

Urban Regeneration Practitioners under Construction. An Unfinished Story of Professionalization

Original

Urban Regeneration Practitioners under Construction. An Unfinished Story of Professionalization / Quaglio, Caterina. - In: ARDETH. - ISSN 2532-6457. - STAMPA. - 10-11:(2022), pp. 139-155. [10.17454/ARDETH10-11.09]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2984385 since: 2023-12-07T09:24:58Z

Publisher:

Rosenberg & Sellier

Published

DOI:10.17454/ARDETH10-11.09

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)



Ardeth

A magazine on the power of the project

10-11 | 2022
Competency

Urban Regeneration Practitioners under Construction

An Unfinished Story of Professionalization

Caterina Quaglio



Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/ardeth/3041>

ISSN: 2611-934X

Publisher

Rosenberg & Sellier

Printed version

Date of publication: December 1, 2022

Number of pages: 139-155

ISSN: 2532-6457

Electronic reference

Caterina Quaglio, "Urban Regeneration Practitioners under Construction", *Ardeth* [Online], 10-11 | 2022, Online since 01 November 2023, connection on 05 December 2023. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/ardeth/3041>



The text only may be used under licence CC BY-NC-ND 4.0. All other elements (illustrations, imported files) are "All rights reserved", unless otherwise stated.

Urban Regeneration Practitioners under Construction. An Unfinished Story of Professionalization

Caterina Quaglio

Abstract

What are the enabling conditions, mechanisms, and criticalities in the process of construction of professional expertise? Elaborating on the results of an empirical and case study analysis carried out across different European countries, the essay addresses this question focusing on the process of professionalization of the architects involved in some major European area-based regeneration programs developed between the 1980s and the first decade of the 2000s. To this end, the text first analyzes the implementation of competencies and knowledge in action, reflecting on the role of architects in some key operations distinctive to this field of urban regeneration. The focus then shifts to a collective dimension to investigate the transferability of the competencies acquired to other *ordinary* contexts. In conclusion, a disconnection is highlighted between the dissemination of a repertoire of codified best practices and the limits imposed on an intrinsically active and interactive professionalism by the unfulfilled innovation of the underlying institutional framework.

Affiliation:

Politecnico di
Torino, Dipartimento
di Architettura e
Design

Contacts:

caterina [dot] quaglio
[at] polito [dot] it

Received:

06 November 2021

Accepted:

18 January 2022

DOI:

10.17454/ARDETH10-11.09

ARDETH #10 #11

The history of peripheral and marginalized urban areas bears evidence of a failure of urban planning and design in the public opinion.

Outlining the background: Crisis and/or opportunity?
The essay investigates the process of professionalization (Hughes, 1963) of urban and architectural designers in the context of some major regeneration programs of deprived and peripheral neighborhoods developed between the 1990s and 2000s in different European countries. In doing so, the aim is to contribute through an in-depth and situated case study to a broader debate on design practices (Doucet, Frichot, 2018). Indeed, this contingency is particularly significant for investigating the construction and transmission of professional competencies and represents a paradigmatic case which allows to address broader questions (Flyvbjerg, 2006). On the one hand, the history of peripheral and marginalized urban areas bears evidence of a failure of urban planning and design in the public opinion. On the other hand, neighborhoods “in crisis” (Jacquier, 1991) gained public recognition in Europe in the last decade of the 20th century, creating the conditions for funding large-scale integrated projects that became a privileged testing ground for the revision of professional practice. From this season of renewal of public and professional action, a new approach to urban regeneration – often defined as *area-based* – emerged as a dominant paradigm in many Community and national initiatives in Europe (Tissot, 2007; Atkinson, 2008; Briata et al., 2009).

For practitioners “the change [...] occurs at many levels and attacks the dimensions of rules, actors and tools” (Pasqui, 2001: 11, translated by the author). In particular, architects engaged in this collective and integrated process of professionalization covering different professional roles: from those working within public offices; to those who benefited from a special relationship with the administrations (Cohen, Grossman, 2015); to internationally renowned figures who contributed to drawing public attention to the issue of urban peripheries (Urban Task Force, 1999; Guillot, 2009). Over the years, design experts – and the same could be said of many other categories of professionals – have thus worked to legitimize what has begun to be described as a specific professionalism that challenged traditional disciplinary categorizations. But while the history of area-based initiatives outlines the contours of an actual process of professional

specialization progressively formalized in a repertoire of best practices (Bonetti et al., 1991; GHK, 2003), it also highlights its limits in terms of transferability and institutional renewal in the long-term.

