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NEW YORK IS ALMOST ALRIGHT?

The first in a series of world-wide investigations on cities
The Urban Age is an investigation into the nature of the modern city in six parts

Deyan Sudjic

ew York is perhaps the most populous and the most usual city of America’s cities. Such qualities are not universally seen as representing positive attributes in a country in which the traditional city is regarded with a certain degree of political and popular suspicion and which is continually elaborating new forms of exurbia.

Understanding New York’s very particular nature, and its prospects is an essential part of coming to terms with the evolving nature of the contemporary city, as it faces up to the reality of the extraordinary size jump of the later years of the 20th century. Scores of cities that have undergone, or are beginning to undergo, similar processes in their development are entire European nations. A city with an effective population of 18 million people – now the sixth largest in the world – is an entity with no historical precedent. If such a metropolitan area is to achieve the cohesion and the sense of identity that until now has been regarded as the fundamental essence of any successful city, then it must either learn from and build upon New York’s experiences, or else find an alternative workable model.

As the first stage in a cumulative sequence of conferences organised by the Cities programme of the London School of Economics, and the Alfred Herrhausen Society for International Dialogue, to be held in six cities across four continents, Urban Age is exploring the deliberately provocative proposition that New York is almost all right. Through a mix of muddle and dynamism, New York is succeeding as a city. It continually attracts new people, and creates new jobs for them. Despite everything else, it has proved itself as an urban machine with an impressive capacity to turn poor migrants into citizens with at least a foothold on the ladder to prosperity. By the standards of a Houston or a Los Angeles, it has done so with relative restraint in its use of land and natural resources. New York, at least in comparison with Houston or Phoenix is a city that has the possibility of bringing its consumption of fossil fuels used for transport under some kind of limit. It still has significant numbers of people who regularly walk to work.

It is a city that has begun to address years of under investment in its infrastructure, and to reclaim its marginalised neighbourhoods, even as it has had to face fiscal problems, a lack of affordable housing, and a middle class under increasing stress. A contrary view would be to see New York as relying on federal and state tax subsidies, overly dependent on an excessively narrow employment base, and facing the prospect of serious difficulties meeting the financial obligations of the bond issues made to fund a huge investment in transport infrastructure. Despite the much publicised turn around in its fortune of the last decade, it still lacks such basic urban infrastructure as a rapid transit link to its primary airport. New York may have more pedestrians than Dallas, but it is also more polluted, faces a famine of affordable housing, dead rats in its gutters, and may be in the midst of what is inevitably no more than a temporary lull between crime waves.

The conference will test both views of the proposition to explore the model of the relatively high density city of New York, as the first step in a series of such investigations that will move to Shanghai and London in 2005, and then to Mexico City, Johannesburg and Berlin. Urban Age is based in the belief not just that these cities have things to learn from each other, but also from understanding themselves in the context of a wider appreciation of similar challenges and opportunities. Above all it is a response to the belief that this is a moment for a reappraisal of the armory, intellectual and practical, that we have for understanding and developing the future of all cities. Despite the complexities and nuances facing the city, the fundamental models for it are still encompassed by two paradigms; the high density versus the low density model.

New York’s experiences offer lessons both for rapidly growing cities such as Shanghai, Mexico City and Johannesburg, some positive, others cautionary, as well as for cities with more similar characteristics such as London and Berlin.

Urban Age is a kind of comparative clinical testing process, exploring new techniques for diagnosis and treatment, across six cities, assessing their wider applicability. In New York, as in the other five cities the conference is undertaking a comparative analysis of key policy areas, from the legal and political underpinnings of government, to the economics underlying employment issues, and the physical form of the city and the degree to which urbanism and architecture impact on it. By bringing together academic specialists with individuals concerned with the day-to-day shaping of urban policy, and the key actors in the field, political, financial, and professional, the Urban Age moves beyond research, to build an agenda for the emerging city.

