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Summary

Urban regeneration has been subject of a changing environment in which increased participation of different sectors of society play a key role. The shift in power and governance structures has put participation in the centre stage, as a key factor to achieve social and economic sustainability in this kind of projects. A response to this challenge is given by the implementation of collaborative planning and network theories. This thesis is focused on the application of these mechanisms in practice, using a case study as an example of the possibilities and limitations of collaborative approaches. By studying the actor relations within the Fenicia Triangle project, a set of conclusions on the applicability of the instruments and the influence of the context is provided. Finally, a set of recommendations for the practice is presented.

Keywords: Urban regeneration, collaborative planning, networks, case study, Bogotá, Colombia

The field of urban (re)development, and subsequently urban development management, has been subject of constant changes and different approaches over time. Some of the foremost challenges of these processes are related to the large number of involved actors, the way they interact and relate to each other and the changes in these relations over time, as projects are proposed, discussed, planned, executed, inhabited and so forth.

Historically, a shift can be seen from planning understood as the execution of a precisely made program, in which the planning authority, in that case the government, holds a leading role; towards an incrementalism view, in which the process is seen as iterative and a larger group of actors are involved; and finally, towards pluralism in which participation is a central issue and the political nature of planning includes an even wider set of actors into the process (Lane, 2005).

At the same time, shifts in the power and governance structures have been occurring. If the group of societal actors is understood as being threefold, that is the State, the Market and the Community, the latter has been reclaiming a leading position and greater involvement over time, encouraged by the aforementioned changes in planning approaches. Governments have become more dependent on a broader set of actors, particularly the civic society, in order to achieve its goals, due to the increasing complexity of contemporary challenges (Klijn, 2008).

This forms part of a broader societal change in which knowledge has become progressively more specialized and distributed and institutional organisations have become more complex and interdependent. Consequently, the previous hierarchical model has become obsolete, and it has been replaced with more horizontal and transactional structures, that call for an increased collaboration among actors (Ansell & Gash, 2008).
This thesis intends to understand the factors that allow for this collaboration to occur in urban (re)development projects. Furthermore, it explores the consequences of these changes in terms of governance and organisational approaches and the way the latter change over time. For this purpose, the research is based on an in-depth study of a critical case, adopting a pluralistic epistemological approach with an interpretivist emphasis. Finally, a series of reference cases is presented in order to better understand the influence of the context in the application of a theoretical framework within a specific situation.

Problem Statement

Collaborative planning emerged as a response to the planning theories implemented throughout the 1960s and 1970s, aiming to respond to the limited role that public participation had up until that moment. According to its main advocates, communication lies at the core of planning. Communication is understood as arguing, negotiating, bargaining and debating and, therefore, implies the involvement of all the concerned actors, for planning to proceed (Lane, 2005). From this a general line of research can be exerted, under the following question:

• How is collaboration achieved in urban regeneration projects?

Despite the changing social, political and economic panorama, the adoption of these collaborative approaches in practice has been slow. This can be due to the conflict between the perceived benefits and the effort (in terms of time and capital) that such endeavours entail, as well as the difficulty to resolve conflicts of interests through discussion. The latter represents a major obstacle that can effectively thwart such complex projects.

This research is concerned with the application of collaborative planning theory in a specific context and the factors that allow for this organisational approach to come about. In order to investigate this phenomenon a case study in Bogotá, Colombia has been chosen. It consists in an urban regeneration project, characterised by a collaborative planning approach. From this, stems the main research question:

• What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?

This question is further down divided in different components, that in turn make up for the thesis structure and form the background of the research. The first part is concerned with the conceptual framework of the research. Thus, it embraces the different theories that swerve around collaborative planning, namely urban planning, stakeholder analysis and networks theory:

• What is collaborative planning and how does it relate to public participation?
• What actors are involved in collaborative urban regeneration project and what roles do they play in the process?
• How do these actors relate to each other?
• How is power distributed among stakeholders in collaborative or networked organisations?
The second part is concerned with the empirical study and therefore with the application of the theoretical framework to analyse the selected case study. As such, the following research questions have guided the observations:

- How is urban planning executed in Bogotá and which instruments can be identified?
- What phases can be identified in the process?
- What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?
- How do these actors relate to each other?
- How is power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?
- How does the context influence the application of collaborative planning in practice?

### Theoretical Framework

#### Urban Planning

The field of urban regeneration has seen different approaches over time, closely linked to the development of planning theories. Building on Horita and Koizumi (2009); and Lane (2005), planning practice can be divided in three major schools, depending on the main approach to the planning process. These are the blueprint model, the synoptic approach and the pluralist approach.

Blueprint planning represents the earliest planning theories, in which the approach was highly rational and normative, with the most prominent theorists being Howard and Geddes. As the name suggests, its objective is to create fixed end-state plans to be executed. This puts the planner in the centre and gives it, as a representative of the state, a large amount of power to be able to implement the proposals.

The second wave of planning can be traced to the 1960s and its related to two perception changes. The leap of scale for plans due to the advent of the automobile and the need to consider planning as an iterative process, that takes feedback from other societal actors. Notable models are synoptic planning, incrementalism (Lindblom, 1959) and mixed scanning (Etzioni, 1968), the latter two taking synoptic planning as a base and adding new insights.

When this classification is related to the changing role of the actors in time, the most relevant criterion to analyse is the role of public participation in the planning process. In this sense, planning theories can be classified according to Arnstein’s ladder levels of participation. This classification is also threefold, namely there is non-participation, tokenism and citizen power (Arnstein, 1969) (Figure 11).
A relation of participation and planning schools can be seen in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Arnstein's Participation Ladder (Arnstein, 1969)](image)

A different classification can be made when considering the origin of the initiatives. On one end of the spectrum typically top-down strategies can be found, such as plan-led or market-led schemes like the ones described by Galland and Hansen (2012): “public-investment planning” and “regulative planning”, where the leading parties are part of the government, and “trend planning” and “leverage planning”, where the initiative comes from the private sector.

On the other side of the balance, typical bottom-up approaches can be deemed as those that explicitly link community development and economy, through citizen empowerment (Jessop, 2002). These processes are characterized by a lesser involvement of public and private parties (i.e. developers), which implies limited funding in numerous occasions (Bailey, 2012). However, this type of developments is relevant because of their organizational flexibility and their social effectiveness (place-making).

**Actor analysis**

Hereafter, an actor is considered as an individual or organisation actively involved in an urban development project (Heurkens, 2012). The stress here lies within the active part. This is meant to limit the focus of the study to the actors that form part of the decision-making process that generates and shapes these projects and to exclude far-reaching institutional, cultural or societal contexts. In this sense, the definition of actors and stakeholders is used interchangeably.

An initial classification can be made according to Streeck and Schmitter (1985) model, which includes three distinct types of actors. Namely, the government (State), the private firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Planning tradition</th>
<th>Planning school</th>
<th>Planning models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Citizen control</td>
<td>Societal transformation</td>
<td>Pluralism</td>
<td>• Communicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delegated power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Marxist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Placation</td>
<td>Societal guidance</td>
<td>Synoptic</td>
<td>• Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Informing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed scanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Therapy</td>
<td>Societal guidance</td>
<td>Blueprint</td>
<td>• Incrementalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manipulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Synoptic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Blueprint planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Geddes, Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Precinct planners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Market) and the citizens or users (Community), as depicted by Pestoff (1992) in Figure 13. For this research, the fourth group will not be used as a strict definition or classification, which is that of the third sector (Associations). In this sense, the definition of mixed or hybrid organisations is deemed more accurate.

Furthermore, in order to understand the position of each actor in relationship with the project’s goal, a stakeholder onion diagram (Alexander & Robertson, 2004; Czischke, 2016) will be used (Figure 14). This diagram is useful to categorise the different stakeholders’ roles in a project by classifying their level of involvement in it. The project as an entity is placed in the centre of the diagram, from which concentric circles are laid out, each one representing level of involvement. Czischke (2016) proposes three levels of analysis:

- Level 1. Primary Stakeholders
- Level 2. Secondary Stakeholders
- Level 3. Wider Environment

In order to position an actor in these levels there are three key elements to analyse (Czischke, 2016):

- Control over essential resources
- Legitimacy
- Veto

Following Czischke (2016) and Sudiyono (2013), these two models are combined in order to have a more precise classification of each actor and understand their positions and the relations among them. This results in an onion diagram, divided in three pie slices, one for each type of actor in which relations can be characterized according to three levels.

**Strong** Based on high frequency and high interdependence of resources
**Ad-hoc** Low frequency and low interdependence (e.g. service provision or financing)

**Indirect** Contextual relation (e.g. related to legal framework or public opinion)

![Illustrative diagram of multi-stakeholder relationships (Czischke, 2016)](image)

Figure 4. Illustrative diagram of multi-stakeholder relationships (Czischke, 2016)

**Networks Theory**

The context in which actors take action and engage in urban (re)development projects is analysed in the light of the changing roles they have in contemporary society, in which horizontal relations replace hierarchical and free market forms to become networks (Poocharoen & Ting, 2015). These structures feature an increased actor interdependency, involvement of diverse actors and multiple levels of governance. This results in a complex context (Klijn, 2008).

The literature concerning network management dates back to the late 90s (see Robert Agranoff & McGuire, 2001; MacGuire, 2006; Poocharoen & Ting, 2015), although its origins can be traced to the early 60s, especially in the context of federalism in the United States (MacGuire, 2006). The recent increase in research seems to be related to the previously mentioned changes in society and the globalized nature of social changes (Castells, 2010). Some of the most relevant are, as presented by Koppenjan and Klijn (2004):

- Increasing intertwinement
- Deterritorialization and globalization
- Value pluralism
- Horizontal relations
Koppenjan and Klijn (2004, p. 1) assert that “governments, businesses and civil society are unable to tackle these issues by themselves”, mainly due to increasing resource dependency among different actors and levels. Therefore, actors are urged to interact in new ways, in the context of strategic networks that do not comply with traditional schemes (e.g. hierarchical or free market organisational principles).

Research Design and Methodology

The research is divided in three main parts. Part One introduces the theme and sets the theoretical background in which the research is conducted. Furthermore, it explains the methodology used in the following sections. Part Two is an empirical research, with a comparative case study structure. Finally, Part Three, synthetises the results of the previous two in a set of conclusions and a discussion about the results and the practice of Urban Regeneration.

This research design functions at the same time as the thesis structure, corresponding to different research activities and reflected in corresponding chapters for each topic. A schematic overview of the research process can be seen below.

Research Methods

Research on urban phenomena is complex and dynamic and is concerned with diverse disciplines and changing contexts (Allen & Davey, 2017). The nature of the studied subject calls for a pragmatic approach, using a variety of methods to address the different elements that the research questions bring about. As Dainty (2008) advocates, “(t)he basic principle of methodological pluralism is that the use of multiple theoretical models and multiple
methodological approaches is both legitimate and desirable if established models and understandings are to be questioned and knowledge furthered”.

The focus of the research is given to the participants of the analysed process and the relations among them. In this sense, it can be defined as a phenomenological research, given the importance of analysing significant statements, of meaning units and developing an essence description (Creswell, 2013). Therefore, the use of grounded theory is favoured because it enables to focus on the context, processes, and interpretations of key players of the units of analysis (Allen & Davey, 2017).

Most importantly, grounded theory allows for the researcher to “compile a variety of actors’ viewpoints without compromising the value of each individual’s perspectives” (Allen & Davey, 2017, p. 2). This is relevant given the chosen data gathering techniques, which rely on interviews to different parties involved in the project, from different backgrounds and representing diverse and often conflicting interests.

In this sense, grounded theory also supports the continuous literature search and collection, as the latter is not exhausted prior to research. This is also compliant with the iterative nature of the research. It serves as means to verify the validity of the information gathered and of the steps taken along the development of the investigation.

This approach is complemented with the use of case studies, which are defined in Proverbs and Gameson (2008) as, a strategy used to research an experimental theory or topic using set procedures, often comprising several different combinations of data collection such as interviews and documentary evidence, where the emphasis is towards investigating a phenomenon within a context (Fellows and Liu, 2003). It can be said that the two methods offer complementarity

Case Study: The Fenicia Triangle

Bogota and the development of the city centre

The exponential growth of the city, both in size and population, has had a large impact on the city centre, mostly by driving the economic focus further away from it. This has caused a deep change in the use of the area and has limited the activities carried in it. Moreover, this phenomenon has transformed the centre into a place of passage, rather than a mixed-use district and most importantly it has reduced significantly the amount of housing in it.

As opposed to some of the aforementioned financial centres that are still active nowadays, such as the CBD or the WTC, the historic centre lacked a diversified offer to retain wealth. Its services cater to daily use almost exclusively. The most representative of which can be, administrative or governmental functions, educational facilities and tourism. In the meantime, the area has kept a relatively stable set of residents, that do not attract further private investment for a structural renovation. This is due in part to their economic capacity, but also to the prevalence of a negative attitude towards regeneration.
The way that the city of Bogotá has developed from the second half of the 1950s has resulted in a segregated urban fabric in which private interests prime over public wellbeing and welfare programs. Moreover, this type of development is supported by public policies, which are greatly influenced by market parties. This is important to understand the effect that different governments have had over the city.

A notable change in the approach to city planning and urban development from the 2012 government, which focused into equality and the ‘access to the city’ for the majority of the population. This was reflected on the inclusion of more social programs, including mixing social housing with private led developments. As a side effect this implies a bigger extent of collaboration between different parties and particularly for the community.

This new approach from the government makes a difference regarding the type of projects that can be developed and challenges new actors to participate in the development of the city. It can be said that without the attitude of the government towards social initiatives and general welfare, a project such as the Fenicia Triangle would struggle to be approved.

At the same time, the traditional speculative system acts as the biggest opponent to some of the developments. A part of the partial plans that are proposed lack the support of private financiers or do not offer enough profit as developers expect and therefore are never deployed. In this sense, the broader policy of low governmental intervention also acts negatively, since it doesn’t offer incentives for private parties to engage in alternative projects.

On the other hand, private parties seldom resort to alternative practices in development, on one hand because it is not mandatory to do so and, on the other hand, there is a preconception that such practices will lead to losses in the execution of the project. These can be caused by increase of direct costs, delays, legal issues or an impact in the final sale price of the product.

It becomes relevant to follow the development of the project given the legal instability surrounding these types of initiatives. In this sense, the project can be seen as an experiment for different types of arrangements between parties, supported by regulations.

It can be seen that a major hindrance for urban development and planning in Bogotá is the size of the city and the connection between different scales. A plan such as the one for the Extended City Centre has a coverage over a highly diverse section of the city, covering the majority of different land use classifications, heritage areas, redevelopment foci and well-established areas, among others. This generates all sorts of criticism over its ability to act on a context based manner. On the other hand, there is a constant debate about the reduced scope of partial plans and its ability to influence the areas that surround them.

While reviewing the partial plan in particular, the measures to withstand the gentrification in the area can be discussed, mainly regarding the tax levels and real estate price increases. This has been a common phenomenon in the city, resulting in high quality projects (mainly housing) that host the local population for ten to twenty years, and shortly after start to be traded in the market for higher prices. The population thus is not forcedly displaced, but will not find similar quality in central locations.
The Fenicia Triangle

When analysing temporal development and the changes in organizational structures and governance arrangements, the project can be divided in four clear stages. First, two stages that can be characterised as top-down initiatives, each led by a different actor, but that failed to reach completion. Then, two stages in which a collaborative approach was implemented, resulting in a highly favourable environment for the project development.

Around the year 2000 a new Master Plan for the city was adopted, that changed the status of several areas in the city centre, including Las Aguas neighbourhood, from conservation to regeneration. At the same time, ambitious infrastructure projects like the Bus Rapid Transit system, Transmilenio, put the area on the eye of developers again. In this context, a project emerged for a Cultural Centre to be situated at the cross of two main roads in the area.

This project was started by the Local Government in conjunction with AECID (Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation), a Spanish governmental organisation. By 2011, the project had reached a stall after the Spanish government retreated, due to the financial crisis, and the local government had invested a large amount of money in purchasing and demolishing the plots. However, the low prices paid for the houses along with the large number of expropriations, created a negative environment in the existing community in the neighbourhood.
In a parallel development, Los Andes University, an educational institution whose campus is located in the neighbourhood, started a project to formulate a Partial Plan for the area, responding to a call of the Local Government for urban regeneration plans around the city, in an attempt to counter (sub)urban sprawl, as well as to their physical infrastructure growth. The technical team made a proposal to be presented to the Local Government and then discussed with the community, according to the regulations. However, the mistrust generated by the Cultural Centre project had created a resistance in the community, that showed up at the first hearing with protest signs, claiming lack of participation. This, coupled with bureaucratic idleness, effectively hampered the initiative.

It was clear at this point that the top-down approach used in the previous two phases was not yielding the expected results and was being rejected openly by the civic society. Amidst this situation, a new proposal came from the Management Faculty within Los Andes University. The idea was to make a new proposal, for the area, focusing on regeneration and revitalisation of the area, while avoiding the displacement of the existing population, by increasing participation and collaboration.

It took six months only to setup the office that would take care of the project, a multidisciplinary team with different components, such as Social, Financial, Legal, Technical and a transversal unit that coordinated the different activities. The group started to work under three principles. First, the city is not built by architects and developers, but rather by social actions. Second, social actors have knowledge that is valuable to the process. Third, it is relevant to design an urban regeneration program in which the actual inhabitants can stay in the area. To carry on with this objective, the most important issue to tackle was to build trust among the different stakeholders.
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This was done in two different ways, one related to the project itself and other, related to the social fabric present in the area. For the project, the team started working with the community on three different levels, plenary sessions, open to everyone; focus groups, targeted to smaller groups with similar interests; and, individual meetings, to understand particular situations. On a social level, a series of social programs were created that fostered the interaction between the University and the community. These programs included school aid for elementary level students; technical education for young adults; entrepreneurship coaching for business owners; and it education for the elderly.

The participative planning workshops resulted in the generation of a plan that was later presented to and further discussed with the Local Government. Out of this process two important results came out. First the approval of the partial plan and the emission of the decree that gives legal validity to the plan. This includes an agreement where the current owners get a one-to-one area replacement in the new projects (e.g. a homeowner with a 120m2 unit will receive an equal amount of area in one or more new housing units). Second a series of legal instruments to protect the community from being displaced, that can be applied to any Partial Plan. For example, the current tax level can be preserved for ten years (and can be further reviewed after that period) or a restructuration to the distribution of ‘charges and benefits’ between stakeholders, that allows for first agreement to be applied.

Currently the project is in its final development phase, before the start of the execution. It consists in a series of participative design workshops, where the proposed regulations are grounded into volumes and typologies. At the same time, a new commercial component is in charge of marketing the project to developers, that will be in charge of the construction.
Complementary Cases

The different cases that were analysed as complementary present a common characteristic. They are all attempts of mixing both top-down approaches with bottom-up practical strategies. At the same time, they share a similar social, economic and political context in which the project operates. That is, countries in which the private enterprise takes a strong leading role, the government has a regulating nature and public participation is reduced.

In this context, each project attempts to engage in a form of collaboration, between the Market, the Community and the Government, in which decisions are made after a thorough deliberation and an agreement comes from the multiple interests involved. The different conditions of each project make this collaboration difficult and in the following paragraphs the reasons for the shortcomings in the different projects are exposed.

The fact that these projects focus mostly on informal areas of the city (i.e. Buenos Aires and São Paulo) poses a challenge for a more comprehensive collaboration between diverse actors. This is mainly reflected in the lack of interest of market parties to participate, because there are not enough economic incentives for it. These projects are done by the community, for themselves and therefore fail to provide an economic profit to external parties.

At the same time, while they provide a strong bonding for the community and prove to be very successful in terms of social cohesion, their impact outside the project area is limited and they are not catered to increase the connection of the intervention areas with the rest of the city, or to attract different users outside the existing community. While this is generally a negative element, it avoids the gentrification process associated with the social mix of other regeneration projects.

In most of the cases there is an important role of the government and its objectives. As a key player, its will to carry on projects that might take more time or resources in early phases is an essential element to attain any results. A clear example of failure in this interaction is the Villa 31 project in Buenos Aires, where the project was pushed by the University and NGOs more than by the government, resulting in lack of interest by the latter. It can be argued that the process was carried out as a bottom-up project and lacked a deeper integration of the different relevant actors. In other words, the horizontal organisational structure, was never attained, due to lack of participation of key stakeholders.

Similarly, a project such as the one in Quito, has a potential of creating a strong social movement and has a partial support of private parties, as consultants and investors, but lacks government recognition and larger investments to achieve some of its objectives. This makes it highly dependent on the will of the community.

A general conclusion from these projects is that the lack of a wide network of actors from different backgrounds, more specifically, from the three different sides of Pestoff (1992) triangle, hinders the possibility to attain sustainability in the different fronts that are proposed throughout this thesis, that is both in the social and economic aspects. The collaboration can be characterised as incomplete and it is reflected on the results of the projects.
In Villa Tranquila there was a very effective social strategy but lack of investment. In Villa 31 and in La Mariscal, there was a lack of synergy with the government. In São Paulo, there was a lack of discussion with the community for the programme in certain areas. The lack of a closer involvement, therefore, brings obstacles to the accomplishment of some of the economic, social or political objectives of the projects.

When analysing the different sub questions formulated for the main case study, the following results can be obtained. Regarding phasing, the lack of involvement of key actors, limits the creation of a collaborative setting, as well as the legal support that the government might provide (with the exception of the São Paulo project). This makes it difficult to create a phasing in the project that marks the institution change and the flow between different types of organisations that resulted characteristic of collaborative planning approaches.

Regarding stakeholder participation, the results were not favourable, as previously mentioned. This is deemed to be the main cause for the limited impact that the projects might have had. A lack of interest, time or capital might have hindered the completion of communication and trust building processes, aimed towards creating a discussion arena that includes a wider array of actors.

Regarding the way that actors relate to each other, it remains clear that the aforementioned lack of cohesion among relevant stakeholders limits the creation of common objectives and the alignment of interests between the Government, the Market and the Community. This implies a surge of conflicts between some of the parties that end up affecting the interests of the most vulnerable stakeholders. This is traceable in all the projects.

It is relevant to mention that in the cases of Buenos Aires and São Paulo, the intervention of an educational institution as a key player in the development, marked a clear difference with traditional initiatives. This is related to the non-profit nature of these institutions. The positive results in these cases have as a key factor, the participation of Universities with a strong technical and social focus, that make sure to guide the process and safeguard the objectives of the projects. The extent of their success varies depending on the case, but their presence is a catalyst for improving the conditions of the areas. In the same manner, the presence of an association in the Quito project proves to be relevant for this purpose. The joint efforts of the community and the private sector, provide both knowledge and the social inertia to execute a part of the programme.

The previous part is strongly related to the power structures at play in each project. As previously mentioned, the lack of a more collaborative approach, results in a less horizontal and more hierarchical organisation. This means that power asymmetry plays an important role in limiting capacity building in the different projects. At the same time, it creates, or maintains, a struggle of power between the stakeholders actively involved in the project and those who are not.

Generally speaking, all the cases offer the view of a partial implementation of collaborative structures and present limitations that are entirely context related, rather than related to the organisational approach. This reinforces the conception of opportunity to develop projects with
a collaborative approach and the large number of variables that must be aligned to attain results using such mechanisms.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Context and Planning Instruments

“How is urban planning executed in Bogotá and which instruments can be identified?”

The research revealed a complex panorama of different tools at various scale levels, which are reviewed periodically and seem to be in line with international developments.

This results interesting, because it provides to the different parties involved in urban planning and urban development programs a broad set of possibilities to interact with the built environment. The integration of different scales is particularly relevant, because it opens the possibility to intervene at area level, that is in neighbourhoods or smaller areas, through the use of Partial Plans, especially for regeneration programs.

In addition, all the instruments provide several means for public participation, which is the key factor for collaborative planning (Healey, 1992; Hillier, 1993; Lane, 2005). It has been argued that there is even an excess of participation dependencies, to the point that the public is confused on where exactly to take their doubts and propositions (A.M. Potes, personal communication, May 2, 2017).

It can be concluded that there is a wide array of instruments not only allowing for the emergence of collaborative approaches, but even fomenting it, such as the Masterplan of 2013 (Decree 364), which had participation as a central element for policy generation. Furthermore, these mechanisms are flexible enough to be adapted to innovative approaches in the practice. On the other hand, the particularities of the political climate in the city in particular, and in the country, in general, can be either an incentive or a deterrent for the implementation of more participative approaches.

Phasing and Institutional Change

“What phases can be identified in the process?”

The insights on this subject is relevant to understand not only the emergence of different organisational structures (E.g. the replacement of hierarchies for more horizontal and self-governed structures), but also the perception of this change from the perspective of the different parts of society (I.e. Market, Government and Community).

As previously explained, there are two main conceptions on institutional change and, consequently, on the milestones that indicate a transition. First there is an evident organizational change, related to governance. This change is gradual and concerns setting up communication arenas, to discuss specific issues depending on the phase that the project is in (E.g. an arena to discuss the general interests in the first stages followed by an arena to discuss
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...the technical details of the urban plan). The specific characteristics of this organisation will be discussed in the following sections. Second, there is a strong necessity to give legitimacy and validity to the results of the discussions carried out in this arena. For this project, legitimacy was represented on legal acts, that formalized the planning process (E.g. The Decree 420 of 2014, which regulates the Partial Plan for the Fenicia Triangle).

Finally, an important element that is related to phasing, is the fact that collaborative structures are not static, the long-term nature of urban projects implies that relations among actors are “continually in a dialectic and ‘restless’ flux, due to struggles in various arenas at various levels at once” (Healey, 2003, p. 113). This means that phasing not only reflects the institutional change from hierarchies to horizontal organisations, but also between different types of collaboration.

Stakeholder Participation

‘What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?’. The initial findings pointed to the participation of a broader than usual number of stakeholders in the project. As previously mentioned, the experimental nature of the project is largely given by its divergence with more traditional planning practices, especially when it comes to public participation. The positive finding is therefore, the presence of members of each different classification, as well as from hybrid organisations (E.g. Los Andes University or the ProBono Foundation, both situated as hybrid Community-Market figures).

It is relevant to emphasize on the institutional change that was previously mentioned. One of the key factors to signal the switch between the second and third phases of the project, is the extension of the project network. On one hand, new institutions took part on the project; on the other, a larger percentage of the involved organisations got engaged with the project. The latter is particularly true for the different groups and individuals within the inhabitants of the neighbourhood.

The insights from the process are twofold. First the aforementioned extended participation was not a given. Building a coalition from a collection of diverse stakeholders is a strenuous process. It requires to understand the different resources that each stakeholder brings forward to the discussion arena and balance them when necessary, to avoid hindrances in succeeding phases. Second, the role of some members in the organisation is to facilitate and foster the entry to the project network to those stakeholders that are directly affected by the project, but that might ignore the objectives of the plan or simply refuse to interact with other members.

This type of actors has been deemed the ‘enabler’, due to their main action of facilitation the collaborative process. Furthermore, they emerge in order to safeguard the discussion arenas to give legitimacy to the process and to establish lines of communication across different levels and within specific organisations.
Actor Relations and Power Distribution

‘How do these actors relate to each other?’

‘How is power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?’

It is clear that the construction of collaborative structures and horizontal project networks doesn’t come naturally for the different actors involved in the Fenicia project. It doesn’t come naturally for the actors involved in urban regeneration, urban planning or policy generation for that matter, in the Colombian context. Therefore, it is relevant to underline the necessary processes in order to attain such an institutional change.