Research methodology

The essay is based on the results of an empirical research conducted over three years across France, Scotland and Italy¹ through the in-depth analysis of three case studies. Specifically, the subject of the investigation are three regeneration programs of public housing neighborhoods developed between 1980 and 2010 in Orly, Edinburgh and Turin, which have been part of a common history of political and professional exchange at the European level.² All three cases have been publicly recognized as successful examples of exceptional scope and resonance in the European context. Taken together, these three stories thus provide a representative and articulate cross-section of a season of European regeneration initiatives and of the issues they raised in public and professional debate. From a methodological point of view, the empirical study was based on a hybridization between research practices, sources and tools drawn from different disciplinary backgrounds: archival research, ethnographic fieldwork, institutional and oral history. In addition, the analysis is not limited to the official space and timeframe of the projects, but it also takes into account the impacts they have produced in the long term at different local, national and transnational scales. More precisely, the article is based on three main types of sources: direct sources produced during the development of regeneration programs – project drawings, reports, evaluations, etc.; indirect and/or contemporary sources that retrospectively offer reflections on the experience of the area-based regeneration initiatives and their results – including interviews with different categories of actors personally involved in the regeneration programs³ –; and the disciplinary literature outlining the background to the research questions.

The text therefore combines the point of view – and words – of the protagonists of three area-based regeneration programs as they emerged from the analysis of direct sources, and the results of a rereading that, today, allows to grasp some critical aspects

1 – The research was developed within the Ph.D. program in “Architecture. History and Project” of the Politecnico of Turin.

2 – The three programs are the Développement Social de Quartiers in Orly (~1982-1995); the New Life for Urban Scotland in Edinburgh (~1989-1999), and the Programma di Recupero Urbano di Via Artom in Torino (~1995-2008). For the detailed history of each case, which constitutes the documental basis of the present work, see: Quaglio, 2020. The Ph.D. thesis is available online in open access at (<https://iris.polito.it/handle/11583/2844232?mode=full.13517>).

3 – More than fifty semi-structured interviews were conducted with officials, administrators, residents, professionals and researchers involved in the programs. For a complete list of the interviews see Quaglio, 2020, “Bibliografia e fonti”.

Architects are portrayed by means of the different roles they perform, moving from the figure of the “expert” to the “reflective practitioner”, to the “reform conspirator”.

visible only in the long run. Indeed, the historical perspective adopted in the research provides a new angle to “change the focus and questions” (Fourcaut, 1999: 116), addressing the issue of how the actions of designers affect (or not) different contexts in a perspective that is both chronologically, geographically and disciplinarily extended. The aim is to make visible connections and logics that often remain implicit in the practice (Stengers, 2005; Doucet, Frichot, 2018) and, in doing so, to contribute to a broader disciplinary and academic debate.

To this end, the results of the empirical research are combined with the pragmatist interpretative tools of Science and Technology Studies and Actor-Network Theory (Latour, 2005; Felt et al., 2017). The work, therefore, looks at the contexts of professional action both in terms of physical places – neighborhoods, professional and public offices, etc. – and as *collectives*, or “procedure[s] for collecting associations of humans and nonhumans” (Latour, 2004: 238) around a common “matter of concern” (ivi: 244).

The text is structured according to two levels of observation, corresponding to different contexts and moments – not necessarily successive, but often simultaneous in the programs – in the process of professionalization of urban regeneration practitioners. The operational field is the first level analyzed; the focus then shifts to the professional career on the one hand, and the institutional framework on the other, in order to question the way in which the competencies acquired in action are transferred and obtain public recognition and legitimacy. Consequently, throughout the text, architects are portrayed by means of the different roles they perform, moving from the figure of the “expert” (Dawson et al., 1993) to the “reflective practitioner” (Schön, 1983; Amendola, 2009), to the “reform conspirator” (Laino et al., 1994; Jacquier, 2015).

Construction: The implementation of competencies in and from action

The first level of the process of professionalization discussed in this essay relates to the implementation of competencies in action as a result, directly, of the elaboration and reinterpretation of practices in a negotiating and relational dynamic and, indirectly, of the

circulation of ideas and examples at the national and international scale. In this phase, practitioners act in a dual context: on the one hand in the neighborhoods targeted by the regeneration programs and on the other hand in the interdisciplinary working groups set up to pilot the projects.

Although the empirical analysis was developed across different countries and temporalities, it is possible to identify a number of recurrences in the way professional action takes place throughout the programs. In particular, the practices implemented locally have been traced back to four macro-operations that characterize the regeneration programs under study: assembling, setting a perimeter, transformaing, anchoring. Each of them involves a wide range of *actants* (Latour, 2005: 54) – including designers, politicians, residents, but also regulations, money, instruments, etc. – which determine the way these general operations are implemented in context-specific practices. After providing a quick description of each macro-operation, the focus will turn to discussing the role played by architects and the way it affected both the design process and their professional practice.

