning decisions can affect land use, both directly by determining which land is devoted to transport facilities such as roads, parking lots, and ports, and indirectly by affecting land use accessibility and development costs in different locations.
Direct impacts of Pasupati fly over

Direct Impacts

The increase of land area allocated for transportation facility: the road.

Impact on 3 road segments, Pasteur-Cihampeulas, Cihampeulas-Tamansari, and Tamansari-Surapati:

• The changes of townscape characteristics and existing typical streetscape
• Increases area of paved land for road construction

• The loss of green area previously marked as a typical characteristic of road corridor at Pasteur-Cihampeulas and Surapati segments (a series of King Palm trees at Pasteur-Cihampeulas segment and Juliana Boulevard-the longest linear park in Java Island- at Tamansari-Surapati segment)
Impacts of Pasupati fly over

- The loss of visual access of street user to old buildings along the artery road side
- The fly over passes through and separates dense residence located in Cikapundung valley
- The changes on land use around the new road is a functional change from houses to commercial and office buildings
Impacts of Pasupati fly over

Encourages the growth of other functions that eventually become a generator or inducer for other changes

- These changes have been resulting in the formation of mixtures between residential function and other functions such as stores, schools, workplaces and recreation at walking distance

- Transformation start to lead to the emergence of new urbanism concept on settlement located around this Pasupati fly over
Introduction of New Urbanism

• Accommodate social differentiation without exclusion. Rather than a single, shared vision, neighborhood planning would support variety, including multiple and varied activities, lifestyles, and identities.

• New Urbanism has been institutionalized with a formal organization—the Congress for New Urbanism—of more than 2,500 paying members, regular conferences, and a formal charter.
The Myth of Community

• The inadequacies of New Urbanism for urban Neighborhoods with diverse populations can be understood in light of the "myth of community"
Community's characteristics

- Community involves sharing in others' needs and interests in a sense of solidarity, common consciousness, and mutual understanding. People who consider themselves members see their community as having a "specific heritage, common self identification, a common culture and set of norms."

- Community members share common values and practices, a common vocabulary, and a "common ordering of individual needs and wants into a single, shared vision of the future in which all can share."

- Community invokes a "desire to bring multiplicity and heterogeneity into unity... [and later] a longing for harmony among persons, for consensus and mutual understanding."

- The ideal of community denies and represses social difference. It ignores the fact that the polity is not a unity in which all participants share a common experience, identity, and values.
Critiques of New Urbanism

• Well-founded communities often exclude, define themselves against others, and erect all sorts of keep-out signs (if not tangible walls)
• New Urbanism accepts the ideal of community as its philosophical foundation. New Urbanism seeks to create and sustain community, without seriously questioning the underpinnings or the appropriateness of this goal.
• For New Urbanists, community is implicitly assumed as an outcome of placing diverse residents together in a well-designed neighborhood.

• New Urbanism design principles:
  – Income and need for services as the primary differences between residents. Absent is any discussion of group differences in culture, values, lifestyles, attitudes, and so on.
  – Beyond disparities in income and resources, different groups of residents are essentially similar.
Critique of New Urbanism

• New Urbanist design principles assume that diversity must be attracted by accommodating in-moving, lower-income apartment dwellers or by attracting middle-class, urban pioneers, depending on the context. Diversity is not regarded as an existing characteristic of communities.

• This assumption is understandable, considering the contexts in which New Urbanism has often been engaged (i.e., new upscale suburban communities and urban public housing projects). The assumption breaks down, however, when New Urbanism is applied to urban neighborhoods in which diversity already exists.
An ideal of city life

• For neighborhoods with diverse populations, the ideal of city life may be more suitable than the ideal of community that is promoted by New Urbanism.

An Ideal of City Life:
• Social relations affirm—not deny—group differences
• Multiple groups coexist side by side, maintaining their own identities, lifestyles, values, and so on
• Difference does not imply exclusion since no single group dominates
• Groups live together in the city without forming a single "community."
New Urbanism: Its Principles, Projects, and Impacts

- At the neighborhood level, New Urbanists recommend that mixed uses (commercial, civic, residential, public spaces, and other) be incorporated in each community.
- The goals are to provide jobs near where people live and to allow residents to walk or bicycle to the places they need to go.

New Urbanists recommend:
- Neighborhoods incorporate alternative forms of transportation to decrease auto dependence (transit is especially favored).
- Neighborhood design should reinforce the unique identity of each place by adopting a consistent and distinctive architectural style that draws on local history, culture, geography, and climate.
DIVERSITY AND NEW URBANISM

• Supporting diversity in neighborhoods represents an important goal of New Urbanism
• New Urbanism promotes the end of segregation between rich and poor yet New Urbanist practice offers few strategies that directly support diversity

New Urbanism supports diversity chiefly by:
• Encouraging the provision of a range of housing prices and housing types in each community
  Idea: Residential proximity will "bring people of diverse ages, races, and incomes into daily interaction"
• Addressing the functional and psychological needs of the "minority" or in-moving population
Concerns of New Urbanism in Urban Neighborhoods Revitalization

• The use of New Urbanism to revitalize urban neighborhoods with diverse populations raises several concerns:

