**DIÁLOGOS**

**Kevin Lynch ‘The art of site planning’**

K.Lynch describes the *site planning* as “the art of arranging structures on the land and shaping the spaces between; an art linked to architecture, engineering, landscape architecture and city planning”. He describes the socio-anthropological aspects of planning the material environment. One of the main responsibilities of the *artist* (architect, engineer, urbanist) is what influence on people the site is making. It is very important how the structures are ordered on the ground and what size has the space inbetween. The space impacts the individual psycologically (for example if the free space is too small it results depression) and the individual impacts it physically. /Space as a representative of Nature/ The human lives in a particular place (space) and in the same time the place *lives* thanks to the individuals in it. A good human habitat is one with diversed natural resources and shaping the environment in a beautiful but funcional way is the healthies solution for the socium.

**Christopher Alexander ‘La ciudad no es un arbol’**

It is all about *natural* and *artificial.* Building a city from *zero* on an empty field lets the human to express so that is how the orthogonal straight lined urban structure was born. The straight line is a human invention (one of the most proudest for the humanity) and it demonstrates the rationality in space. But there are also towns whose evolution was driven by the Nature or more specifically – following it. The topography of a place, led by the water which cuts through, is first and main condition for creating a city. In both cases (artificially and naturally developed settlements) there are two actors – Land and Planner. The situation is similar – there is a ground which is manipulated. From that moment on it depends on the *decisions* and the *conditions*. It could be ordered rationally or it could be shaped naturally. The natural shaping is simply following the given directions (an example could be the patterns of some of Granada’s neighbourhoods placed on hills or a town by a river). But at the end (like in the beginning) they are both the same because it is all about the human needs and this dynamics reflect on the territory in an artificial way and a city cannot be assumed as a tree (or to accept totally theories which compare the city to an organism: one of the reasons is because the city is a unity of many complex elements but it isn’t necessary for them to depend one on another). From the other side a city it cannot be fully projected or systemized because of the Life itself – not everything depends on the planner.   
My conclusion is that the conflict (or the harmony) *artificial-natural* in a city is the force which makes it evolve.

**V. Gregotti ‘El territorio de la Arquitectura’**

Gregotti speaks about the comlexity of the typology. He defines two model types: a model which extracts copies and behavior patterns; a set of characteristic features whose intersection in a given phenomenon allows us to classify them. This type tends to organize the experience by schemes, process that people tend to do to simplify, which facilitates dealing with the information, also it depends on the degree of definition that the user gives, because it is essencial avoiding confusion when studying. Systemizing the architectural process is what makes it a science (not art only), but being a complex matter, creating a *one fits all* type is impossible. Therefore, the author tries to give two solutions: high level of service in a single multifunctional registry or service flexibility in a much less limited and trained to operate.

**J.L. Gomez Ordonez – ‘Trazar el territorio’**

Prof. Gomez Ordonez states the basis of shaping the territory. The *components* and the *communications* between them are equally important. *Communicating* naturally results *shaping* – traces are *cutting* through the land and they create the forms of the urban morphology. The city geometry depends on distance and importance of the connected elements, the manner in which they are connected, if this connection attracts more connections (or creates more) etc. The *orthogonal* andthe *radial* urban structures are the best example of a “traced” territory because of the recognizable figures which compose them.

**Manuel de Sola-Morales – ‘Me interesa la piel de ciudades’**

The ideas arch.De Sola-Morales is sharing are very punctual and actual. The necessity of a “material” instead of the “conceptual” and *trendy* contemporary architecture is the what should be the focus and main topic in most of the forums, schools, projects, strategies etc. “Material” in sense of being *functional* and *serving* the society. The well planned/designed/builded site is simply a ground base which drives the city life to flow and develop itself. The oposite force of the *well done* sites isn’t the *poorly made* ones but *creating without concidering* the long-term effects of the intervention in reality driven buy the market needs. *Lack of concideration of the future* combined with the era of *social networks* *and personal branding* results a *seeking* *fame* architecture. The “disease” or the “tomb” of Architecture is not creating to help the *evolution* as species but creating tohelp *expression* of the ego and this is the biggest enemy of the Urbanism.

**Manuel de Sola-Morales – ‘Unwin: Para un urbanismo particular’**

In this text Manuel de Solà Morales reviews Unwin’s urban planning. Raymond Unwin’s describes two planning typoligies and the tension between them: "formalism" which rests on legislation in the layout and in the traditions of the Classicism and the Renaissance and "informalism" based on the place, on the construction, on the contrast and on the difference. Unwin promotes the "urbanism in practice" without following any school and dogmas.