The first group of practices refers to the assembly of the conditions defining the operational framework of regeneration initiatives. In the programs analyzed the assembly took the form of contractually formalized temporary working structures – Geddes (2000) defines the 1990s as the years of the “new orthodoxy” of local partnership. This is mainly due to exogenous and extraordinary resources employed for the activation of area-based programs in the 1990s. If on the one hand this allowed the development of exceptionally ambitious projects in a limited period of time, on the other it subjected the design action to a condition of temporariness. Consequently, the position assumed in the assembly phase determines the boundaries of designers’ action in the development of the program, their role and, eventually, the competencies they are called upon to mobilize. In both the cases of Turin and Edinburgh, the extraordinary structures set up to accompany the regeneration projects were absorbed into the ordinary administrative apparatuses at the end of the official programs, thus radically changing their role and scope for action. In Orly, instead, both the limited size of the municipality and the continuity

It is possible to identify a number of recurrences in the way professional action takes place throughout the programs.

4 – Particularly controversial in this regard was the selection of the neighborhood of Wester Hailes in Edinburgh for the New Life of Urban Scotland, attributed to political interests of MP and Secretary of State for Scotland Malcolm Rifkind (Scottish Office, 1996).

The delimitation of an intervention area responds to all intents and purposes to a design rationale that only a pragmatic and qualitative experience of the territory allows to control.

of funding guaranteed by the French *politique de la ville* ensured greater consistency to the regeneration process of the *grand ensemble*.

The second macro-operation involves the definition of the perimeters of intervention. Even if officially attributed to objective criteria and indicators, one of the lessons learnt from the first area-based initiatives is that the delimitation of an intervention area responds to all intents and purposes to a design rationale that only a pragmatic and qualitative experience of the territory allows to control (Barca et al., 2012). The definition of program perimeters was one of the most delicate phases in all the histories analyzed. On the one hand, it raised major criticalities and debates as a policy choice;⁴ on the other, it was integrated and mixed with ordinary urban policies as a response to technical needs and interests. Regeneration programs, in the simple act of defining perimeters, produce very deep impacts on the targeted places. Indeed, although they are social and purposive constructs, the perimeters of the projects acquire validity in the course of action, precisely by irreversibly modifying the very conditions that determined their existence – areas are selected to be transformed.

Accordingly, the agreement on perimeters is followed by the implementation of an integrated project aimed at the transformation of the targeted areas. In the area-based initiatives of 1990's, urban transformation typically took shape in a broad spectrum of interventions – architectural, but also social and economic –, ranging from those aimed at *restoring* a state of recognized original or potential quality (e.g. Faure, 1996; Ferrante, 2013); to the *fragmentation* of what is described as a homogeneous and problematic area into smaller units (e.g. Castro, Denissof, 2005); to projects intended to generate a comprehensive transfiguration of the targeted areas (Lelévrier, Noyé, 2012). The Grand Ensemble of Orly, for example, has been the subject at different times of all these modes of intervention. If the 1980s are characterized by projects aimed at the *rehabilitation* of the existing neighborhoods of the Grand Ensemble, during the 1990s, practices of demolition and *residentialization* (Oddos, Geoffroy, 2007) aimed at structurally altering its physical and social fabric gained political and professional legitimacy.

The fourth and last macro-operation involves all the measures implemented in the course of the programs which are explicitly aimed at anchoring (Agger et al., 2016) their results at the end of the initiatives – hence also at the end of extraordinary funding and the extraordinary presence of practitioners in the neighborhood. As a matter of fact, the exceptional nature of the initiatives implies, from an operation point of view, that the presence of professionals in the neighborhoods shall be “biodegradable” (Avedano, 2003). In other words, the goal of anchoring strategies is to ensure that when the extraordinary structures and measures are dismantled, both the territories and the institutions have acquired the necessary tools for ordinary management (Agger, Jensen, 2015). The case of the Turin *Programma di Recupero Urbano* is particularly exemplary in this regard. At the end of the program, an *ad hoc* Community Foundation was established with the explicit goal of “stabilizing the results of the urban regeneration process initiated by the city of Turin [...] through the valorization of private resources and their reinvestment in processes of common interest for the territory” (Fondazione della Comunità di Mirafiori ONLUS, 2017: 5, translated by the author).