As mentioned before, the emergence of collaborative structures is related to two separate and interrelated processes. On one hand, the condition of building trust among the different involved parties. On the other hand, the creation of effective communication channels. These two processes form a virtuous cycle and are mutually reinforcing, that is, with an increase in trust, communication is facilitated and with constant communication, trust is gained. Both of these processes are part of what Koppenjan and Klijn (2004) call a rise of ‘arenas of interaction’.

The success of the first phases project is rooted in the creation of arenas that go beyond the scope of the urban plan. The process of building trust included creating discussion settings regarding the specific project (E.g. to discuss the different interests or to discuss technical definitions of the plan); as well as opening discussion spaces devoted to strengthen the relation among different actors. This last point was particularly focused towards the occupants of the area, that is the community, the market organisations and the mixed organisations, with the mindset of a better cooperation and integration in the future.

The second part of this theme is related to power balance in the project. The relevance of this discussion is rooted on the premise that collaborative structures and networks are an alternative to hierarchical organisations. Therefore, it is implied that in order to achieve collaboration, there must be a process of power distribution and a set of mechanisms to limit the power of those who possess an advantage when entering negotiations (E.g. land ownership, knowledge, connections, influence).

The empirical observations revealed two different sides to this issue. First, the balance of power is necessary and the mechanisms to achieve it can be varied. This can be attained through governmental regulations (E.g. limitations to land ownership, expropriation, subsidies, transfer of benefits), by agreements between the parties or by the inclusion of key stakeholders in charge of limiting the use of excessive power from given parties. All three of these mechanisms were tested on the Fenicia project, with successful outcomes. Some of the agreements between parties even came to be regulations, that can be further applied in subsequent projects (i.e. Decree 446, related to benefits of the inhabitants and transfer of benefits).

The second side to power balance, is an insight that came from theory and that was confirmed with the interviews. MacGuire (2006) states that “a clear distinction between hierarchies and
collaborative management is not always accurate” and that in practice is common to see a mix of the two approaches. This is understood as the necessity for leadership in collaborative regeneration projects, which became a recurrent theme in the research.

As a matter of fact, the initiation, development and completion of the different processes that have been carried out in the Fenicia Triangle, have had a leadership figure in several levels. The same is true for the different components of the project. However, it is important to notice that the leadership figures are not static, are not appointed and do not have veto power to overrule the decisions of the rest of the stakeholders. In this sense, the leadership is not a representative figure, that executes the will of other stakeholders, but it represents a safe guarder of the general objectives of the project. As put by MacGuire (2006), “the presence of a lead organization, acting as system controller or facilitator, is often a critical element of effectiveness in collaborative management”. In the Fenicia project this figure can be seen shifting both horizontally (between organisations) and vertically (within organisations).

There are two conclusions. First, that the relations in collaborative structures are dependent on the correct implementation of a cycle of trust building and effective communication. Second, that such projects depend on a strong leadership in order to overcome the obstacles posed by the complexity of the interactions and the networks that are established (McGuire & Agranoff, 2011).

Context Influence

‘How does the context influence the application of collaborative planning in practice?’.

Starting from the general political, economic and social orientation of Colombia, it is important to take into account its neoliberal alignment. This is represented by privatization of public utilities, cut-backs of public spending, political decentralization and reforms of trade protection, among others. To this panorama adds up an extended corruption that permeates the different spheres of the state and the market, which create an elitist environment for business and policy generation. This implies that the benefits of market transactions are unfairly distributed.

Such a context is particularly resistant to changes in the status quo and the generalized protection for the free market, from every sector of the population, hinders the application of socially oriented programs. It also creates an imbalance in power, which results in a poor representation of the different sectors of society, but most importantly a very reduced expression of the most vulnerable population.

At the same time, the global shift towards a shared economy and an increased participation in the different spheres of policy generation, has a direct impact in the perception of the general public. The demand for more integration in the field of policy making and economic growth brings about the possibility to discuss new approaches such as collaborative planning.

At the same time, the direct operative way of making business and politics in this environment, implies a close relationship between parties that might be involved in the project, such as educational institutions, financial institutions, technical consultants, along with the government
agencies, developers and the community. These ties can be useful in moments of distress or in order to facilitate procedures, that otherwise might be hindered by bureaucracy.

The presence of such stakeholders proves to be particularly useful, if the organisation doesn’t adhere to one of the three societal alignments (Market, Government, Community), but instead it represents a hybrid organisation. In this case the possibilities of having particular interests in the project is reduced.

At the same time, the unique position of the University was an enormous advantage for the project in several ways. First, given its connections with the government, there was a constant communication with it and a standing trust. Second, it’s extended knowledge network facilitated the implementation of innovative solutions, when needed. Third, its non-profit nature helped achieve agreements on the distribution of benefits with the community. Fourth, this unique position allowed it to lead the project until the current phase, in which a developer should take over.

Finally, it is relevant to mention the favourable political climate towards collaboration and towards this project in particular. The support from the different governmental agencies, creates a positive synergy in which the discussions held among the actors are easily enforceable. At the same time, it creates a positive environment within the governmental institutions in order to collaborate among them and foster innovation in both fields (E.g. the creation of new legal instruments).

A Different Context

A similar conclusion can be held for the complementary cases. For these ones, it was relevant to notice that the lack of complete integration between the three sectors of society was a deterrent factor that impeded a more meaningful impact. The three cases represent different aspects of the aforementioned factors, that were not taken into account, reinforcing the belief that they are necessary in order to achieve collaborative organisations.

In the cases of Buenos Aires, a lack of connection with the government and with private capital is evident in the type of interventions that were proposed. Characterized by their bottom-up approach, they are limited both in the extent of benefits that can be obtained from market transactions and from regulation and subsidies. In these cases, the figure of the educational institution was important as bearer of knowledge and coordinator of the projects, however it lacked the connection with other relevant parties.

In the case of São Paulo, the limitation was given in terms of public participation, which in the end limited the impact of the project for the community. This is evident in the lack of appropriation of public spaces that can be seen in several segments of the Integration Park. A recurrent critique revolves around a series of children playgrounds that remain unused, due to their strange location. In the same way, typical dynamics of the neighbourhood such as the market, disrupt the bike traffic.

In the case of Quito, the clear position of the Mariscal group against the government, causes a tension of power that is negative for the development of larger scale interventions. The project
is limited to small scale interventions, that are observed as disruption in legality by the local government. The support of private parties in terms of knowledge and capital is relevant to achieve these goals, but the lack of integration with other relevant parties hampers the extent of the project.

It can be concluded that the application of collaborative approaches is highly dependent on key factors, such as participation, communication, trust building and horizontal network creation, that a lack of one of the elements represents a serious threat to achieve both social and economic sustainability. At the same time, the dynamics of the context are highly relevant when choosing the mechanisms to achieve these factors.

**Towards a Collaborative Approach**

The research over collaborative planning in the Latin American context has resulted in a positive outlook for the application of these mechanisms in a markedly neoliberal context. As seen before, the importance of the setting and influence of path dependency are key factors to take into account in policy transference.

The broad institutional change that can be seen in the Western world, but that is not exclusively limited to its extents, has made way into the Latin American context. The increased demand for public participation and more active citizenship is rapidly becoming a subject of discussion in the different sectors of society. This is relevant, taking into account the high flexibility of the institutional framework in this particular context, which allows for rapid adaptations of innovative approaches.

The built environment and more specifically, urban areas, are the most relevant arenas of human interaction and the *de facto* locations of contemporary development. This makes Urban Planning a central issue in the discussion of participation as means of making politics. The increase of participation in urban planning implies a rise in the complexity of interactions between Government, Market and Community, that needs to be managed adequately in order to obtain the most beneficial results for society at large in the long-term.

The study of the Fenicia Triangle case has resulted in a positive outlook for the use of collaborative approaches to urban regeneration and marks the beginning of a more integrated way of practicing urban planning in the Colombian context. From this the main research question ‘What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?’ can be answered as follows.

Collaboration is dependent on the alignment of a broad series of contextual factors, as much as it depends on ensuring an adequate process related to the construction of a communication network among a broad set of stakeholders.

Starting with the latter, collaboration emerges when the majority of the legitimate actors of the project (i.e Market, Government, Community), establish a series of arenas of interaction, in which the interests of the different parties can be discussed and veto power is shared among the stakeholders. In order for collaboration to be initiated and executed, a firm leadership is needed, in order to safeguard the general objectives of the project. Furthermore, a clear
awareness of the specific context is necessary in order to take advantage of the positive externalities that it may offer, as well as to tackle the threats that might be latent in it.

The detailed components of this explanation have been explained over the previous sections and concern the specific tools that can be used to achieve collaboration in similar projects. At the same time, the ongoing nature of the Fenicia plan, calls for a reiterated review as time goes by, in order to assess the strong points and the shortcomings of this particular strategy, as well as its flexibility in terms of facing the characteristic uncertainties of contemporary practice.

Implications for Policy and Practice

This research has concluded with a positive outlook on the experimentation of collaborative approaches in the Latin American context as means to achieve a socially just society while maintain financial profit. As such, there are some important lessons in order to continue this exploration.

First, collaborative approaches are dependent on a series of factors, which help to achieve social and economic sustainability. These factors are primarily, the creation of interaction arenas in which actors can build trust an exert an effective communication. The balance of power in order to give way to the discussion of all the relevant interests. The presence of leadership to safeguard the main objectives of the process. At the same time, the context determines the necessity to look after an adequate political climate and the inclusion of external stakeholders that provide resources that otherwise are lacking in the project.

Therefore, the application of collaborative mechanisms in markedly neoliberal environments, requires a deep analysis of the context in order to select the adequate tools to achieve sustainability. This is related to the complex nature of aligning interests of diverse actors, but also to the presence of necessary resources within the relevant stakeholders. It is this careful analysis that will give the context specific answers to the application.

That is to say, that there is no single model of collaboration that can be applied in urban regeneration projects. The unique nature of the different political, social and economic context calls for handmade solutions. However, the ultimate objective remains to achieve the aforementioned factors, which have been identified to guarantee a higher rate of success. At the same time, it is relevant to note that collaborative planning is an iterative process. That is to say that constant evaluation of the input and outcomes of the process are necessary to assess the implementation of the selected tools.

It is recommended that the organisations that have the initiative for a collaborative approach in urban regeneration pay close attention to the definition of arenas of interaction where the different stakeholders can engage in a virtuous cycle of building trust and effective communication. This is the starting point for a discussion in which interests are discussed in equal terms and power asymmetries can be balanced. If any of the former are not to be properly assured, there is a high probability that the process will fail before completion, or that it will not attain the desired objectives.
At the same time, the appropriate leadership must be appointed for the different stages of the process as well as for the different components of the process. It is important to bear in mind that this leadership must be dynamic and responsive to the changes in the environment, the organisations and the institutions. The reason for this is twofold. First, the different processes in the project require diverse types of knowledge and expertise. Second, the permanence of a leadership figure throughout the project creates asymmetries of power, that hamper the decision-making process and can favour some interests over the others.
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1. Introduction

The field of urban (re)development, and subsequently urban development management, has been subject of constant changes and different approaches over time. Some of the foremost challenges of these processes are related to the large number of involved actors, the way they interact and relate to each other and the changes in these relations over time, as projects are proposed, discussed, planned, executed, inhabited and so forth.

Historically, a shift can be seen from planning understood as the execution of a precisely made program, in which the planning authority, in that case the government, holds a leading role; towards an incrementalism view, in which the process is seen as iterative and a larger group of actors are involved; and finally, towards pluralism in which participation is a central issue and the political nature of planning includes an even wider set of actors into the process (Lane, 2005).

At the same time, shifts in the power and governance structures have been occurring. If the group of societal actors is understood as being threefold, that is the State, the Market and the Community, the latter has been reclaiming a leading position and greater involvement over time, encouraged by the aforementioned changes in planning approaches. Governments have become more dependent on a broader set of actors, particularly the civic society, in order to achieve its goals, due to the increasing complexity of contemporary challenges (Klijn, 2008).

This forms part of a broader societal change in which knowledge has become progressively more specialized and distributed and institutional organisations have become more complex and interdependent. Consequently, the previous hierarchical model has become obsolete, and it has been replaced with more horizontal and transactional structures, that call for an increased collaboration among actors (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

This thesis intends to understand the factors that allow for this collaboration to occur in urban (re)development projects. Furthermore, it explores the consequences of these changes in terms of governance and organisational approaches and the way the latter change over time. For this purpose, the research is based on an in-depth study of a critical case, adopting a pluralistic epistemological approach with an interpretivist emphasis. Finally, a series of reference cases is presented in order to better understand the influence of the context in the application of a theoretical framework within a specific situation.

The context chosen for the study is that of the ‘Fenicia Triangle’ regeneration project, in the city of Bogotá, Colombia. The objective is to understand the application of the theoretical insights of collaborative planning and network theory, to analyse the relations between the different actors and recognise the key factors that allow for collaboration to appear in this specific context. Furthermore, it seeks to understand how these theoretical insights are applied in a typical neoliberal structure.

Below, a summary of the problem statement and the research relevance is presented. First a definition of the problem statement is raised, along with the research questions that structure
the study. It follows an overview of the units of analysis and the geographical scope of the research. Furthermore, a summary of the research positioning and its relevance in terms of its contribution to science and society is discussed, along with its utilisation potential. Finally, an overview of the thesis structure is presented as a roadmap for the following sections.

## 1.1. Problem Statement

Collaborative planning emerged as a response to the planning theories implemented throughout the 1960s and 1970s, aiming to respond to the limited role that public participation had up until that moment. According to its main advocates, communication lies at the core of planning. Communication is understood as arguing, negotiating, bargaining and debating and, therefore, implies the involvement of all the concerned actors, for planning to proceed (Lane, 2005). From this a general line of research can be exerted, under the following question:

- How is collaboration achieved in urban regeneration projects?

Despite the changing social, political and economic panorama, the adoption of these collaborative approaches in practice has been slow. This can be due to the conflict between the perceived benefits and the effort (in terms of time and capital) that such endeavours entail, as well as the difficulty to resolve conflicts of interests through discussion. The latter represents a major obstacle that can effectively thwart such complex projects.

This research is concerned with the application of collaborative planning theory in a specific context and the factors that allow for this organisational approach to come about. In order to investigate this phenomenon a case study in Bogotá, Colombia has been chosen. It consists in an urban regeneration project, characterised by a collaborative planning approach. From this, stems the main research question:

- What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?

This question is further down divided in different components, that in turn make up for the thesis structure and form the background of the research. The first part is concerned with the conceptual framework of the research. Thus, it embraces the different theories that swerve around collaborative planning, namely urban planning, stakeholder analysis and networks theory:

- What is collaborative planning and how does it relate to public participation?
- What actors are involved in collaborative urban regeneration project and what roles do they play in the process?
- How do these actors relate to each other?
- How is power distributed among stakeholders in collaborative or networked organisations?

The second part is concerned with the empirical study and therefore with the application of the theoretical framework to analyse the selected case study. As such, the following research questions have guided the observations:
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- How is urban planning executed in Bogotá and which instruments can be identified?
- What phases can be identified in the process?
- What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?
- How do these actors relate to each other?
- How is power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?
- How does the context influence the application of collaborative planning in practice?

Following Robert Agranoff and McGuire (2003), it is critical for the research to understand why collaboration emerges at all. In order to analyse these changes, the preferred design is cross-national comparative research, using a single in-depth case study and reference cases. This allow to compare the vast theoretical background, with the practice and therefore understand how the strict academic classifications fit into the dynamic empirical examples. Furthermore, the comparative nature allows to isolate the context variable, to better understand its influence in the processes. For a more detailed overview of the problem statement see Section 2.1 (Problem Statement)

1.1.1. Units of Analysis

The research is focused on the actors involved in a single urban redevelopment project, that has the characteristics of collaborative planning, located in Bogotá, Colombia. Collaboration is intended as the active participation of organisations belonging to three different spheres, according to (Pestoff, 1992), namely the Market, the State and the Community, in every stage of the process. Furthermore, it implies a shift from a hierarchical organization, towards a more horizontal one.

Within this universe, the research focuses on the relations among the different organisations through the experience of individual actors, in order to understand the different perspectives on the factors that allow for this collaboration to emerge. In order to gain a comprehensive impression of the different relations, the selection of respondents is made as wide as possible and under the condition to include at least one member of each of the three aforementioned classifications.

1.1.2. Geographical Scope

The research is designed as a single in-depth case study, with reference cases. Thus, it is focused on a single case study, which closes down the geographical scope to a single city within a country. This allows for a focus on context-specific variables that influence the project. In this case, the scope is limited to the city of Bogotá, Colombia. At the same time, the complementary cases were selected based on similarity of political, social and economic structures in the countries they are in. This selection was limited to Latin American countries, more specifically to Argentina, Brazil and Ecuador. The overview of this cases is meant as a measure of the influence of the context in the project and therefore provides confirmation to the context-based hypotheses of the research.
Overall, these countries can be characterised among nations that adhere to some form of neo-liberal political and economic plan (Harvey, 2007). In this sense, urban development in these countries is characterised by a large influence of the market parties, a limited participation of the state and a low influence from the community. Furthermore, the economic growth after the second half of the 20th century brought a rapid expansion of cities and, consequently, a deterioration of city centres, in favour of suburban sprawl. Finally, this caused large social problems and spatial segregation. In this context, there are recent initiatives to engage in urban regeneration projects that include a collaboration component.

1.2. Research Positioning and Relevance

The research is framed in the Urban Development Management chair of the Management in the Built Environment Department of the Faculty of Architecture. Furthermore, it’s part of the research laboratory ‘New Generation Waterfronts’. However, this thesis departs from the main subject of the laboratory (port cities), to focus on the broader development management sphere. This choice responds to different factors. First, a limitation of practical examples about collaborative planning. Second, a profound knowledge of the context of the main case study. Finally, a perceived ease in the data gathering process, due to personal acquaintanceship with relevant actors of the process.

The overall focus of the research area is to understand why and how urban projects come to being and how these can be managed. Within this broad context, the specific focus lies on the actors that take part on the different processes and the relations among them as units of analysis (Figure 9). This is explored in specific cases of urban regeneration projects that use collaboration as means to achieve social and economic sustainability.

![Figure 9. Research placement within the Urban Development Management framework](image-url)
1.2.1. Scientific Relevance

The scientific relevance of this research is summarized in the investigation of the application of theoretical planning mechanisms in diverse contexts. Particularly, the application of collaborative planning, a theoretical framework developed in the Anglo-Saxon context, applied in the Latin American context, more specifically in Colombia, which has been characterised for its neoliberal policies.

As such, this research adds up to the existing material on Urban Development management. The added value lies in the focus of the research in changes of organizational approaches over time and the analysis of crucial factors that enable these organizational approaches to happen in diverse contexts. Previous research has focused on the changing role of the different actors in urban development processes (Geesing, 2015; Heurkens, 2012), their strategies (Daamen, 2010) and different organisational models focused on sustainability (Steen, 2016). This investigation adds up to the knowledge already available by adding a time variable. This is relevant to understand the dynamic nature of urban regeneration processes.

1.2.2. Societal Relevance

The focus of this research on projects that include a broad range of actors, in which power structures are not traditional and keep changing over time, makes it relevant for a wide audience. The analysis of cases that employ a more collaborative approach results in a series of lessons that can be used in future urban development projects.

Furthermore, the increasing trend of civic participation in several political and economical arenas is an incentive to continue the research on this field, striving to achieve higher sustainability in urban development, intended in the broad sense of the word, while focusing on the social aspect of it.

The choice for a case study that is ongoing and at the same time an experimental project in several aspects is relevant to evaluate its performance and lessons learned from the process, while at the same time offering the option to adjust elements or improve the general performance. Furthermore, it offers the possibility to bring academia closer to the practical environment, which results particularly valuable in a context in which such collaboration is not usual.

Furthermore, it is on the best interest of the research, as well as of the different organisations involved in the project that collaborated in it, to review the various processes and be able to understand separate points of view and ways of analysing a single project or event. Thus, the objective is to make the information collected available first for the involved actors and more widely to society at large.

1.2.3. Utilisation Potential

The outcome of the research should help all parties involved in urban development processes to better understand the relations among actors and their long-term character. Furthermore, it
can be of particular interest to governmental parties and planning authorities that want to explore approaches to urban regeneration with increased public participation and non-traditional governance structures. In the same sense, it can be used by market parties and the civic society alike, to understand the different roles that parties can have in these processes.

Its main objective is thus to provide a collection of tools that help to analyse the context in which urban development processes materialize. It is implicit that given the dynamic and iterative nature the process, these tools are not a one-off endeavour, but are meant to help understand the variations in the context and, more specifically, in the way that the different actors relate to each other.

The conclusions and recommendations are suitable for policy transferability in several scales. First, in the immediate context, that is for urban regeneration projects in different zones of the city and its metropolitan area. Second, on a national scale, for large cities that have been subject of urban sprawl, deterioration of city centres and consequentially of social segregation. Third, on an international level, there are several countries that share a similar political, social and economic environment in which planning is carried about.

1.3. Thesis Structure

The thesis structure doubles as a research structure and it helps to organize the different processes that lead to answer the research questions. The thesis is divided in nine chapters, starting with this introduction and followed by three chapters. First, a conceptual exploration. This includes two sections, the theoretical framework and the methodological approach to the research. Second an empirical part. This includes an in-depth analysis of a main case study, along with a set of reference cases that further delve into the context. Finally, a synthesis, that includes the main conclusions and a brief discussion over the research results and process. This structure is further explained in section 3.1 (Research Design).
Part 1   Concepts
2. Theoretical Framework

This section collects the background of the research proposal. First it sets the subject by defining a problem statement and a set of research questions. Then it provides a literature review of the relevant academic sources on the theme and the specific topics that follow the research questions. The review is closed with a set of conclusions. Finally, a review of previous relevant research is presented, to position the thesis amidst the knowledge base.

2.1. Problem Statement

Urban regeneration is a complex process that involves diverse groups of actors, such as national and local governments, international organizations, trans-national corporations, place entrepreneurs, and community and environmental groups, that collaborate striving for change (Desfor & Jørgensen, 2004). It seeks to answer a problem in the urban fabric that resulted in decay that can be observed not only in single units, but in whole areas, with borders that are not always easy to define.

Moreover, urban fabrics are not solely made out of physical elements, that is to say that social, political and economic relations make for a big part of what identifies a place, both as a unit and as a part of a larger urban area. This means that urban decay is not merely solved with built interventions, but social strategies make for an important part of the success factors (Jauhiainen, 1995).

There can be seen a change in social and political arenas in which collaboration is every time more present and discussed as an alternative to both bottom-up and top-down approaches. As Sehested (2009, p. 247) explains, “planning is increasingly exercised in a fragmented governance system consisting of numerous policy networks that stretch across public and private boundaries (horizontal governance) and across levels of public decision making (vertical governance)”.

Therefore, a central issue to urban (re)development is how the different involved stakeholders relate to each other, in general, and how the public participates in policy generation, in particular. Traditionally, the different planning approaches rely on a central figure to initiate, lead and execute the different processes. In the vast majority of cases this role I vested upon the government or private market parties, such as developers (Galland & Hansen, 2012).

The role of other stakeholders has been limited to different extents depending on the context in which the projects are carried out. Ranging from non-participation, to complete control, passing through different degrees of tokenism (Arnstein, 1969). Societal changes have been increasing the level of involvement of different actors in public policy generation and execution over time (Robert Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Ansell & Gash, 2008; Castells, 2010; Desfor & Jorgensen, 2004; Healey, 1998; Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004; MacGuire, 2006; Poocharoen & Ting, 2015; Sehested, 2009).
Although this discussion has been present in the field of urban regeneration for more than a decade (Couch, Sykes, & Börstinghaus, 2011; Healey, 2003; Lane, 2005), there is not a large amount of completed projects that stick to this approach. However, there is a growing number of ongoing endeavours, which gives room to analyse how these projects came to being. From this reasoning, a general theme to conduct the research is established in the following question:

- How is collaboration achieved in urban regeneration projects?

As previously mentioned, social, political and economic relations are key elements of specific areas, this makes for the choice of a specific context in which the research will be carried out. Therefore, the empirical part of the research is concerned with the application of the theoretical framework in a specific context. The choice of this context responds to several factors. First, the presence of the aforementioned collaborative structures. Second, a first-hand knowledge of the political, economic and social structure in which the specific project is put into practise. Third, in consequence of the latter, ease access to the organisations that participate in the project. The context chosen is the city of Bogotá, Colombia, and the specific project is the ‘Fenicia Triangle’ regeneration plan. From this, the main research question is stemmed as follows:

- What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?

This question is further down divided in different components, that in turn make up for the thesis structure and form the background of the research. The first part is concerned with the conceptual framework of the research, thus the theories that will be explored in order to analyse the problem. The second part is concerned with the empirical study and therefore with the application of the theoretical framework to analyse the selected case and the particularities of the specific context. From this a series of sub questions are derived.

The first part of the research is concerned with establishing a theoretical framework with which the empirical studies can be analysed. Taking into account the main subject of this research, which corresponds to the relations among the different actors in collaborative planning settings for urban regeneration, the first element to understand is collaborative planning and its origins:

- What is collaborative planning and how does it relate to public participation?

The second element of the theoretical research aims to understand which actors are concerned in collaborative planning settings. This is concerned with a general classification of the stakeholders and their roles:

- What actors are involved in collaborative urban regeneration project and what roles do they play in the process?

Finally, a key element to understand the aforementioned relations among stakeholders as well as a central underpinning in collaborative planning concerns power distribution. Regarding this
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Klijn (2008) foresees that “the trend towards various forms of horizontal governance will ultimately transform nations into network societies in which interdependence and horizontal relations are paramount”. This implies an even sharing of power among the different sectors of society. Thus, the following becomes relevant.

- How is power distributed among stakeholders in collaborative or networked organisations?

The second part of the research is concerned with the application of these theories to a practical scenario. The nature of the following sub questions is to identified the aforementioned concepts in a case study and understand how the specific context influences its operation. As such, the first element to be analysed is the planning context in which collaborative planning is executed:

- How is urban planning executed in Bogotá and which instruments can be identified?

An important factor of these projects is the institutional change that is present in order for collaboration to be ignited and further maintained, that is to hold this situation over a long span of time (Healey, 2006). The motivation for keeping track of the temporal dimension lies on the dynamic nature of the relation networks among the different parties involved in urban development processes. As Healey (2003, p. 113) explains, “these relations are continually in a dialectic and ‘restless’ flux, due to struggles in various arenas at various levels at once”, in consequence “the demands placed upon [public and private organizations] vary and change over the course of time: there are diverging and competing values that also change over time” (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004, p. 4). Therefore, the second element to analyse is:

- What phases can be identified in the process and what milestones mark the change from one to the other?

The third element to be analysed is the group of stakeholders involved in the process. This analysis is to be carried on for each of the previously identified phases, using the tools that the theoretical framework provides:

- What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?

In the same way, the different relations that stem from this process and the organisational change that derives from collaborative structures will be explored:

- How do these actors relate to each other?
- How is power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?

In order to conduct an in-depth data-analysis, the following question guides the extraction of key evidence from the case:

- How does the context influence the application of collaborative planning in practice?

The preceding concepts can be then translated into a conceptual model (Figure 10), that structures the research around four main questions.
2.2. Theories

The theoretical framework for this research explores the different concepts that relate to the research topic, in order to create a conceptual research model. The academic literature findings are presented with a funnel approach, from broad definitions to the specific concepts, that help understanding the factors that lead to more collaborative approaches within Urban (Re)Development processes.