  – Physical changes may not be the best solutions for social problems
  – New urbanist ideas may have different meanings to different groups
  – Neighborhood renovation may displace low-income residents
  – New urbanist participatory design processes may not accommodate diverse groups
1. Physical changes may not be the best solutions for social problems

• New Urbanism promotes physical changes that may not be the best solutions for the social problems that face many urban neighborhoods
  - "We recognize that physical solutions by themselves will not solve social and economic problems, but neither can economic vitality, community stability, and environmental health be sustained without a coherent and supportive physical framework" (Congress for the New Urbanism 2000, v)

• however, New Urbanism is accompanied by no such equally cohesive or persuasive set of non physical solutions
  - physical solutions may be favored because they allow expedient and highly visible improvements
  - Such was the case in the city of Bandung. The issues arise from fly-over-road have physical planning implications, but those are secondary. Local residents' recommendations contrasted with the focus on "clean up" and beautification that has been the concern of many planners and architects.
1. Physical changes may not be the best solutions for social problems

- Physical changes (beautification) but not social problem solution
2. New urbanist ideas may have different meanings to different groups

- New Urbanism promotes ideas such as mixed uses, more walkable neighborhoods, and locally relevant architecture. In neighborhoods with diverse populations, shared understandings of these ideas cannot be assumed. Rather, the multiple, disparate meanings of these ideas must be explicitly interrogated.

- Example: “walking” and “shop”
  - “walking”: as “strolling”? VS as essential transportation?
  - “shop”: upscale retail to draw in outsiders? VS markets for daily use by local residents?
2. New urbanist ideas may have different meanings to different groups

Three key New Urbanist strategies here in terms of planning for diverse neighborhoods:

• Neighborhood design should incorporate locally relevant architectural styles

Problems:
– The question of who identifies the relevant "local" context matters
– Planners alone cannot identify the aspects of the local context to be incorporated in design guidelines or building styles
– Well-meaning professionals will misinterpret or caricature key aspects of local cultures to which they do not belong

Solution:
New Urbanist practices require more attention to how locally relevant features are identified
2. New urbanist ideas may have different meanings to different groups

- Create a center in each community

Problems:
- Public spaces are not universally public, no matter what their form
- The design of a space, its uses, and its meanings resonate differently with diverse groups and must be addressed directly
- Who and what are imagined as the users and uses of this "center"? Extended families for holiday celebrations? Office workers on lunch breaks?

Solution:
- In settings with diverse populations, a network of multiple forms of appropriate public spaces may be more essential than a single "center"
- Open-minded public spaces—flexible enough to accommodate a wide range of activities and populations

- Provide a diverse range of housing types
3. Neighborhood renovation may displace low-income residents

- Impacts of Urban Neighborhoods Revitalization by New Urbanist: property values may rise and original residents and businesses may not be able to afford to remain

- Any effort to apply New Urbanism to revitalize urban neighborhoods must deal seriously with the issue of how to maintain affordability for residents and businesses. The needs of existing residents (renters as well as homeowners) and businesses should be central in discussions, not an afterthought

- "Improving urban design" may become a strategy to eliminate affordable housing and to discourage those who do not fit the "community profile". New Urbanism must take care to avoid being put to the service of this agenda in neighborhoods with diverse populations

- Possible strategies to promote affordability include inclusionary zoning, fair-share housing policies, density bonuses, subsidies for construction and rental/mortgage costs for low-income households, and others
4. New urbanist participatory design processes may not accommodate diverse groups

- New Urbanism advocates extensive public involvement in neighborhood design and planning.

- BUT, diverse groups may not all feel equally comfortable participating in urban planning or "government"-related activities, caused by:
  - They may not have equivalent knowledge about planning or its potential impacts on their lives and may not have similar power to shape its outcomes.
  - Groups may not favor the same locations for participatory activities and may not prefer the same kinds of individuals to facilitate these activities. (Professional consultants and city staff are not "neutral" players.)
4. New urbanist participatory design processes may not accommodate diverse groups

Disputes among groups

- A rejection of Pasupati fly-over construction project due to an obstacle in land releasing
4. New urbanist participatory design processes may not accommodate diverse groups

- The fly over passes through and separates dense residence located in Cikapundung valley
4. New urbanist participatory design processes may not accommodate diverse groups

- If participation is to promote stakeholder control and genuine engagement, then participatory planning and design techniques must go further:
  - Techniques must balance power within the "public" as well as between the public and professionals
  - Participatory processes must be culturally competent
  - New Urbanism must assume a diversity of participants from the outset. Thus, participatory methods should be designed while considering the multiple identities of local groups, rather than tailored to groups as an afterthought
  - Planners should recognize cultural diversity as part of the basic makeup of cities and should develop participatory (and other) planning methods that appropriately engage specific "publics" and balance power among them
  - Consultants and planners must also guard against manipulating participation tools to favor New Urbanist solutions
4. New urbanist participatory design processes may not accommodate diverse groups

- Participation methods that accommodate real power sharing and control over the agenda will create roles for residents that go beyond "consultation." Such methods may be more likely to reflect the values of groups who differ from planners and consultants in terms of cultural and class background.
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