London and New York are cities with striking parallels. When their metropolitan areas are taken into account, they have comparable populations, size, and economic base. Both are attracting newcomers drawn from an extraordinarily widespread range of countries. Both have in the past suffered from the loss of traditional industries associated with their roles as port cities. They have very analogous structures, at least as far as their business districts are concerned. London’s West End office area parallels Midtown, the City is Wall Street, and Lower Manhattan is reflected in Canary Wharf.

The two cities have considered similar remedies for their difficulties, from new financial instruments for funding public transport, to various forms of tax incentives for housing and job creation, to road pricing and policing methods. An interchange has produced a significant flow of key individuals between the two cities to take up senior roles in their implementation. And at the same time, New York and London have as many discontinuities. Their political structures are in fact very different. And in their ethos, there is the paradox of a New York supposedly governed by market forces, actually shaped by rent control to an extent that London with its supposedly more socialised system has never contemplated.

But a comparison of New York and London offers a rich potential source for the understanding of the impact of urban change, and policy and design upon it.

Urban Age is using four distinct themes as the focus for its explorations of the forces that drive the urban process to arrive at some sense of synthesis around the key issues facing the city. The aim is to relate policy and economic issues to the physical form of the city, equally critical concerns that are too often isolated from each other. This underpins the series of questions that urb. Age asks. They are posed in the context of New York’s concern to all major cities, and by interrogating the fundamental issues of what it means to make a city, the hope is to bring fresh clarity in helping us make choices. Cities are economic mechanisms that create the wealth that sustains their people. But do jobs build cities or is it cities that build jobs? In other words, is it those urban qualities of a city that are within our power to change that are responsible for attracting fresh investment that brings jobs. Or is it simply the creation of jobs that brings with it, all those other desirable urban qualities.

The public realm is the key aspect of contemporary life that is unique to the modern city where strangers can come together to share the experience of city life. But at a time of public fear of terror, how is it still possible to feel safe in the crowd?

The city may be a powerful machine for the transformation of the migrant poor into more affluent city dwellers. But to judge by the stress the middle class find themselves under, priced out of affordable housing, concerned by public education and health systems, the city must address the squeezed middle, especially in the field of housing. Then there is the issue of movement within the city. Commuting distances driven by the cost of housing, and an imbalance between mass transit systems and the private car are escalating. Finding ways of reducing journey times is a vital part of improving the quality of life in a city.

Each of these issues sparks off a whole group of contingent questions. And the issues that they raise are interrelated. They form the starting point for a dialogue that will move to Shanghai, and London, Mexico City, Johannesburg and Berlin to contribute to the production of a major statement about the nature of the contemporary city. This cannot be a prescriptive blueprint, advocating the low density garden city, or the high density alternative of the past. It must go beyond the tidy minded attempts of the past to zone cities by functions. Its form will depend on clarity about the definition of the city, and a pooled experience of its nature.

Deyan Sudjic is architectural editor of The Observer and co-chair of the Advisory Board of the Urban Age.
It is almost 20 years since William H Whyte in *City*, his study of the exodus of corporate headquarters from New York’s downtown, suggested that a corporation that is tired of Manhattan is tired of life. Whyte plotted the movement of executive jobs from the city streets to isolated corporate campuses, in the 1960s and 1970s and he explored the worrying tendency of such companies to implode shortly afterwards.

He pointed to Union Carbide and American Can in particular as organisations that built themselves new corporate palaces that won architectural awards, but marked the last stage of their existence as independent entities. The exurban location, he suggested, had the effect of isolating corporations from the face-to-face economy of the city, and thus further weakened companies that were already vulnerable. And he made a comparison with those companies that stayed behind and flourished, or even those who did make the move, but left behind a vestigial front office in the city that grew more and more crowded as those executives who could, made the decision to stay. He could equally well have been talking about London, or Paris which experienced precisely the same moves as corporations attempted to capitalise on the land value of their buildings.