This reconstruction allows to put forward some specificities and criticalities that characterize the professional practice of architects in urban regeneration programs. First of all, professionals act in complex relational contexts, not only putting their technical knowledge at the service of a multidisciplinary collective, but also working for the capacitation of that collective. Moreover, they need to become familiar, on the one hand, with a context that presents exceptional and temporary structures and hierarchies and, on the other, with a long and stratified practice of inhabiting the neighborhoods (Amendola, 2009) – precisely what regeneration programs have often been accused of neglecting or oversimplifying (Allen, Bonetti, 2018). Uses, management and maintenance of spaces influence, therefore, the outcomes of a project as much as the design of the space, so that priority must be given to empowering processes. Ultimately, the role of the designers expands and calls into question *meta-projectual* competencies that can be summarized in the ability to “contextualize the action” (Laino, 2012: 183)

Ultimately, the role of the designers expands and calls into question *meta-projectual* competencies that can be summarized in the ability to “contextualize the action”.

We deal with a
“cross-fertilization”
in which the
advancement of
a collective and
complex process
depends on the
strengthening
of individual
competencies.

by grasping and systematizing resources and processes characterized by a high level of unpredictability in a *sustainable* way with respect to a specific place. These considerations, which overall can be synthesized in a widespread demand of renewal in the professional practice, have been progressively brought into focus by the literature that has analyzed regeneration programs from within, i.e., from a contemporary or immediately subsequent perspective. A long-term observation allows not only to better systematize and conceptualize these reasoning, but also to highlight some critical steps. What emerges is the picture of a “reflective practice” based on both situated, adaptive and critical knowledge (Haraway, 1988) that relies on different forms of “tacit knowing-in-action” (Schön, 1983: 49-50), in the continuous and osmotic interaction with places, tools and actors. However, unlike Schön’s practitioner, who remains in a position of centrality in the cognitive process, the *critical reflexivity* of regeneration designers is an attitude dependent on external phenomena and on other professionalisms (Amendola, 2009). We deal with a “cross-fertilization” (Jacquier, 2015: 61) in which the advancement of a collective and complex process depends on the strengthening of individual competencies, that is, on “a work on the ‘cognitive’ ground from which new frames take shape that redefine both the situation and the actors.” (Bifulco, de Leonardis, 2006: 41, translated by the author). The reflective practice therefore represents for the professionals involved in the programs a specific form of “empowerment-in-practice” (Adams, 1996: 38), which becomes manifest in an extension of both their skills and their social capital, understood here as “the norms and networks that enable people to act collectively” (Woolcock, Narayan, 2000: 226). Many of the problems encountered in the case studies (see the next paragraph) are related to a non-strategic formulation of the professional mandate, which tends to put architects in a *weak* position within the process, limiting their perspective and scope for action to a marginal and technical portion of the problem. When they had a more pronounced influence on the long-term impacts of regeneration, architects instead held direct roles in the administration or partnerships. In other words, the technical skills of the designers have

become relevant only if they were expressed within the collective at the appropriate time and in the appropriate form, i.e. during the construction of the context/collective itself.

Contamination: Individual careers and ex-post transferability

As a further step, the research investigates the relationship between the acquisition of competencies on an individual level and their possible transfer through and beyond the “careers” of professionals (Goffman, 1959). How can this tacit knowledge based on direct experience be generalized and transferred to a collective dimension at the end of the programs? In order to answer this question, the competencies implemented in the area-based initiatives have been investigated in relation to their journey across longer professional and personal trajectories, questioning the impacts that they have produced on other collectives.

To this end, from a methodological point of view the research work shifted from consultation of direct and archival sources to the assemblage of academic interpretations concerning the evolution of architects’ professional practice and nonacademic narratives related to the long-term impacts of the three regeneration projects object of the empirical study. Special attention was paid to the reconstruction of the working biography of the protagonists of the projects with the aim of interrogating the transferability of practices and skills along their career path.

At a first level, this knowledge transfer happens through the *contamination* of ordinary contexts such as public and professional offices. Almost all of the *experts* directly involved in the regeneration projects describe the competencies acquired through direct experience as a resource that they could mobilize in their subsequent occupations. Giovanni Magnano, for example, architect and director of Turin’s Progetto Speciale Periferie (PSP) from 1997 to 2006,⁵ recounts that several initiatives promoted in later years when it was moved to the “public housing sector” reproduce, albeit with much more limited resources, the logic and working approach of the PSP – namely, the development of cross-sectoral projects and the enhancement of territorial resources.⁶ Overall, however, since the contamination of ordinary contexts has

5 – The Progetto Speciale Periferie was an extraordinary project launched in 1997 by the City of Turin and responsible in the late 1990s and early 2000s for the coordination of an exceptional season of area-based urban regeneration programs in the city.

6 – E.g.: Lo.Ca.Re social housing agency; the “Solidarity Cohabitations”; the “Youth Cohabitations”.

