

Session 5C - Cities for whom? Asymmetries, economies and exclusion in the urban space

14:30 - 16:00 Friday, 17th June, 2022

Scientific Day - Theme 5. Changing Economy for Equitable Cities

Presentation type Oral

Chair Beatriz Caitana, Jose Luis Fernández, Luciane Lucas dos Santos

The conventional models of the market economy have not been able to reduce asymmetries, or generated by the transformation of the urban space. Although the discourse on sustainable urban development has been grounded in social inclusion and an ecological perspective, environmental gentrification has subordinated equity to profit-minded development and deepened economic disparities (Checker, 2011). Social exclusion, due to social markers such as race, gender, nationality, age or sexual identity to name but a few, has defined the experience of minorities in relation to access to the city. Representations of their perspectives are usually underrepresented in the design of the landscape. Their access to social, cultural and safety facilities has been impaired. Participation by minorities in the decision-making processes of urban planning has been permanently neglected. Taking the notion of the inclusive city as a starting point, this session aims to reflect on the traps that the inclusion discourse might produce in relation to urban planning issues and public policies. The session will also highlight the strategies, intervention models, methodologies and policies that work towards an urban regeneration proposal that values heterogeneity in terms of landscape, economic alternatives, aesthetic experience and uses of city space. Different proposal formats are welcomed, including scientific papers, case studies, policy briefs, and artistic performance, among others. Given the emphasis on public policies, the participation of policy-makers and analysts, social scientists and environmental activists is encouraged.

CHECKER, M. (2011). Wiped out by the "Greenwave": Environmental gentrification and the paradoxical politics of urban sustainability. *City & Society*, 23: 210-229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-744X.2011.01063.x>