The literature review is encompassed in the wide-ranging field of Urban Regeneration, which has been defined as “a comprehensive and integrated vision and action which leads to the resolution of urban problems and which seeks to bring about a lasting improvement in the economic, physical, social and environmental condition of an area that has been subject to change” (Roberts & Sykes, 2000, p. 17).

To better understand the extent of this definition, an analytical approach results useful. By dividing it into smaller subjects, the relation between the theory and the practice can be easier to understand. Urban Regeneration is deeply related to Urban Planning theory, as an integral part of it. In this sense, it is important to understand the changes that have been seen in theory and practice of this field, focusing on the roles that the aforementioned actors have had in the different stages and the contemporary understanding of the problem. This leads to an in-depth chapter discussing the approach that has been explored in the case studies, which is collaborative planning (Healey, 1998, 2003, 2006).

A first observation is that there is an implicit subject to the vision and action that are being referred to. This subject is understood as the different actors involved in such process, which might be individuals or organizations, holding a stake in the project. For this, a threefold division will be used, namely the State, the Market and the Community. The exploration of this classification results relevant to explore tools for empirical analysis.
Furthermore, this division implies a broad societal frame, which will be explored in the light of Anthony Giddens (1984) theory of structuration, in order to understand what these actors do in relation to the context in which they are set, the ‘agency’ and the ‘structure’, respectively. This represents the context of the process, which can be defined as the ‘arenas’ in which the project is conducted. This definition is rooted in networks theory and results appropriate to understand how actors interact and relate to each other (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004; MacGuire, 2006).

This section is closed with a series of conclusions regarding the different theoretical fields, the tools that each of them offers and the possibilities to apply them in practice in the following phase of the research. Furthermore, it tries to find a clear relation among them, in order to structure the analysis of the case studies.

2.2.1. Urban Planning and Public Participation

The following two sections are bound to answer the first research sub question, namely ‘What is collaborative planning and how does it relate to public participation?’. In order to do so, the main historical background of urban planning is explored, as well as different classifications according to the institutional framework. It follows a correspondence between different theories and public participation. Finally, a more comprehensive exploration of collaborative planning is presented.

The field of urban regeneration has seen different approaches over time, closely linked to the development of planning theories. Building on Horita and Koizumi (2009); and Lane (2005), planning practice can be divided in three major schools, depending on the main approach to the planning process. These are the blueprint model, the synoptic approach and the pluralist approach.

Blueprint planning represents the earliest planning theories, in which the approach was highly rational and normative, with the most prominent theorists being Howard and Geddes. As the name suggests, its objective is to create fixed end-state plans to be executed. This puts the planner in the centre and gives it, as a representative of the state, a large amount of power to be able to implement the proposals.

There are two main criticisms to this approach. On one hand, the planner makes numerous assumptions on the needs of the society and the future development of the context in which the project is embedded. The usual result for these endeavours is that they are outdated even before implementation and tend to simplify the context. On the other hand, it implies a highly hierarchical political system, that takes little account of private interests or the opinion of the general public.

The second wave of planning can be traced to the 1960s and its related to two perception changes. The leap of scale for plans due to the advent of the automobile and the need to consider planning as an iterative process, that takes feedback from other societal actors. Notable models are synoptic planning, incrementalism (Lindblom, 1959) and mixed scanning (Etzioni, 1968), the latter two taking synoptic planning as a base and adding new insights.
The main difference with early theories lies on its pragmatism, based on the recognition of the flawed nature of blueprint planning and introduction of reviews and consultations to cope with the uncertainty of the future. At the same time power centralization is questioned and this opens the doors for different actors and different levels in the decision-making process. On the other hand, criticisms rise towards concepts still embedded from blueprint planning. There is still a distinction between politics and planning and there is a unitary view of society, that is, the plans respond to a broad need, rather than to conflicting views inside the urban context.

From the mid-1960s onwards, there have been several different approaches, that do not share a common method and therefore they can be classified as pluralist approaches. However, they all try to overcome the aforementioned criticisms addressed to earlier methods, especially those to the synoptic models. Among these is relevant to mention transactive planning (Friedmann, 1973), advocacy planning (Mazziotti, 1974), bargaining (McDonald, 1989) and communicative theory (i.e. Collaborative planning) (A. Giddens, 1994; Healey, 1992; Hillier, 1993). Two main points set these models apart. First there is a recognition of the political nature of planning and, second, there is a recognition of differing opinions among actors, even those pertaining to the same groups.

When this classification is related to the changing role of the actors in time, the most relevant criterion to analyse is the role of public participation in the planning process. In this sense, planning theories can be classified according to Arnstein’s ladder levels of participation. This classification is also threefold, namely there is non-participation, tokenism and citizen power (Arnstein, 1969) (Figure 11).
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A clear change can be seen from the early waves that position market parties as executors and gives no room for public participation, while assuming a unified public opinion. Passing through synoptic approaches that started to recognize the public as an important participant, albeit only in a consultative manner and, implicitly recognized the involvement of more figures besides the planning authorities in the process. Finally, contemporary approaches consider participation a fundamental element of the planning process. A summary of this can be seen in Figure 12.
A different classification can be made when considering the origin of the initiatives. On one end of the spectrum typically top-down strategies can be found, such as plan-led or market-led schemes like the ones described by Galland and Hansen (2012): “public-investment planning” and “regulative planning”, where the leading parties are part of the government, and “trend planning” and “leverage planning”, where the initiative comes from the private sector.

Notable examples of this approach are large scale projects, which focus on heavy transformation of the built environment, such as demolitions of extensive areas; and large investments, both by private and public parties, such as the ones implied in erecting iconic new buildings and area densification. An example of this kind of approach is the city of Bilbao, with its waterfront regeneration project, featuring an array of buildings designed by star architects, as well as new infrastructure and water cleansing in the river (Martinez-Perez, 2014).

On the other side of the balance, typical bottom-up approaches can be deemed as those that explicitly link community development and economy, through citizen empowerment (Jessop, 2002). These processes are characterized by a lesser involvement of public and private parties (i.e. developers), which implies limited funding in numerous occasions (Bailey, 2012). However, this type of developments is relevant because of their organizational flexibility and their social effectiveness (place-making).

This type of projects can be found in both formal and informal urban developments. The rapid growth of cities in developing countries is a clear example of the second, mainly due to the large amount of informal housing in slums, which is in many cases self-built and a product of community formation and place-making. The fast wave of suburbanization in Latin American cities in the second half of the 1900s was vastly constituted by unregulated housing settlements, done through land occupation or illegal land sales (Ward, 2012).

These two ends of the spectrum represent a common conception of the normative approach, that is to say that projects can only be initiated by one of the actors involved in it and that this variable will determine the type of project to be executed. In practice, there is rarely if ever such a strict classification and what can be seen is that projects are more grey than black or
white, using elements from one and the other. Furthermore, projects are seldom realised under a single approach and tend to switch approaches in different phases.

2.2.2. Collaborative Planning

The most appropriate theory to frame the current research is collaborative planning, due to its particular focus on communication as means for policy making and the implication of overarching relations among different parties or types of actors. It is understood first as an interactive process and then as “a governance activity occurring in complex and dynamic institutional environments, shaped by wider economic, social and environmental forces that structure, but do not determine, specific interactions” (Healey, 2003, p. 104).

This sets this approach apart from other theories, by focusing on the organisational structures rather than on the ‘planning’. This is relevant because a major aspect of the regeneration processes relates to the relations among the different stakeholders, before any discussion or agreement takes place, regarding the actual execution of a project (Healey, 2006).

Given its problem-solving nature, it can be said that planning is an “issue of interaction, where the actors with a stake in the problem must manage to coordinate their perceptions, activities and institutional arrangements” (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004, p. 9). Furthermore, it is focused on processes rather than the outcomes, since most of the attention is given to the discourse first and the practice later. In this sense it analyses process outcomes (Healey, 2003).

There are criticisms for the collaborative approach as well. First, inequalities in the power structures of the networks can result in a more hierarchical relationship, led by the more dominant actors (Ansell & Gash, 2008; van Bortel, 2016), this puts the needs of the actors in different levels and that will have an effect on the perceived outcome of the project. Second, since participation is mostly voluntary, incentives to participate are directly related to the relation between participation and policy outcomes.

At the same time, the fact that no clear trend can be seen in contemporary approaches to urban planning, it can be said that a single approach is not appropriate for every case. The intrinsic relation between context and policy implies that multiple models may work for different projects.

2.2.3. Actor analysis

The following section aims to cover the following sub question, ‘What actors are involved in collaborative urban regeneration project and what roles do they play in the process?’. This question is divided in two parts, first a definition and classification of the actors and a system to facilitate the subsequent analysis of their roles within the case studies.

In order to understand the relations among the different parties involved in Urban regeneration processes, a first step is to define actors. Hereafter, an actor is considered as an individual or organisation actively involved in an urban development project (Heurkens, 2012). The stress here lies within the active part. This is meant to limit the focus of the study to the actors that
form part of the decision-making process that generates and shapes these projects and to exclude far-reaching institutional, cultural or societal contexts. In this sense, the definition of actors and stakeholders is used interchangeably.

An initial classification can be made according to Streeck and Schmitter (1985) model, which includes three distinct types of actors. Namely, the government (State), the private firms (Market) and the citizens or users (Community), as depicted by Pestoff (1992) in Figure 13. For this research, the fourth group will not be used as a strict definition or classification, which is that of the third sector (Associations), since it can also be frequently positioned among only two of the three previously mentioned categories. In this sense, the definition of mixed or hybrid organisations is deemed more accurate.

Furthermore, in order to understand the position of each actor in relationship with the project’s goal, a stakeholder onion diagram (Alexander & Robertson, 2004; Czischke, 2016) will be used (Figure 14). This diagram is useful to categorise the different stakeholders’ roles in a project by classifying their level of involvement in it. The project as an entity is placed in the centre of the diagram, from which concentric circles are laid out, each one representing level of involvement. Czischke (2016) proposes three levels of analysis:

**Level 1. Primary Stakeholders** These actors are involved in the day-to-day development on the project and have a significant influence on it, reflected on their veto power. This is due to their strong control over resources. A large part of the relations that shape a project take place between actors on this level.

**Level 2. Secondary Stakeholders** The main difference between primary and secondary actors is that the latter are not involved in everyday decision making. However, they still have a medium to high control over resources.
Level 3. Wider Environment These actors are not directly involved with the project and therefore lack control over resources or veto power. However, they form part of the context in which the projects are developed and therefore represent the framework in which the process is carried out.

In order to position an actor in this levels there are three key elements to analyse (Czischke, 2016):

Control over essential resources The classification of resources is limited to four categories, following Koppenjan and Klijn (2004). First there are financial resources. Second, production resources, e.g. land ownership, technology or equipment. Third, competencies, e.g. authority to decide upon planning policy. Fourth, knowledge. A fifth type of resource is also identified, which is legitimacy, but for this analysis it will be considered as a separate element to analyse.

Legitimacy The widely accepted definition is that of Suchman (1995) which provides a broad-based and inclusive approach. It is “a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (Suchman, 1995, p. 574).

Veto The power of a stakeholder to unilaterally forbid, temporarily or permanently the execution of an action in the project.

Following Czischke (2016) and Sudiyono (2013), these two models are combined in order to have a more precise classification of each actor and understand their positions and the relations among them. This results in an onion diagram, divided in three pie slices, one for each type of actor in which relations can be characterized according to three levels.

Strong Based on high frequency and high interdependence of resources

Ad-hoc Low frequency and low interdependence (e.g. service provision or financing)

Indirect Contextual relation (e.g. related to legal framework or public opinion)
At the same time, it is essential to execute an objective comparison of the position of each actor, in relation to their interests, resources, veto power and legitimacy. In order to do so, a simple table is proposed (Table 1), to give validity to the position of each actor into the abovementioned diagram, as well as to understand the possible dynamics between the actors and the points of agreement and dispute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Veto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERU</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area</td>
<td>Legal power (Expropr.) Technical knowledge Financing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProBono</td>
<td>Solve ownership issues Defend the rights of minorities</td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Example of stakeholder analysis table

2.2.4. Network theory

Following the multi-stakeholder relations diagram and important subject to analyse is ‘How do these actors relate to each other?’ and ‘How is power distributed among stakeholders in collaborative or networked organisations?’. In order to do so, an exploration of governance and network theories is presented below. This responds to the aforementioned changing
environment in which urban (re)development processes take place and the emerging organisations that accomplish them.

The context in which actors take action and engage in urban (re)development projects is analysed in the light of the changing roles they have in contemporary society, in which horizontal relations replace hierarchical and free market forms to become networks (Poocharoen & Ting, 2015). These structures feature an increased actor interdependency, involvement of diverse actors and multiple levels of governance. This results in a complex context (Klijn, 2008).

The literature concerning network management dates back to the late 90s (see Robert Agranoff & McGuire, 2001; MacGuire, 2006; Poocharoen & Ting, 2015), although its origins can be traced to the early 60s, especially in the context of federalism in the United States (MacGuire, 2006). The recent increase in research seems to be related to the previously mentioned changes in society and the globalized nature of social changes (Castells, 2010). Some of the most relevant are, as presented by Koppenjan and Klijn (2004):

**Increasing intertwinement** This refers to the increase of resource dependency among organisations, especially those with different nature (i.e. different types of actors, according to Pestoff’s scheme) and in different levels, that is to say in both horizontal and vertical organizational schemes.

**Deterritorialization and globalization** Economic and political activities are less bounded to geographical places. At the same time, modern communications reinforce the global impact of cultural phenomena.

**Value pluralism** In a complex social context there are multiple subcultures, with a diverse set of values. This is in line with contemporary the tendency towards individualism (Castells, 2010), in which individuals tend to follow their own judgements, rather than adhere to a hierarchical mandate.

**Horizontal relations** There is a change from an authoritative to a negotiating society. This is particularly evident for governments, that can no longer rely on the support of the society in order to generate and execute their policies. This is reflected on a shift of the instruments they use, increasingly making use of consultation and cooperation strategies.

Koppenjan and Klijn (2004, p. 1) assert that “governments, businesses and civil society are unable to tackle these issues by themselves”, mainly due to increasing resource dependency among different actors and levels. Therefore, actors are urged to interact in new ways, in the context of strategic networks that do not comply with traditional schemes (e.g. hierarchical or free market organisational principles).

Nevertheless, networks do not depict a standard model and there is a great variation from project to project. As Sehested (2009, p. 247) describes it, there is “a scale of policy networks ranging from open and integrating networks with a plurality of participants, to closed and elitist governance networks with few participants.”
Furthermore, it is relevant to note that, in practice, “a clear distinction between hierarchies and collaborative management is not always accurate” (MacGuire, 2006). This accounts for two different characteristics of stakeholder interactions. On one hand, strict theoretical classifications hardly describe the empirical processes carried out in daily activities. On the other hand, projects carried out over long terms of time are divided in different phases, which in turn may require different organisational approaches.

Finally, the larger the network becomes, the more difficult it becomes to sustain a horizontal organisation among stakeholders. This is due to the difficulty to establish and distribute tasks among the different actors and the increasing demand for network skills, which results in more centralized forms of governance (McGuire & Agranoff, 2011; Provan & Kenis, 2008). It is argued that the presence of a lead organisation can help reduce the complexity of self-organisation, while conferring legitimacy to the process (MacGuire, 2006).

### 2.2.5. Conclusions

Those analysing governance processes need to look carefully at the power relations of argumentative processes as well as the consequences of the outcomes of these processes (Healey, 2003).

The initial review of planning in a historical context clarified that a clear shift form normative and rational approaches has been happening after the 1960s. This has resulted in a wide array of approaches that identify characteristically contexts in which different strategies can produce successful outcomes. The societal change in which urban regeneration processes are embedded accounts for this change.

Important factors such as political decentralization, economic and cultural globalization have a direct impact on the complexity of policy generation at every level of the government. Conversely, it increases the pressure on market parties and the community to participate more actively in these processes and this results in a large pool of shared resources to work with.

Rather than having to select between top-down or bottom-up approaches, the constitution of interdependencies can be presented as an interface between both of them (Agger & Sørensen, 2016). It is on this point that both collaborative planning and networks theory become relevant in order to analyse contemporary urban issues.

A key issue that scholars point out is the dynamism of inter-actor relations and organisational aspects within policy generation. This becomes the central aspect of the research when analysing the factors that prompt an increase in collaboration and interdependencies that result in a project.

While collecting the tools to classify the actors and analyse their role, it became clear that a determining factor of the type of relations they will have is the type of resources that they bring into the project. This will be a key point to analyse, since it determines the initial power structure and helps to understand the measures taken to balance the possible disparities.
Furthermore, the specificity of the context does not undermine the utility of analytical tools to better understand it. This is particularly true for the relational aspect of the projects. As the research is developed, these tools will be assessed regarding their appropriateness for stakeholders in urban regeneration projects.

2.3. Previous Research

The field of research for collaboration of different actors in policy making and urban regeneration is highly diverse and therefore not easy to classify. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions from the existent literature that explores practical applications of the research subject. Furthermore, there is contrast between the vast amount of literature regarding collaboration, networks theory and stakeholder analysis, even in the field of urban regeneration, and the limited number of practical cases studied regarding its application. The review of previous research is divided in two parts. First, journal papers that concern the subject and then academic literature, both on doctoral and master levels will be examined.

A common finding is also that the outcomes of the practical endeavours, represented in case studies in various sectors, are hardly measured. They focus mostly on process outcomes, that is on the conditions under which stakeholders acted collaboratively (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Little attention is paid therefore on the factors that set the process going and in their dynamic nature.

Examples of researchers and students from universities getting involved in urban regeneration projects can be seen in Japan. As described by Harada and Jørgensen (2016), the neutral position of these entities, can be useful for them to become coordinators for the different involved organisations, this can be related to the concept of ‘facilitative leadership’ (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Furthermore, the research projects can focus on several aspects of the ongoing projects, from social aspects, such as governance to planning issues or more specific architectural solutions.

This can prove beneficial for both sides of the projects. On one hand the researchers and students can share knowledge from successful case studies in terms of participation methods, urban planning solutions or architectural ideas (Harada & Jørgensen, 2016). On the other hand, the projects provide new data and a practical case to enrich knowledge data bases in the educational sector. Furthermore, the integration of students in discussion boards enhances can be useful to successfully integrate them into societal issues in later stages of their careers.

Previous academic research has explored the changing situation within the urban planning and development processes, especially focusing on the roles of the different actors. The research from Geesing (2015) studies the relation between the private market parties and the civic sector. In this case, the main focus was to devise the role of real estate developers related to the engagement of end users, and civic society in general, in development processes. The focus lies on the developers’ side and to the extent that public participation has an added value in urban development.
Research by Steen (2016) focused on the long-term sustainability of urban development process and analysed cases of urban regeneration in the Netherlands. The analysis was set to answer which approach offered a better outcome, between top-down and bottom-up. In this sense, a wider actor relations’ study was carried out, but mainly focused on the process result. The outcome of the research states that a new approach, in the middle of the two aforementioned extremes is the most successful and that the role of the government is better understood as a facilitating entity and a safe guarder of the overall direction of the process.
This chapter discusses the research design and methodology. Yin (2014) defines a research design as “the logic that links the data to be collected (and the conclusions to be drawn) to the initial questions of a study”. It starts with the general structure for the research, followed by the methods to be used and concludes with the data gathering techniques employed on the empirical part of the thesis.

3. Research Design

The research is divided in three main parts. Part One introduces the theme and sets the theoretical background in which the research is conducted. Furthermore, it explains the methodology used in the following sections. Part Two is an empirical research, with a comparative case study structure. Finally, Part Three, synthetises the results of the previous two in a set of conclusions and a discussion about the results and the practice of Urban Regeneration.

This research design functions at the same time as the thesis structure, corresponding to different research activities and reflected in corresponding chapters for each topic. A schematic overview of the research process can be seen in Figure 15.
3.2. Research Methods

Research on urban phenomena is complex and dynamic and is concerned with diverse disciplines and changing contexts (Allen & Davey, 2017). The nature of the studied subject calls for a pragmatic approach, using a variety of methods to address the different elements that the research questions bring about. As Dainty (2008) advocates, “(t)he basic principle of methodological pluralism is that the use of multiple theoretical models and multiple methodological approaches is both legitimate and desirable if established models and understandings are to be questioned and knowledge furthered”.

The focus of the research is given to the participants of the analysed process and the relations among them. In this sense, it can be defined as a phenomenological research, given the importance of analysing significant statements, of meaning units and developing an essence description (Creswell, 2013). Therefore, the use of grounded theory is favoured because it enables to focus on the context, processes, and interpretations of key players of the units of analysis (Allen & Davey, 2017).

Most importantly, grounded theory allows for the researcher to “compile a variety of actors’ viewpoints without compromising the value of each individual’s perspectives” (Allen & Davey, 2017, p. 2). This is relevant given the chosen data gathering techniques, which rely on interviews to different parties involved in the project, from different backgrounds and representing diverse and often conflicting interests.

In this sense, grounded theory also supports the continuous literature search and collection, as the latter is not exhausted prior to research. This is also compliant with the iterative nature of the research. It serves as means to verify the validity of the information gathered and of the steps taken along the development of the investigation.

This approach is complemented with the use of case studies, which are defined in Proverbs and Gameson (2008) as, a strategy used to research an experimental theory or topic using set procedures, often comprising several different combinations of data collection such as interviews and documentary evidence, where the emphasis is towards investigating a phenomenon within a context (Fellows and Liu, 2003). It can be said that the two methods offer complementarity.

3.2.1. Literature Review

The first part consists of an analysis of the subject and its relevant theoretical background, by means of literature review. This first part of the research will use a funnel approach, from the broad concepts to the specifics of the subject. This results on a problem definition and a set of research questions. Additionally, the tools found on literature are used to measure the different concepts in the case studies.

The literature review is meant to be a permanent process throughout the duration of the research. This allows to find further insight during each part of the process. First it can be used to test the validity of the hypotheses, then it can be used to assess the theoretical framework
against the empirical data and finally, to reflect upon the conclusions of the thesis. In this sense, it represents an iterative process, very much similar to the one depicted in the theory that is being studied.

The literature review is focused mainly on scientific sources from a range of origins, including books, scientific articles, dissertations and theses. The diversity of the material seeks to give a comprehensive view on the subject, on one hand, and provide a theoretical grounding to context specificity and knowledge transferability. Furthermore, the specific location of the cases calls for a quest on local literature, which can be also non-scientific. Thus, the use of grey literature makes for an important part of the empirical study.

3.2.2. Case Studies

The choice for a case study research strategy responds to the nature of the subject to be studied. On one hand, there is a comprehensive amount of literature on the different topics that have been mentioned and, on the other, there is a shortage of practical applications in the field of urban (re)development. The objective is then to find the application of academic concepts in factual scenarios. In this sense, it can be defined as both an explorative and explanatory research.

Furthermore, this thesis is not focused on building theory from the ground, but rather about finding different relevant aspects, and, thus, related theoretical points of view, to explain concrete phenomena. This is a key aspect in order to breach the large gap between theoretical insights and everyday practice, and reinforces the choice for this methodological choice.

Case studies are defined by Yin (2014, p. 18) as “empirical inquiries that investigate a contemporary phenomenon (the “case”) in depth and within its real-world context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident”. Furthermore, this method is preferred when relevant behaviours can’t be manipulated, that is over which the researcher bears no influence or control (Yin, 2014).

Starting from the literature study and the broad subject definition an initial case exploration was conducted, aiming to find cases in different contexts, within the European setting. This initial phase included informal talks with professionals in the field of architecture and urban planning, as well as academic discussions within the environment of TU Delft. However, this initial search was not entirely satisfactory.

The search of examples led to expand the scope worldwide and to the finding of an initial case in South America. More specifically the ‘Fenicia Triangle’ regeneration project in Bogotá, Colombia. This case encompasses both the concept and context to be studied and was used as a guide to continue the case selection.

From the cases to be further explored, a short selection of similar cases in different countries was made to conduct a comparative study, in order to understand the effect of the specific context on the approach to the problem. Regarding this method Couch et al. (2011, p. 6) explain that “cross-national comparative research, as a means of generating understanding and explanations of different social phenomena, has as an advantage its ability to account for the
influence of context in moulding societal responses to different issues”. This search resulted in a group of four cases in Argentina, Brazil and Ecuador, that presented similar characteristics, albeit with differing outcomes.

The objective is to understand different planning processes, management methods and organisational approaches, as well as “local power structures, political agendas and forms of decision-making” (Bassett, Griffiths, & Smith, 2002). Furthermore, even though urban regeneration processes and approaches are highly context specific, urban problems and the implementation of different approaches can create general lessons, that reach beyond these boundaries (Roberts & Sykes, 2000).

There is a choice to be made between having a broad array of cases or fewer but with a deeper insight. That is to say, the decision on scope versus depth was made taking into account that the objective is to draw specific conclusions on the selected variables, rather than general lessons. In order to conduct an in-depth analysis within the available time frame, the study will be conducted with a main case, the Fenicia Triangle and a set of reference cases in other Latin American countries. The main consideration is to be able to maximise the reach of lesson learning (Proverbs & Gameson, 2008) from the latter cases.

3.2.3. Case Selection

The objective of a case study is to support the main goal of the research, that is to help answering the research questions. In this case ‘What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?’. Furthermore, as a qualitative research is important to clarify that the cases are purposefully selected, to best understand the problem and the research question (Creswell, 2013). Therefore, the following set of criteria has been taken into account to select the cases.

**Location** The focus on inner city regenerations defines a broad context to explore. As mentioned before, the search for projects is currently set on the Latin American context. The limit to a similar political, social and economic structure is meant to reinforce the validity of the results and to reduce the possibility for extreme cases.

**Size** Urban Area Development defines roughly a project size that goes beyond single buildings and that can be constituted of several blocks or a neighbourhood, while excluding large urban interventions or regional projects. Initially a definition for the type of projects was set as ‘Middle scale urban regeneration’. This definition is strongly tied to the scale of the interventions and leaves important organisational conditions out, thus it was discarded.

**Actors Involvement** The main characteristic for a project to be selected is related to the actors that participate in it. Representatives from the government, the market parties and the community have to be involved and engage in the whole process in order to consider a case for selection. This doesn’t exclude other entities from the projects, such as non-for-profit organisations or academic institutions (Mixed or hybrid organisations), which may be relevant to a given development.
**Time** The project should be in process of being executed or recently built. This condition is connected to the relational aspect of the research, as well as to its contemporary nature. An important component of the data gathering process (see Section 3.2.4) relies on the direct contact with the different parties. It is relevant to have access to participants in the present time and to count on their recent experience, rather than a distant memory of the events.

**Data Availability** An important criterion is related to the ease of access to information, in order to make conclusion drawing possible. Given the selected techniques (further explained in Section 3.2.4) its relevant to be able to access a wide array of documents as well key stakeholders of the processes. This is further explained by Proverbs and Gameson (2008) as, availability of documentary information and access to persons involved, for interviewing purposes.

### 3.2.4. Data Gathering Techniques

Case studies share multiple approaches with historical research in that they both try to (re)construct what happened in real-case scenarios. A case study distinguishes itself by its contemporary nature. Furthermore, they have more variables than data points (a data point assumed as a single case study), in which case the research has to rely on multiple data sources. Finally they make use of previous theories to guide data collection and analysis (Yin, 2014).