Almost all of the *experts* directly involved in the regeneration projects describe the competencies acquired through direct experience as a resource that they could mobilize in their subsequent occupations.

7 – This situation recurs in all three cases under study. Especially explanatory in this regard was Luisa Avedano, in charge of the European network Quartiers en Crise for the City of Turin until 2007 (personal interview, 27/11/2018).

Professionals who cover the role of *diplomats* frequently face the limits of an unfulfilled empowerment, not because of a lack of their skills, but because of a lack of collective acknowledgement of those skills.

often been in the hands of a relatively small number of people, it has produced very uncertain outcomes, poised between an almost spontaneous propensity of individuals to internalize lessons learned from direct experience and a structural difficulty in rooting such knowledge within larger systems.

Isabelle Stengers, recognizing *diplomacy* as one of the main challenges posed to practitioners, warns, “Diplomats must be ‘empowered’ but this means that the people who empower them have the power to do so, and also the power needed to accept being put at risk by the propositions the diplomats bring back.” (Stengers, 2005: 193). In the stories investigated, professionals who cover – often in spite of themselves – the role of *diplomats* frequently face the limits of an unfulfilled empowerment, not because of a lack of their skills, but because of a lack of collective acknowledgement of those skills. This is the case for the many public and private professionals who, upon completion of the extraordinary regeneration programs, could not use the experience gained as an added value for their job growth.⁷ Consequently, when professionals lacked sufficient autonomy and power in the position they covered after the regeneration programs, they were often compelled to return to ordinary working methods.

A further level of contamination concerns the institutional-regulatory sphere. The reform of the institutional context was, in fact, a priority objective for the proponents of area-based initiatives, explicitly oriented towards “an in-depth transformation of the ways of doing things, of behaviors and of the logic of action of public and private actors” (Jacquier, 1991: 30, translated by the author).

To address the issue of institutional innovation, a metaphor widely used in the public debate of the 1990s was the binomial network/framework. According to this interpretation, the network would represent an alternative and a complement to an institutional framework structurally destined to leave behind some gray areas – in this case, the *neighborhoods in crisis*.

These network and framework models are not mutually incompatible. To the contrary they can form a symbiosis, even if it is occasionally conflictual. Partnership organizations, these latter-day Trojan horses, seek to foster this co-existence

in order to regenerate, at the margins, the traditional institutions. (Dawson et al., 1993: 46).

For those *reform conspirators* (Laino et al., 1994; Jacquier, 2015) who patiently guided the emergence of the area-based approach across different contexts, the ultimate target was, therefore, the very *institutional architecture* in the backdrop of the programs. This meant, however, going beyond the goals and scope of a single regeneration program and using it as a trigger for a wider reform of the overall institutional and professional context.

During the 1990's the progressive transition from government to governance systems (Bifulco, de Leonardis, 2006; Le Galès, Halpern, 2013) opened the way for an overall (re)organization of the relationship between the political and professional components in public decision-making processes. One of the most interesting aspects of the partnerships of area-based initiatives was precisely to bring technical and political figures at the same table – albeit within the circumscribed context of a program – and, in this way, to offer the conditions for the construction of a system of interactions which, while respecting them, did not reflected the ordinary hierarchies. Both technical officials and external professionals who participated in the three programs under study testify to the exceptional conditions of work context set up during the regeneration programs, which have been rarely found in their subsequent occupations.⁸

The proliferation of handbooks and reports bears witness of a season of political success of area-based initiatives in Europe – and, accordingly, of the progressive legitimization of urban regeneration *experts*. However, in the history of area-based initiatives, the structural innovation of the very tools and rules that define the context for professional actions turned out to be a much more controversial goal. In retrospect, many sources recognized in the exceptionality of the conditions characterizing the area-based initiatives of the 1990's the cause of their difficult reproducibility and the main symptom of their limitations as benchmark urban policy (Carpenter, 2006; Tosi, 2004; specific to the case of Turin see: Fioretti, 2008). Outside the perimeters of the programs, the renewal of the professional and institutional framework has

8 – E.g. Jean Deroche (consultant architect for the city of Orly, principal coordinator and designer of the Développement des Quartiers), personal email, “Notre histoire d'Orly”, 28/04/2019; Steve McGavin (Strategic Officer for the Edinburgh Council in the Wester Hailes Partnership), personal interview, 04/07/2019; Alessandra Aires (Urban Planning and Land Division of the City of Turin, in charge of the urban project of the PRU of Via Artom), personal interview, 20/02/2018; Giovanni Pesce, (former Urban Regeneration Sector of the City of Turin, tutor for the area of Via Artom during the PRU), personal interview, 21/02/2018.

