

# Journal of Urban Technology

## From 'Smart in the box' to 'Smart in the city' – rethinking the socially sustainable smart city in context --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Full Title:</b>	From 'Smart in the box' to 'Smart in the city' – rethinking the socially sustainable smart city in context
<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	CJUT-2019-0058R1
<b>Article Type:</b>	Special Issue Paper
<b>Keywords:</b>	smart cities; social sustainability; space and place; context
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>This paper focuses on the importance of framing and conceiving smart urban initiatives and schemes in a highly context-sensitive way, and argues that place-based approaches are essential for enhancing the social sustainability of smart cities. It does so highlighting how such perspective is often ignored by discourses and visions that favor generalized and socially skewed ways of framing the 'city' as well as the citizens who are expected to become 'smart' and benefit from high technologies. These, the paper argues, leave out the important nuances and social and spatial 'interstices' that make places unique, and by doing so weaken the ability of smart to be inclusive and afford a rich landscape of technological appropriation making cities more resilient.</p>
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Alessandro Aurigi Nancy Odendaal
<b>Response to Reviewers:</b>	We have included a list of changes detailing our response to the comments from reviewer 1. We have welcomed all of them and addressed them as best as we could do.

## From 'Smart in the box' to 'Smart in the city' – Rethinking the Socially Sustainable Smart City in Context

### *Abstract*

*This paper focuses on the importance of framing and conceiving smart urban initiatives and schemes in a highly context-sensitive way, and argues that place-based approaches are essential for enhancing the social sustainability of smart cities. It does so highlighting how such perspective is often ignored by discourses and visions that favor generalized and socially skewed ways of framing the 'city' as well as the citizens who are expected to become 'smart' and benefit from high technologies. These, the paper argues, leave out the important nuances and social and spatial 'interstices' that make places unique, and by doing so weaken the ability of smart to be inclusive and afford a rich landscape of technological appropriation making cities more resilient.*

### **Introduction**

The smart city narrative has recently become closely associated with the concept of sustainability. Early warning systems and control room monitoring enabled through sensor technology make an important contribution to mitigation and anticipation of the shock impacts of climate change. Smart grids and water monitoring systems enable resource efficiency and feedback loops. Whilst the operational elements of smart cities are largely uncontested, there nevertheless exists a need to shine a sharper light on the long-term sustainability of digital urbanism. Concerns have emerged regarding the packaged smart city: the delineated norms and standards, technological fixes and comprehensive marketing solutions to complex urban problems, promoted by multinational software and hardware firms. In this paper, we refer to this prevalently pre-packaged, product-like version of the smart city, as the 'smart in a box' and interrogate the social sustainability of technology-driven solutions to complex social issues. In writing this paper we aim at looking at a number of initiatives, most of which have been reviewed before, but in a way that frames and highlights a different interpretation of this phenomenon and argues for the 'smart city out of the box' or a 'smart *in* the city' approach to incorporating digital technologies and media into context-sensitive city making. The central position of the paper is that this is significantly more socially sustainable. While we posit a particular argument with regard to how we think about technology-embedded urbanism, our intention is to provide an alternative lens to analyzing and understanding the nature of smart urbanism. Foregrounding the technical aspects of smart, we argue, makes the qualities of place and the human agency that crucially contribute to city-making invisible. Revealing and re-affirming these and their role through research, and then re-embedding them into smart urbanism practice, is fundamental to constructing a socially sustainable vision of the future city.

The paper structure unfolds as follows: we begin discussing what is often a pre-packaged, generalized and idealized interpretation of what the city (and the smart city) is. This is referred to across this paper as the 'smart city in a box' to highlight the over-simplification of the civic concept and the standardization of issues in much of the smart-related discourse and practice. We provide a critique that questions notions of citizenship and social sustainability embedded in the assumptions that drive many of these initiatives. The increasingly ubiquitous nature of the smart city narrative – its policy mobility and application to many parts of the global North and South - necessitates a global perspective. The purposeful inclusion of literature on the global South has implicit and explicit aims in this regard. We argue from a standpoint of multiple urbanisms, where qualities such as informality and urban inequality emphasized in the literature on cities in the global South, are acknowledged as issues that resonate globally. More explicitly, we recognize that the work on cities of the global

South provide valuable insights into the many challenges and potential solutions that potentially enable more socially sustainable cities. In short, a global focus that learns from the north and south provides a more robust resource for exploring what a socially progressive and sustainable smart city could look like. We further conclude on the implications this work would have for future research on sustainable smart cities.