The selected case-studies are analysed with a qualitative approach, concentrating on the interaction between the different actors and the relationships among them. The methods to conduct the analysis are threefold. First, document analyses are used to understand the initial objectives and stated outcomes of the different parties, as well as understanding their position along the process. Second, semi-structured interviews with stakeholders are meant to understand specific concepts related to the theoretical framework. Lastly, informal talks with stakeholders partially involved in the projects and professionals related to the planning and/or urban regeneration sphere can provide missing pieces to reconstruct the processes. Taking into account that each of these methods provide only a limited point of view, triangulation is a key factor in order to provide a deeper insight into the processes.

The interviews were conducted among the different types actors, including at least a representative from the State (e.g. members of the responsible planning agency), the Market (e.g. developers or investors of the projects), the Community and the mixed or hybrid organisations (e.g. non-profit or academic organizations), to assess the dynamics of their relations, the level of integration of the different organisations, the governance approaches that were used and track its changes over time.

Finally, this results in answers to the research questions and a set of recommendations for the actors involved in the process as well as for future endeavours that seek to increase public participation for planning purposes. Furthermore, a reflection on the relevance of the methods selected for the field of study and a discussion on the state of the art in practice will be addressed.
A key aspect of qualitative research in general, and grounded theory in particular, lies in coding the collected information. According to Bryman (2012) coding can be defined as “a process whereby the data are broken down into their component parts and those parts are then given labels. [...] (T)hen recurrences of these sequences of coded text within and across cases and [...] links between different codes [are searched for]” The objective is to “link the process of making sense of the data with the research questions that provided the starting point, as well as with the literature relating to retirement and also with the theoretical ideas the authors use to illuminate the issue” (Bryman, 2012).

The structure for this process follows after what Czischke (2014) defines as ‘open coding’ and ‘contextual coding’, after Eisenhardt (1989a, 1989b). Taking into account the similarity of the background information regarding the actors, that is their affiliation with one or two of the three categories in Pestoff (1992) welfare triangle (Community, market, government), then “codes generated in the initial phase (open coding) (are) linked to contextual information in a second phase through a process named here ‘contextual coding’. This type of coding aimed at identifying relationships at two levels: between codes, and between codes and contextual aspects” (Czischke, 2014), namely the aforementioned categories. This process is illustrated in Figure 16.

3.2.6. Data analysis: Presenting the Findings

In order to give a comprehensive depiction of the case studies, the following structure will be used to present the data. Cases will be described with three different approaches. First an objective reconstruction of factual information, which aims to understand the temporal development of the project. Second a classification of the information found in secondary and primary data collection, focusing on stakeholder and relational characterisation. Third, a summary of the findings of primary data collection, with an emphasis on relational aspects, as highlighted in the theoretical framework.
The latter focuses on finding common perceptions from different actors regarding specific questions that point towards the relations among different parties and the factors that allow for collaboration to work in the project. Finally, an account of positive and negative characteristics of the process, aims to identify further aspects that may have not been taken into account during the research process.

In order to present the data, (Czischke, 2014) method of distinguishing ‘majority reports’, which can be defined as shared perceptions, that is opinions expressed by more than one respondent (ideally more than half of those who addressed the subject), and ‘minority reports’ which can be defined as dissenting perceptions, or else opinions that only one or two respondents expressed.

The following is an example of a table used to present the data analysis (Table 2). It focuses on broad themes, corresponding to contextual codes. Furthermore, each theme can have one or more attributes, illustrated by quotes from the interviews. Finally, this data is classified either as a ‘majority report’ or a ‘minority report’ (Czischke, 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Majority Reports (agreements)</th>
<th>Minority Reports (divergence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Quote (Examples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (Example)</td>
<td>Poor communication</td>
<td>'the explanation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affected the project</td>
<td>the project was not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Example)</td>
<td>clear for the community'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication is a</td>
<td>'we could connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tool to builds trust</td>
<td>better with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Example)</td>
<td>through the workshops’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Template for primary data analysis. Based on Czischke (2014)

In order to maintain the respondent’s privacy, abbreviations will be used to identify the different quotes. This is directly related to their classification according to the welfare triangle (Pestoff, 1992). Furthermore, a reference to the organization will be presented, when deemed necessary, refer to Appendix A (Translations and Abbreviations)
Part 2  Case Study
4. Case Analysis

This section covers the descriptive and analytical information of the selected case studies. It starts with a general description of the context and goes on to further analyse the identified variables in the theoretical background. As stated before the selection of the cases was made for a main case study, which will be analysed in depth and a series of complementary cases that give an overview of similar processes in different countries in Latin America. Moreover, this covers the following sub-questions, applied to the specific case:

- How is urban planning executed in Bogotá and which instruments can be identified?
- What phases can be identified in the process?
- What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?
- How do these actors relate to each other?
- How is the power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?
- How does the context influence the application of collaborative planning in practice?

The main case study corresponds to the development of an area in the centre of Bogotá, Colombia, which displays the characteristics previously mentioned and was selected based on its uniqueness in the local planning and developing context, therefore providing the opportunity to measure observe an unseen phenomenon in the city. It can be classified according to Yin (2014), simultaneously, as a critical, extreme and revelatory case, justifying its selection as a single focus.

This case will be described chronologically, divided into phases that have been identified corresponding to key decision moments in which organisational structures switched. Subsequently an interpretation of each phase in the light of the theories that have been explored in Section 2 (Theoretical Framework).

The complementary cases correspond to similar developments in other countries in Latin America, where political contexts can be deemed similar and that have involvement of different actors. The absence of representative cases in the field of urban regeneration, particularly with the participation of the private sector, is already a condition for developments both in Colombia and in Latin America. This results in a large amount of cases that are community driven and focused, but that might lack large investments.

These cases will be explored as a whole, focusing on the key factors that facilitated or hampered the emergence of collaborative structures. Then, a set of conclusions will be dragged, to understand the influence of the context in the different projects and the applicability of lessons learned in diverse environments. The key elements hindering the aforementioned integration of a wider set of actors becomes a crucial point of analysis.
4.1. Bogotá and the (Re)Development of the City Centre

This section describes the context in which the main case is situated. Starting with an overview of the historic development of the city, then focusing on the planning instruments and documents that set the framework for the project.

4.1.1. From Compact Centre to Urban Sprawl

The city of Bogotá has had a convoluted development since its foundation in 1538. Being the capital of the country meant a central role in both administrative and economic terms, however the city kept a slow growth until the mid-1900s. From the 1950s onwards the population of the city grew amply, going from a 300.000 inhabitants in the late 1940s to 1,5 million in the mid-1960s, 5 million in the 1990s and close to 8 million today (SDP & SDH, 2014). This statistic only contemplates city proper population, but it increases further when including the metropolitan areas and nearby towns that are part of the floating population.

The city centre of Bogota is host to the colonial Spanish Empire settlement, where the seat of the Viceroyalty of New Granada was first established. Following the independence from the Spanish, the city became the capital of the Great Colombia, first, and Colombia, later. Therefore, its function as administrative focal centre has been maintained throughout time and it is equally relevant nowadays. As such, it accommodates the main national governmental entities to this day, such as the presidency, the palace of justice, the congress as well as the local government. It is from this historic centre that the city started to develop.

While the development of the city until the 1930s was limited to the centre and further along the north and south exits, the second half of the century has been characterised for its polycentric nature. With changes in the economy and new services coming along, the financial core moved northwards, creating new development focuses. Consequently, the main businesses decided to move away from the city centre, establishing new and more modern office areas in the north and leaving behind those that appeared obsolete.

This process was repeated approximately four to five times, creating a clear pattern of commercial areas, focused mostly on office space, that can be traced to specific periods in time by analysing the type of architecture that was built. Clear examples of this are the International Centre (Centro Internacional), the first new development in the 1960s, which adhered to international modernism. The Chapinero CBD, with architecture from the 1980s and 1990s, where the Stock Exchange area is located. The World Trade Center area, with buildings until the 2000s, where several multinational companies have their headquarters. And, more recently, the Usaquen area, developed mostly after the year 2000, hosting prime office space for large companies.

This type of development is closely related to the economic policies enforced both by the national and the local governments, that adhere strongly to neoliberalism, which according to
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(Harvey, 2007) “is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices”.

In this light, and especially after the 1950s, the policy has focused on guaranteeing a proper environment for the free market to develop and the implementation of specific programs such as privatization of public utilities, cut-backs of public spending, political decentralization and reforms of trade protection. This has had a direct effect on urban planning and Bogotá has not escaped from these dynamics. Along with the protection of central areas, due to heritage regulations, new developments have focused on the peripheries, effectively extending the limits of the city over time.

The obsolescence of real estate has provoked new waves of urbanization in previously unoccupied areas, or in those where the local government changed the regulations to favour the market. This latter case, which includes increases in density limits or changes in land use, has been historically lobbied by private actors, mostly developers and the construction related industries, in order to maintain their economic power (Romero Novoa, 2010).

The main effects of these policies on the urban fabric are inequality and segregation. These can be seen on the creation of the aforementioned economic centres in the north area of the city, which bring about new developments guided by speculation and privatization. The prices for different types of real estate, thus, have increased substantially and have remained out of reach for the majority of the population, which has driven the expansion of the city to the south and the west and has created a clear zoning based on real estate prices.

Furthermore, the protection of the market dynamics by the government implies also that most of the urban and developable land is privately owned. This exacerbates the speculation over real estate prices and forces the government to develop state led initiatives in peripheral locations, to benefit from lower land prices and larger unused areas (SDP & SDH, 2014).

4.1.2. Legal Instruments and Regulations

The local government approaches urban planning across several scales. First there is a master plan for the city, which establishes the regulations for the development of the following 10 years approximately, labelled Territorial Ordinance Plan (Plan de Ordenamiento Territorial, POT). Second, there are urban plans (Plan Urbano, PU) for large areas of the city, (E.g. The Extended Centre plan, which covers approximately 11,000Ha), which contain guidelines and strategies for the development of an area, based on future needs and specific opportunities. Finally, there are Partial Plans (Plan Parcial, PP), for neighbourhoods, or smaller areas, which have the specific regulations for a development that is not contemplated in the zoning plan.

The latter are the legal instruments through which urban regeneration programs are usually carried on the city. These developments are done on areas that the zoning plan highlights as potential development hubs and where private investors and developers perceive a potential
for profits. The private market parties are usually leading these types of developments, lobbying for regulations which allow to increase the land value by demolishing actual buildings and increasing the quantity and quality of usable area offered. Simultaneously, there are public initiatives, that usually seek to cover the lack of affordable housing and services, usually in peripheral areas, as mentioned before.

These planning instruments have their origin in the first Urban Reform Law (Ley 9ª de 1989) and further on with the Land Development Plan Law (Ley de Desarrollo Territorial, Ley 388 de 1997). To better understand the case study, there will be an overview of the operating regulations from this point onwards. Furthermore, it is relevant to clarify that planning regulations are as much a long-term plan as a political flag for new campaigns in the local governments.

In the first phases, the active POT (Decreto Distrital 619 de 2000, Decreto Distrital 190 de 2004) was heavily focused on the development of transportation infrastructure and into the expansion of the city in all its boundaries to respond to the lack of housing and services for its growing population. At the same time it identified areas to be densified in the central locations (Romero Novoa, 2010).

With the change of local governments in 2012 a new set of regulations came into place (Decreto Distrital 364 de 2013). This master plan focused on densification of the central areas (And at the same time limiting urban expansion), the creation of mixed used districts (As opposed to a stricter zoning in the previous decree), the pursue of social inclusion (Through mandatory levels of social housing in new developments), and more generally into environmental protection.

The new regulation came into power with great resistance both from established political parties and, most importantly, from economic elites that feared a decrease in profits from speculative developments. This opposition coupled with the concern of the wealthiest part of the population of a decrease in real estate prices, gave the master plan a short life. The decree was effectively suspended only one year later by the Council of State, arguing that its implementation was executed incorrectly by the mayor at that moment. With the derogation of the decree, the previous master plan regained validity, although with minor adjustments.

It is relevant to mention that, even with the suspension of the regulation, several initiatives were launched and several projects started during its implementation. From a legal point of view, the suspension can’t have a retroactive effect and thus, all the projects approved during the law’s lifespan ought to be completed.

4.1.3. The Plan for the Extended City Centre

Over the following sections an exploration of the second and third scales that affect the project of Fenicia will be explored. First the general plan for the revitalisation of the Extended city centre and then more specifically the partial plan for the area defined as the Fenicia Triangle.

The Extended City Centre of the city of Bogotá is the common definition for an area of 11,406Ha, that extends from the colonial city centre towards the north, including the different
economic centres that have been developed over time (Figure 17). As a whole, it comprises the majority of the economic services of the city and contains some of the most expensive neighbourhoods of the city.

The area corresponds to a 25% of the urban area of the city and, correspondingly, houses a quarter of the total (urban) population of the city, amounting to close to 2 million people. Out of this population the majority is classified in the low-middle income bracket (based on the strata tax-classification of 1 to 6, in which 1 is the lowest and 6 is the highest, this area has around 1.2 million people grouped in the 3rd level).

The general objective of the plan is to ‘revitalize’ the area. The selection of the word ‘revitalize’ instead of ‘regenerate’ is explained through the recuperation of “vitality and cultural significance of a city built through generations” (SDP & SDH, 2014). The main means to do this include updating public services infrastructure, increase the public space offer while recovering its collective meaning and finally increasing the access of the whole population to the urban habitat.

This last point includes a set of very concrete measures, in which the most important one is to develop new housing in the Expanded City Centre, guaranteeing that it will be accessible to low-income households. This is supposed to promote and increase social mixture and
A main issue related to this process is the financial sustainability as a key factor for new projects.

It also represents a major change in the way that affordable housing is developed in the city, since it imposes minimums for social housing in every new project (30% for new developments and 20% for regeneration projects (SDP & SDH, 2014)) and creates a tax for developers that choose not to include affordable housing in their developments. This is opposed to the traditional government-led Public-private partnerships done in the past, which focused on securing low prices on the land, which resulted in what's known as macro-projects (Large scale social housing developments in peripheral areas).

4.1.4. The Fenicia Decree

Urban planning regulation for the city of Bogotá define Partial Plans as the “instruments through which the dispositions of zoning plans are developed and complemented for specific areas of the urban territory” (Alcaldía Mayor de Bogotá, 2014). These documents provide the specific regulations for an area development as well as a technical background to support its enactment and a description of its economic viability.

The studied area and most of its current projects fall under the effects of the Partial Plan for the Fenicia Triangle (Parcial de Renovación Urbana "Triángulo de Fenicia", Decreto 420 de 2014). This document collects the main objectives of the Extended City Centre plan and applies them to the specific location and clarifies the legal mechanisms through which the involved actors will develop the project.

For the Fenicia project, there was an additional set of discussions with the owners and neighbours, before the first interactions with the local government. This collaborative round is not necessary for the approval of a plan and, even if its encouraged by the different stances of the government, is not commonly executed.

The main objective of the Plan is to set the framework for new developments in the area. This is done through densification (Replacement of old buildings with taller constructions), increase of public space (Supported by the aforementioned densification), repurpose of historic or heritage buildings, renovation of public infrastructure and changes in land use.

The result of this project doubles the capacity of the area, in terms of number of dwellings, population and public space. At the same time, it adheres to the laws regarding inclusion of
affordable housing, by making approximately 20% of the dwellings social housing. Finally, it proposes a mixed-use approach, with housing (Social and market sector), public functions, commercial functions, offices, and educational facilities. Basic information for the project is summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Situation</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhabitants</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>3000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubic space</td>
<td>3,8Ha</td>
<td>6,6Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area for Sale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>134,925m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Fenicia Triangle general data.

A key element that came out of the initial discussions with the inhabitants of the sector regards the restitution of area in the new developed projects and the levelling of taxes for a limited period of time. These are two legal instruments agreed upon with the local government to avoid the displacement of the local population due to real estate speculation pressure.

The first agreement implies an exchange of area, in a 1:1 ratio, for each owner in the area to be intervened. This exchange applies also for the use of the land or area in the building (1m² of housing will be replaced with 1m² of housing, and so on for commercial uses or parking spots). This guarantees the quantitative preservation of the area, while increasing the quality of the built environment (effectively replacing old buildings, with new ones). On the other hand, it guarantees the conservation of the commercial dynamics of the sector.

The second measure relates to the tax levels for the new units. Given the increase in quality and in land value, tax increase is the most common driver for gentrification in the city. The objective is to maintain current levels, for a minimum of ten years, so that the population can slowly adapt to the new situation. It comes on the condition that the owner must stay and inhabit the unit, otherwise all the benefits bestowed upon the property are lost.

4.1.5. Conclusions

The exponential growth of the city, both in size and population, has had a large impact on the city centre, mostly by driving the economic focus further away from it. This has caused a deep change in the use of the area and has limited the activities carried in it. Moreover, this phenomenon has transformed the centre into a place of passage, rather than a mixed-use district and most importantly it has reduced significantly the amount of housing in it.

As opposed to some of the aforementioned financial centres that are still active nowadays, such as the CBD or the WTC, the historic centre lacked a diversified offer to retain wealth. Its services cater to daily use almost exclusively. The most representative of which can be, administrative or governmental functions, educational facilities and tourism. In the meantime,
the area has kept a relatively stable set of residents, that do not attract further private investment for a structural renovation. This is due in part to their economic capacity, but also to the prevalence of a negative attitude towards regeneration.

The way that the city of Bogotá has developed from the second half of the 1950s has resulted in a segregated urban fabric in which private interests prime over public wellbeing and welfare programs. Moreover, this type of development is supported by public policies, which are greatly influenced by market parties. This is important to understand the effect that different governments have had over the city.

A notable change in the approach to city planning and urban development from the 2012 government, which focused into equality and the ‘access to the city’ for the majority of the population. This was reflected on the inclusion of more social programs, including mixing social housing with private led developments. As a side effect this implies a bigger extent of collaboration between different parties and particularly for the community.

This new approach from the government makes a difference regarding the type of projects that can be developed and challenges new actors to participate in the development of the city. It can be said that without the attitude of the government towards social initiatives and general welfare, a project such as the Fenicia Triangle would struggle to be approved.

At the same time, the traditional speculative system acts as the biggest opponent to some of the developments. A part of the partial plans that are proposed lack the support of private financiers or do not offer enough profit as developers expect and therefore are never deployed. In this sense, the broader policy of low governmental intervention also acts negatively, since it doesn’t offer incentives for private parties to engage in alternative projects.

On the other hand, private parties seldom resort to alternative practices in development, on one hand because it is not mandatory to do so and, on the other hand, there is a preconception that such practices will lead to losses in the execution of the project. These can be caused by increase of direct costs, delays, legal issues or an impact in the final sale price of the product. It becomes relevant to follow the development of the project given the legal instability surrounding these types of initiatives. In this sense, the project can be seen as an experiment for different types of arrangements between parties, supported by regulations.

It can be seen that a major hindrance for urban development and planning in Bogotá is the size of the city and the connection between different scales. A plan such as the one for the Extended City Centre has a coverage over a highly diverse section of the city, covering the majority of different land use classifications, heritage areas, redevelopment foci and well-established areas, among others. This generates all sorts of criticism over its ability to act on a context based manner. On the other hand, there is a constant debate about the reduced scope of partial plans and its ability to influence the areas that surround them.

While reviewing the partial plan in particular, the measures to withstand the gentrification in the area can be discussed, mainly regarding the tax levels and real estate price increases. This has been a common phenomenon in the city, resulting in high quality projects (mainly housing) that host the local population for ten to twenty years, and shortly after start to be traded in the
market for higher prices. The population thus is not forcibly displaced, but will not find similar quality in central locations.

4.2. The Fenicia Triangle

The project for the Fenicia Triangle will be explored in light of its chronological development. For this purpose, it is divided in five main sections. First the initial situation, then the first development stage, that concluded in a stall, followed by a failed attempt to regulate the area, and, finally, two phases of the current development, namely preparation and planning. Each of them will be described narratively and then analysed in the light of the theoretical framework, focusing on the involved actors, their relations and the turning points that allowed for organisational change.

4.2.1. A Starting Point: ‘Las Aguas’ Neighbourhood

The project is located in downtown Bogotá, on the northern side of the historic city centre, in the ‘Las Aguas’ neighbourhood (Figure 18). The area has a historic relevance in the city because it contains a number of heritage buildings dating back to the colonial period, including the house of Simón Bolivar, a noted political and military leader involved in the country’s independence process. Furthermore, it has hosted a wide range of functions over time, most significantly it accommodated some of the first offices and financial services of the city, along the ‘Jimenez’ avenue.

Nowadays it consists of several educative institutions, commercial areas, offices and, to a lesser extent, housing. Furthermore, it is relevant to mention the close proximity of a large part of the national and local government institutions, in the historic centre. The accelerated development of the city, especially towards north and west, left this area with a mixture of new developments, fostered almost entirely by the aforementioned education centres, and old buildings that quickly became obsolete, especially in the Fenicia area.

This area, represents very clearly the thorough social division that affects the city. First, there are educational centres that are recognized for their high level as well as for their high costs.
This attracts a group of academics and students in daily flows from other parts of the city, fostering the growth of commercial services, such as restaurants, copy shops and small convenience stores. At the same time, it increases the flow of automobiles and puts pressure on the parking demand of the area.

The office buildings that are left in the area and its surroundings represent an obsolete assortment, that has been out of the prime stock for several decades at this point. The great distance to the current financial and commercial centres makes it unattractive for most businesses giving rise to residual office space, catering to small businesses whose owners live nearby or that are somehow related to the governmental or educational sectors.

Finally, housing is divided among two or three level houses, of which most of them are owner occupied, and apartment buildings, with high levels of private rental arrangements. When observing the population of the area, a clear division can be seen between these two types of housing, being the later a wealthier portion, usually with higher education. On the other hand, there is housing that sits on the mid-low to low end of the price spectrum and some of them have serious qualitative deficiencies. The latter is true for the houses and is related to self-building and spontaneous development.

The regeneration of this area had been in hold since the mid-1990s, when it was identified as a potential area for new developments that could bring life back to the old city centre. However, there was not enough interest from public and private parties alike to initiate any project (Mahecha, 2008). It was not until the mid-2000s that the refurbishment of the ‘Jimenez’ avenue, brought attention back to the area and discussions around new projects started. A general overview of the process can be seen in Figure 19.
As previously mentioned, the development of the city took place for the most part in the second half of the past century, fuelled by an aggressive economic policy. Part of the decentralization of the state included the possibility for private educational institutions to operate parallelly to public ones, given that they could guarantee that quality would be equal to or higher than that provided by the state.

This led to the creation of several private higher education institutions that tried to step away from the deep religious orientation of traditional education as well as the limits imposed by the government to other institutions, for example in terms of budget. These institutions saw the surroundings of the city centre as a proper location for their ventures and profited from the low prices offered when the service firms left towards the newer districts.

The location offered several advantages. It was close to all the national and local governmental entities, which is an advantage both for the operations of the institutions as well as for the knowledge economy that derives from this proximity. It was well connected with public transportation, since the development of infrastructure always took into account the ease of access to and from the old city centre. The area had a mixture of heritage buildings, apt for use as educational campuses and free areas for future expansion.

Most of these features are still valid today, with the exception of the last one. Along with the development of the city, the different owners used most of the available development area, with large investments in housing in the 70s and 80s and conversely large investments by the educational institutions in the 90s and more specifically after the 00s. This phenomenon started putting pressure to the real estate development of the neighbourhood. A clear example of this relates to the ground for campus expansion for educational institutions, that depended on private agreements with large groups of owners in order to have sufficient space for a new building.

4.2.1.1. Stakeholder Analysis

In order to understand the development of the project in its different phases, an important part of the context is made of the different organisations present in the territory, this is to say, the actors that could be involved in any given project and the relations among them. This determines the starting point to further interpret the data collected to analyse the aforementioned stages.

Following the division established in the theoretical framework (Section 2.2.3), actors will be classified according to their position in Pestoff’s welfare triangle. This means an initial classification in three defined groups (Market, Government, Community) and a further description of hybrid actors, that might be in between two of these groups.

On the market side, there are internal actors, mainly represented by owners (or full-time users) of land in the area, with business legal status. Among this group there are two main types of actors, large enterprises, such as Blindex, a car armouring company, and small businesses, such as restaurants, copy shops, convenience stores, parking lots, among others. There are also external actors, involved ad-hoc with any given project, represented by consultants in different fields. These can be architects, technical advisors (E.g. structural engineers) and contractors,
as well as financing parties (e.g., Banks, investment funds). Furthermore, there are actors in the surrounding areas, which have an interest in the project, albeit with a low decision capacity. These are actors of the first type, that is owners or users with business-like status. Most of them are small commercial units, such as the aforementioned, but there are for-profit educational institutions and other services (e.g., medical, law).

On the government side, there is only one institution operating in the area, that is a social service agency (Family Welfare Instituto, Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar-ICBF). Additionally, there is a cultural heritage building, the Simon Bolivar House (Quinta de Bolivar), which functions as a museum and has an important touristic appeal. Conversely, there are several external organizations that are involved in urban development projects (ad-hoc). For this sector, it would usually include the Local Planning Agency (SDP), the Local Heritage Institute (IDPC), the Habitat Agency (SDH), and its branch the Urban Renewal and Development Agency (ERU), the Urban Development Institute (IDU), public service providers (e.g., Water, energy). On a larger extent, the local government as an entity, represented by the Mayor, the Local Government Agency (SDG) and the City Council.

The community refers widely to the inhabitants of the area, which form a heterogeneous group, based on their socio-economic classification. The neighbourhood encloses assets that range from strata 1 to 3. This makes for people with different incomes, backgrounds and education levels. More widely the community includes the population of the neighbouring zones as well as that of the city in general.

As a last point, there are entities which are not easily classifiable in these three categories. A clear example is Los Andes University, a private university, that however is a non-profit organisation. In this sense, it can be put in the middle between the community and the private sector, sharing values with both. The same can be said about some public service providers, which are private companies, standing between the government and the private categories (e.g., Gas, waste management). Outside the area, there are a wide variety of educational institutions with the same aforementioned position, such as America University, Jorge Tadeo Lozano University, Central University, among others. This spectrum can be summarized in the following scheme (Figure 20).

---

1 This categorization is applied to the land, but widely it classifies the population in different groups with similar socio-economic characteristics (From low to high, ranging from 1 to 6). Also, it allows for the allocation of subsidies related to public services. The higher strata (5 and 6) pay a surcharge to finance the lower strata (1 and 2), while the ones in the middle (3 to 4) pay approximately the real cost for the services (Wallace, 2014).
4.2.1.2. Relations Characterisation

An important analysis that comes from this initial identification is that of the relations among these different actors. Being the most relevant ones, those among those who inhabit the area. In this subject, a first contrast can be identified between the community as a whole and the private educational institutions, but particularly towards Los Andes University.

It can be said that the local community feels distrust in these institutions and sees them as private entities moved by profit, rather than by social motives or common welfare (This conception can be equally extended to market parties, such as developers or financiers). This stems directly from the private character of the institutions, which allows them to control their tuition fees, highly limiting the access to the majority of the population, while maintaining a high academic level. This creates a social division between society and the university, as an institution but also towards its students.

The case of Los Andes University is an extreme one, since it is the most expensive private university, both in the city and in the country (with the exception of specific programs in other institutions, e.g. medical specialisations), but it also holds the highest position on both educational and research aspects in most national and international rankings. This creates a sense of alienation from society, that in turn looks at them as “rich people” and “wiseacres or know-it-alls”.