Many sources recognized in the exceptionality of the conditions characterizing the area-based initiatives of the 1990's the cause of their difficult reproducibility.

If bottom-up contamination does not trigger innovations in the structural framework, the risk is, that the capital of knowledge and skills acquired in the programs will remain bound to the volubility of individual trajectories and/or frustrations.

collided with a sectoral working practice extremely entrenched in both the bureaucracies and the habits of public offices. The progressive accreditation of new working methods and professional figures, while undeniable, is therefore to be read as the partial outcome of an unfulfilled process of innovation. Following the path through which practices and tools have been deposited and evolved in the working routines of administrations and professional offices, the traces of innovation are rather found in the single device or episode. “The concept of ‘bricolage’ is pertinent, where ‘bits and pieces of the existing ideational and institutional legacy are put together in new forms” (Mendez, 2013: 641).

If bottom-up contamination does not trigger innovations in the structural framework, the risk is, therefore, that the capital of knowledge and skills acquired in the programs will remain bound to the volubility of individual trajectories and/or frustrations. The conditions for an effective public capitalization of this legacy would therefore reside both in the acknowledgement and in the overcoming of the scale of the *proximity* of neighborhoods as “local laboratories” (Bacqué et al., 2005) and of individuals as conspirators of innovation.

Final Remarks: The Value of Indefiniteness

The history of area-based regeneration programs of the 1980s and 1990s is usually recounted as a successful parable that pioneered highly innovative models of work or, on the contrary, as a season of policies which failed to tackle structural problems. This article offers new insights to overcome this success-failure binomial and question (I) what is the legacy of this experience in terms of knowledge and competencies acquired by professionals in the short and long time and (II) how it contributed to the professionalization process of the urban and architectural designers who took part in it.

Regeneration programs have actually proven to be extremely productive places for professional innovation, architectural and otherwise, which initiated a long process of legitimation and accreditation of the figure of the *urban regeneration expert*. Places where “public choices and collective behaviors interact strongly with the real life of institutions – changing them,

consuming them, renewing them, confronting them.” (Donolo, 1997: 8). But also places – or rather *collectives* – that have shown their limits in the very conditions of exceptionalism within which they operated. Even among the protagonists of the programs of the 1990s, what prevails is, indeed, the depiction of a season of exceptional but unaccomplished experimentation. While accepting the impossibility to generalize a universally valid working model – or even one that can be transmitted through a “mute” repertoire of best practices –, what this experiences can help to outline is “a ‘theory of action’ to which [actors] have recourse in a rhapsodic, commingled, cross-cutting, and diverse manner depending on occasion and conjuncture.” (Crosta, 1998: 8). In the history of area-based initiatives, this very indeterminateness has proven to be of great practical use in the implementation of programs, an essential condition for individual and collective learning and innovation. For innovation to occur, the collectives responsible for regeneration must therefore function as adaptive systems capable of responding to evolving and unforeseen circumstances. They must, consequently, rely on a high level of interpretability and/or ambiguity. But, as March (1991: 71) points out:

Adaptive systems that engage in exploration to the exclusion of exploitation are likely to find that they suffer the costs of experimentation without gaining many of its benefits. They exhibit too many undeveloped new ideas and too little distinctive competence.

In the programs, this risk became manifest in a widespread propensity to work in a restricted – and, as such, effective – field of action, bypassing the most bureaucratized and cumbersome procedures. However, renouncing the contamination of institutions and ordinary bureaucracies also means circumscribing the professional role to a restricted sphere, to a nucleus of experts who, at the end of the programs, do not dispose of the frameworks necessary to transmit or fully legitimize the experiences gained in action. The professionalization of urban regeneration experts is, therefore, not a linear trajectory. It is, rather, a path that can be reconstructed only by delving into the “interstices of ‘innovative’ actions of urban regeneration”

For innovation to occur, the collectives responsible for regeneration must therefore function as adaptive systems capable of responding to evolving and unforeseen circumstances.

How design processes can be intentionally used as a means to promote not just contingent outcomes, but structural professional and institutional innovation?

(Tedesco, 2011), in the most hidden legacies left in the places, people and institutions. As a consequence, a particularly critical node resides in the transferability of this kind of legacy, which highlights a discrepancy between careers and best practices. That is, between competencies based on the reflective ability of architects to *interpret* their role in a social context (Hughes, 1963), and a crystallized repertoire of practices circulated independently of the rhythms and the contexts on which they depend. In order to contribute to an actual professional legitimization of architects as urban regeneration practitioners, the challenge, inaugurated but not concluded by the programs of the 1990s, lies therefore in an overhaul of institutional systems of *power* capable of opening some cracks to new forms of effective *empowerment* (Taylor, 2000: 1033).