### **Problematizing Sustainable ‘Smart’**

Defining what a smart city is or might be is an exercise that can range from the apparently obvious to the near impossible. The vast amount of publicly available information about smart city-related concepts, products and envisaged solutions mirrors the utopian hype that Graham and Marvin (1996) critically described as characterizing the emergence of urban advanced telecommunications and cyberspace at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Much of this presents a generic concept of the smart city as an urban revolution in the making. While concepts of smart do not necessarily entirely or exclusively align with views of ‘digital’ urbanism (see for instance Caragliu et al, 2011), any quick Internet or literature search will reveal how the role of ICTs dominates how the phenomenon is described. This ‘revolution’ seems always to be enabled by a series of technological products – be them infrastructural or software-based ones – and ‘solutions’ that can be superimposed on and merged with elements of the built environment in both newly and appositely built towns, or as retrofits to existing cities. The visual language of corporate smart city visions reveals an ‘ideal city’ that forms a coherent whole, seamlessly connected through ICT infrastructure and run on big data. Recently the development of check boxes of codes and standards further perpetuates the ‘city/neighborhood in a box’ idea. This pre-packaged city concept vastly contrasts with the messy textures of the real city. The ubiquity and homogeneity of the visual language of these visions (Rose, 2017) highlights how particularly stark the contradictions between what is idealized and what is real are. These are stronger for cities which do not conform to the one-size-fits-all large, hi-tech metropolis model offered, and are even more blatant in the global South. Furthermore, the language of smart is often used to market edge cities/neighborhoods that perpetuate urban sprawl. These urban fantasies, as Watson (2014) refers to them, are not only indicative of exclusionary urban development, but also real estate interests driving a spatial vision that defies sustainable and compact urban development (Ballard et al, 2017).

More critical accounts of the phenomenon have of course highlighted how diverse and complex this landscape is. Various typologies have evolved in the corporate and governance spheres of what smart cities are capable of, and should be addressing. Three trends in contemporary discussions in the media and literature are discernable (Odendaal, 2016). The first is a seemingly more direct engagement with the social and cultural coordinates of urbanity. In many cases this is marketing language used to augment corporate agendas, a visual language that emphasizes global connection and a ubiquitous urban vision of enhanced efficiency and seamless service delivery. The second is an engagement with natural sustainability and specifically climate change (Cowley et al, 2018), reinforcing the relationship between resilience, early warning and disaster management and intertwining with the ‘eco-city’ concept (Caprotti, 2014). The third shift is an explicit acknowledgement of other infrastructure services (Odendaal, 2016). The relationship between ICT and other utilities has always been implicit. Municipal utility billing systems rely heavily on centralized information capture and processing for example. Explicit references to technology enabled management of services and digital innovations such as smart grids focus on the interrelationship between utility parts. What emerges is a narrative that suggests comprehensive city making through technological connection; a “modern infrastructure ideal” (Graham and Marvin,

2001) where the connection between the technical and the social, the technical and the natural, and between infrastructure functions all contribute to seamless and efficient urban systems.

To make sense of tentative and partial accounts of this range of work and approaches, Mora et al (2017) offer – through a bibliometric longitudinal analysis of research – an extremely useful overview of the status and directions of the debate, beyond the hype easily found on the Web. This on the one hand confirms the strong role of what the authors call a ‘corporate’ tech-driven model of the smart city, which “fails to account for the social and cultural challenges that smart-city developments pose in anything but technological terms” (p.19). However, a strand of mainly academic literature pointing at a ‘holistic’ and ‘human-centric’ interpretation of the phenomenon and its opportunities is identified as a promising counterpoint to technocratic rhetoric.

Adding to, and complementing those observations, the point this paper wants to highlight is that the prevailing discourses on the smart city, certainly the ones with a commercial, technocratic root but also part of the scientific, R&D and critical accounts, whilst perhaps calling for a degree of connection with an often generic concept of ‘community’, tend to encourage thinking which is not as deeply engaged with the local context where smart ‘concepts’ are proposed and applied. Furthermore, it can be argued that the specific challenges and opportunities offered by place need to be brought into the fold, and require contextually embedded responses if any smart solutions are to be socially sustainable. The ‘smart city’ is too often framed as a general construct responding to generalized challenges and conditions – and often offering generalized products as ‘solutions’ to these. This in turn makes smart urbanism much less of a re-invention of place and more of a re-mediation (Bolter and Grusing, 1999: 182) and technological fixing of take-for-granted and partial views of what the city is and what its citizens do and need. Smart seems – in other words – much more of a hi-tech endowment of the status quo, and confirmation of a recent middle-class oriented drive toward urban development and management trajectories, than a movement supporting any major re-invention of how we conceive urban space and more generally inhabitation. We argue that this leaves little room for the structural changes and fresh thinking necessary to enable social and ecological sustainability. At worst, the smart city policy discourse can become a smokescreen that distracts from the more immediate issues facing a city (Watson, 2014). Furthermore, the generic problem formulation, and codified smart solutions that emanate from such analyses, leave little room for local innovation. This can be observed in the ways both the ‘city’ and its problems, and life within it – so the ‘citizens’ – are interpreted within much of the debate. In order to formulate sustainable smart city responses that are cognizant of the structural parameters of urban spaces as well as the local conditions that inform citizen-led responses, we argue for a more textured understanding of the ‘analog’ city and its relationship to technological evolution.