Whyte was describing an economy, and a city landscape that has changed beyond recognition in many significant aspects. But he posed a critical question about the relationship between the city, in its role as an accumulator of wealth, and its physical form. The Greenwich - Stanford corridor where so many of those corporations which resisted the tax incentives offered by a rattled New York City to encourage them to stay ended up, must be understood as just as much a part of the wider urban region of New York as Lower Manhattan. But in its physical form it is entirely different: low density, and with little physical infrastructure to permit the casual interaction which is the traditional quality of the city. In Whyte’s view then, the exurban form is not one that can be said to sustain job creation in the sense that the dense urban model can. The developers who built the business parks were building for jobs not cities. If they had built genuine cities, as is arguably the case in Canary Wharf in London, then they might have built more jobs in the long term.

Of course there are celebrated examples in other urban regions in which exurban agglomerations have turned into the kind of innovative clusters that have indeed generated jobs. Silicon Valley was the classic example. The reality is that a city as large and as complex as New York experiences both phenomena simultaneously.

New York has areas of exurban growth where companies go in search of space that costs less than the prime business areas of downtown. And even these areas could well learn from Whyte by exploring ways in which the physical structure might be modified in ways that could begin to replicate at least some of the traditional qualities of urbanism that encourage those face-to-face transactions that the traditional city does so well. But it also has areas in the inner core, such as the garment district, and silicon alley which have proved important incubators for the growth of new jobs. However this process has itself put at risk some of the traditional employment generators in these areas, especially those which have traditionally offered jobs in the reach of the newcomers to the city who make up 65 % of the population of New York.
TRAVELING LESS, LIVING BETTER. WHO PAYS?

Transport policy is struggling to keep up with the changing shape of the city.

In one way at least New York is the most European of America’s big cities. The city depends on public transport to a far greater extent than Los Angeles or Houston or even Chicago. Just over 50 per cent of New York City’s working population travel to work by public transport. Like London – where the figure is around 40 per cent, it began building its transit system in the 19th century, and also like London, its explosive period of growth in the first half of the 20th century was fuelled by suburban railway lines.

But then New York had Robert Moses to build its transit system in the 19th century, and also like London, its explosive period of growth in the first half of the 20th century was fuelled by suburban railway lines.

But then New York had Robert Moses to build the parkways, while London produced a very different civic figure, Frank Pick to usher in the golden age of London Transport’s unified system of buses and tube trains, tied together with a network of elegant station architecture, its specially designed typeface, and its iconic system map. Both cities struggled to live up to those glory days throughout the 1970s and 1980s when they appeared locked in a downward spiral of decline, with poorer standards of comfort and safety, dwindling passenger numbers. Their systems struggled to follow the flow of people to the edge of the new car based suburbs. Paris and Tokyo managed to integrate their suburban railway networks with rapid transit underground lines. London has seen what such lines have to offer but has so far failed to match them. New York hasn’t even tried.

Public transport is not only an issue of numbers, operating it efficiently requires skill and sophistication, and an urban structure which favours it. New York for example, may have substantially more buses than London, but London makes better use them; they carry more people, more miles than New York’s. The early archaeology of the underground lines left its mark on New York, as did the gaps between them. The same is true of its three separate commuter rail networks – Metro North, the Long Island Rail Road, and NJ TRANSIT. This system shrank substantially in the 1950s. The possibility of re-opening previously abandoned lines, especially in New Jersey is now an option while Metro North has plans to extend their Harlem and Hudson lines.

It is only the investment of vast sums of money in New York’s transit systems that reversed decades of decline. Since the early 1980s $30 billion, or more than $1.5 billion per year, has been spent on replacing and rehabilitating the New York metropolitan area transit systems. Fifty-six hundred subway cars, upwards of 1,000 commuter cars and 4,300 buses have been either purchased or overhauled. The subway system has restored over 500 miles of track and refurbished over 60 stations. Of the $30 billion, just over half ($15.2 billion) has been spent by the MTA for the NYC subway system, almost $1 billion per year for the 16-year period. The Port Authority has spent over $1.3 billion on PATH and the three commuter rail networks have used almost $10 billion to upgrade their capital plant. Over $3.1 billion has been spent on the bus networks in the two states.

London is currently in the midst of an equally ambitious bout of investment in its transit services, though it has already achieved some tasks which have so far eluded New York such as connecting its main airport to the mass transit system.