This feeling can be summarized in a popular saying about people from the University: “Facing Monserrate, turning their back on the city” (“De cara a Monserrate y de espalda a la Ciudad”), which refers to the fact that the University is located right underneath the Monserrate mountain, a major landmark in the city, but it still keeps its campus closed to the public. Furthermore, it
emphasises the fact that people in the university don’t seem understand the problems of the rest of the city’s society (and the country, by extension), because of their privileged situation.

A similar diagnose can be cast for the relationship between the community and the government. The former usually fears that the latter will prioritize tax collection from more expensive developments at the expense of displacing local communities. Furthermore, distrust also comes from frequent corruption scandals in various levels of the government.

Additional distrust comes from the relations between some of these institutions. A clear example, again, comes from Los Andes University, which is closely related to both the government and the market parties. Both academics and students are usually involved in politics and in high ranking governmental positions, as well as involved with large corporations that invest in real estate and urban development.

Thus, the general environment in urban regeneration projects is of distrust among the different actors. The level of distrust among the other actors, besides the community, can vary depending on the local government in charge at any given moment. Administrations that are closer to the market parties will favour speculative developments, while more welfare oriented ones will try to regulate the free market, increasing distrust among the two of them.

4.2.2. First Phase: A Rough Start

The first stage of the project can be situated at a moment in which development regulations and political power were particularly favourable for private parties and market speculation. In this context, most of the investment for infrastructure and regeneration of the city was made through public-private partnerships.

Once the interest in redeveloping the old city centre aroused, the first project to change the somehow derelict face of it was an infrastructure investment for the new public transportation system (Bus Rapid Transit, named Transmilenio) between 1999 and 2002. Given the importance of the area, the decision was made to have a renowned architect design the intervention for the segment that would enter the city centre, through the Av. Jimenez (This particular section would come to be known as Eje Ambiental).

This plan consisted in closing the road for private vehicles (making only available for the bus system and pedestrians), using cobblestone as opposed to asphalt and recovering the water element that was lost with development (the road follows an old riverbed). This project paved the way for future interventions and for the start of speculation surrounding the whole area. The first projects to appear consisted in renovations of emblematic buildings along this axis for high-end housing, hotels and commerce. Such is the case of the Continental Hotel, turned into a mixed used building (hotel, apartments and an underground bar), or the Augusta Hotel, fully renovated, including restaurants in the ground floor.

The neighbourhood of Las Aguas quickly became a target for further renovation, due to its location and a particular plot caught the attention of developers and the government alike. The
area located in the crossing between the 19th Street and the 3rd Road\textsuperscript{2}, which has been a hotspot for commerce for several decades (Figure 21). Moreover, the endpoint of the BRT was located in this corner, improving its connectivity and increasing the pedestrian traffic in the whole area.

![Figure 21. Location of the first phase projects. Source: Google Earth, Landsat, DigitalGlobe (2013)](image)

The area for the development was included in the PU of the time for this area, that was named ‘Plan Centro’. For this plan, the designation for the neighbourhood of Las Aguas was changed from conservation to renovation, and this implied the possibility to change the existing regulations and engage in new projects. Each block was numbered and the specific corner in question became known as Block 5 (Manzana 5) and divided in two plots, one destined for a public building and one for a housing complex with retail facilities (Empresa de Renovación Urbana, 2011).

In this context, a governmental Spanish organisation, AECID (Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo, Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation) manifested its interest in developing a cultural centre around 2006. After discussions with the local government, they agreed on a partnership in which the Spanish government would invest to build and operate the building for 65 years. The initial plans agreed upon a completion date in 2010, thus extending the benefit until 2075 (El Tiempo, 2008).

A special figure was used in order to start the development process, an International Cooperation Agreement (Convenio de Cooperación internacional No. 001 de 2006). Through this, an initial budget of €2,5 million for the building was allocated and the city committed to provide the lot (Block 5, Plot 1). At the same time, it was agreed upon conducting a design competition for the new building (Empresa de Renovación Urbana, 2011).

The local government got engaged in its two main tasks. First to conduct a competition, which was done through the SCA (Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos, Colombia Architect Association) and completed a year after, in 2007. The winner was Juan Manuel Pelaez (Figure 22) and the competition featured several renowned local architects, such as Daniel Bermúdez, Giancarlo Mazzanti, Daniel Bonilla, Ricardo La Rotta, Camilo Restrepo and María Luisa Vela.

\textsuperscript{2} The basic planning of Bogotá from the colonial era until now is based on a grid of perpendicular numbered roads. Calles run from East to West and their number increases northwards. They will be referred to as ‘Streets’. Carreras run from South to North and their number increases westwards. They will be referred to as ‘Roads’. Throughout this thesis, the locations in the city of Bogotá will be addressed in this manner, given the lack of a more appropriate translation for these terms.
The competition was highly publicized and generated positive attention from the public in the city, which saw it as a clear sign of improvement for the centre.

Figure 22. Visualizations of the winning proposal for the Spanish Cultural Centre. © Juan Manuel Pelaez arquitectos. Source: www.flickr.com/photos/juanmanuelpelaez

At the same time, the second task started, which implied the purchase of a large number of properties located in the block, in order to provide new development area for the new projects. This task was done through the ERU. The first action of the local government was to provide a legal framework for the purchase, and it did so through a decree (Decreto 240 de 2006) that established a condition of ‘urgency’ to do so. Furthermore, it provided the ERU with the faculty to apply eminent domain if necessary.

The process started promptly with a valuation of the terrains, that concluded with a very low pricing for the existing buildings. This valuation had the support of the Real Estate Association (Lonja de Propiedad Raíz) and thus an initial negotiation took place. The approach of the government came with great resistance of the owners in the area, that felt that their properties had been unfairly valued. Furthermore, the extensive promotion of the project in the media was not comparable with the low information provided to the local community.

The process continued nonetheless, resulting in numerous legal battles between the community and the government and a general sense of dissatisfaction of the inhabitants, due to the conditions of the purchase. A number of expropriations were executed, which lowered even more the profits to the owners. To this, followed the demolition of the aforementioned buildings, to prepare the area for the new developments (Urbina Vanegas, 2015).

Up until this point, the local government had invested a large amount in land purchase and improvements (2,500 Million Pesos, or the equivalent to €870,000\(^3\)) and a further amount in

---

3 Amounts that are presented in Colombian Pesos (COP) will have their equivalent in Euros (EUR), calculated using the exchange rate of the time, or its closest available reference value.
building permits (around €120,000). However, the project was not moving forward, due in part to bureaucratic incumbrance but also to continuing legal battles with some previous owners that were expropriated. Around this time, the public opinion turned against the project and several inhabitants of Las Aguas neighbourhood created a group to oppose further interventions in the area, which was labelled ‘Do not take Las Aguas’ (No se tomen Las Aguas).

The project had effectively reached a stall only two years after being started and shortly a new downturn came its way. Due to the economic crisis in 2008, the Spanish government retreated from the project around 2010, having already invested close to €600,000. The area was left derelict in physical terms, with an enclosure surrounding the demolished area, that increased the feeling of insecurity and lowered the visual quality of the zone, all while flaunting banners related to the ‘new face of the city centre’ (Figure 23). Most importantly it caused a strong polarization between the different organisations involved, because of the way that the process was carried out.

![Image of the area after demolition](Contraloría de Bogotá, 2012)

There were several attempts to restart the project, amidst the start of a very unstable political period, in which the mayor was demoted due to a corruption scandal. In this case, the suspension resulted in two different (acting) mayors holding the seat from May 2011 until December, when the new elected mayor took position. This added to the time spent on the preceding scandal, slowed down the development processes in the whole city. By the end of this phase, the local comptroller agency had already started investigating the ERU for budget squandering (Contraloría de Bogotá, 2012).

4.2.2.1. Stakeholder Analysis

The main actors involved in this process were: The local government, represented by the ERU, and the SDH, directly and the SDP and City Council in specific moments. The Spanish
government, represented by AECID. Market parties represented by architects participating in the competition and construction companies participating in the demolition process. The community, represented by inhabitants of the sector. The latter can be classified between the owners of plots in Block 5, the rest of the owners of the area and the ‘Don’t take Las Aguas’ collective.

Figure 24. Multi-stakeholder relationships for Fenicia. Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Veto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERU</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area</td>
<td>Legal power (Expropr.), Technical knowledge, Financing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDH</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area, Manage housing provision</td>
<td>Legal power, Technical knowledge, Financing</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area</td>
<td>Technical knowledge, Legal power</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Issue regulations</td>
<td>Legal power</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptroller</td>
<td>Audit governmental operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
Type of Stakeholders
PE  Primary Stakeholder
SH  Secondary Stakeholder
WE  Wider Environment Stakeholder

Type of Relation
--- Strong
----- Ad-hoc
----- Indirect
Towards collaborative approaches in urban regeneration

Table 4. Stakeholder analysis Fenicia. Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECID</td>
<td>Impulse projects that foster development abroad</td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>Gain recognition, Produce high quality design,</td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>Economic interest</td>
<td>Technical capacity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Owners</td>
<td>Keep own houses Have a liveable neighbourhood</td>
<td>Land Ownership</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't take Las Aguas</td>
<td>Stop new developments in the area, Create a social movement</td>
<td>Legal knowledge Social support</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Keep own houses Have a liveable neighbourhood</td>
<td>Land Ownership</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Institutions</td>
<td>Improve their campus’ surroundings</td>
<td>Close relationship with the government Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.2. Relation Characterisation

It can be seen from the type of relations and the characteristics of each stakeholder, that the initial institutional set-up was made in a traditional, normative way. It was a top-down project, led by the local government in association with the Spanish agency, that was supposed to develop as a PPP (Public-Private Partnership), led and managed by the ERU. In this sense, it can be classified inside the synoptic planning perspective according to Lane (2005) and to public-investment planning, according to Galland and Hansen (2012). Additionally, if the participation of the public is taken into account, it can be said that it is a tokenistic approach, limited to informing the community.

Furthermore, while analysing the power balance it can be seen that the hierarchical scheme takes away the power from the community. Neither the market parties nor the state representatives maintain a direct relation with the inhabitants. This is evident on the short-term eviction notices, which created discontent. The veto power of the different community parties is characterised as limited, because despite the fact of having multiple instances and entities where legal action against the project could be taken, the effect of this complaints was reduced. Most of the complaints were ignored, due to the priority given to the project as part of the city development, while some others were stuck in bureaucracy.
4.2.3. Second Phase: A False Step

The second phase of the project ran parallel to the first one. It had its roots on the revision of the city POT in 2003, which marked the area adjacent to Los Andes University campus as a part of the areas available for urban regeneration. In this context, the University decided to play a leading role in the formulation of a Partial Plan for the area, taking advantage of the knowledge it had within its staff and faculties (Pinilla & Moreno, 2016).

Up until that point the development of the University was limited by the Av. Jimenez to the north, an imaginary border it had deliberately not crossed, leaving the existing neighbourhood untouched until that point. At the same time, the University had been actively renovating its physical infrastructure, which included the construction of new buildings. At this point the last big endeavour had been the Mario Laserna building, which hosts the Engineering Faculty in 2007.

Around this same time, a plot in the Fenicia area became available in the market. This particular plot hosted a parking lot and was owned by the Bavaria brewery and subsequently by the Santo Domingo Foundation. In the process of the merger between Bavaria and SABMiller, the former disposed its non-productive assets, which included the aforementioned plot. The plot was offered first to the adjacent tower complex, the Fenicia Towers, which didn’t reach an agreement on the purchase and later to Los Andes University.

The University found this spot ideal for meeting the demand for parking space, which had been increasing with the constant growth of the campus and its staff. At the same time, the Management Faculty was amidst an accreditation process that implied a modernization of their facilities. The lack of space to develop a new building called for an unusual solution, to stack the new building for the Management Faculty on top of the Parking building (A total of ten floors, of which the first six are parking levels and on top there are four mixed use stories).

The idea was well received by the University and gave them the opportunity to develop a more context conscious building, rather than a functional parking garage. To strengthen the concept, the building was equipped with classrooms, restaurants and most importantly an open exhibition area in the ground level, that could be open to the public. The façade is the same for the parking area, as well as for the other uses, making it difficult to recognize as a parking structure. This building was finished in 2007 and marked the entry of the University to the Fenicia area.

The opening year coincided with a call of the Local Government for Partial Plans for urban regeneration around the city, as part of a larger plan to stop the city expansion and reuse several areas that were derelict and to alleviate the pressure on new infrastructure that the ongoing sprawl was causing. At this point an impressive number of around 40 different projects around the city were being discussed, and Los Andes University took the opportunity to make a proposal for the Fenicia area.

A team was formed to tackle the assignment, conformed by different architecture professionals in association with a private developer firm. The latter was common strategy for the University to reduce its risks, while having a vision from an experienced company in urban development.
The regulation for Partial Plans at the time was not very detailed and mostly consisted on a delimitation of the intervention area, in which the Local Government established a set of conditions (Infrastructure, services, public functions, among others) and the PP promoter would deliver a proposal based on them.

Nevertheless, the process required a minimum of public participation, consisting in a consultation round with the inhabitants of the area, after the PP was formulated and accepted by the Local Government. Before this acceptance, there was a meeting between the University and the Government to discuss the status of some heritage buildings in the area. A group of residents assisted to this meeting to complain about the formulation of the plan and the lack of information from the University.

This marked a turning point for the project, because it was evident that the way that the project was led until that point was not working for the type of project that would be developed. A major doubt regarded the moment in which the participation process was supposed to happen, since this was designed for greenfield development, in which there are few owners and negotiations tend to be simpler. In this case, with a large number of owners, renters and different uses already in the area, the process appeared to be secretive and exclusive.

Finally, the project had entered a bureaucratic loophole in the governmental institutions, where it remained stalled for some years, before it was completely retired. By the year 2009, there was an added discontent due to this parallel two phases. On one hand, the project for Block 5 had pressured some of the inhabitants to leave the area on unfortunate conditions. On the other hand, a wider project for the area, led by the University, was conducted with a lack of participation, even if it followed all the steps required by the law.

4.2.3.1. Stakeholder Analysis

The main actor involved in this phase are Los Andes University, as an institution, and the team of professionals that developed the plan. The local government, represented by the SDP and the ERU. And the inhabitants of the Fenicia area.
Table 5. Stakeholder analysis Fenicia. Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Veto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERU</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area</td>
<td>Legal power, Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area</td>
<td>Technical knowledge, Legal power</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhabitants</td>
<td>Keep their houses</td>
<td>Land Ownership</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a liveable neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Andes University</td>
<td>Expand campus</td>
<td>Technical knowledge, Contacts, Land Ownership (2%)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve its surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Andes PP development team</td>
<td>Develop a Partial Plan according to the University requirements</td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Assist university</td>
<td>Knowledge, Contacts</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Multi-stakeholder relationships for Fenicia. Phase 2
4.2.3.2. Relation Characterisation

An initial look reveals that the number of involved actors is lesser than in the first phase and that the central figure is the Los Andes PP development team, while the government holds an important position as well. The type of relations between actors, mostly being ad-hoc or even indirect in some cases, shows the lack of cohesion of the work group as well as the lack of communication among them.

This can be characterised as a typical top-down, synoptic approach (Lane, 2005). It can be classified as a “leverage planning” approach (Galland & Hansen, 2012), aimed to be developed by a private party, with a traditional scheme.

This represented a further step in building a negative opinion of the University and the Government, from the point of view of the community. They were perceived to have a vested interested in developing the project, while ignoring the community. This added up to the failure of the Block 5 project in creating a troubled social environment in which projects would have a hard resistance from the start.

4.2.4. Third Phase: A New Beginning

A relevant factor that differentiates the Fenicia Triangle Partial Plan from others, is the fact that its promoter, Los Andes University, is also a ‘resident’ of the area. In most projects, whether they are private or public led, it is an external figure, intervening an area, and leaving afterwards. In this case, after any given project, the University will still be there and this makes for an added responsibility towards the end result. The plan is not only for their campus, but for its environment and its surroundings. A different approach was needed to carry this project along if it was ever to be made successfully, or at least reducing the resistance towards it.

At this point the University decided to stop the process and evaluate the way to move forward. The initiative came from the Management Faculty, more specifically from a professor that led the Strategy area of the faculty, named Oscar Pardo. He expressed concern over the way that the PP was being led and proposed a new strategy, based on his works for the ‘Progresa centres’. These were initiatives in other cities in the country (Bucaramanga and Barranquilla), structured by the Management Faculty, to achieve regeneration and revitalisation of city centres by having productive units close to housing units. The idea is to maintain a flow of people inside the city centres, while making them attractive to the rest of the city.

Based on these experiences the idea to create Progresa Fenicia was born. This was meant to be an entity, fuelled by the University, as put by Oscar Pardo “It is important not to treat this as a consultancy, but instead to take advantage of the capacity and the actors within the University” (M. Suarez, personal communication, April 6, 2017). It took six months to set-up an office that was made out of five different components: Social (Led by a professor of Social Responsibility of the Management Faculty), Financial (Led by a finance professor, now the dean of the Management Faculty), Legal and Public Management (Led by a professor of the Law Faculty), Technical and Urban (Led by the Campus Manager), and a Pedagogic component, which was transversal to the rest of them. All of this, led by Prof. Oscar Pardo, with the interesting fact
that while mostly being part of the Management Faculty, none of them were Business Managers by profession, rather by specialization, resulting in a multidisciplinary team from the start.

At the same time, the University knew that the area needed to be developed carefully in terms of density and land-use. Besides the benefits of having an improved surrounding, attention was given to the nature of the University’s population, it is a floating one. Both in the short term, coming and going daily, but also in the mid-term, with strong presence during the academic year and greatly reduced in holiday periods, which account for three to four months in a year. The first issue is related to car traffic, excessive densification will bring more cars (partly due to parking spaces regulation). The second is related to social and economic sustainability during low demand periods and to minimize the dependence of the area from the university.

This scheme for a future development was taken for approval to the University’s rector and board and it was well received. It fit well with the general idea to make more attractive the surrounding areas of the campus, but most importantly with the social responsibility ideal of the institution. It provided a unique chance of improving society at large, right from the physical location of the University. The plan was approved and given resources, with a milestone outline to assess its progress.

The first step taken, was to initiate a discussion between the different components of the office, to set a series of principles to proceed. First it was clear that the city is not built by architects and developers, but rather by social actions. Second, social actors have knowledge that is valuable to the process. Third, it is relevant to design an urban regeneration program in which the actual inhabitants can stay in the area. This last point was critical that it was considered the main issue with the first approach. This is explained as follows: “when you start a typical project approach, and you have urban plans and building designs, and show a 60-story apartment tower to the inhabitants of the area, they don’t see themselves in the project, they feel attacked, and the reaction will be to defend themselves, to avoid participation”

Starting with this approach, the first phase of the project started, a process of building trust. This was a key issue, as mentioned before. If the objective was to include a wider part of the population (ideally all of it), a proper setting for discussion and sharing ideas was first to be laid down. The following course of events took almost two years to be completed.

There were three levels of collaboration. First, plenary sessions, aimed to the people in the neighbourhood, but open to anyone in the city. They were meant to broadcast the idea behind a Partial Plan, the concept of collaboration and the necessity of creating a group that included everyone in order to start discussing the project. Second, there were focus groups. These were smaller meetings, that tried to identify common interests between the different actors (E.g. home owners, retail owners, renters), and bring them together to understand their point of view. Finally, there were meetings with individuals, to discuss particular situations (E.g. problems with land ownership or land titles).

A key issue that arose in the first sessions with the joint groups, especially those of the Architecture Faculty, was the type of language to be used in such a diverse setting. A step towards the recognition of the heterogeneity of the involved actors implied breathe possible
distance between members with vastly different backgrounds, in order to convey the ideas and concepts that were being discussed. A clear example of this came in one of the plenary sessions in which a neighbour responded to the idea of ‘social construction’ by clarifying that she “was not willing to lay down a brick” (M. Suarez, personal communication, April 6, 2017).

Trust was built through conversations, but also through agreements. An example is the limitation that was set from the beginning to the amount of area that the University would occupy in the new development, of maximum 15% of the total. This means on one hand that the rest, that is 85%, is meant for different uses (Housing, retail, offices, hotel, etc.), but it also dismisses the common conception of the objective of Los Andes being to take over the whole sector.

In the same way, the University waived the right to a profit form the development, a right established by the law for any urban development promoter. This was the way of saying that they were not there to gain a monetary profit from the process, but rather that the investments that were being made, would be returned through externalities (Improvement of the area). Additionally, some of the decisions made during the collaboration processes put an economic stress to the project, reducing the possible profit (when compared to a traditional development) and this represented a way to partially relieving this aspect.

A key aspect of the process of building trust in this point is the creation of a series of social programs by the University, that stand independent to the project, and that aim to construct a community, taking into account the permanence of both actors in the area and the common objective of attaining a better quality in the future. These programs are fourfold. First, a School Aid, for the elementary level kids, in which university students help them with homework and additional lessons. Second, a Foundation for Job, directed to young adults, providing formation in a technical career. Third, Fenicia Entrepreneurship, aimed to the business owners, directed by the Management Faculty and providing education similar to an MBA. Finally, IT education for older people.

Given the proximity of the University to the project, especially before the emission of regulations from the state. The necessity of a mediator in the process of participative planning was required. This role was fulfilled by the City Overseer (Veeduria Distrital). There was scepticism before their arrival, because they could hamper the progress made, but they proved to be a valuable addition and finally gave legitimacy to the process, that so far was (intentionally) kept very informal. This was due to the fact that strict control over the discussions and particularly over attendance, was an obstacle for creating a stronger bond between the University and the community. Nevertheless, at this point the requirement to document the agreements came as a concluding act to this initial phase.

After a first agreement was reached, the matter was taken to the government for the PP to be evaluated. After a set of discussions with the different agencies a final agreement was reached, which is reflected in the adoption of the 420 Decree, the official regulation for the Fenicia Triangle Partial Plan. This is a major milestone for the project, both because it proved to be a success in terms of collaboration, but also because it meant positive progress towards the detailed planning that would follow.
An important lesson for the involved actors at that point was to understand the heterogeneity of the participating group. This meant not only to understand different interests coming from different organizations, but most importantly, the (sometimes substantial) differences within the organisations. This is true for the community, the University and the government. First, the community is made out of people with different socioeconomic conditions. Furthermore, they can be classified, broadly, depending on their property tenure. There are owners of houses (two-story adobe houses and two- and three-story houses built of concrete and brick), owners of apartments in condominiums, owners of commerce units, owners of parking lots. There are renters, in formal agreements but also living in tenement buildings. Finally, there are inhabitants without a legal ownership and public space invaders.

Second, the University is made out of different parts. There is an academic population, made out mostly of professors, which can be further divided in faculties or even in research groups. There is a student population, that is not homogeneous, and in which there are individuals interested in the project, some even participating actively, and others that are not. There is also an administrative area.

Third, the government is made out of different institutions, some of them working with the same objective, such as the ERU, the SDP and the SDH, but that may not agree on specific subjects. At the same time, there are other institutions whose objective is to exert control, such as the Overseer (Veeduría Distrital). And figures, such as the mayor, that can influence the decision of the above. Furthermore, the different processes in each institution can interfere with one another or be hampered by externalities.

In retrospective, actors agree that the new Urban Plan is not even that different to the one that was already proposed in the second phase, by the Architecture Faculty. However, it is not a matter of physical design, but rather of legitimacy. The new design is the result of a discussion between different actors and a series of agreements among them. Even if not everyone agrees with little details, they agree on the final result. That makes a substantial difference in the acceptance of the plan.

4.2.4.1. Stakeholder Analysis

This phase of the process had a substantial increase in the level of collaboration as well as the number of parties involved in the process. In order to understand the different positions the relations will be explored in different levels. First a general one and then detailed organizational schemes. This is due to the complexity of the networks that were established in this period and the multiple relations between different organisations.

The main organisations involved were the following. On the government’s side, there was the ERU, the SDH, the SDP as well as the Overseer Agency (Veeduría Distrital) and the Mayor. On the community side, there are house owners, house renters, apartment owners (on condominiums) and informal inhabitants. Furthermore, there’s a group of dissident inhabitants, represented by the ‘No se tomen Las Aguas’ committee. On the market side, there are architects and business owners (commerce and parking lots). Finally, on hybrid roles there’s the University, with Progresa Fenicia, the rector in head of the administration, students involved and those who are not. There is also ProBono, the legal advice company.
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Figure 26. Multi-stakeholder relationships for Fenicia. Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Veto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERU</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area</td>
<td>Legal power (Expropr.)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDH</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area, Manage housing provision</td>
<td>Legal power</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Impulse regeneration projects in the area</td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Execute gov. program, Show results</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseer Agency</td>
<td>Guarantee the legitimacy of the processes</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guarantee participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House owners</td>
<td>Improve living conditions, Profit from project</td>
<td>Land Ownership</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- **Type of Stakeholders**
  - PE: Primary Stakeholder
  - SH: Secondary Stakeholder
  - WE: Wider Environment Stakeholder
- **Type of Relation**
  - Strong
  - Ad-hoc
  - Indirect
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge &amp; Contexts</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment owners</td>
<td>Improve living conditions, Profit from project</td>
<td>Land Ownership</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House or Apartment renters</td>
<td>Secure housing situation, Improve living conditions</td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenement house renters</td>
<td>Improve living conditions</td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal inhabitants</td>
<td>Legalize their situation, Improve living conditions</td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t take Las Aguas</td>
<td>Stop urban projects in the area, Maintain and improve current living standards</td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bussiness owners</td>
<td>Improve profit</td>
<td>Land Ownership</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>Improve city through design, Gain recognition</td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Andes University</td>
<td>Improve surroundings, Expand campus</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>Create an equitable project, Create a liveable urban area</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>Manage the university</td>
<td>Decision power</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students involved</td>
<td>Have liveable campus and surroundings</td>
<td>Context knowledge</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (Gen.)</td>
<td>Have liveable campus and surroundings</td>
<td>Social influence</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProBono</td>
<td>Solve ownership issues</td>
<td>Technical knowledge</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Defend the rights of minorities

Table 6. Stakeholder analysis Fenicia. Phase 3

4.2.4.2. Relation Characterisation

Taking into account the stakeholder analysis from the first phase, it can be clearly seen that the second phase is much more complex in terms of relations among actors as well as the amount of them that gain legitimacy and veto power. This is due to the collaborative nature of the project, especially when it comes to the agreements between the community and the University and those between the community and the Government.

In this sense, the project can be classified, according to Lane (2005) inside the pluralistic approach to planning and more specifically as a communicative approach. This stems from the less hierarchical organization and the amount of direct relations between members of different backgrounds.

The complexity of the network is also explained in the processes that are taking place. This is the moment in which the framework for collaboration is established and therefore it requires for an intense discussion, prior to the planning activity, per se.

4.2.5. Fourth Phase: From the Paper to the Practice

After the key milestone represented by the legal action of the government, the organisation of Progresa Fenicia also changed to accommodate its new objectives. Starting from 2015 the project had a new manager, with a more private oriented background and an overseeing board, made of representatives from large developer companies and financiers (Amarilo, Ospinas, Prodesa, Titularizadora de Valores). This structure is meant to help decision processes oriented towards the commercial success of the project, taking as a starting point the achievements in the social aspect of the previous phase.