Towards this end – which transcends the scope of this work –, the capitalization of relevant experiences is a key step for increasing scientific understanding of the interaction between architectural practice and urban development processes – and vice versa – and for raising questions that require further investigation. Two issues emerged from the history of area-based regeneration programs, in particular, are considered critical to current professional practice and teaching: how to transfer those soft competencies, which enable architects to put their technical expertise to work in complex decision-making contexts? And how design processes can be intentionally used as a means to promote not just contingent outcomes, but structural professional and institutional innovation?

References

- Adams, R. (1996), *Social Work and Empowerment*, Basingstoke Hampshire, Macmillan.
- Agger, A., Jensen, J. O. (2015), *Area-based Initiatives-And Their Work in Bonding, Bridging and Linking Social Capital*, “European Planning Studies”, vol. 23, n. 10, pp. 2045-2061.
- Agger, A., Roy, P., Leonardsen, Ø. (2016), *Sustaining Area-based Initiatives by Developing Appropriate “Anchors”: the Role of Social Capital*, “Planning Theory & Practice”, vol. 17, n. 3, pp. 325-343.
- Allen, B., Bonetti, M. (2018), *L’habiter, un impensé de la politique de la ville: pour un renouvellement du sens de l’action*, La Tour d’Aigues, Éditions de l’Aube.
- Amendola, G. (ed.) (2009), *Il progettista riflessivo: scienze sociali e progettazione architettonica*, Bari-Roma, Laterza.

- Atkinson, R. (2008), *European Urban Policies and the Neighbourhood: An Overview*, "Urban Design and Planning", vol. 161, n. 3, pp. 115-122.
- Avedano, L. (2003), *Rigenerazione urbana e reti europee: la partecipazione di Torino in Quartiers en Crise*, tesi di laurea, relatore G. Dansero, Università degli Studi di Torino, Corso di Laurea Magistrale in Scienze Politiche.
- Bacqué, M.-H., Rey, H., Sintomer, Y. (eds), (2005), *Gestion de proximité et démocratie participative: une perspective comparative*, Paris, Découverte.
- Barca, F., McCann, P., Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2012), *The Case for Regional Development Intervention: Place-based versus Place-neutral Approaches*, "Journal of Regional Science", vol. 52, n. 1, pp. 134-152.
- Bifulco, L., de Leonardis, O. (2006), *Integrazione tra le politiche come opportunità politica*, in C. Donolo (ed.), *Il futuro delle politiche pubbliche*, Milano, Bruno Mondadori, pp. 31-58.
- Bonetti, M., Conan, M., Allen, B. (1991), *Développement social urbain: stratégies et methods*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Briata, P., Bricocoli, M., Tedesco, C. (2009), *Città in periferia: politiche urbane e progetti locali in Francia, Gran Bretagna e Italia*, Roma, Carocci.
- Carpenter, J. (2006), *Addressing Europe's Urban Challenges: Lessons from the EU URBAN Community Initiative*, "Urban Studies", vol. 43, n. 12, 2006, pp. 2145-2162.
- Castro, R., Denissou, S. (2005), *[Re]Modeler, métamorphoser*, Paris, Éd. du Moniteur.
- Cohen, J.-L., Grossman, V. (eds) (2015), *AUA: une architecture de l'engagement, 1960-1985*, Paris, Carré.
- Crosta, P. L. (1998), *Politiche: quale conoscenza per l'azione territoriale*, Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Dawson, J. et al. (1993), *Quartiers en Crise: Citizenship Laboratories For Europe?*, Quartiers en Crise Programme 1991-93 Final Report, Commission of the European Communities, Directorate General XVI-Regional Policies.
- Donolo, C. (1997), *L'intelligenza delle istituzioni*, Milano, Feltrinelli.
- Doucet, I., Frichot, H. (2018), *Resist, Reclaim, Speculate: Situated Perspectives on Architecture and the City*, "Architectural Theory Review", vol. 22, n. 1, pp. 1-8.
- Faure, A. (ed.), (1996), *Entre les tours et les barres: restructurer les espaces publics des grands ensembles*, Lyon, CERTU.
- Felt, U. et al. (eds), (2017), *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, Fourth edition, Cambridge (MA), The MIT Press.
- Ferrante, A. (2013), *A.A.A.: adeguamento, adattabilità, architettura: teorie e metodi per la riqualificazione architettonica, energetica ed ambientale del patrimonio edilizio esistente*, Milano, Bruno Mondadori.