The question both cities face is where to invest next, in terms of achieving the greatest return, and how they will meet the long term cost of financing these projects.
The Urban Age conference is examining the wider issues that are raised by the provision of housing in mature cities such as New York through the focus of the future of a number of key sites in the city. Each of them demonstrates an aspect of the pressures that are tending to squeeze the middle class out of the city centre, a movement which in turn puts pressure on other, more peripheral areas.

A tendency common in every big city is for neighbourhoods to become more locally homogeneous, and so segregated from the diversity of the wider social fabric of the city. It is a tendency that is represented at its most extreme and negative way by the gated community, and in a more positive way by the tendency of ethnic communities, or creative artists, or young singles, to cluster together.

The conference looks at how immigrant and minority populations fare in the New York housing market, a city with 65 per cent of its people drawn from ethnic minorities, compared with 28.8 per cent in London. Do negative effects on the nature of individual neighbourhoods outweigh the positive effects of concentrations? What impact is this form of urban differentiation and fragmentation having on the cohesion of the city, and the quality of urban life? Assuming that such a tendency is not necessarily an entirely positive one; cities need to take steps to encourage the creation, or the safeguarding of built environments that can support diverse neighbourhoods and inclusive local communities. In particular, it is not only forms of tenure and questions of affordability that have a significant impact on these issues. The physical and spatial form of housing and urban design can serve to enhance the coexistence of various social groups, including families, that opt for "city life" over suburbanization.

The starting point in most discussions of urban design is the question of density. It has become something of a given that high density makes for vitality in a city, providing the sheer numbers of people in the concentrations needed to support everything from a mass transit system to schools, cinemas, public libraries and post offices. In New York City, gross residential density is 71.1 persons per hectare, while in London it is 45.6 persons. In New York it is 33.9 per cent of households that have children under 18, compared with 28.6 per cent in London.

High density cities are also regarded as better suited to reducing dependence on the private car, and thus bringing a range of environmental benefits. But it is not necessarily the case that all parts of a city should be equally dense. If high urban densities are considered a desirable goal, then so is home ownership, and these may not be compatible. If that is the case, then we need to determine the best policy mix to try to achieve both. Is there such a thing as an optimum urban density? And how much variation in density should there be between dense urban cores and more sparsely developed peripheral areas?

In the context of a city with as dense an urban core as New York, and its competition for land between housing and industry, how much room is left for new or in-fill developments. This is an issue which it is within the reach of local government to influence directly through rezoning and permitting the conversion of the city’s waterfront and industrial areas. The regulatory system in New York City certainly influences the city’s potential for growth. But what are its strengths in terms of providing city residents with the stability that communities need to flourish?
One of the most pressing social issues today is ‘civility,’ which means much more than good manners or breeding. It names the capacity of people to live together, beyond legal dictates or police coercion to behave well. Civility is a particular concern in cities, because of the density and diversity of urban places; only the most elaborate laws, the most intrusive policing can control behaviour in the complex society of the city. Such total control is hardly a desirable social ideal. In the end, getting along well with foreigners, people who are richer or poorer or of a different race, are all matters which should be engrained into everyday life.

Much current urban policy has given up, however, on civility. The ‘zero-tolerance’ approach to policing assumes that unless every small offence against public order is punished, larger offences will ensue; society cannot steady itself without the draconian threat of daily, detailed punishment. The emergence of gated communities is based on a kindred premise; to be safe, urban enclaves have to be rigidly regulated; open communities will degrade into disorder. These new practices join classic means of social control such as racial and religious segregation and ghettoisation, which established forbidden territories – on the premise that people who differ cannot and should not live together.

How then can civility be restored to the city? That broad question has a physical, and indeed architectural, dimension. We can design spaces and buildings which encourage people to behave well toward one another. The continuous street-walls throughout New York, for instance, contained people’s activity in public, and made public behaviour visible – the phenomenon Jane Jacobs once called ‘eyes on the street.’ Gap-tooth streets of isolated buildings do not, by contrast, form such a visible container for civility. London parks have worked to the same end by a different means, when, as in Hyde Park, large stretches of lawns dominate over plantings of trees. Again, the spreading of housing estates for the poor throughout London meant that rich and poor became accustomed to one another, and adjusted to one another, with a relative minimum of police enforcement; when London began building huge housing estates, warehousing the poor, the police had to take the place of social habits.