### **Constructing the (Smart) City**

Digital technologies, hardware sensors and devices, software and big data – the fundamental components of smart urban systems – promise ways to understand and manage increasingly complex systems. Their affirmation calls for the ‘city’ to be interpreted as a critical, over-complex entity, which changes very rapidly and has become about unmanageable through traditional approaches. The spatial problem, therefore, focuses on the expected trajectories of sprawling, growing large urban centers. This is an approach that transcends and somehow precedes smart city debates and has been noted in a more general sense by Robinson (2006) who argues that “Because the analysis of global- and world-cities theorists have come to rely on identifying the significance of cities to only certain elements of the global economy, cities that are poorer, marginal to key

globalizing economic sectors or, as Manuel Castells (1983) puts it, 'structurally irrelevant' receive very little attention in this approach" (p.99). But this fits particularly well the logics of corporate smart urbanism, as economies of scale coupled with the ability to conceive easily transferable systems and 'solutions' are a key enabler of a prospected commercial offer. Therefore the city is conveniently problematized through the need to find ways to cope with large scale and growth, and the prospect of managing future 'megacities' as a consequence of unstoppable urbanization tends to be the vastly prevalent interpretation offered of the urban condition. This involves dealing with 'more': more energy consumption, more vehicular traffic, more pressure on natural resources, more people including any perceived strain from immigration - and so on. The spectre premise of mass urbanization is repeated in the introductions to most documents marketing smart technologies for cities (see for example Team Ambrosus 2018 on the Ambrosus.com blog). The 'usual suspects' of highly ranked smart cities - Singapore, Barcelona, New York, Amsterdam and London - together with purpose-built new towns like Songdo or Masdar (Forbes, 2018; Ierek, 2018; Chaturvedi, 2018) are provided as models for construction of smart cities elsewhere and for the ideas they can embed.

These cities are clearly different from each other, but they all respond to a characteristic in common: they are seen and represented as successful, growing cities (or ready to grow in the new towns case) which face a series of possible issues with resources, capacity, pollution and the management of mobility. They need to act to avoid becoming victims of their own success and the consequences of over-population and an erosion of safety, environmental quality and more generally quality of life. More than an opportunity to conceive new forms of urbanism then, and with them new economic models, smart technologies are presented as a necessary set of remedies for protecting the city and equipping it to grow in a controlled and safe way. The case for the smart city is therefore often made by employing emergency discourses, which depict the urban condition as critical if not actually terminal, and highlight the desperate need for urgent technological fixes. Cities are described as "ill-equipped to deal with the shift in population and lack the necessary scale of infrastructure required to support it" (Living PlanIT, 2011). Anil Menon argues on the CISCO blog that "With limited resources, obstacles that range from traffic congestion and pollution to infrastructure constraints and overcrowding are increasingly amplified – all of which requires a paradigm shift in how we approach and manage these types of situations" (Menon, 2013). Similarly, Schneider Electric argues on its website that "Cities face huge challenges: congestion, pollution, blackouts, crime, debt and rising costs - while competing with each other for investment, jobs and talents. Cities need to become smarter: more efficient, sustainable and liveable" (Schneider Electric, 2014), and GSMA remarks that "To ensure that the cities of the future are safe and healthy places to live and work, smart city initiatives are being established globally" (GSMA Connected Living website).