The signature of the Decree which gave way to the development of the project was the first milestone in the process. However, a mere signature does not build an urban plan. The decree effectively changes the regulation for the area, establishing a new set of rules, a framework for a new development, but it is not a detailed design. It is the starting point of a process, that is secured by a legal action.

This process started with a new stage of technical studies, beyond the general definitions of the decree, in a path towards a more concrete project. Among these first steps there was a round of collaborative design, focused on defining the actual type of buildings, public spaces, mix of uses in each block. This process was led by a professor of the architecture faculty and his design bureau. The main issue that was discussed was the treatment of public space, common areas of the new condominiums, which are semi-private areas, and to a lesser extent, private areas.

This process also includes a test fit of the proposed areas, checking the density, building heights, separation between building units, ratio of different uses, among others. From these
meetings, the architectural team worked in a series of plans and visualisations, to start shaping the image of the future project, which can be seen in the following figure.

![Visualization of the product of participative design workshops.](image)

As mentioned before, the decree only sets the framework for the development project, but the Urban Action Unit is the actual instrument to execute this new regulation. It gives powers to the governmental institutions to purchase properties or to start eviction processes when necessary. An UAU can be limited to a single block or a limited area of a Partial Plan, which is the case for Fenicia. This is done in order to set clear phases for the development and manage different developments separately. The first emitted unit in the area, aptly named the 1st UAU, was given a green light on March 2016.

A key step to start any permit request in the City is related to the ownership of the land, more specifically to the agreement between the owners of the land, to pursue such a request. The common instrument used to legitimize this agreement is a commercial trust scheme, in which an ‘autonomous patrimony or estate’ is formed, out of the contributions from the different actors (Landowners, the project promoter, investors and the city government represented by the ERU), and from where the profits are later distributed, according to the agreements set on the PP (Pinilla & Moreno, 2016).

This process is ongoing in the present, lacking the signatures of some of the actors involved in the project, namely the promoter. This is due to a long decision process inside the University, that threatens the results reached so far with the process, because it causes uncertainty among the other actors and brings back the ghosts of distrust between the different parties. When this trust is established the construction will have a green light, so a parallel duty of the project is
to present it to private parties, to select a market party that would provide a final proposal and execute it. This is an ongoing process as well and its outcome remains to be seen.

4.2.5.1. Stakeholder Analysis

For this phase, the actors involved are reduced in number, mainly due to the agreements that were achieved during the previous phase, which allows for a generalisation in certain groups, such as the inhabitants, divided in those who agree on the project and those who stand against it. This includes the owners of business units. Furthermore, in the government side, the decisions are limited to the institutions directly involved with the project, keeping the mayor as a power figure, due to the switch of electoral periods. The University side has an added figure, which is the board. Finally, a private market party appears, to shift to an execution process.

This phase represents a stabilization of the tumultuous relations of phase 3. As such it continues to be within the communicative tradition (Lane, 2005), and more specifically as a collaborative organisation. This can be seen in the multiple strong connections between different stakeholders, but also in the appearance of ad-hoc relations whose function is to maintain the stability of the project, mostly by guaranteeing its legitimacy.

It is also clear that Progresa Fenicia acts as a leader figure in this stage. This leadership, however does not imply a larger decision power, which is reflected on the veto power of the other agents.

Nevertheless, a more hierarchical organisation can be seen within the organisations and that is related to the internal decision-making processes. A clear example is the appearance of the board of counsellors in Progresa Fenicia, or the influence of the Mayor towards the Planning
and Habitat agencies and their subsidiaries. Their power is countered by the fact that they are not primary actors and therefore are not involved in day-to-day decision making.

4.2.6. Future Developments

After the incorporation of a private party in the project, the construction phase of the 1st UAU can be started, making the whole process visible for the wider population of the city. This will represent a major milestone in the project and will set the framework for the process that will be carried with the other UAUs.

The shift to a commercial trust will mean a shift in leadership from the University to a private market party, which will in turn become the responsible for the project and its execution, in each UAU. Its relevant to mention that while the University will keep a presence as part of the trust, its decision power will decrease and a new relationship needs to be formed with the oncoming developer. This will prove to be a challenge for the future phases.

Figure 28. Possible structure for the future developments

4.2.7. Parallel Developments: Different Approaches

The project for the Fenicia Triangle is only one of the several regeneration projects that are being executed in the city centre of Bogotá, as previously mentioned. One of the projects that has been developed in parallel is that of Block 5, the area that concerned the first phase of the project and that was not included in the PP (See section 4.2.2 First Phase: A Rough Start). The lacking condition of the area became a focus for the government and developers alike. It worked as a testbed for a different type of agreement, a more traditional Public-Private arrangement (PPP), in which each part develops a project in the two plots of the area.
The long experience of both the government and the private parties in projects with this type of mediation, along with a legal framework built around the figure of the PPPs, allowed for this area to be developed in a prompter manner.

The project consists of a block, divided in two plots, one for a private development and one for a public building. The first is a housing complex, that comprises three high rise towers for a total of 1800 inhabitants. The project is aimed towards students, professors and researchers of Los Andes University, and one of the towers is used exclusively by the University, while the remaining two remain open to the market. Furthermore, it includes commercial premises (Restaurants, pharmacy, stationery, banks, hairdressers, supermarkets) and additional services (study rooms, TV rooms, entertainment rooms, gym, laundry premises).

Figure 29. Block 5 and Ongoing projects

The second one corresponds to a public building, the city cinemathéque, a film museum with educational and cultural projections, summing up to 5,000m2 of new buildings. This is the result of a public design competition.

Figure 30. Visualization of the ongoing projects
5. Data Analysis

The following chapter presents the findings of the interviews with the different actors of the project. The aim of this phase of the research was to gain insight of the perceptions of the different parties of the process and understand how organisations interacted with each other as well as within each of them. This part of the process aims to answer the main research question, namely:

- What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?

In order to do so, it addresses the following sub questions, highlighting the key observations made in each subject:

- What phases can be identified in the process and what milestones mark the change from one to the other?
- What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?
- How do these actors relate to each other?
- How is power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?

Furthermore, the empirical research covered a wide gamut of subjects and was characterised by its open nature, giving way to new insights on previously unforeseen factors. These new readings on the process are summarized in a separate section. The objective of these reflections is to find the differences between the practice and the theory and to grasp the methods of concept application in different contexts.

The information is presented in tables that summarize the recurrent themes mentioned by the authors, exemplified by quotes or general phrases used during the interviews. In order to better understand the type of responses, a reference to the interview schedule can be seen in Appendix C (Interview Guide). A brief discussion over the findings is presented for each subject. Furthermore, the conclusions of this section are addressed in chapter 8 (Conclusions, 8.1 Key Findings).

5.1. Phasing

The approach to the process of the ‘Fenicia Triangle’ regeneration project started with a fact checking exercise. This required building up a timeline for the process, cross checking facts from different sources, in order to create a storyline, presented in Section 4.2 (The Fenicia Triangle). The objective was not solely to build a compelling story, but to identify the different moments in which organisations and relations changed, that is to track time as a key variable of collaboration. For this purpose, the following question was addressed ‘What phases can be identified in the process and what milestones mark the change from one to the other?’. The responses to the different questions assessing this matter are collected under the theme Phasing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Majority Reports (agreements)</th>
<th>Minority Reports (divergence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Quote (Examples)</td>
<td>Attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing</td>
<td>“the internal organisation at Progresa Fenicia has changed recently, before it was in charge of the campus management, now there is a board. It changes the way we relate” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the different profiles of the leaders have been a result of the project’s needs; each stage has had the leader it needs” HO-PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestones are determined by legal acts</td>
<td>“a key moment was the signature of the Partial Plan decree, from then on the project had legal power” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Every milestone has been legal, they’ve set the pace. First the decree 420 in 2015 and now the Action Unit in 2016” HO-PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about the future</td>
<td>“The situation has been neglected lately and people are starting to get preoccupied” COM</td>
<td>Expectations help marketing the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The project is caught in a bureaucratic loophole, it’s not a”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
priority right now”
HO-PF

“Stall in the last years. Lack of decision. Conditions are defined but a final step is lacking”
HO-PF

“Times can be optimized. The process has been delayed much longer than expected, since it is not a central issue in the University’s agenda, this delays decision-making”
HO-PF

Table 7. Key characteristics of collaborative planning. Phasing

The first topic to analyse while recovering the data from the interviews is the notion of time in the project. This is a relevant issue, given the fact that urban (re)development projects are medium to long-term endeavours (Bailey, 2012) and relations are highly dynamic (Healey, 2006; Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004). Therefore, a key factor that facilitates the understanding of collaborative structures is identifying turning points along the development of the process in which relations and organisations change.

The case of the Fenicia Triangle has had four clear stages up until this moment. The first stage had an unclear start and ending, due to its tortuous development and to the fact that it was single handed by the government. This last point results relevant when defining the type of interactions that can take place, which results evident in the stakeholder analysis previously conducted. The lack of agreement regarding the different conflicts impedes the evolution of the phase and thus, the identification of milestones related to institutional change.

For the later phases, as well as for the future endeavours of the project, the definition of the change results clearer. A new phase starts with a change in organisational structure, thus a change in the project’s governance and has a clear end with a legal act. This reflects two major aspects of the planning process. On one hand, the importance of working towards a stable communication environment and, on the other, the legitimacy of the legal protection over the discussions that take place in the duration of such phase.

The second phase stands as a failed attempt to achieve a communication environment, due in part to the approach of the planning team and in part to the existing legislation regarding the nature of public participation. It’s start can be placed with the formation of the technical team and its end with a failed legal act, hindered by the public protests. From this point onwards, there is a relevant change in the governance structure in favour of a less hierarchical one.
This is the case for the third phase. Its start can be roughly defined by the formation of the team that conducted the discussions with the community and the government. This marked a departure from the top-down approach that characterised the first two phases. The results of the process in this phase are legitimised by the Partial Plan decree signature, which confers legal obligations to the agreements reached until that moment. It represents a turning point due to the fact that the nature of the following discussions changes considerably.

For the ongoing fourth phase, the key element to sign its ending would be the signing of a contract between a private party, in this case a developer, and the ‘autonomous fund’ that needs to be created among the land owners in the project. This effectively gives start to the construction phase, for each of the Urban Action Units of the project.

It was clear from the responses of the different participants, that the moments that were considered as milestones differed greatly depending on their role in the project. For the individuals in charge of creating and maintaining communication channels, the variation between different organisational structures (E.g. From hierarchical to horizontal and between a limited group of participants to an extended stakeholder participation) represents a turning point. At the same time, for those in charge of technical aspects, the legal acts give legitimacy to the soft and unmeasurable work carried out in the discussion sessions.

5.2. Stakeholder Participation

A key element of collaborative planning and network governance is that of participation. In this context, participation it’s understood as the active involvement of (all or most of) the relevant stakeholders during the different phases of the process. Therefore, the focus is twofold, on the involvement of a large part of the individuals or organisations that are affected directly by the project; and, on the nature of their participation. The question was formulated around this concept: ‘What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?’ It results relevant to understand if the position of actors pertaining to different sectors of society (E.g. Market, Community, Government) had similar perceptions regarding the overall organisation and governance of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Majority Reports (agreements)</th>
<th>Minority Reports (divergence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Quote (Examples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Participation</td>
<td>Participation Initiatives</td>
<td>“It was important for the community to understand the project, so I became a sort of leader, to help them get information” COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The support of the city was attracted in order to create a..." COM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of initial involvement</th>
<th>&quot;Not everyone would attend to these workshops, but they would attend other activities that not necessarily were part of the ‘planning’ process. But they helped creating the right environment to initiate further dialogues” HO-PF</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lack of initial involvement&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not everyone would attend the collaborative planning workshops, even if there was participation, you’d see that the same people would come over and over” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;There had been an initial workshop round. The key question was: why do people don’t&quot; HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pilot initiative that would clear the doubts surrounding urban regeneration” HO-PF

“We started meeting with people block by block, because we realized most of the inhabitants didn’t know about the project. This was a heavy fieldwork” HO-PF

“The process allowed the community to organize itself and have a voice” HO-PF

None

None
Table 8. Key characteristics of collaborative planning. Stakeholder Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enablers</th>
<th>GOV</th>
<th>HO-PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Overseer was a key element as mediator”</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Participation of the overseer meant to formalize the process. Later they became mediators, especially with the opposition”</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Importance of the presence of the Overseer as a mediator”</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Presence of the Overseer was key to legitimize the process”</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the presence of key people with knowledge in different areas helped the project”</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process of verification of the initial condition for collaboration set in the research concluded with positive findings. The necessary involvement of different parts of society was
particularly effective after phase 2, that is when the efforts where located into making a horizontal organization.

The process, however, was not a simple one. Albeit an open invitation stood for the different participants from the beginning, there were two key elements that hindered its application. First, a lack of interest in the project, fuelled by lack of knowledge of its content. This was particularly true for the community, that avoided expressing its opinion deliberately in the first meetings. Second, a lack of trust between the different parties, that kept them from initiating a fruitful discussion. This had two different motivations, on one hand, bad experiences from the past and, on the other, lack of experience in this kind of processes.

It remained clear that not every actor involved in the process came as a direct affected of the project. Such is the case of the Overseer, which became a figure of legitimacy and process safeguarding, that lacked within the involved actors. In spite of being an external actor (moving from a wider environment actor to a secondary stakeholder, according to the stakeholder analysis previously executed), its presence enabled the correct development of the process.

5.3. Actor Relations

In order to better understand how the obstacles to collaboration were overcome, a deeper analysis needs to be made on the relations among the different actors. This is the key focus of the research and seeks to understand the necessary steps to achieve networked organisations able to plan and execute a (re)development program. The main question guiding this section is therefore: ‘How do these actors relate to each other?’. The main objective is to understand the different relational dynamics that make up a collaborative process, in order to compare them with traditional structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Majority Reports (agreements)</th>
<th>Minority Reports (divergence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Quote (Examples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>(Initial) Lack of trust between the actors</td>
<td>&quot;the University was not seen as a friend of the community, but more as an invader&quot; COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;the community felt that the University had hidden interests, there was no trust for the project&quot; HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building trust and processes that help to increase trust</td>
<td>“The project was received with scepticism by the community, that didn’t see the renovation as necessary”</td>
<td>GOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“trust doesn’t mean that we agree, trust means that we can talk and that we are available to discuss”</td>
<td>HO-PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Building trust is related to close relationships. Social work needs a high level of relatability.”</td>
<td>HO-PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“social programs were important to build connections with the community, without having to discuss the project”</td>
<td>HO-PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the social programs that were integrated into the project were very important to start building trust”</td>
<td>HO-PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator for negotiations</td>
<td>“without the work of concertation, consultation and trust, it wouldn’t be possible to talk about the negotiations in the way it’s done today”</td>
<td>HO-PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the process of informing the society and discussing the”</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats to trust</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Stall in the last years. Lack of decision. Conditions are defined but a final step is lacking” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Switch to execution has been too slow, because of a conflict of interests” COM</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“current stall creates uncertainty and fuels the opposition” COM</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication issues</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“there was a problem with the language, it was too technical for the community to understand” COM</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There was a communication problem. People were not understanding the project” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There were Problems with communication. A difference in interests” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Explaining the costs associated to the project to everyone is a challenge, especially with such a diverse population” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“discovering that many dwellers were not properly informed about the project” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Process of informing the society and discussing the project was important for gaining trust and reaching an agreement with the community” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Not everyone would attend to these workshops, but they would attend other activities that not necessarily were part of the ‘planning’ process. But they helped creating the right environment to initiate further dialogues” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting interests, personal vs general interests</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion with the government was good, especially given the characteristics of the project</strong> HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not everything can be subject of a joint decision, but everyone needs to be informed about decisions that will be made</strong> HO</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“an important factor was the fact that the community had a say and communicated their interests”</strong> GOV</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The value of the first collaborative workshops is the fact that the people participated, giving validity to the process</strong> HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“The process allowed the community to organize itself and have a voice”</strong> HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“There was a need to inform the people better, in order to understand their position and their interests”</strong> HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“an important issue is the mix of general interests and personal desires and expectations”</strong> HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Very heterogeneous neighbourhood with</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clashing Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Community is heterogeneous. Homeowners do not have the same interests as renters or as business owners” Gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Personal interests were more important than global objectives in the beginning and that was hard to change. It meant a change in mentality” Com

Table 9. Key characteristics of collaborative planning. Actor Relations

The process of developing stable relations between actors in collaborative processes has two main components that are interrelated. On one hand, a process of building trust among the different parties and, on the other, an effective communication among these stakeholders. These two elements exist in relation to one another, forming a cycle. Good communication brings about trust and, in turn, the latter enhances communication. The opposite can be said when one of the two is hindered, creating a vicious circle that can impair the entire process.

A particular condition of this project lies on the excess of distrust among the different parties. This lack of trust is rooted mainly on socioeconomic differences, of which a clear example is the conception of one another between the community and Los Andes University. Besides these differences, there is a general lack of trust in the government and a lack of trust in the capacities of other actors. The sector of society that felt the largest risk with the project was the community, that felt an asymmetry of power when confronted with the University or with the government and felt the possibility to be treated unfairly. This situation makes it more relevant to study the different interactions, in order to overcome such difficulties.

The most relevant change that the different parties perceived, when going from the second to the third phase, was related to the intense process of building trust that needed to be made in order to start any discussions. The process of creating an arena in which the different actors can have a say is essential. This is explained by Koppenjan and Klijn (2004) as follows: “The complexity of these issues gives rise to arenas of interaction: actors are forced to operate in the context of strategic games and networks that are new to them and in which their standard operating procedures are no longer adequate”.

Therefore, a successful process of building trust, is one in which the different stakeholders adapt to the new context and create a network of interaction in which communication can be given. In this case, there was a twofold approach. On one hand related to the project, creating
arenas for technical discussion, where the interests of the different parties could be exposed. On the other hand, creating arenas for different types of interaction, which can be sustained outside of the specific project scope. This last point is particularly relevant when taking into account the long-term duration of the project. An example of this are the social programs created by the university, which were not necessary and are no longer tied to the physical renovation of the area, but remain relevant to strengthen the relation among the different inhabitants of the sector, both individuals and organisations.

It is relevant to emphasize that this is not a one-way process and previously gained trust can be easily lost if the project fails to deliver to the different parties. An important part of the planning process is concerned with building (realistic) expectations over what might happen and most particularly over when this might happen. Therefore, uncertainty is presented as the biggest impediment to maintaining trust among the involved parties.

A consequence of the process of trust building is the opening of new communication channels, that allow for the different interests to be discussed. However, not only trust is necessary in order for these discussions to be fruitful, as can be exemplified by the initial problems within Fenicia. The setting of discussion scenarios is the first step, but a common language for the discussions needs to be set. There can be large differences in levels of education and levels of expertise within certain subjects, that limit the transmission of information among parties. Again, the large socioeconomic differences within the project were one of the motives for these discrepancies.

Once this problem is solved, the main issue regarding the discussions is the identification of different interests and subsequent alignment towards a common objective within the framework of the project. This process presents the largest number of obstacles in any kind of collaborative project, because an agreement is not attainable in every situation or the strategies to achieve it fail. This doesn’t mean that every single individual must agree on a single objective and have a shared interest over the project. It means that the possibilities to discuss each position are given and the different stakeholders can compromise on the actions to take towards the benefit of the project.

Furthermore, the increasing number of actors involved renders this discussion scenarios hard to manage and increases the amount of diverse opinions (MacGuire, 2006). The response to this problem was to have discussions at different scales and in different arenas, which in turn concerned interests at different levels. This means, that discussions were carried at the same time with all the involved stakeholders, with groups of shared interests, with groups sharing the same expertise and finally, with individuals. However, this process comes with a drawback, since it implies additional time invested to collect and discuss points of view. This increased duration implies an additional financial investment, represented on the human capital responsible for this task within the different organisations, as well as the facilities and tools necessary.

This can be a critical factor in the applicability of collaborative methods in future endeavours, when the involved parties do not consider necessary the investment in developing adequate relations with each other and instead chose to stick to the status quo. For this case, as it can be
seen in other collaborative ventures, the time and capital spent on creating a stable network represents an improved process during the execution phase (E.g. Adams & Tiesdell, 2013; Ansell & Gash, 2008; Desfor & Jørgensen, 2004; Harada & Jørgensen, 2016; Healey, 1998; Hopkins, 2010; Provan & Kenis, 2008).

Both positive and negative aspects can be retrieved in the Fenicia case. First, the efforts to regain trust among the different parties was highly effective, and possible through new channels of communication. These channels were used to discuss the technical aspects of the project and, in turn, increased the trust among the different parties. At the same time, the integration of market parties, such as developers, as well as new members inside the organisation (i.e. the new directing board) question the method of execution, comparing it to the efficiency of traditional contracting.

5.4. Power Structures

The initial research focus contemplated the analysis of a theoretically flat, self-organizing structure, that would be in concordance with collaborative governance and network theories. This proved to be wrong first in a deeper theoretical exploration (E.g. MacGuire, 2006) and later, and more evidently, in the empirical study. This initial approach ignored a key element of the interaction between members of distinct parts of society, as well as individuals within organisations, which is related to power distribution and its dynamics in a project. Consequently, a research sub question addresses the aforementioned topic: ‘How is power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?’.

Although this question is deeply related to the previously discussed theme on how actors relate to each other, it represents the biggest departure from the theoretical field and contributed to new insights in the research. From the interviews, two main issues arose. First, the relevance of leadership and the different figures it may have. Second, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Majority Reports (agreements)</th>
<th>Minority Reports (divergence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Quote (Examples)</td>
<td>Attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power structures</td>
<td>Positive Initiatives</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(quoting Oscar Pardo’s vision)</em> “my dream is to be able to say in 2025 that, thanks to Los Andes University, the families in the area and the neighbours will have better life conditions” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“University sees the opportunity of starting a new”</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators and leaders</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A professor in the Management Faculty, Oscar Pardo came forward with the proposal to use a different strategy for the development&quot; HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would say that the Management faculty initiated the process&quot; HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;in the beginning, there’s a clear leadership from Oscar Pardo&quot; HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;it’s important to have a fluent connection with the government. The clear leader in this aspect was Juan Felipe Pinilla&quot; HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The leaders at the different&quot;</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Government institutions agreed on the objectives that were pursued in the project, as concepts for urban regeneration. This was a key factor to generate the regulations applicable to these projects.”

Shifts in governance schemes

“There are times when there is a more horizontal relationship, but at other times you have to take the lead, according to the milestones of each project. It is not static.”

Leadership is a key factor. First a charismatic leader to start the project […] then a leader with technical knowledge […] now a leader that understands the language of the market.”

Individuals vs. organizations

“The people involved make a big difference. The project has survived 4 Mayors, 2 Rectors and 3 different managers and the idea behind it has been maintained”

“This is a matter of the people rather than institutions. Institutions are the same, but attitudes”
Table 10. Key characteristics of collaborative planning. Power Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character of the organisations</th>
<th>“name and prestige of the University has facilitated the process” HO-PF</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Importance of the University as a promoter. In order to safeguard the interests of the different parties” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We have a particularity, we are urban regeneration promoters who live in the area to be regenerated. That changes everything. We’re going to be both responsible and beneficiaries of what happens with the urban regeneration process” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the vision of the University was a relevant factor” GOV</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“importance of the University as a promoter, because of its influence and contacts” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the participation of different parts of society, collaboration is characterized by a distribution in power, shifting from hierarchical structures, to more horizontal ones. During the
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It remained clear that, while the decision power is shared among a large number of organizations and decisions are taken after discussing, there needs to be a clear objective to aim for and a figure of leadership that enables the project to move forward.

Therefore, leadership is a key factor for collaboration in two ways. First, collaboration does not emerge on its own, especially when the context calls for the use of more traditional, hierarchical approaches. This means that initiative has to exist, coming either from an individual or an organization, that lays the foundations to start a project. Second, each phase of the project has objectives that are better tackled by someone with a given expertise. This figure is not a decision maker, but rather a conductor or pacesetter, that helps to set common objectives and guides the project towards them. This might include providing a framework, facilitating negotiations, providing technical knowledge, among others. “These individuals bring to the networks not only their agency’s resource based power, but also their willingness to make the network succeed in solving difficult problems” (McGuire & Agranoff, 2011).

As MacGuire (2006) conveys, “the presence of a lead organization, acting as system controller or facilitator, is often a critical element of effectiveness in collaborative management”. In the Fenicia project this figure can be seen shifting in different levels, between organisations and within organisations. First, the negotiation process that has been carried out in phases 3 and 4 has been leaded by Los Andes University in general and the Progresa Fenicia organisation, in particular, which remains clear not only on the stakeholder analyses, but also in the testimonials of the different actors.

However, this leadership has not been static and has been personified by different individuals along the development. A first leader was Oscar Pardo, who initiated the process and determined the institutional change towards collaboration. Following this, leadership was vested on the Project’s management, represented by the campus director, Maurix Suarez. More recently, leadership was transferred to a new director, German Castellanos. This structure is also prone to change as soon as the development starts to be executed, transferring the leadership to the developers as organisations, and to the project managers as individuals.

At the same time, leadership within the processes that make up for the general project prove to be a key factor, albeit less evident than the abovementioned head leadership. This is vested in individuals that coordinate certain components of the project or that help to bring a group of people together, in order to foster participation, discussion, among others. A clear example of the latter is the head of the Local Council, German Madrid, which identified a lack of cohesion within the different groups of inhabitants of the area and worked towards eliminating the asymmetry of information that characterised the initial stages. At the same time, coordinators of the social programs within the Progresa Fenicia organisation were key to establish communication channels between the University and the community, that eased the communication in more formal arenas.

In any of the cases, the major hindrance that was cited by the different stakeholders, regardless of their position within the broad societal classification, was the alignment of individual and collective interests. Again, the large number of organisations involved hampers the task of
aligning the conflicting opinions. Nevertheless, the effective leadership of the different organisations moved the project forward, despite the presence of an ever-diminishing opposition.

Finally, it’s worth mentioning that a determining factor for the realisation of the project lies on the existent power structures of the wider environment in which it develops. This is explained by the favourable position of Los Andes University, in relation to the local government as well as the private sector. The use of an existing network and the access to decision arenas that other stakeholders might not have access or might ignore its existence, positively influenced the project. Furthermore, it was influential in its role as a leading organisation, represented by Progresa Fenicia.