Richard Sennett is Professor of Sociology at LSE and NYU and is co-chair of the Advisory Board of the Urban Age.
URBAN AGE NEW YORK PARTNERS

The Deutsche Bank Americas Foundation
The Rockefeller Foundation
The Brookings Institution
Minerva LSE Research Group

The Deutsche Bank Americas Foundation administers the philanthropic activities of Deutsche Bank within the United States, Latin America and Canada. Together, the Bank’s Community Development Group and Foundation carry out the firm’s corporate citizenship commitments through a program of loans, investments and grants. The Foundation supports non-profit organizations, that concentrate on community development, education, and the arts, to provide distressed communities and disadvantaged individuals with opportunities for safe and affordable housing and economic advancement. The Foundation also seeks to enrich these communities by providing access to the arts, supporting local leaders, and strengthening local organizations.

www.cib.db.com/community/

The Rockefeller Foundation
The Rockefeller Foundation is a knowledge-based global foundation with a commitment to enrich and sustain the lives and livelihoods of poor and excluded people throughout the world.

The foundation emphasises the importance of generating new, and harnessing existing knowledge to addressing the complex and difficult challenges faced by poor people. Its various areas of work are based on science, technology, research and analysis.

www.rockfound.org

The Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program

The Metropolitan Policy Program was launched in 1996 to provide decision-makers cutting-edge research and policy analysis on the shifting realities of cities and metropolita areas.

The program reflects our belief that the United States is undergoing a profound period of change. That is reshaping both the roles of cities, suburbs, and metropolitan areas and the challenges they confront. For that reason, a new generation of public policies must be developed that answers to these new circumstances.

We are redefining the challenges facing metropolitan America and promoting innovative solutions to help communities grow in more inclusive, competitive, and sustainable ways.

www.brookings.edu/metro/

Minerva LSE Research Group

The Minerva LSE Research Group is a ground-breaking joint venture between Minerva and the LSE Cities Programme, which undertakes original research initiatives into key factors impacting on urban development with the intention of influencing public policy. In 2004 the group published ‘Density and Urban Neighbourhoods in London.

Minerva is one of the UK’s largest property investment and development companies with gross assets of over £1 billion. It is listed on the London Stock Exchange and is a constituent of the FTSE 250.

ORGANISED BY LSE CITIES PROGRAMME AND THE ALFRED HERRHAUSEN SOCIETY FOR INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE

LSE Cities Programme
The Cities Programme was established at the London School of Economics and Political Sciences in 1996. Our main objective is to link the urban social sciences with the design of cities’ built environment and infrastructure. As an international centre of excellence in the social sciences, the LSE has a longstanding commitment to an innovative understanding of urban society.

Our purpose is simple and broad: to improve the quality of the built environment. The design of urban buildings, places and spaces is often at odds with the needs of urban society. We aim to make the built environment more socially sensitive, and to make people more aware of the social role of architecture and planning. In 2003 the programme formalised its consultancy and research work by setting up Enterprise LSE Cities Limited.

Contact details
Cities Programme
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
E cities@lse.ac.uk
www.lse.ac.uk

The Alfred Herrhausen Society for International Dialogue
The Alfred Herrhausen Society is a centre of independent thinking that seeks to identify traces of the future in the present, and thereby raise public awareness of the directions in which society is moving. As Deutsche Bank’s socio-political think tank, the Herrhausen Society is driving change. Change that is reshaping both the shifting realities of cities and metropolitan America and promoting innovative solutions to help communities grow in more inclusive, competitive, and sustainable ways.

Our purpose is simple and broad: to improve our understanding of urban society — and we strive to make the built environment more socially sensitive, and to make people more aware of the social role of architecture and planning.