The global reference in the GSMA and other mainstream smart narratives is not incidental, and suggests a global homogeneity of issues and the consequent suitability of global solutions. As the adoption of a rhetoric of urban crisis due to exponential growth, coupled with the challenges of climate change adaptation and monitoring, suits the smart city discourse so well, the sprawling mega-cities of the South can also naturally provide both a critical-mass market and a test bed for these technologies. The smart city phenomenon is no longer simply a Northern idea. The corporate mobility of the notion of smart, together with other fashionable terms such as 'eco' and 'world-class' provide politicians and investors with the motivational discourses to justify smart city initiatives. The Modi regime in India has engaged in creating 100 smart cities in India in 10 years. The language resonates with that used in the global North. Smart cities are defined as "cities that leverage data gathered from smart sensors through a smart grid to create a city that is livable, workable and sustainable" (Sethi, 2014). Private companies such as IBM and Cisco are touted to invest in smart grid infrastructure while the government of Singapore is claimed to be interested in supporting the

construction of 10 smart cities on the Delhi-Mumbai industrial corridor. The *Business Standard's* Sunil Sethi (2014) speaks of it as a "... fuzzy, New Millenium fantasy", with technology hubs such as Bangalore and Hyderabad's technology districts coexisting with slums and *chawls*.

However, references to social sustainability and contextual engagement are tenuous. The emphasis tends to be on improved quality of life, an emphasis on climate change and the fact that vulnerability to floods and storms in over half of developing world is a reality, as well as the need for improved governance (Odendaal, 2016). Technology is the simple, as the panacea for social and environmental ills. The inherent assumption is that the economic benefits of ICT-enhanced service improvement and delivery will eventually distribute to the poor. Efficiency seems to be the key for a better life for all, in an over-expanding city. We – it is argued – are living in cities which are fundamentally out of control, and that is becoming a terminal condition. Such a dystopia can be counter-balanced by the soft utopia of smart fixing. As Söderström et al (2014) argue in their revealing analysis of IBM's Smarter Cities' discourse: "'smarter cities' is a mild utopianism: it promises efficiency rather than paradise on earth" (p.316). Digitally-assisted urbanity brings with it the benefits of the de-materialization of otherwise polluting processes (as Benedikt had argued in 1991 in his celebration of the emergence of 'cyberspace'), universal services, and above all expert systems which assist living and moving, and manage the otherwise spiraling out of control issues. The analysis on strategic trajectories for smart city developments carried out by Mora et al (2018) tends, if anything to generally confirm the presence of such bias. Particularly, what is described in the so-called 'classification system 2' of smart city initiatives, which lists the main application domains observed across a series of case studies analyzed by various authors, aligns with a picture which is skewed towards the idea of a successful, growing and increasingly hard to manage urban center. Prevalent are applications focusing on the management of resources, efficiency improvements, service delivery, safety and the valuing of cultural heritage. Whilst none of these is of course wrong per se, and all are needed in a general sense, the near absence from such picture of different initiatives trying to address other, socially relevant themes is something to reflect upon. The discourse of the growing and almost runaway urban machine in need of fixing does help shrouding and distracting attention from other, though radically different, perspectives. Before discussing these we also need to look at the problem from another viewpoint. Interpreting the city as rapidly urbanizing, growing and being subjected to increasing consumption and mobility issues and a desire for control, safety and cleanliness, also implies a relatively narrow focus on who the 'citizens' are, how they use and inhabit their urban places, and what issues matter to them.

### **Who Are the Smart Citizens?**

Robert Hollands (2008) outlines how wide and complex the range of interpretations of the 'smart city' concept can be. But he also remarks how this ends up being generally simplified and its aims seen as very much aligned with a gentrified vision of urban economic development, all geared towards certain classes of citizens. Instead of representing a change of direction, an innovative view and approach, it can very much mirror and reinforce the trend:

The smart/creative city can become not only more economically polarized, but also socially, culturally and spatially divided by the growing contrast between incoming knowledge and creative workers, and the unskilled and IT illiterate sections of the local poorer population (Peck, 2005; Smith, 1996). Urban gentrification in this regard, refers not just to housing and neighbourhoods as it once did (see Butler,

1997), but increasingly to consumption, lifestyle and leisure in the city (see Chatterton and Hollands, 2002) (Hollands, 2008: 312).