5.5. Other Factors

The objective of conducting semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions was chosen purposely to dig into external factors that were not taken into account in the previous sections. This strategy had two objectives. First to test the validity of the theoretical approaches and more specifically, the scope of communication theory in urban planning. Second, to retrieve important factors that lie beyond the theoretical framework in which the research was conducted. In this sense, this section contributes to answer the main research question: ‘What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Majority Reports (agreements)</th>
<th>Minority Reports (divergence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Factors</td>
<td>Social sustainability</td>
<td>Scope of the (social) project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“social programs are a key part for understanding the diversity of the community” HO-PF</td>
<td>“the issue of social responsibility of the project is not ambitious enough. It’s different to have social responsibility for the University than for the project” HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Importance of social programs not only for the project but for the community” COM</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Social aspects of the project are very positive, even if they represent a negative impact in the financial aspect” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The idea is not to make only to make buildings and public space, but to continue with the social process” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The power of the social programs is reflected on the”</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy instruments</th>
<th>“A key achievement was the establishment of a new regulation for ‘charges and benefits distribution’” GOV</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Biggest example of their disposition of the government is the Decree 446, which regulates the new conditions for ‘charges and benefits distribution’ in regeneration projects, as a result of the work done in Fenicia” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Importance of the discussion to achieve a different type of ‘charges and benefits distribution’” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The exchange on 1:1 ratio was a big achievement. But it generated several discussions in the group. Mainly on how it was going to be financed” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“An achievement of the project is to balance the benefits to the different users” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentrification</td>
<td>“The prospective improvement of life conditions motivates people to stay” HO-PF</td>
<td>Spatial Limitations</td>
<td>“The limits of the PP are too strict and limit the intervention while having areas that require attention nearby” HO-PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The objective is to make a project that will benefit everyone in the area, the University and the surroundings. The people need to stay” HO-PF</td>
<td>Scope limitations</td>
<td>“Concern about gentrification without pressure. People take profit and leave voluntarily” HO-PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It is important to understand that a physical change does not entail an instant improvement in their socioeconomic position. It’s necessary to establish protective measures to counter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>Threats coming from the market</td>
<td>“New priority is to gather resources, but this can come with a social cost if it’s not well managed” (AMP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The financial side of the project is an issue. The social sustainability aspect comes at a high price” HO-PF</td>
<td>Threats coming from the market</td>
<td>“New priority is to gather resources, but this can come with a social cost if it’s not well managed” (AMP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A project of this type doesn’t work only on social aspects. Commercial aspects are equally relevant. If the project doesn’t have economic sustainability it won’t be done” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If the project is not embraced by the private parties, it will forever remain as one of the initiatives that had a great potential but failed” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Developers do not receive a community to work with, they receive service land to build on” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The biggest challenge is to create a truly mixed urban area, in social and economic terms” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The opportunity came from regulation: There are areas defined to be regenerated and it should be done though a Partial Plan” GOV</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“opportunity presented in the new regulation” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There was an opportunity due to the change on regulation” HO-PF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The government also saw an opportunity of renovating an area with good services and infrastructure, while the University attended their campus requirements” GOV</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Key characteristics of collaborative planning. External factors
It is clear that while stakeholder relations make up for a large part of collaboration, it’s not limited to this aspect. There are additional factors and conditions that act as positive enablers for the project to move forward, such as those related to the social sustainability, that reach beyond the physical aspect of the plan. The same can be said for the set of policy instruments that resulted from the discussions, which can be applied in different projects and new initiatives. At the same time, this also made evident the different obstacles to the project and to collaboration in the specific context. Examples of the latter are the fear of gentrification or the financial feasibility of the project.

The financial sustainability issue has been harder to tackle than its social counterpart. This is due to the fear of innovation of large and established market parties, that prefer to stick to their traditional business structure. It remains as an uncertainty, whether the change of focus with the intervention of market parties will be a threat to the attained social objectives, or if the current organisation can withstand the pressure of the market instruments.

A different case is the relation with the governmental agencies, that have been ready to stand by the project and support it. This is due to several factors. First, there is a positive atmosphere surrounding the increased participation of the population in day-to-day processes. This is part of a large-scale change that has been in paper for the last three decades, but that has been difficult to implement in practice. Therefore, the lack of experience in this kind of projects makes for pilot testing a positive characteristic in any endeavour. Second, the general premise of economic and social sustainability, that has theoretical support from the technical documents generated so far, means that the participation of the state can be limited to coordination and facilitation, rather than investment. This matches with the decentralized figure that characterises Colombian politics. Third, the support of what could become a flagship project in terms of urban regeneration is relevant for the objectives of the Government in the long-term.

Finally, it’s relevant to mention the factor of opportunity in such a project. The emergence of a collaborative approach in the Colombian setting, in general, and in the Fenicia case in particular, is the result of several externalities that converged. Without the initiative of key people at the University, the positive political climate for experimentation and the will of the community to get involved beyond their usual margins, the extent of collaboration that has been observed would not have been attained.
6. Complementary Cases

This chapter explores a set of cases of urban regeneration initiatives across different Latin American countries, in order to analyse the influence of the context in the development of distinct organisational structures and more specifically on the emergence of collaborative schemes. These complementary cases are explored in a more general manner, in order to assemble a wider vision of the phenomenon in different places.

The issue of exponential growth can be seen in several Latin American cities, mainly due to the good economic climate in the second half of the 20th century, coupled with a substantial migration of population towards urban areas. A clear consequence of these processes was the increase of population and the successive overcrowd and segregation due to the slow responsiveness of the local governments. Clear examples of this phenomenon are cities like Buenos Aires and São Paulo, which are today some of the most populated cities in the continent and the largest in each country.

In these cities, cases of collaborative planning with the aid or leadership of universities can be found, as described by Leguía (2011), where educational institutions act as mediators between local communities, governmental entities, market parties and, occasionally, NGOs. Other cases, such as La Mariscal neighbourhood in Quito, present different origins, from the community itself, collaborating with architects and entrepreneurs.

A recurrent theme in the revised cases in Latin America is that most of the efforts of collaborative planning are done in peripheral communities or in unplanned settlements that have become part of the city as time goes by. Thus, in most of the cases, the projects focus on empowering communities to improve the conditions of their neighbourhoods, but lack the participation of market parties or financiers, to increase the impact of these interventions.

6.1. Buenos Aires

The city of Buenos Aires has had a long history with informal settlements, due to its position as one of the main ports in the region and the ample immigration processes throughout its history. Two examples of these settlements, usually referred to as shantytowns (Villa Miseria), where there have been collaborative processes, are Villa Tranquila and Villa 31.

The first one is located in the area of Avellaneda and was characterised by high levels of violence and insecurity. The project to regenerate the area stemmed from the collaboration between several academics from different universities, such as the University of Buenos Aires, Harvard and TU Delft. The process was led by Flavio Janches, an architect and professor of the University of Buenos Aires.
The process included an initial mapping and analysis of the area, conducted in collaboration with John Beardsley and Max Rohm, within the course “Non formal Buenos Aires: Public Space Strategies for Emergency Settlements”, at the Graduate School of Design de Harvard University. This analysis included an intense teamwork with the community, doing interviews and workshops in order to better determine the expectations, desires and necessities of the affected population.

The result of the project was the design of a network of public spaces and services, such as parks, sports courts, market facilities, among others, that take from the existing relations between the inhabitants in order to shape spaces that could improve the social interactions.

The second case has been less successful, even if it had a larger interest from the government and the media in the last decade. Villa 31 is located in the area next to the old harbour, and next to some of the most expensive residential areas of the city. However, the settlement lacks basic services, such as electricity, running water or sewage in large areas. This contrast sparked the interest of the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Buenos Aires, led by professor Javier Fernández Castro, in order to improve the area and connect it with the rest of the city.
The project had a holistic view of the area, rather than focusing only on specific interventions, it proposed a broad scale, related to the opening of the neighbourhood to the city, working at its borders, strengthening its social interactions, mainly through the market, but also with the empowerment of meeting areas and finally with punctual home improvements.

The University had a mediator role among the government and the different NGOs that work in the area and was the main sponsor lobbying the project to the local authorities, in order to have it approved by 2009. The execution, however, has not occurred as expected, and the succeeding governments have invested less and less on the project. A new government starting on 2016 has reactivated the project and it is expected to continue the interventions.

6.2. São Paulo

The project for the Park of Integration (Parque da integração), located in the districts of Sapobemba and São Mateus, was conceived as a series of interventions aiming to create common spaces for several areas with different physical and social characteristics. Its programme included a series of spaces, such as sports facilities, community centres and children’s playgrounds, all connected by a main axis that cuts through the different neighbourhoods, following the layout of the Rio Claro water pipeline (Audutora Rio Claro) (Figure 33).

Figure 33. Location of the Integration Park. Source: Google Earth, Landsat, DigitalGlobe (2017)

The area had been characterised by high rates of crime and violence and had become a hotspot for drug trafficking. This was in part a result of the urban form, that left several residual spots, where these activities were concentrated.

In order to tackle the problem, the local government started a collaboration with the Faculty of Architecture of the School of the City (Escola da Cidade), which proposed a linear park as a joining central element for the project. Most importantly it assumed a role of mediator between the different actors of the process, in this case the government, the inhabitants, several NGOs that were active in the area (some of which were local) and Sabesp, a state company in charge of the city’s water and waste management.
6.3. Quito

The city of Quito has had a similar development as other Latin American cities. As the capital of Ecuador, it had a central role in the commercial and financial aspects of the country and it was greatly influenced by speculation over the territory. This is particularly evident after the 1960s, when urban area grew approximately 500%, while greatly decreasing its density (Carrión & Erazo Espinosa, 2012).

A central area of the development of the city is the district of ‘La Mariscal’, located to the north of the historic city centre and characterised by its touristic appeal (Figure 34). It concentrates a large number of clubs, bars, restaurants, cafes as well as hotels, being the Foch Square its focal point. The development of this area has had two sides. First, as an important touristic quarter it has a separate administrative division, focused on the district alone. At the same time, its functions attract insecurity and deterioration of public space (Zibell, 2016).

The initiative of OPUS La Mariscal (Operación Urbana Sostenible, Sustainable Urban Operation) was born form the inhabitants of the neighbourhood. They felt that the government was not paying sufficient attention to the problems of the area and decided to take matters in their own hands, creating an organization made of the local community, aided by technical consultants.

The main objective of the program was to establish an ‘auto-regulated territory’ with a ‘neighbourhood government’, that would have the power to act on area matters and communicate to the local government on equal terms. This was based on two principles. First, to empower the community to take responsibility and act on their own behalf and for their own benefit. Second, to relieve the burden of community interventions from the local government, that was generally absent until that point (Schans, 2016).

This last point can also be interpreted as a shift of responsibility from the government to the community. It seeks to make a deeper change in the way citizens approach political action, by
shifting from a subordinate or dependent citizenship to an active one. This reflects a common situation in Latin American cities, whereas communities expect the local governments to intervene in their favour, without participation, that is, in a paternalist manner.

The project has six lines of action, which are safety, urban agriculture, social services, public space, neighbourhood identity and sustainability. Each line of action then is translated into punctual projects to be executed in the short and mid-term, to improve the quality of life of the neighbourhood in perceptible ways.

Among the first accomplishments of the project there is the establishment of an urban farm that is producing certified foods for the community, the renovation of two houses in the area to use for the ‘neighbourhood government’ and as a local police station, planting over one hundred new trees and establishing new uses for public spaces in the quarter. To this it can be added the renovation of a third house, to host a meeting place, the promotion of street art and a new scheme for handling organic waste to use as fertilizer in the urban farm, all projects which are undergoing or soon to be completed.

However, this bottom-up initiative has not been completely accepted by the city and the local government itself. There is a constant debate with the local authorities about the legitimacy of an independent governance scheme, that works ‘outside’ the legal framework. Regarding this issue, the zone administrator claims that the generation of such a governance scheme is not possible and out of any discussion.

The confrontation goes beyond the philosophical debate about the approach of the community and has taken actions from the authorities, for example, against the local private security, which has been accused of power abuse and against the renovation of houses by the local community, which is said to interfere with the duties of the government. At the same time, the representatives of the community keep claiming lack of support from the local administration and even hindrance in the execution of community activities, for example by delaying permits over the recovered houses.
7. Data Analysis

In this chapter, a review of the theoretical framework and the previously reviewed empirical lessons from the main case study, will be applied for the different complementary cases. The objective is to compare the different processes and identify positive and negative factors that were involved in these developments. The objective is to attain a deeper knowledge of the influence of the context in the process as well as to identify possible variables that assist or limit the use of collaborative approaches for urban (re)development.

The different cases that were analysed as complementary present a common characteristic. They are all attempts of mixing both top-down approaches with bottom-up practical strategies. At the same time, they share a similar social, economic and political context in which the project operates. That is, countries in which the private enterprise takes a strong leading role, the government has a regulating nature and public participation is reduced.

In this context, each project attempts to engage in a form of collaboration, between the Market, the Community and the Government, in which decisions are made after a thorough deliberation and an agreement comes from the multiple interests involved. The different conditions of each project make this collaboration difficult and in the following paragraphs the reasons for the shortcomings in the different projects are exposed.

The fact that these projects focus mostly on informal areas of the city (i.e. Buenos Aires and São Paulo) poses a challenge for a more comprehensive collaboration between diverse actors. This is mainly reflected in the lack of interest of market parties to participate, because there are not enough economic incentives for it. These projects are done by the community, for themselves and therefore fail to provide an economic profit to external parties.

At the same time, while they provide a strong bonding for the community and prove to be very successful in terms of social cohesion, their impact outside the project area is limited and they are not catered to increase the connection of the intervention areas with the rest of the city, or to attract different users outside the existing community. While this is generally a negative element, it avoids the gentrification process associated with the social mix of other regeneration projects.

In most of the cases there is an important role of the government and its objectives. As a key player, its will to carry on projects that might take more time or resources in early phases is an essential element to attain any results. A clear example of failure in this interaction is the Villa 31 project in Buenos Aires, where the project was pushed by the University and NGOs more than by the government, resulting in lack of interest by the latter. It can be argued that the process was carried out as a bottom-up project and lacked a deeper integration of the different relevant actors. In other words, the horizontal organisational structure, was never attained, due to lack of participation of key stakeholders.

Similarly, a project such as the one in Quito, has a potential of creating a strong social movement and has a partial support of private parties, as consultants and investors, but lacks
government recognition and larger investments to achieve some of its objectives. This makes it highly dependent on the will of the community.

A general conclusion from these projects is that the lack of a wide network of actors from different backgrounds, more specifically, from the three different sides of Pestoff (1992) triangle, hinders the possibility to attain sustainability in the different fronts that are proposed throughout this thesis, that is both in the social and economic aspects. The collaboration can be characterised as incomplete and it is reflected on the results of the projects.

In Villa Tranquila there was a very effective social strategy but lack of investment. In Villa 31 and in La Mariscal, there was a lack of synergy with the government. In São Paulo, there was a lack of discussion with the community for the programme in certain areas. The lack of a closer involvement, therefore, brings obstacles to the accomplishment of some of the economic, social or political objectives of the projects.

When analysing the different sub questions formulated for the main case study, the following results can be obtained. Regarding phasing, the lack of involvement of key actors, limits the creation of a collaborative setting, as well as the legal support that the government might provide (with the exception of the São Paulo project). This makes it difficult to create a phasing in the project that marks the institution change and the flow between different types of organisations that resulted characteristic of collaborative planning approaches.

Regarding stakeholder participation, the results were not favourable, as previously mentioned. This is deemed to be the main cause for the limited impact that the projects might have had. A lack of interest, time or capital might have hindered the completion of communication and trust building processes, aimed towards creating a discussion arena that includes a wider array of actors.

Regarding the way that actors relate to each other, it remains clear that the aforementioned lack of cohesion among relevant stakeholders limits the creation of common objectives and the alignment of interests between the Government, the Market and the Community. This implies a surge of conflicts between some of the parties that end up affecting the interests of the most vulnerable stakeholders. This is traceable in all the projects.

It is relevant to mention that in the cases of Buenos Aires and São Paulo, the intervention of an educational institution as a key player in the development, marked a clear difference with traditional initiatives. This is related to the non-profit nature of these institutions. The positive results in these cases have as a key factor, the participation of Universities with a strong technical and social focus, that make sure to guide the process and safeguard the objectives of the projects. The extent of their success varies depending on the case, but their presence is a catalyst for improving the conditions of the areas. In the same manner, the presence of an association in the Quito project proves to be relevant for this purpose. The joint efforts of the community and the private sector, provide both knowledge and the social inertia to execute a part of the programme.

The previous part is strongly related to the power structures at play in each project. As previously mentioned, the lack of a more collaborative approach, results in a less horizontal
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and more hierarchical organisation. This means that power asymmetry plays an important role in limiting capacity building in the different projects. At the same time, it creates, or maintains, a struggle of power between the stakeholders actively involved in the project and those who are not.

This doesn’t mean that there is a lack of leadership in each project. This can be identified as a positive factor in all of the analysed projects and results a key element for the results that were achieved. However, the lack of a greater involvement of stakeholders, limits the leadership figure to a single organisation. Consequently, the process of economic sustainability of the projects has a large impact.

It can be said that the absence of a directly involved stakeholder, that holds a privileged position to engage in discussions at different levels and enjoys access to decision making spheres in the different parts of society, acts as a limitation to the different projects. In Buenos Aires and Quito, the government and the market parties are not involved to a deep extent, which limits the capital that can be invested as well as the legal support. Oppositely, in São Paulo, the community is not deeply involved in the planning scenarios, which limits the social impact of the project.

Generally speaking, all the cases offer the view of a partial implementation of collaborative structures and present limitations that are entirely context related, rather than related to the organisational approach. This reinforces the conception of opportunity to develop projects with a collaborative approach and the large number of variables that must be aligned to attain results using such mechanisms.

Finally, the different conclusions attained from these cases will be added to the reflections on the main case further discussed in section 8 (Conclusions).
Part 3  Synthesis
8. Conclusions

The goal of this thesis is to provide an overview of the practical application of collaborative planning and networks theories in urban (re)development. In this context, it intends to understand the factors that allow for collaboration to occur such projects. Furthermore, it explores the consequences of these changes in terms of governance and organisational approaches and the way the latter change over time. For this purpose, the research is based on an in-depth study of a critical case, adopting a pluralistic epistemological approach with an interpretivist emphasis.

Following the initial premise, the research is structured around a general question, ‘How is collaboration achieved in urban regeneration projects?’, the specific study therefore can be generalised in the main research question, ‘What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?’. The thesis starts from the premise that the relations among the different actors involved are a key factor to the success of these kind of projects, therefore the focus is given on the relational aspect of the project. From this connection, the following research framework emerged, represented in a conceptual model (Figure 35).

The main question is further down divided in different components. Namely the context and the planning instruments related to the project; the key phases of the project; the stakeholders involved and their roles; the relations among these actors; the distribution of power in the project. Finally, this thesis focuses on the influence of the context in the application of theoretical insights.

This chapter presents the conclusions of this research in two parts. First, key findings are summarized. This is done by responding to the research questions and highlighting the insights that the empirical study brought about. Second, a reflection on the implications of these conclusions on policy and practice will be presented.
8.1. Key Findings

In order to answer the main research question, the main findings are structured around the sub questions and the insights of the different components that were identified in the empirical study. Moreover, an analysis of the connection with the theoretical grounding is provided for each of these sections.

8.1.1. The Context and the Planning Instruments

The first step in the analysis consisted in reviewing the broad social, political and economic context in which the project is embedded. This is the starting point from which the theoretical underpinnings can be reviewed thereafter. Following the question: ‘How is urban planning executed in Bogotá and which instruments can be identified?’, the research revealed a complex panorama of different tools at various scale levels, which are reviewed periodically and seem to be in line with international developments.

This results interesting, because it provides to the different parties involved in urban planning and urban development programs a broad set of possibilities to interact with the built environment. The integration of different scales is particularly relevant, because it opens the possibility to intervene at area level, that is in neighbourhoods or smaller areas, through the use of Partial Plans, especially for regeneration programs.

In addition, all the instruments provide several means for public participation, which is the key factor for collaborative planning (Healey, 1992; Hillier, 1993; Lane, 2005). It has been argued that there is even an excess of participation dependencies, to the point that the public is confused on where exactly to take their doubts and propositions (A.M. Potes, personal communication, May 2, 2017).

In the current instruments, there are certain processes that are not well conceived, such as the participation methods in Partial Plans. This is an example in which public participation is conceived as ‘consultation’ (Arnstein, 1969), which according to Lane (2005), has been a preferred approach by government agencies. This implies that the development of a plan has been done prior to the public interaction, effectively reducing their power and the possibility to bargain or trade-off on the results. It was evident also for the residents of ‘Las Aguas’ neighbourhood, that protested firmly against the first proposal by Los Andes University.

Despite these shortcomings, the system offers a positive outlook for the future, because of its flexibility. This particular impasse was solved through the use of different methods, not contemplated by the legal framework, but that were observed carefully by the government and can serve as examples to modify the procedures, to empower participation. Adding to this, there is the case of the Decree 448 of 2014, through which the benefits for the originals dwellers in regeneration areas are distributed.

When it comes to the way in which these tools are used there is a more polarized opinion. Even with the existence of appropriate instruments and the possibility to discuss any necessary modification, the governmental agencies are still in charge of its administration and there can
be several instances of bureaucracy blockage and disagreements among different organisations or within the same organisation.

These institutional attitudes can vary greatly on the individuals that hold certain positions in the determined governmental period, as put by M.C. Rojas (Personal communication, May 12, 2017) “This is a matter of the people rather than institutions. Institutions are the same, but attitudes towards the problem change”. This can be a deterrent for increased interaction between the different parties involved in urban regeneration and accounts for the lack of trust that has been identified throughout the research.

It can be concluded that there is a wide array of instruments not only allowing for the emergence of collaborative approaches, but even fomenting it, such as the Masterplan of 2013 (Decree 364), which had participation as a central element for policy generation. Furthermore, these mechanisms are flexible enough to be adapted to innovative approaches in the practice. On the other hand, the particularities of the political climate in the city in particular, and in the country, in general, can be either an incentive or a deterrent for the implementation of more participative approaches.

8.1.2. Phasing and Institutional Change

The research started with the premise that collaborative planning is an alternative to an existent hierarchical approach in policy generation. In the particular case of Colombia, this approach is characterised as top-down, led primarily by market parties, albeit also by the government in other cases. This is what Galland and Hansen (2012) define as ‘Trend planning’, where market demands set the conditions of the development. This is also referred as ‘neoliberal planning in practice’ by Allmendinger (2009, p. 121). Furthermore, it is also common to find Public-Private Partnerships, especially for developments related to public goods. This can be classified as ‘Leverage planning’ (Galland & Hansen, 2012).

Taking this context into account, the rise of collaborative approaches is considered to be a moment of institutional transition, because it implies a change in the preferred method of action of the relevant stakeholders involved in policy making and more specifically in urban planning and regeneration programs. In order to identify the moments of passage, it was relevant to question ‘What phases can be identified in the process?’. The aim was to recreate a narrative from the different anecdotes of the actors, while identifying the presence of collaboration.

The insights on this subject is relevant to understand not only the emergence of different organisational structures (E.g. the replacement of hierarchies for more horizontal and self-governed structures), but also the perception of this change from the perspective of the different parts of society (I.e. Market, Government and Community).

As previously explained, there are two main conceptions on institutional change and, consequently, on the milestones that indicate a transition. First there is an evident organizational change, related to governance. This change is gradual and concerns setting up communication arenas, to discuss specific issues depending on the phase that the project is in (E.g. an arena to discuss the general interests in the first stages followed by an arena to discuss
the technical details of the urban plan). The specific characteristics of this organisation will be discussed in the following sections. Second, there is a strong necessity to give legitimacy and validity to the results of the discussions carried out in this arena. For this project, legitimacy was represented on legal acts, that formalized the planning process (E.g. The Decree 420 of 2014, which regulates the Partial Plan for the Fenicia Triangle).

Finally, an important element that is related to phasing, is the fact that collaborative structures are not static, the long-term nature of urban projects implies that relations among actors are “continually in a dialectic and ‘restless’ flux, due to struggles in various arenas at various levels at once” (Healey, 2003, p. 113). This means that phasing not only reflects the institutional change from hierarchies to horizontal organisations, but also between different types of collaboration.

To this subject, R. Agranoff (2003) explains that there are four different types of networks (i.e. Informational, Developmental, Outreach and Action), and each one is characterised by the level of involvement of the stakeholders, the type of interactions between them and the product of this interaction. It can be said that the different structures that were evident in the empirical study reflect these differences.

8.1.3. Stakeholder Participation

Following the context setting questions, the research focused in the participants of the project. The question to address is thus, ‘What actors are involved in the process and what roles do they play?’. The objective was to identify if the project complied with one of the main conditions of collaboration, namely the participation of members from the previously identified societal characterisations according to Pestoff (1992), Market, Community and Government, as well as the possible presence of Mixed or Hybrid Organisations. Furthermore, it was relevant to understand the position of each actor as they entered into the project.

The initial findings pointed to the participation of a broader than usual number of stakeholders in the project. As previously mentioned, the experimental nature of the project is largely given by its divergence with more traditional planning practices, especially when it comes to public participation. The positive finding is therefore, the presence of members of each different classification, as well as from hybrid organisations (E.g. Los Andes University or the ProBono Foundation, both situated as hybrid Community-Market figures).

It is relevant to emphasize on the institutional change that was previously mentioned. One of the key factors to signal the switch between the second and third phases of the project, is the extension of the project network. On one hand, new institutions took part on the project; on the other, a larger percentage of the involved organisations got engaged with the project. The latter is particularly true for the different groups and individuals within the inhabitants of the neighbourhood.

The insights from the process are twofold. First the aforementioned extended participation was not a given. Building a coalition from a collection of diverse stakeholders is a strenuous process. It requires to understand the different resources that each stakeholder brings forward
to the discussion arena and balance them when necessary, to avoid hindrances in succeeding phases. Second, the role of some members in the organisation is to facilitate and foster the entry to the project network to those stakeholders that are directly affected by the project, but that might ignore the objectives of the plan or simply refuse to interact with other members.

This type of actors has been deemed the ‘enabler’, due to their main action of facilitation the collaborative process. Furthermore, they emerge in order to safeguard the discussion arenas to give legitimacy to the process and to establish lines of communication across different levels and within specific organisations.

8.1.4. Actor Relations and Power Distribution

Following the identification of the stakeholders and the analysis of their resources, the main subject of the research was approached. As stated in section 2.1 (Problem Statement), the units of analysis for this research are actor relations. This theme is divided in two main parts. First, on the specific relations among stakeholders, which responds to the question ‘How do these actors relate to each other?’. Second, a derived theme from the empirical results, that became more relevant as the research advanced, that is power balance. Thus, the following question will be addressed subsequently, ‘How is power distributed between the different actors involved and how does this relate to collaborative planning?’.

The relations among the different stakeholders were analysed from two different perspectives, theoretically and empirically. The first is concerned with mapping the networks in the different stages, as part of the stakeholder analysis. The second is related to the perceived relations extracted from the experiences of the different actors.

It is clear that the construction of collaborative structures and horizontal project networks doesn’t come naturally for the different actors involved in the Fenicia project. It doesn’t come naturally for the actors involved in urban regeneration, urban planning or policy generation for that matter, in the Colombian context. Therefore, it is relevant to underline the necessary processes in order to attain such an institutional change.

As mentioned before, the emergence of collaborative structures is related to two separate and interrelated processes. On one hand, the condition of building trust among the different involved parties. On the other hand, the creation of effective communication channels. These two processes form a virtuous cycle and are mutually reinforcing, that is, with an increase in trust, communication is facilitated and with constant communication, trust is gained. Both of these processes are part of what Koppenjan and Klijn (2004) call a rise of ‘arenas of interaction’.

The success of the first phases project is rooted in the creation of arenas that go beyond the scope of the urban plan. The process of building trust included creating discussion settings regarding the specific project (E.g. to discuss the different interests or to discuss technical definitions of the plan); as well as opening discussion spaces devoted to strengthen the relation among different actors. This last point was particularly focused towards the occupants of the
area, that is the community, the market organisations and the mixed organisations, with the mindset of a better cooperation and integration in the future.

The second part of this theme is related to power balance in the project. The relevance of this discussion is rooted on the premise that collaborative structures and networks are an alternative to hierarchical organisations. Therefore, it is implied that in order to achieve collaboration, there must be a process of power distribution and a set of mechanisms to limit the power of those who possess an advantage when entering negotiations (E.g. land ownership, knowledge, connections, influence).