Founded in 1992, the Society is dedicated to maintaining and building on the legacy of Alfred Herrhausen. The Alfred Herrhausen Society for International Dialogue was established in 1992, as a centre of independent thinking that seeks to identify traces of the future in the present, and thereby raise public awareness of the directions in which society is moving. As Deutsche Bank’s socio-political think tank, the Herrhausen Society is driving change. Change that is reshaping both the shifting realities of cities and metropolitan America and promoting innovative solutions to help communities grow in more inclusive, competitive, and sustainable ways.

The London School of Economics and the Alfred Herrhausen Society for International Dialogue would like to apologise for any confusion that has arisen by adopting the name ‘Urban Age’ for the series of conferences on cities. The Urban Age Institute, a US-based organisation which is partnered with the World Bank, has published the Urban Age Magazine since 1990, recently relaunched in Fall 2004 (www.UrbanAge.org ). The Urban Age Institute shares many of the same goals and objectives as our series of conferences, and we apologise for any inconvenience caused to them. We would like to draw the attention of all participants to a forthcoming conference on sustainable urban development which takes place in New York City in March 2005 (www.actemia.com/go/March2005).
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JOHANNESBURG/SPRING 2006
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FRIDAY 25 FEBRUARY

Location
W Hotel Union Square, 2nd Floor

09.00 – 09.30 Opening Session

Welcome
Ricky Burdett, Director, Urban Age, LSE
Wolfgang Nolak, Spokesman of the Executive Board, Alfred Herrhausen Society for International Dialogue

09.30 – 10.45 New York and London

TWO MODELS OF THE METROPOLIS
Chair, Bruce Katz, Brookings Institution
Understanding the city: Socio-economic trends and spatial pattern
Tony Travers, Director, Greater London Group, LSE 15 min
Empowering the city: Legal structures and political power
Gerald Frug, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School 15 min
Working in the city: Local economies in a global environment
Saskia Sassen, Professor of Political Economy, University of Chicago and LSE 15 min
Designing the city: The architecture of identity
Deyan Sudjic, Director, Architectural crisis, The Observer 15 min
Open discussion 45 min

10.45 – 11.00 Coffee Break

11.00 – 12.15 Labour Market and the work place

DO JOBS BUILD CITIES OR DO CITIES BUILD JOBS?
Chair, Bruce Katz, Brookings Institution
Opening Statement
Dietmar Läpple, Professor of Regional and Urban Economics, TU Hamburg-Harburg 5 min
Propositions
New media networking and manufacturing in dense urban environments
Susan Christopherson, Professor, Cornell University 15 min
Building typologies of the economy of change
Hasan Sacks, Age-Klein Professor, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University 15 min
Responses
Carl Weisbrod, President, New York Downtown Alliance 5 min
Frank Duffy, Founder, DSGW, London and New York 5 min
Sharon Zukin, Professor of Sociology, City University of New York 5 min
Jonathan Rose, Principal, Jonathan Rose Companies LLP 5 min
Open discussion 45 min

12.15 – 12.30 Lunch

Lunch talk
An urban age in a suburban country?
Bruce Katz, Director, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution

12.45 – 16.00 Mobility and Transport

TRAVELLING LESS, LIVING BETTER. WHY NOT?
Chair, Bruce Katz, Brookings Institution
Opening Statement
Hermann Knopflacher, Professor of Transport Planning, TU Vienna 5 min
Propositions
Making a transport strategy work for New York
Robert E. Paezwell, Director of the Institute for Urban Systems, City University of New York 15 min
Financing urban transport
Richard Rennich, Principal, Ravitch Rice and Company 15 min
Making places for movement
Alejandro Zaera Polo, Joint Director, Foreign Office Architects 15 min
Responses
Katherine Lapp, Executive Director, Metropolitan Transportation Authority 5 min
Bob Yaro, President, Regional Plan Association New York 5 min
Kathryn Wylde, President, Partnership for New York City 5 min
Open discussion 60 min