Such a vision of a dominant – and somehow desirable – category of highly skilled, exigent and mobile city dwellers and indeed visitors, with specific lifestyle and ‘quality of life’ needs, has been repeatedly highlighted by various authors (see for instance Sorkin, 1992 and Wilson, 1995) critiquing an increased commodification of public space beyond – and before – any smart urbanism discourses. These new mobile middle classes with disposable income and a need for “the finest features and benefits (...) history, culture, safe neighbourhoods, good housing, shops and education, and progressive local government” (Boyer, 1993: 125), bring with them a skewed view of what themes are important and what urban environments can do for their citizens. Anna Minton, another author who has extensively commented on the control and commodification of UK cities, has referred to the Business Improvement District (BID) model as a leading, key example of such trend. This model implies the prioritization of certain needs which are seen as coherent with the shopping-related needs of urban users: “The first layer on which the whole structure depends is the creation of a clean and safe environment, so just as man needs to breathe and eat to survive, these parts of the city need to be clean and safe. The next layer is ‘transport and access’, the level up is ‘marketing and branding of the area’ and the apex is the creation of a ‘memorable experience for visitors’” (Minton, 2009: 43)

The reassuring and business-friendly features of a service-rich, clean and safe environment, with good transport links and offering a ‘memorable experience’ to citizens who very much behave like visitors, are in fact largely echoed by smart city technology offerings, and celebrated by the related commercial literature. The prevalent, mainstream visions of smart urbanism involve an urgency to address the needs for cleaner and environmentally more sustainable towns, though with a marked focus on high-middle class expectations whilst – as previously noted by Hollands (2008) – celebrating the role of cities as centers of attraction of highly-skilled, wealthy and mobile urbanites involved in a growing knowledge economy. Hitachi’s Smart Cities website for instance warns about “the growth of slums, air pollution, the difficulty of acquiring fresh drinking water, the treatment of waste water and sewage, energy supplies, traffic congestion, and waste disposal”. It however presents solutions evoking a series of scenarios about ‘Living in a Smart City’ which are strongly skewed towards the needs and expectations of a mobile and wealthy middle class. These range from “Freedom to Work When and Where you Want” to “Convenient Vehicle Use as Part of the Community” and “Well-balanced Lifestyles in Tune with How People Live” (Hitachi website). Similarly, GSMA’s Connected City initiative and exhibition claims to address “making homes and cars smarter, travel swifter, shopping easier and urban living safer and more environmentally friendly” (GSMA website). GSMA also keeps a ‘Smart City Index’ categorization and ranking, which interestingly is based on indicators named “Smart Mobile Services”, “Business, Economic and Mobile Cluster Impact”, “Smart Mobile Citizens” and “Mobile Infrastructure” (GSMA Smart City Index). Another notable example is the impressive Living PlanIT documentation on what has been defined as the blueprint for an ‘urban operating system’. This also makes explicit reference and places great emphasis on the importance for cities to foster knowledge economies, and how smart urbanism can be central to it, arguing for “strategies to increase the sophistication of their populations to service and attract advanced industries” (Living PlanIT, 2011: 4).

Such rhetoric bases its strength on offering a simplistic but easy to communicate message about the smart city. This is so effective that even non-commercial, government-funded bodies promoting research and development have readily adopted it. In its much-diffused short animated video introduction to the theme, titled ‘A Glimpse at Cities of the Future’ (Innovate UK, YouTube content), Innovate UK ends up echoing and promoting commercial smart urbanism clichés. This is done by offering a vision of the future ‘city’ which is generic and entirely dominated by examples of

technology deployed to assist lifestyles of a consuming middle class living in individual houses, concerned with shopping and aspiring to a sanitized, safe and socially homogenous environment.

The smart city of the future is therefore described through the following imagery:

time	Imagery
0:25	Well-dressed couple enjoying what is hinted at being a somehow 'smart' penthouse or luxury flat while relaxing on sofa
0:48 – 0:53	Panoramic view on modernist-looking city. Skyscrapers and tidy riverside park with people relaxing and walking
1:01	Generic residential buildings with solar panels on roofs
1:03	Trafficked urban bridge with wind turbines embedded in main structure
1:07	Fairly abstract picture of (seemingly) solar generators in generic luxury condo complex with many well-kept flower beds
1:17 – 1:27	Smart high street: shopping mall-like imagery with shops organized in levels, galleries and escalator-based vertical circulation. White lady trying dress combinations in front of a smart mirror in a shop. White mother with child on lap entering another shop through automatic doors
1:36 – 1:43	Self-driven taxi/pods picking up well-dressed people
1:56 – 2:02	Robotic pizza delivery cart/pod delivering food to contemporary terraced house
2:13 – 2:18	Organic-shaped buildings in clean, park-dominated city. Flying drone either delivering something or maybe patrolling area, whilst happy-looking family of three talks with policeman (Figure 1)

