

## Brief report of the ENHR – Workshop on Social Innovation & Participation

Monday 20 June 14:00 - 17:00h – Court Room

### COORDINATORS:

Drs. ing. Gerard van Bortel & dr. Reinout Kleinhans (both OTB Research Institute for the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology, NL), ir. Kristel Aalbers (Delft University of Technology, NL)

### GENERAL THEME DESCRIPTION:

Developing sustainable environments has evolved from a primarily physical ‘bricks and mortar’ activity towards a hybrid discipline where social, economic and spatial measures come together, not only to create a sustainable built environment but also develop sustainable neighborhoods and communities. This calls not only for technical innovations but also for improvements from a social perspective.

This raises challenging questions for researchers and practitioners alike. The key issue for the workshop is: how can the built environment contribute to creating socially sustainable communities and neighborhoods? What is social sustainability in the first place: social capital, collective efficacy, mixed communities and housing solutions, environments that facilitate upward social mobility? What are the interrelations between physical and social sustainability? How can housing policies and housing management practices support social sustainability? What is the impact of planning, building and management processes on social sustainability? How can we design and manage planning, building and housing management process to include the numerous and diverse actors and disciplines in an open, effective and accountable way? How do we ensure that weaker, underprivileged and often underrepresented groups can participate in decision-making processes?

This workshop will be profoundly interdisciplinary in nature. We seek to engage researchers and practitioners from various fields such as building, planning, housing, public management in lively presentations and debates.

### WORKSHOP SET UP:

After a welcome word by Gerard van Bortel all paper writers were asked to present their paper in 15 minutes. Papers were combined by similarities in topics in 2 rounds. Directly after 2 or 3 presentations a discussion was started.

### PROGRAM:

14:00	Introduction	Gerard van Bortel - Welcome, introduction to workshop aims and themes, structure and time-management
14:15		Sake Zijlstra en Giselle van Stolwijk - Participation in collectively sold private renovations [36] <i>Page 62 of the book of abstracts</i>
14:30		Arun Bajracharya - Innovation in the context of a developing country: a case of group housing project [110] <i>Page 64 of the book of abstracts</i>
14:45		Marco Aurelio Stumpf Gonzalez – Building renewal on social housing – case study on the Rubem Berta settlement, Porto Alegre, Brasil <i>Page 23 of the book of abstracts</i>
15:00	Discussion	Paper authors will present one overarching point for discussion emanating from the papers (2 minutes each)
15:15	Coffee and tea break	
15:30		Beck Collins, David Boyd - Exploring different community attitudes to sustainable technologies [133] <i>Page 65 of the book of abstracts</i>

15:45		Amar Bensalma - Sustainable renovation of the large-scale housing estates, built in France of the 1950s and 1973s [75] <i>Page 63 of the book of abstracts</i>
16:00	Discussion	Paper authors will present one overarching point for discussion emanating from both papers (2 minutes each)
16:15	Closing	Gerard van Bortel - Workshop closure, summary of main outcomes from the presentations and discussions
16:30	Drinks	

## **DISCUSSIONS:**

### **15:00 Discussion**

Question addressed to Sake: In which way were the goals set for the interior and exterior of these DIY houses?

Answer by Sake: The municipality set the goals for the exterior. The individual homeowners set the goals for the interior. An architect advised the homeowners.

Question addressed to Sake: How was the available room divided between the participants and determined?

Answer by Sake: In the Wallisblok project a registration system was used. Via this registration system homeowners were selected, including their demands for the amount of square meters they wanted. The division of the square meters was a complex period. In other projects (later on) the lay out was set before participants could register. Participants were asked to register for certain parts within the already drawn lay out.

Question addressed to Sake: Is the chosen lay out still flexible?

Answer by Sake: The walls that have a supporting function for the building structure are fixed and cannot be removed. Most living areas however have an open living plan, which provides certain flexibility.

Question addressed to Arun: Does the municipality set extra measures, especially sustainable measures, for the buildings you have shown us in your presentation?

Answer by Arun: Considering the fact that the examples are in developing countries, most of the time there are no extra measures set by the municipality.

Question addressed to Marco: Who are the homeowners and are they the ones subsidizing the project?

Answer by Marco: The federal bank is the organization subsidizing the project.

Question addressed to Sake: Who was the property owner before the municipality bought those properties?

Answer by Sake: Several private parties owned all separate houses within the block. Due to the fact that it was a problem area (drug abuse, prostitution), special legislation became supportive for the transformation.

Question addressed to Sake: Did the new homeowners knew each other before the project started?

Answer by Sake: No, the municipality advertised the project by telling they owned houses, which were on offer for free. New homeowners had to spend a certain amount of Euros on the renovation of their house in order to be selected as a new homeowner.

### **16:00 Discussion**

Question addressed to Beck: Could you inform us on your theoretical framework?

Answer by Beck: Actually, it is described in the paper.

Question addressed to Amar: Why did you choose the period 1950-1973 for your research?  
Answer by Amar: In that period a certain planning law was applied.

Remark addressed to Amar: It might be interesting to have a look at the case study of arriving cities. The examples of the Bijlmermeer and Slotervaart in The Netherlands might be inspiring to you.

Question addressed to Beck: Why should sustainability be discussed with the inhabitants? You probably would not ask them to advise on topics like sound barriers or other building details, why would you on the topic of sustainability? The risk might be that sustainable measures become optional.

Answer by Beck: Thank you for this interesting question. It probably is needed to address this sustainability topic and to treat it in another way because the political will is not big enough (yet).

Question addressed to Beck: Could you describe the type of community your research focuses on? Different types of houses seem to be part of the project, and different types might ask for a different approach.

Answer by Beck: Most of the houses of the research project in Birmingham are brick attached houses. Some of these houses were already renovated, but still felt poor (insulation was not well enough).

Question addressed to Beck: Could you tell us what the main technology is you have focused on?

Answer by Beck: The focus is on energy, but in a wide range. The aspects that were applied in the project, which focused on solar energy, set the restriction. It would be interesting to find out whether the element adding PV would change their behavior in a more sustainable way.

Question addressed in general: Is it possible to use physical measures to upgrade the social aspects of people?

Answer by Amira: The Slotervaart and Bijlmermeer project in The Netherlands show an upgrade. But both are large-scale projects, both focusing on people aspects.

Answer by Sake: For Wallisblok using physical measures to upgrade the social aspects of people worked well. All occupants of this block were new to the area. However, existing occupants of the area have mentioned not to notice any effects, the prior social problems have become less.

Answer by Amira: The neighborhood of Hillsborough in Johannesburg South Africa shows that a block-by-block approach does not work for such an area (large-scale). The approach chosen at this moment for Hillsborough is a large-scale method.

Answer by Beck: The focus should be on jobs and skills, creating possibilities for the occupants of the area. That is what happened in Birmingham.

At the end of the workshop all paper writers were thanked for their presentation. The two presentation rounds followed by two discussion rounds worked well. The workshop session was experienced as a fruitful afternoon.