16.15 – 16.30 Coffee Break

16.45 – 17.15 Debate

Connecting urban governance and planning
Chair, Bruce Katz, Brookings Institution
Panel
Anthony Williams, Mayor of Washington D.C.
Enrique Peñalosa, Mayor of Bogotá 1997 – 1999
Tony Travers, Director, Greater London Group, LSE
Carl Weisbrod, President, New York Downtown Alliance
Ester Fuchs, Special Advisor for the Mayor for Governance and Strategic Planning, City of New York
Open discussion 30 min

17.45 – 18.00 Concluding Remarks

Location
W Hotel Union Square, 2nd Floor

SATURDAY 26 FEBRUARY

10.00 – 11.45 Public Life and Urban Spaces

FEELING SAFE IN THE CROWD
Chair, Tony Travers, London School of Economics
Opening Statement
Sophie Boddy-Gendert, Director, Center for Urban Studies, Sarhoma 5 min
Propositions
Civilising security in New York: A view from Europe
Sophie Boddy-Gendert, Director, Center for Urban Studies, Sarhoma 10 min
Crime currents in New York and the co-production of security
Jeff Fagan, Director of the Center for Violence Research and prevention, Columbia University 15 min
Does space matter to public life?
Ron Koolhaas, Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Rotterdam 15 min

11.45 – 12:00 Coffee Break

12.00 – 13.30 Housing and Neighbourhoods

SQUEEZING THE MIDDLE
Chair, Tony Travers, London School of Economics
Opening Statement
Ricky Burdett, LSE and Director, The Urban Age 5 min
Propositions
Affordable housing, manufacturing and the artist community:
Williamsburg Green Point Waterfront
Shawn Donovan, Commissioner, New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development 15 min
Integrating large institutions into fine grain urban neighbourhoods:
Columbia University expansion
Martin Tolérus, Chairman, SOM Architects 15 min
Responses
Amanda Burden, Director, NYC Planning Department 5 min
Michel Serkin, Principal, Michael Serkin Studio, NYU 15 min
Nick Ratman, Director, Joint Center of Housing Studies, Harvard University 5 min
Ron Sulllman, Co-founder, Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development 5 min
Open discussion 40 min

13.30 – 14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 15.00 Debate

The need for urban models?
Chair, Deyan Sudjic, The Observer
Panel
Ron Koolhaas, Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Rotterdam
Peter Eisenman, Eisenman Architects, New York
Alejandro Zaera Polo, Foreign Office Architects, London

15.00 – 16.00 Concluding Remarks

NEW YORK IS ALMOST ALRIGHT?
Towards a Programme for the Urban Age
Chair, Tony Travers, London School of Economics
Contributions
Bob Yaro, President, Regional Plan Association New York
Carl Weisbrod, President, New York Downtown Alliance
Saskia Sassen, Professor of Political Economy, LSE and University of Chicago
Richard Sennett, Professor of Sociology, LSE and NYU
Damiel Rose, President, Rose Associates

Comments and closing Remarks

18.00 – 19.30 Reception

Location
MoMA – The Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53 Street

Main entrance
Hosted by the Department of Architecture & Design, MoMA
Susan Christopherson
Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University
Susan Christopherson is an economic geographer whose research focuses on: industry restructuring and its implications; the evolution of economies; issues in urban markets; particularly labour flexibility; and location patterns in service industries, particularly the audio-visual and new media industries. In 1998, after specializing in the Media Centre in Oslo, she was a faculty member of the Graduate School for Advanced Research and Renewal: The Emergence of a Diverse Urban Economy (co-ordinated with Vigdis Frank Pendl and Chicago). She is currently engaged in research on the media industries in New York City and on new economic development initiatives.

Shaun Donovan
Commissioner, New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development
Shaun L. Donovan is a Commissioner of the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) where he oversees the Department’s 5,000 employees and 300,000 housing units in the evolution of New York City’s housing stock. Donovan is responsible for implementing Mayor Bloomberg’s $13 billion housing initiative, “Housing New York: A New Generation,” which will fund the creation or preservation of 66,000 units of affordable housing over the next five years. It is the City’s most ambitious housing plan in over 25 years. Previously Donovan was the Managing Director of Predominant Mortgage Capital Company and CEO of one of the nations largest Federal Housing Administration lenders. Donovan has a Master of Public Affairs and Policy and Government from Harvard University, a Master of Urban Planning from Columbia University and a Bachelors in Architecture from Harvard. Donovan currently serves as Chair of the Joint Housing for Cities at Harvard University, the National Housing Conference, and the National Association of Housing and Development Agencies.