Amongst other things it is revealing how this whole 'city of the future' picture very much resembles an idealized and sanitized version of the city of the present, or better of the BID-like component and commercial development aspirations of a certain view the city of the present. It is also strongly exclusive towards a specific 'model' citizen and some of their most banally perceived needs like safety, shopping, buying take-away food and having energy aplenty. Virtually no problematization, critique and re-invention of lifestyles as well as urban morphology, inhabitation, work, models of service delivery etc is offered in such vision which is nevertheless supposed to somehow communicate and summarize combined academia and industry R&D efforts. What could be expected to be daring and perhaps quite 'lateral' in setting down ideas for imagined futures, particularly as it comes from a research publicly funded agency, ends up being socially narrow and conservative, only trying to feel futuristic through an elementary declaration – through imagery – of the presence of high technology in modernism-inspired, generic environments. It can be argued that – beyond its hi-tech content and promise – the prevalent way the smart city is imagined and marketed tends to share and reinforce the same bias towards control, branding and a relative insensitivity to local contexts that a certain type of economic development-driven production of physical urban spaces has shown in the past few decades. What is being portrayed as a technological revolution does not seem to be underpinned by any particular idea for a progressive model, either in socio-economic organization or indeed civic design. Hollands's observations fundamentally still stand, though in a different, evolved and more technologically sophisticated landscape.

**Figure 1:** Smart city imaginary in Innovate UK's short video. *Source: Innovate UK YouTube channel*

What is most problematic with this narrow, sanitized interpretation of the future city, is its exclusionary rhetoric. Smart city-in-the-box solutions that envisage a seamless urban experience from the connected home, to the use of Wi-Fi-enabled transport to the hyper connected workplace, assume a particular digital citizen that bears little resemblance to those living at the margins. The



digital fantasy can easily translate into an analogic nightmare for some. Examples from the global South are again quite fitting and perhaps the most blatant in terms of showing how socially skewed smart visions can be. As shown in Datta (2015; 2018) and Das's (2015) ongoing work on the smart city programme in India, there are important questions to be asked regarding citizenship and exclusion (Datta 2015; 2018). Not only do smart city interventions have little contextual relevance but they also have impacts on livelihoods in inequitable conditions. The largely infrastructure-led approach to the implementation of smart city programmes runs the risk of perpetuating inequality, at worst, but misses an opportunity to use technology to enhance livelihoods, at best. The relationship to informality, hence a significant aspect of 'context', for example, is largely unexplored, yet the footloose nature of technology enables an intimate relationship between livelihoods and smart appropriation (Odendaal, 2014). Thus, the relationship between smart city and responsive place making has transformative potential, yet has recently become a code for particularly reductive trends of area-based regeneration and master planning.

The smart city can therefore be a simple, digitally-enhanced way of re-packaging and re-mediating recent forms of commercial urbanism by providing new ways to boost a certain vision of the city and its 'users' further. The 'smart citizen' uses the city in a way that implies high levels of mobility, and the need for ubiquitous services to support such mobile and knowledge-based occupations. It is assumed that the smart citizen is very conversant with high and mobile technology, can afford all sorts of hi-tech gadgetry, and is willing and expecting to interact with advanced systems of data feeding and reporting. It is also assumed that such citizens are themselves highly mobile and potentially disloyal – they can move somewhere else easily – hence behave as the paying customers of the city. The latter is therefore driven to provide them with the control, services, safety and cleanliness they expect, which is why it needs to become smarter. Most proposed projects do not question any of the typical high-middle class models of living, or address alternative views. For instance, the motor car and its presence in the city is never particularly put in doubt or challenged, but is remediated by technologies that offer enhanced ways to use it. These can for instance envisage ride-share mechanisms on autonomous vehicles, a 'smart' vision critiqued as still less efficient than buses (Walker, 2018), or easily find parking spaces (see for instance Lamba, 2013), in the attempt of making individual vehicles appear more socially and environmentally acceptable.

### **Getting Out of the Smart Box**

How do we then re-focus and widen our understanding of what the smart city could be – and what it could address and re-invent – moving away from the dominance of the visions discussed so far? As Hollands (2015: 70-71) points out (referring to Hill, 2013) what we need could be “to shift the debate about smart cities towards the *raison d'être* of cities— the people and citizens who live in them”, and away from an assumption of high technology being the main – or even sole – agent within an otherwise static view of the city as a platform functional to the over imposition of high tech devices and networks. This implies first of all widening the range of urban issues and the views of what matters in the shaping and re-shaping of urban environments. We need to get out of the simplistic 'smart box' as described above and be more inclusive of city types and issues.