The empirical observations revealed two different sides to this issue. First, the balance of power is necessary and the mechanisms to achieve it can be varied. This can be attained through governmental regulations (E.g. limitations to land ownership, expropriation, subsidies, transfer of benefits), by agreements between the parties or by the inclusion of key stakeholders in charge of limiting the use of excessive power from given parties. All three of these mechanisms were tested on the Fenicia project, with successful outcomes. Some of the agreements between parties even came to be regulations, that can be further applied in subsequent projects (i.e. Decree 446, related to benefits of the inhabitants and transfer of benefits).

The second side to power balance, is an insight that came from theory and that was confirmed with the interviews. MacGuire (2006) states that “a clear distinction between hierarchies and collaborative management is not always accurate” and that in practice is common to see a mix of the two approaches. This is understood as the necessity for leadership in collaborative regeneration projects, which became a recurrent theme in the research.

As a matter of fact, the initiation, development and completion of the different processes that have been carried out in the Fenicia Triangle, have had a leadership figure in several levels. In the initial phases, the leadership of Los Andes University, represented by the Progresa Fenicia program has been a key factor to its advance. As a project, it benefitted from the initiative of the Management Faculty, represented by Professor Oscar Pardo. Subsequently, the project has had different leaders, according to the stage that it is into (E.g. the campus manager, when a technical overview was needed and a commercial manager, when the project undergoes a marketing strategy).

The same is true for the different components of the project. The legal discussions with the government were led by Juan Felipe Pinilla and the most intense social interaction, in order to build trust and open communications challenges, were the result of a joint effort between Franco Ambrosi and his team (Social component) and Ivonne Rueda and hers (Through the coordination of the social programs). On the community side, the figure of German Madrid as the leader of the Local Council was key to overcome the opposition within the inhabitants. And, in the government, the action of the Planning and Habitat Secretaries was key to coordinate the different agencies towards the approval of the plan.

However, it is important to notice that the leadership figures are not static, are not appointed and do not have veto power to overrule the decisions of the rest of the stakeholders. In this sense, the leadership is not a representative figure, that executes the will of other stakeholders, but it represents a safe guarder of the general objectives of the project. As put by MacGuire
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(2006), “the presence of a lead organization, acting as system controller or facilitator, is often a critical element of effectiveness in collaborative management”. In the Fenicia project this figure can be seen shifting both horizontally (between organisations) and vertically (within organisations).

There are two conclusions. First, that the relations in collaborative structures are dependent on the correct implementation of a cycle of trust building and effective communication. Second, that such projects depend on a strong leadership in order to overcome the obstacles posed by the complexity of the interactions and the networks that are established (McGuire & Agranoff, 2011).

8.1.5. Context Influence

Taking the theoretical insights into account, an empirical related question is necessary to close the analysis. Thus, it is relevant to ask ‘How does the context influence the application of collaborative planning in practice?’. The main objective is to review the specific conditions that were brought about by the specific context.

Starting from the general political, economic and social orientation of Colombia, it is important to take into account its neoliberal alignment. This is represented by privatization of public utilities, cut-backs of public spending, political decentralization and reforms of trade protection, among others. To this panorama adds up an extended corruption that permeates the different spheres of the state and the market, which create an elitist environment for business and policy generation. This implies that the benefits of market transactions are unfairly distributed.

Such a context is particularly resistant to changes in the status quo and the generalized protection for the free market, from every sector of the population, hinders the application of socially oriented programs. It also creates an imbalance in power, which results in a poor representation of the different sectors of society, but most importantly a very reduced expression of the most vulnerable population.

At the same time, the global shift towards a shared economy and an increased participation in the different spheres of policy generation, has a direct impact in the perception of the general public. The demand for more integration in the field of policy making and economic growth brings about the possibility to discuss new approaches such as collaborative planning.

Needless to say, the application of such mechanisms needs to take into account the added effort that takes to build trust among the different participants and the necessary agreements that need to be made in order to balance the asymmetry of power. This might be represented on additional time and capital to be invested in the projects, to guarantee three important conditions. First, the possibility to build trust; second, an effective communication between stakeholders; third, a power balance that allows for the different interests to be discussed in equality of terms.

At the same time, the direct operative way of making business and politics in this environment, implies a close relationship between parties that might be involved in the project, such as educational institutions, financial institutions, technical consultants, along with the government
agencies, developers and the community. These ties can be useful in moments of distress or in order to facilitate procedures, that otherwise might be hindered by bureaucracy.

The presence of such stakeholders proves to be particularly useful, if the organisation doesn’t adhere to one of the three societal alignments (Market, Government, Community), but instead it represents a hybrid organisation. In this case the possibilities of having particular interests in the project is reduced.

These various elements can be observed in the Fenicia case, when analysing the difficulties that were encountered in the trust building process. This represented the biggest obstacle for the initial stages, given the impossibility to create an extensive interaction arena. The consequence was that communication was not carried with all the relevant actors, but only with a minority that felt interested. This resulted in an increased duration of the process (of over a year) and a heftier investment by the University, that financed all the programs.

At the same time, the unique position of the University was an enormous advantage for the project in several ways. First, given its connections with the government, there was a constant communication with it and a standing trust. Second, it’s extended knowledge network facilitated the implementation of innovative solutions, when needed. Third, its non-profit nature helped achieve agreements on the distribution of benefits with the community. Fourth, this unique position allowed it to lead the project until the current phase, in which a developer should take over.

Finally, it is relevant to mention the favourable political climate towards collaboration and towards this project in particular. The support from the different governmental agencies, creates a positive synergy in which the discussions held among the actors are easily enforceable. At the same time, it creates a positive environment within the governmental institutions in order to collaborate among them and foster innovation in both fields (E.g. the creation of new legal instruments).

8.1.6. A Different Context

A similar conclusion can be held for the complementary cases. For these ones, it was relevant to notice that the lack of complete integration between the three sectors of society was a deterrent factor that impeded a more meaningful impact. The three cases represent different aspects of the aforementioned factors, that were not taken into account, reinforcing the belief that they are necessary in order to achieve collaborative organisations.

In the cases of Buenos Aires, a lack of connection with the government and with private capital is evident in the type of interventions that were proposed. Characterized by their bottom-up approach, they are limited both in the extent of benefits that can be obtained from market transactions and from regulation and subsidies. In these cases, the figure of the educational institution was important as bearer of knowledge and coordinator of the projects, however it lacked the connection with other relevant parties.

In the case of São Paulo, the limitation was given in terms of public participation, which in the end limited the impact of the project for the community. This is evident in the lack of
appropriation of public spaces that can be seen in several segments of the Integration Park. A recurrent critique revolves around a series of children playgrounds that remain unused, due to their strange location. In the same way, typical dynamics of the neighbourhood such as the market, disrupt the bike traffic.

In the case of Quito, the clear position of the Mariscal group against the government, causes a tension of power that is negative for the development of larger scale interventions. The project is limited to small scale interventions, that are observed as disruption in legality by the local government. The support of private parties in terms of knowledge and capital is relevant to achieve these goals, but the lack of integration with other relevant parties hampers the extent of the project.

It can be concluded that the application of collaborative approaches is highly dependent on key factors, such as participation, communication, trust building and horizontal network creation, that a lack of one of the elements represents a serious threat to achieve both social and economic sustainability. At the same time, the dynamics of the context are highly relevant when choosing the mechanisms to achieve these factors.

8.1.7. Towards a Collaborative Approach

The research over collaborative planning in the Latin American context has resulted in a positive outlook for the application of these mechanisms in a markedly neoliberal context. As seen before, the importance of the setting and influence of path dependency are key factors to take into account in policy transference.

The broad institutional change that can be seen in the Western world, but that is not exclusively limited to its extents, has made way into the Latin American context. The increased demand for public participation and more active citizenship is rapidly becoming a subject of discussion in the different sectors of society. This is relevant, taking into account the high flexibility of the institutional framework in this particular context, which allows for rapid adaptations of innovative approaches.

The built environment and more specifically, urban areas, are the most relevant arenas of human interaction and the de facto locations of contemporary development. This makes Urban Planning a central issue in the discussion of participation as means of making politics. The increase of participation in urban planning implies a rise in the complexity of interactions between Government, Market and Community, that needs to be managed adequately in order to obtain the most beneficial results for society at large in the long-term.

The study of the Fenicia Triangle case has resulted in a positive outlook for the use of collaborative approaches to urban regeneration and marks the beginning of a more integrated way of practicing urban planning in the Colombian context. From this the main research question ‘What factors bring about collaboration in urban regeneration projects in Colombia?’ can be answered as follows.
Collaboration is dependent on the alignment of a broad series of contextual factors, as much as it depends on ensuring an adequate process related to the construction of a communication network among a broad set of stakeholders.

Starting with the latter, collaboration emerges when the majority of the legitimate actors of the project (i.e Market, Government, Community), establish a series of arenas of interaction, in which the interests of the different parties can be discussed and veto power is shared among the stakeholders. In order for collaboration to be initiated and executed, a firm leadership is needed, in order to safeguard the general objectives of the project. Furthermore, a clear awareness of the specific context is necessary in order to take advantage of the positive externalities that it may offer, as well as to tackle the threats that might be latent in it.

The detailed components of this explanation have been explained over the previous sections and concern the specific tools that can be used to achieve collaboration in similar projects. At the same time, the ongoing nature of the Fenicia plan, calls for a reiterated review as time goes by, in order to assess the strong points and the shortcomings of this particular strategy, as well as its flexibility in terms of facing the characteristic uncertainties of contemporary practice.

8.2. Implications for Policy and Practice

The final step of the research process is the synthesis of the conclusions into lessons that can be learned for practical applications. An objective of the thesis was to evaluate the application of theoretical mechanisms on a given context in order to understand the extent of its success. This analysis is carried out in different levels, first a reflection on the subject of collaboration, followed by general lessons and specific recommendations.

On a broader context, a relevant discussion is to be made regarding the way that democracy is understood and effected in contemporary society. This is true for the particular context of Bogotá and Colombia, but could easily be extended beyond these borders. It can be said that merely representative democracy has a failure in representing the voices of the different members of society, especially when there is a clear power asymmetry. This is exacerbated by the political inclinations of more neoliberal countries, that allow for these inequalities to grow. A possible answer to this problem lies in a more participative approach. It remains to be seen if the results of this participatory processes in urban development have a positive effect on society at large, but examples of collaboration in different fields have emerged in the past decade and are suitable for investigation.

Given the compromise with collaboration of the different societal actors, but most specifically of the government and the market, it is relevant to remember its main objective. Collaboration is proposed as an alternative to traditional practices, that provides both social and economic sustainability to a given endeavour. In this sense, its concerned with extending the benefits of the market transactions to a broader extent of the population, while at the same time including them to take decisions regarding the possible projects. This compromise comes at a cost, which is represented in both time and capital. It needs to be understood that this investment is not
wasted and that profit can be earned not only in social terms, but in increased value over longer periods of time.

This is particularly true for urban planning and urban (re)development, which are medium to long-term endeavours, set in highly dynamic contexts. The compromise to engage in collaborative planning implies taking the time to build a stable network, through trust building and to manage a larger set of conflicting interests. This effort is associated at a financial cost that needs to be invested upfront and that might be recovered only after a considerable amount of time. Therefore, it is relevant to provide a sound financial design in this type of endeavours, that will attract private capital and, moreover, result equally appealing as a traditional development.

8.2.1. Lessons and Recommendations

This research has concluded with a positive outlook on the experimentation of collaborative approaches in the Latin American context as means to achieve a socially just society while maintain financial profit. As such, there are some important lessons in order to continue this exploration.

First, collaborative approaches are dependent on a series of factors, which help to achieve social and economic sustainability. These factors are primarily, the creation of interaction arenas in which actors can build trust and exert an effective communication. The balance of power in order to give way to the discussion of all the relevant interests. The presence of leadership to safeguard the main objectives of the process. At the same time, the context determines the necessity to look after an adequate political climate and the inclusion of external stakeholders that provide resources that otherwise are lacking in the project.

Therefore, the application of collaborative mechanisms in markedly neoliberal environments, requires a deep analysis of the context in order to select the adequate tools to achieve sustainability. This is related to the complex nature of aligning interests of diverse actors, but also to the presence of necessary resources within the relevant stakeholders. It is this careful analysis that will give the context specific answers to the application.

That is to say, that there is no single model of collaboration that can be applied in urban regeneration projects. The unique nature of the different political, social and economic context calls for handmade solutions. However, the ultimate objective remains to achieve the aforementioned factors, which have been identified to guarantee a higher rate of success. At the same time, it is relevant to note that collaborative planning is an iterative process. That is to say that constant evaluation of the input and outcomes of the process are necessary to assess the implementation of the selected tools.

It is recommended that the organisations that have the initiative for a collaborative approach in urban regeneration pay close attention to the definition of arenas of interaction where the different stakeholders can engage in a virtuous cycle of building trust and effective communication. This is the starting point for a discussion in which interests are discussed in equal terms and power asymmetries can be balanced. If any of the former are not to be properly
assured, there is a high probability that the process will fail before completion, or that it will not attain the desired objectives.

At the same time, the appropriate leadership must be appointed for the different stages of the process as well as for the different components of the process. It is important to bear in mind that this leadership must be dynamic and responsive to the changes in the environment, the organisations and the institutions. The reason for this is twofold. First, the different processes in the project require diverse types of knowledge and expertise. Second, the permanence of a leadership figure throughout the project creates asymmetries of power, that hamper the decision-making process and can favour some interests over the others.
9. Discussion

This chapter closes the research, by presenting a discussion over the research process, the conclusions and proposing an agenda for further research. It is divided in three parts. First, a summary of the limitations of the research. Second, a reflection on the relevance of the research. Finally, a set of recommendations for continuing the investigation.

9.1. Limitations to the Research

Any research process has impairments from different points of view, be it in terms of its approach, its methodology or simply a matter of time. This thesis is no stranger to such impairments.

The conception of a research as an iterative process has been very helpful to review the decisions made in every step, adjust the focus of the research and continuously reduce the scope of the process. In this sense, a particularly helpful framework was that of grounded theory, because it allowed to give sense to the constant appearance of new literature and information, as well as to structure it within the research.

Then, time was a relevant concern. The limitation to one case is related also to the duration of the research. On the other hand, it opens up a handful of possibilities for further research in the same field. Finally, an important concern regarding the transferability of knowledge to similar contexts remained as an objective. That seemed a reasonable motive to understand similar cases, albeit in a more restricted, less profound manner.

The strictly qualitative method selection can be regarded as a limitation on the research, but also as an opportunity to further conduct research in the future. This choice has two sides. First, the fact that is an ongoing project, hinders the possibility to evaluate its results. Adding up to this is the long-term nature of urban processes. Second, the research topic and units of analysis call for qualitative methods, given the difficulty to measure relational aspects. It can be said that any given measure in this subject will result in an incomplete view, due to its social nature.

9.1.1. Case Studies

The selection of case studies for an actor centred research, with focus on relational aspects comes as a logic step. It has to be said that the possibility to analyse the practical aspect of any theory is a key step in research and help to balance the distance that exists between the two fields in many cases.

An important step during the research process was the shift from a comparative case study design, with two in depth cases, to a single case study. This choice had several underlying factors. The selected subject is not widely practiced in urban regeneration around the world, with the specific criteria that were selected. This resulted in a short list of possible cases that would result difficult to study with sufficient depth. The large amount of information to be
processed, coupled with the time limitation, resulted on a scope reduction. The approach to the main case and its participants, that came early on the process, proved to be more challenging than expected. The availability of time from the respondents was very limited and their responses, highly inconsistent at first, but very rich towards the ending. A consideration on cultural context and interest on the work I was performing, also led to limit the extent of the research.

9.1.2. Primary and Secondary Data Analysis

The importance of having both primary and secondary data, from diverse sources proved to be a key point for a deeper analysis and understanding of the case. Primary data collection will be discussed in depth in the next section. Secondary data collection was a very interesting process. First, there is an important part of the documentation that is made of legal documents. These are lengthy and written in a dense language sometimes, which makes it difficult to grasp their main points.

Second, the lack of abundant research in the field and more specifically surrounding the case (mostly due to the fact that it is an ongoing development, but also to a less research oriented context) called for a wider scope regarding the document search. This included the use of grey literature to complement the existing documentation.

9.1.3. Interviews

The interviews provided, by far, the deepest understanding to the specific process and to collaboration in urban development in general. The amount of data that was collected from talks with people many different backgrounds was helpful to reconstruct the process, on one hand, and to understand different positions and attitudes towards the project, in the other.

This particular part of the research came late in the process, which proved to be a challenge, in the sense that most of the raw data to be analysed was collected in the very end of the writing process. However, it is relevant to note that it gave a wider panorama to the research subject. Regarding this subject, it was concluded that a larger pool of data resources was more valuable than a limited one, thus encouraging me to conduct the maximum number of interviews possible.

On a final thought, the interviews were valuable not only from an academic point of view, but also from a personal one. I can say that my position towards the way that urban development is conducted was greatly shaped by some of the talks that I had. Besides the readiness of every interviewee to share their knowledge on the project, I deem more valuable, their eagerness to discuss also subjects beyond the research and having very interesting talks about the city and society at large.
9.2. Research Relevance

9.2.1. Scientific relevance

The field of Urban Development research is, as its practice, a broad and wide encompassing one. This implies a conversion of disciplines and theories, which interact and collide, maintaining the discussion at a continuous high. This research is no stranger to this approach and from the beginning it tried to fit into the current field of knowledge.

The use of a mixed-method approach responds to this prerogative. The benefit of using diverse methods for a qualitative research is twofold. On one hand, different methods are used to analyse different kinds of data and later on be able to compare the theoretical framework with the empirical results. That is, it helps to analyse data, that otherwise wouldn’t correlate to each other. On the other hand, it gives validity to the results, mainly by triangulation of the different outcomes.

9.2.2. Societal relevance

The choice for a case study that is ongoing and at the same time an experimental project in several aspects is relevant to evaluate its performance and lessons learned from the process, while at the same time offering the option to adjust elements or improve the general performance. Furthermore, it offers the possibility to bring academia closer to the practical environment, which results particularly valuable in a context in which such collaboration is not usual.

An important factor is related to the organisation that the theory and the case study focus on. The main implication being the collaboration between actors from different parts of society and the possibility to discuss the theoretical framework with them. This becomes relevant as a way to understand the different positions present in such a project and in a larger scale in every societal context. The possibility to open dialogue channels with and between such a diverse array of participants proves to be a valuable objective on its own.

Furthermore, it is on the best interest of the research, as well as of the different organisations involved in the project that collaborated in it, to review the various processes and be able to understand separate points of view and ways of analysing a single project or event. Thus, the objective is to make the information collected available first for the involved actors and more widely to society at large.

9.3. Recommendations for Further Research

There are several possibilities to extend the body of knowledge presented in this research, both in terms of the topics that were explored, as well as the selected case(s). First, regarding the topic, it represents a contemporary discussion in terms of planning and more broadly in terms of politics. Given the changing political climate that can be observed worldwide, the question
of the extent of participation and collaboration between different parts of society is of relevance.

Therefore, the options to explore the subject of collaboration in general, and collaborative planning in particular, from different points of view, are plentiful. Moreover, given the multidisciplinary nature of the subject to be studied, it calls for the same approach from academia. This can be said in terms of fields of expertise, as well as research methods to be explored from new perspectives.

Within the subject of collaborative planning, this research focused on actors and their relations, as factors for the emergence of new organisational structures. Based on the Urban Development Management framework referenced in the introduction (Figure 9), it is relevant to study the other three aspects, namely the Strategies, the Areas and the Outcomes, as well as the relations among them.

In terms of the main case study, the Fenicia Triangle, there is still a long timeframe to study the project. Given that is still ongoing and that the execution phase is yet to be started, there are ample opportunities to analyse the subject. First, on the same subject of this research, it is relevant to analyse the shifts in power structures, relations among actors and organisational structures in the coming phases of the project, that is in the execution (short to mid-term) as well as in the future use (mid to long-term).

Furthermore, given the experimental nature of the project, it is relevant to analyse its impact within the local planning attitudes and its influence on society, in general, and the specific community involved, in particular. As mentioned above, this is not restricted to an urban development or planning point of view, but rather to a multidisciplinary approach.

It is relevant to complement the qualitative body of research, that comes from social sciences, with quantitative research, that allows for a more concrete evaluation of the different strategies that were explored throughout this thesis. This would be the final aspect to add validity to the project as an exploration of urban (re)development and new ways of collaborating in the Colombian context.

The time devoted to such research can be extensive, it would certainly be this case, if there were no time limitations to it. My curiosity on the subject tells me that I have only scratched the surface on the subjects that were discussed. That being said, I stand firmly by the common saying that “a project is never finished, just abandoned”\(^4\). I’m afraid the time has come for me to leave this particular research behind.

\(^4\) This quote, sometimes attributed to Leonardo Da Vinci referring to art and more recently to Paul Valéry referring to poems, has been one of the things I’ve come to realize about every single endeavor I’ve undertaken. In my case, it came through a professor while studying architecture, referring to construction projects. It seemed to make sense at that moment when I thought about deadlines for drawings and models, but it became clearer as I started working in my own projects later on. In this occasion, I would simply add the editorial/literary interpretation “writing is never done, only due”.
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Appendices
A. Translations and Abbreviations

In this thesis, the original names of the Colombian organizations will be shown with their original name and translated upon their first appearance. Subsequently, the translated version will be kept for use thereafter. However, when abbreviations will be used, the original version in Spanish language will be kept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Government Agency</td>
<td>Secretaría Distrital de Gobierno</td>
<td>SDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Habitat Agency</td>
<td>Secretaría Distrital de Hábitat</td>
<td>SDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning Agency</td>
<td>Secretaría Distrital de Planeación</td>
<td>SDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Institute</td>
<td>Instituto Distrital de Patrimonio Cultural</td>
<td>IDPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal and Development Agency</td>
<td>Empresa de Renovación y Desarrollo Urbano</td>
<td>ERU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Consejo de Bogotá, D.C.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Comptroller</td>
<td>Contraloría de Bogotá</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Overseer</td>
<td>Veeduría Distrital</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian Architects Association</td>
<td>Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos</td>
<td>SCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian Family Welfare Institute</td>
<td>Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar</td>
<td>ICBF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Council</td>
<td>Junta de Acción Comunal</td>
<td>JAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation</td>
<td>Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo</td>
<td>AECID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Progresa Fenicia’ Program</td>
<td>Programa ‘Progresa Fenicia’</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master plan, Territorial Ordinance Plan</td>
<td>Plan de Ordenamiento Territorial</td>
<td>POT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban plan</td>
<td>Plan Urbano</td>
<td>PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial plan</td>
<td>Plan Parcial</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Action Unit</td>
<td>Unidad de Actuación Urbana</td>
<td>UAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Private Partnership</td>
<td>Alianza público-privada</td>
<td>PPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Trade Centre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>WTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (Welfare Triangle)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (Welfare Triangle)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market (Welfare Triangle)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MKT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or Hybrid Organisation (Welfare Triangle)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>HO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## B. List of Respondents

A list of the interviewees that took part of the research is presented below. It describes the role they had in the project in terms of the organisation they belonged to, their position within the organisation and a general description of their functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mauricio Suarez</td>
<td>Campus Manager, General Manager*</td>
<td>Los Andes University, Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>6-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Lead the project according to the objectives set by the University and with the relevant stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Tascon</td>
<td>Technical Component Counselor</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>10-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Manage the different coordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Guelo</td>
<td>General Coordinator</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>19-Apr-2017</td>
<td>Coordinate day-to-day aspects of the different components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Ambrosi</td>
<td>Social component coordinator</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>21-Apr-2017</td>
<td>In charge of administrative functions, such as budget control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago Ramirez</td>
<td>Economic Development component assistant</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>2-May-2017</td>
<td>Assist in the generation of financial calculations in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Sebastián Pardo</td>
<td>Social programs coordinator</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>2-May-2017</td>
<td>Management of social programs of Progresa Fenicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Madrid</td>
<td>Legal component coordinator</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>3-May-2017</td>
<td>Lead the community according to the general interest of the locals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Felipe Pinilla</td>
<td>President*</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>3-May-2017</td>
<td>Communicate effectively among the different parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4-May-2017</td>
<td>Ana Mercedes Potes</td>
<td>ProBono Foundation</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-May-2017</td>
<td>Lizette Medina</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>Economic Development component coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10-May-2017</td>
<td>Ivonne Rueda</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>General Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12-May-2017</td>
<td>Camila Gutierrez</td>
<td>Progresa Fenicia</td>
<td>Urban component assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17-May-2017</td>
<td>Maria Mercedes Maldonado</td>
<td>Planning Agency, Habitat Agency</td>
<td>Planning Secretary*, Habitat Secretary*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Former position / No longer working for the organisation
C. Interview Guide

The nature of semi-structured interviews calls for an outline of the subjects to be covered. In the following section, a script of the questions are outlined. This script was used as means of presenting the research topic beforehand, to set a context in which the subsequent conversation was going to be held. For this matter, the document was sent to the interviewees in advance. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the interview process is meant to be flexible, and particular questions arousing from specific conversations were frequent, even if not included on the script.

Collaborative planning processes in Bogotá: The Fenicia Triangle project

(Brief introduction about: the researcher and his background, the general topic of the MSc course and the frame of the research within the course)

(Below, you will find an introduction to the subject of the research, including the general concepts and the theoretical framework that it is based on)

This research project focuses on collaborative processes in urban planning in Latin America. It seeks to determine the factors that allow for this type of organization to occur in urban regeneration projects.

The research starts from the premise that there is an institutional change in the field of planning, as it "is increasingly exercised in a fragmented governance system consisting of numerous policy networks that stretch across public and private boundaries (horizontal governance) and across levels of public decision making (vertical governance)" (Sehested, 2009).

In this context, hierarchical organizations, either top-down or bottom-up, are replaced by different forms of collaboration that seek to take advantage of the diverse resources and balance interests of the stakeholders involved in such processes (E.g. civil society, governmental entities, private companies, investors, developers, non-profit entities, among others).

In order to have a clear vision of these processes this research focuses on a single case study, which corresponds to the Fenicia Triangle project, in Bogotá. The study focuses on the relations between the different actors in the process. Therefore, the following interview has been developed to compile the necessary information on the subject. Finally, it is important to underline that the answers represent the point of view of each respondent.

(Do you have any questions before starting the interview?)

(The first question is about yourself and the role you have/had in the project)

(This information is compiled in the following table, in order to identify individual respondents)
Questions

(The interview follows a general guide, illustrated by the following questions. However, it is not limited to them and, on the contrary, it seeks to find the most relevant aspects of the project, according to the point of view of the different people involved)

- How did the Fenicia project originate? Where did the initiative come from and how did the process start?
- Who is/was involved in the project and what role did each person/organisation have?
- Does this group of actors frequently collaborate in regeneration / urban revitalization projects?
- How is/was the relationship between these actors?
- Is there a balance of power between all the actors, or is there a clear leader at each stage?

- Can you describe the project process as a story?
- How do you define the different stages of the project?
  Which are they? What marked the change between one and the other?

- What key factors would you indicate for this kind of project to be developed?
  E.g. the leadership of the university or the political climate in the local administration
- What stands out in terms of integration between different actors in this project?
- What have been the positive aspects? And the negative ones?

- Is there any missing aspect worth mentioning? Or any comments about the project that might be relevant to understand the process?

(This concludes the interview. Do you have any questions?)

(Thanks for your time)