- Fioretti, C. (2008) *Buone pratiche in Italia*, "Urbanistica Informazioni", n. 219, pp. 64-67.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006), *Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research*, "Qualitative Inquiry", vol. 12, n. 2, pp. 219-245.
- Fondazione della Comunità di Mirafiori ONLUS (2017), *Bilancio di missione 2012-2016* [Online]. Available at: https://fondazionemirafiori.it/mirafiori/attachments/BilancioMissione2016-we_b_NEW.pdf [Accessed: 22 July 22].
- Fourcaut, A. (1999), *Les habits neufs des politiques de la ville depuis 1980*, "Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire", vol. 64, pp. 113-119.
- Geddes, M. (2000), *Tackling Social Exclusion in the European Union? The Limits to the New Orthodoxy of Local Partnership*, "International Journal of Urban and Regional Research", vol. 24, n. 4, pp. 782-800.
- GHK (2003), *Ex Post Evaluation of URBAN Community Initiative (1994-1999)*, Final Report.
- Goffman, E. (1959), *The Moral Career of the Mental Patient*, "Psychiatry", vol. 22, n. 2, pp. 123-142.
- Guillot, P. (ed.), (2009), *À propos de Banlieues 89: entretien avec l'architecte Roland Castro*, "Cahiers d'histoire. Revue d'histoire critique", vol. 109, pp. 95-97.
- Haraway, D. (1988), *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective*, "Feminist Studies", vol. 14, n. 3, pp. 575-599.
- Hughes, E. C. (1963), *Professions*, "Daedalus", vol. 92, n. 4, pp. 655-668.
- Jacquier, C. (1991), *Voyage dans dix quartiers européens en crise*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Jacquier, C. (2015), *Empowerment, mythe et réalité. Chronique raisonnée d'un itinéraire rural communautaire*, "Forum", vol. 144-145, pp. 56-66.
- Laino, G. (2012), *Il fuoco nel cuore e il diavolo in corpo: la partecipazione come attivazione sociale*, Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Laino, G., Stanco, A., Stanco, L. (1994), *Quartieri Spagnoli: storia di un intervento*, "Napoli nel Guado", pp. 26-29.
- Latour, B. (2004), *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*, trans. C. Porter, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2005), *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-network-theory*, Oxford (NY), Oxford University Press.
- Le Galès, P., Halpern, C. (2013), *Grandeur et décadence de la politique urbaine de l'Union européenne*, in *Working papers du Programme Villes & territoires, 2013-2014*, Paris, Science Po.
- Lelévrier, C., Noyé, C. (2012), *La Fin des Grands Ensembles?*, in J. Donzelot (ed.), *A quoi sert la rénovation urbaine?*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, pp. 185-218.
- March, J. G. (1991), *Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning*, "Organization Science", vol. 2, n. 1, pp. 71-87.

Mendez, C. (2013), *The Post-2013 Reform of EU Cohesion Policy and the Place-based Narrative*, "Journal of European Public Policy", vol. 20, n. 5, pp. 639-659.

Oddos, É., Geoffroy, G. (eds) (2007), *La résidentialisation en questions*, Lyon, Certu.

Pasqui, G. (2001), *Il territorio delle politiche: innovazione sociale e pratiche di pianificazione*, Milano, Franco Angeli.

Quaglio, C. (2020), *Il fardello pubblico. La rigenerazione "area-based" dei quartieri pubblici: storie di luoghi, pratiche, scambi*. Parigi, Edimburgo, Torino (...1982-2008...), tesi di dottorato, tutor F. De Pieri, co-tutor A. Armando, Politecnico di Torino, Dottorato in Architettura. Storia e Progetto.

Schön, D. A. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, New York, Basic Books.

Scottish Office (1996), *Partnership in the Regeneration of Urban Scotland*, Edinburgh, HMSO.

Stengers, I. (2005), *Introductory Notes on an Ecology of Practices*, "Cultural Studies Review", vol. 11, n. 1, pp. 183-196.

Taylor, M. (2000), *Communities in the Lead: Power, Organisational Capacity and Social Capital*, "Urban Studies", vol. 37, n. 5-6, pp. 1019-1035.

Tedesco, C. (2011), *Negli interstizi delle azioni "innovative" di rigenerazione urbana*, "Archivio di studi urbani e regionali", vol. 100, pp. 82-98.

Tissot, S. (2007), *L'état et les quartiers: genèse d'une catégorie de l'action publique*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil.

Tosi, A. (2004), *Case, quartieri, abitanti, politiche*, Milano, CLUP.

Urban Task Force (ed.), (1999), *Towards an Urban Renaissance. Final Report of the Urban Task Force*, London, Spon.

Woolcock, M., Narayan, D. (2000), *Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy*, "The World Bank Research Observer", vol. 15, n. 2, pp. 225-249.