Discussing a series of major challenges faced by urban designers – and urban landscapes – Loukaitou-Sideris (2012) remarks how “most urban development happens within the context of a market-driven urbanism that often produces 'over-scaled, sterile places or mildly greener versions of conventional development'” (p.468). But this is seen as making such exercises relatively irrelevant and “unable to inventively confront the morphological, functional, and human needs of cities and citizens” (Sorkin, 2009: 155). In identifying a series of important challenges for urban designers, Loukaitou-Sideris looks at US towns and highlights themes, which have in common the need to look

at diversity – between and within cities themselves – and at shaping such places in as inclusive ways as possible. Cities are therefore seen as facing sometimes opposite development trajectories, with an emphasis on the differential challenges posed by both “edgeless” and “shrinking” cities (473), the latter a model in various ways relevant to a multitude of urban centers in both the global North and South which have very little to benefit from ‘solutions’ thought and tailored for their sprawling and economically growing counterparts. Similarly the issue of the presence of informal “ethnoscapes”, “traditionally inhabited by the poor” and “separated from the flashy landscapes of the formal city” raises the observation that “By and large, contemporary urban design practice has not used culture as a determinant of design. While modernism’s ‘universality’ has been condemned, local and cultural idiosyncrasies have often been ignored” (471). As soon as our gaze moves away from the pre-packed smart discourses, back to looking at the city – and in this example urban design theory – the need to enrich, expand and re-focus our consideration of what smartness could and maybe should be for emerges. This re-focusing starts from place and its complex and rich dimensions.

It is interesting therefore how Hollands himself (2015) when considering alternative and more inclusive and sustainable approaches to smartness, highlights examples all based on highly local, contextual factors and involving community-based ideas. What is probably the most relevant aspect of those choices is exactly the fact that high technology is just an ingredient in the projects, not necessarily the main one and certainly not the motivator or the generator of the vision, which is based on local participation and agency on changing place, and cooperative re-invention of aspects of urban living. Moreover, the examples tend to be somehow bespoke, hyper-local and dependent on contextual conditions and opportunities.

These considerations are important as they can further extend and enrich the strategic principles identified by Mora et al (2018) further reinforcing the role of place as both generator and main focus of a more sustainable smart city. The needs to build strategic frameworks, widening participation and collaboration, and combine top-down with bottom-up logics can be confronted with a series of more ‘existential’ questions and challenges about the smart city. Is high technology being leveraged to face and re-invent urbanity on key themes or does it simply provide some tech-fix to the status quo? What do smart city efforts really understand of the city they are dealing with? Are they stemming from and valuing local resources (human, cultural, natural etc) to provide endogenous, sustainable and sensible ways to produce, inhabit and manage the city? Are local energies and agency included? And who/what has agency above all, assuming that technology cannot and should not be seen as the sole factor of change? Communities of course have an important role (see, for instance, de Lange and de Waal, 2019), yet working in an integrated way on technology, people and indeed physical space – so on multi-dimensional notions of place – seems key to an alternative way of seeing smartness.

### **Towards Sustainable Smart Places**

We are mindful of the potential for smart technologies to enable innovation in urban efficiency, which is something stemming from a longer-standing legacy. As Dear has noted, Modernist planning discourse at the beginning of the twentieth century “had been realigned to emphasize ‘unity’, ‘control’ and ‘expert skills’” (1995: 31). The belief in technology as a vehicle towards salvation in troubled times is clearly part of this and perhaps one of the most enduring Modernist sensibilities. Environmental emergencies have presented many layers of challenges for which some infrastructure solutions could play a role. An example is the central operations center in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, a visible example of IBM/municipal collaboration towards producing early warning systems in anticipation of climate change events. Following a flash flood in 2007 that took the city by surprise, the company, together with CISCO and the local authority developed an integrated disaster response