Frank Duffy
Founder, DEGW, London and New York
Frank Duffy co-founded DEGW, a multi-disciplinary “space planning” firm that has grown into one of the world’s largest firms in the field. His work has been closely linked to how architecture as a profession opens up new possibilities in urban development and has continued to develop DEGW’s methodologies to engage the public in an increasingly more expressive use of workspace. Duffy believes in the context of practice. He is a predictable writer and has taken a lead role in many significant debates about the future of the architecture profession. Currently he directs his time between London and New York City where he is Professor at MIT. Duffy has established a career in helping businesses use space more effectively over time. Recent projects include the Cambridgeshire Constabulary – Ormonde Street Children’s Hospital (1996) and extensions to the Swiss Bank Corporation at 100 Broad Street. In 1997 he was elected as a member of the Royal Academy of Arts. He is a frequent writer and commentator on urban and metropolitan issues. He is the co-founder of Redefining Urban and Suburban Futures, a book published by Routledge/FR Timmon Rogers in 2000. Before joining DEGW, he served as Chief of Staff to Henry G. C annors, former Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. He has also served as the staff director of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development. He currently teaches at the graduate school of Architecture and Yale Law School. He is a currently Visiting Professor of Social Policy at the London School of Economics.

Peter Eisenman
Professor of Architecture, Penn State, Architect, Eisenman Architects
In 1980, Peter Eisenman established Eisenman Architects, focusing on housing and urban design projects, facilities planning for the arts and culture, and the planning and director until the year 2002, of the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, an international think-tank for architectural research and publishing, and of the Architectural Association, with Taniguchi and Associates; and New Museum of Contemporary Art in New York and organised the exhibitions of buildings in the restricted zone around the World Trade Center after 9/11. In 2004 he co-authored, “In defense of the Terminus: an investigation of naturalism as a social and cultural force” with Taniguchi and Associates, and saw the book’s WTC: Eerie Building Damage Assessment Report published.
Enrique Peñalosa

Mayor of Bogotá 1997 – 1999

Enrique Peñalosa is the former Mayor of Bogotá, Colombia and was recently appointed to the Board of Directors of Brookings. He was Mayor of Bogotá from 1997–1999, a period in which he oversaw the transformation of the city into a modern city with internet access in every home. Since then, his LLC, a network of community and land use planning and development corporations and institutions, has pursued a career involving a variety of real estate and planning subjects. Rose has served as a Director of the Institute of Urbanism at the Academy of Fine Arts and as a New York City design practice devoted to both practical and theoretical projects at all scales, with a special interest in the City. Recent projects include: masterplanning in Hamburg and Schwerin, Germany; planning for a Palestinian capital in east Jerusalem; and studies of the Manhattan waterfront and the development of the City. In 1993–2000 he was Professor of Urbanism and Director of the Institute of Urbanism at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. He has taught at numerous universities in the US and abroad, including UC Berkeley, Harvard, MIT, Cornell. Well known as the architect of The Village, Visco, his books include: Some Assembly Required, Other Projects realised include the Yokohama International Port Terminal in Japan, and the Barcelona Port in Spain. Besides his architectural work Alejandro Zaera Polo is currently the Dean of Bartlett School of Architecture at universities around the world. His critical and theoritical work has been published in international magazines and a recent monograph on the work of the practice has appeared as part of the 2G series.

Sharon Zukin

Professor of Sociology, City University of New York

Sharon Zukin is Professor of Sociology at Brooklyn College and the University City of New York. She is often a participant in urban studies conferences and has been a leading figure in the field of urban studies for many years. She is a member of the editorial board of the journal Urban Affairs Review and has published extensively in the field of urban studies. Her most recent book is Point of Purchase: How Shopping Changed American Culture (2004). Her current research includes an overview of shopping and consumption, urban development, art, real estate, and racial ghettos.