In a complex matter as planning a town there is not a one solution to every problem and applying fully solely one type of methodology is a limited approach. In any case depending on the situation the best decision should be made. So taking in account the environment (formalism) and making a better change/difference (informalism) is the way a city unfolds its beauty. The fusion between the two typologies is impossible if they are implemented in the same time. The harmony exists only if they are demonstrated as separate steps of the process. After all the “urbanism in practice” is the most reasonable *school* to be *followed* because of its *flexible reactions* and *proper actions.*

**Thomas More – ‘Utopia’**

The book ‘Utopia’ is a symbol of the idea of the *perfect world* but also in a sense of the *not-possible perfection* of the social structure. What makes *utopia* a synonym of a *beautiful fiction* in the contemporary world are the social distances and the characteristics of the time. The social context when More wrote the book was monarchial structure in Europe with glances of intellectual freedom. The idea he declares about replacing people back and forward from the village to the town is very revolutionary and liberating imagining the rights of the villeins of the time. There are very beautiful ideas about everybody doing what suposes to and we, as people who have the possibility of access, should reconcider some of them. Of course nowadays it is impossible to *make* people change their habitation and then to move back after a certain time because everyone’s right to take own decisions but the infrastructure and logistics (especially travel time) between the different towns is an amazing example for a sustainable regional planning.   
Today, after a half of a millenium, a modern remake is demanded. Having more knowledge and being more connected gives us the ease to *create a dream* which could be our reality.

**F. ASCHER – ‘Los principios del nuevo urbanismo’**

The quoted text is the transcription of the most important part of the “Los Nuevos Principles of Urbanism”, in which Francois Ascher expresses a conclusion summarizing the urbanization of the western city. A continuation of transcription of the most important part of the Los Nuevos Principles of Urbanism, in which François Ascher expresses the conclusion that resuming the urbanization of the city, which is the name of the city, and that it is a mundo, en el mundo occidental. There are different type of “new urbanism” that he describes:

A *device* urbanism: which is the urban planning through communication and discussion.

A *thoughtful* urbanism: implementing knowledge as a focus in the project and leading during the whole process from planning to realization.

A *cautious* urbanism: that gives rise to controversies and that means are sought to take into account the effects and demands of sustainable development.

A *participatory* urbanism: the conception and realization of the project are the result of the intervention of many actors with different ideas and the combination of these ideas which is what democracy promotes.

A *flexible* urbanism: of consensus, of catalytic effect, in tune with the dynamics of society. It follows naturally the *participatory* urbanism because after including all of the actors who have interest it is very important to reach consensus.

A *heterogeneous* urbanism: composed of hybrid elements, multiple solutions, redundancies, differences.

A *stylistically open* urbanism: that, by separating urban design from political-cultural and urbanistic ideologies, leaves room for formal and aesthetic choices. Planning and designing a city usually is a result of the political dynamics and cultural context but it is more important for an idea to be elaborated because of its qualities.

A *multisensory* urbanism: that enriches the urbanity of a place.   
  
The fact that there is access to so many diversed tools drives the experts to create better and smarter.

**Jan Gehl – ‘Human scale’**

Jan Gehl is one of the most popular worldwied urbanists of the time. One of his most *brave* projects is making Time Square, one of the most crowded and touristic places in New York, a pedestrian space which turns out to be a great intervention. In the movie he speaks about people *winning back* the cities from the cars. The *king* of the street is the car. Most of the contemporary cities are designed to be suitable motorized motion which makes it hostile to the human. The idea of the “human scale” is about taking in account what the individual seeks in the urban experience, also *what* and *how* he/she needs it. It is very imporatant for the *health* of a community to live in a hospital environment which for example is a street where a human could walk around freely and calmly without being stressed by accidents. Very significant part of the *urban hospitality* are the *sizes* – the (re)design of an area should be concideration of the proportions *human:architectural environment.* The *motor cities* are characterized by vast roads, long and boring walkways without an evidence of decent *human activites* which makes the society to fail being *sane*.

**Barcelona – ‘Superblocks’**

“Superblocks” is a concept of a major scale. it makes the cars to avoid passing through a neigbourhood by forbidding the access and the result is a greater pedestrian-friendly areas. This is the way of transforming the city in a good *humanic* way, because when the goal is reaching *cities for the people* the interventions should be *aggressive* towards the motorized vehicles. It doesn`t brings any traffic conflicts because of the ease of the orthogonal structure to be reconsidered in a new way. When the possibilities are changed the drivers also change their routes not the oposite... I think that “superblocks” is a great approach and gives excelent results human-wise.