and monitoring system that integrates 32 agencies and services and relies on 400 active cameras in the city for continuous surveillance. But these things do not come as neutral and un-problematic. As in most socio-economically divided cities, the concern is that only well-off neighborhoods benefit and that it is an interim measure that detracts from real infrastructural problems. An interesting example of this that we have come across concerns that all-important aspect of smart living which is crime protection and personal safety. Our 2015 research visit to Brazil, part of an ESRC/Newton-funded RCUK-CONFAP International Network project titled 'Augmented urbanity and smart technologies: how "smart" are our cities becoming?' highlighted how strongly related perceptions of crime and the development of 'smart' projects were in that country. The Vigilante app ([www.vigilanteapp.com.br](http://www.vigilanteapp.com.br)) was a prominent startup-generated project on crowdsourced crime mapping, presented as one of the elements of a 'bottom-up' smart trajectory. It offered an interesting and more transparent alternative to the centralized surveillance control centers present in many Brazilian cities. This was initially piloted in the city of Salvador de Bahia during 2015, though now is commercially offered to a wider Brazilian audience. The app aims at enabling the general public to collaboratively report and geo-locate disorderly, criminal or 'problematic' occurrences in their city, constructing a publicly available online map of these. When this was demonstrated to one of the authors, however, the image of Salvador resulting from the app was almost reversed – in terms of safety and needs to improve – to what local common knowledge suggested. The majority of crimes and problems reported were located in well-off areas of the city, with the favela-dominated neighborhood in North-West Salvador showing very few issues (Figure 2). This was clearly not purposefully designed by Vigilante, yet it might suggest a non-surprising differential adoption and handling of the tool, which would be prevalently appealing to, and used by, middle class citizens concerned for their safety. Such a preponderance gives them a privileged position in leading on the perception of crime, and on where to intervene on it, within the city. Moreover, some of these tools – another one being developed at the time was called 'Onde Fui Roubado' ('Where I Was Robbed') – embedded specific choices like the reporting of robberies only. As these happen and are reported mainly where there is wealth that can be stolen, they can also heavily contribute to distort the resulting image of the city.

**Figure 2:** Crowd-sourced reporting of crime in Salvador, Brazil. *Source: Vigilante App*

Questions therefore remain on how distributed the benefits of smart technologies are. Material solutions such as smart grids and water consumption monitoring devices provide innovative operational solutions but largely bypass those falling outside the ambit of networked infrastructure. Interestingly, the popular literature on smart cities tends to favor a networked approach also. However, smart city-in-the-box solutions that envisage a seamless urban experience, from the connected home, to the use of Wi-Fi-enabled transport, to the hyper connected workplace, assume a particular digital citizen that bears little resemblance to those living at the margins. Here we refer to the edges that are often rendered invisible in mainstream infrastructure policy and practice. It could be the immigrant communities that live in overcrowded rooms or those sleeping rough on Northern city streets or the many that live in informal settlements in Southern cities. But it is imperative to note how such 'margins' have been expanding rather than contracting as any trickle-down economic vision, 'smart' or otherwise, might suggest, and now include more urban dwellers who might have been previously identified as part of the middle classes. As noted by Cloke *et al* (2016, p.704) evidence of increases in food insecurity – and the consequent use of food banks by growing chunks of the population of 'First World' countries – is widely discussed and documented for a range of countries in North and South America, Asia and Europe. In the UK, the Trussell Trust food bank network reported constantly raising demand in use from 2013, with a further 13% increase in April-September 2018 respect to the same period in 2017 (Trussell Trust website). In

many cities of the global South the margins are more immediately discernable as the informal economy provides livelihoods for job seekers unable to find employment, and lack of housing opportunities in sprawling cities result in shack settlements. These margins, whether they constitute the majority or not, are largely disconnected from the smart dream.

Not only these are disconnected, but local sense of place is underplayed and possibly assumed to blend in with digital visions. There are two dimensions to this problematic tunnel vision. The one is that the formulation of 'the problem to be solved' is at best, narrow, and at worst, simply wrong. Problematizing urban growth falls into the age-old trap (reflected in early urban planning history) of assuming that the city can be 'tamed' through scientific rationality and imposition of generic predetermined models. Local context is ignored, thereby bypassing endogenous urban character and potential solutions. Recent work on Indian smart urbanism raises the ethical and moral challenges associated with the deployment of smart cities in the global South in particular (Datta, 2015). Examples of these are the social costs incurred in the construction of smart neighbourhoods or cities, leading to displacement of people, and material impacts in terms of public spending that should prioritise immediate basic infrastructure such as water and sanitation. Poor urban dwellers seldom benefit from grandiose urban visions such as that portrayed in the smart city narrative.

The second dimension that we critique more specifically is the loss of potential to enable truly sustainable, resilient cities that respond to local dynamics of place. The two issues of social exclusion and de-contextualization come together and highlight the importance of urban space and place and the need for considering and including interstitial spaces. Smart city technologies, allow and encourage – under logics of efficiency and rationalization of movement – point-to-point interest. The efficiency of digitally enhanced navigation – and even more so the possible advent of the autonomous vehicle – replaces the serendipitous, inefficient appreciation of interstices and the not necessarily negative chance of getting lost and discovering something or someone, as argued by Shapiro (1995) at the dawn of cyberspace-related debates, and more recently by Foth (2016). There is a desired 'seamlessness' that aims to reduce friction of movement and decision-making into a designed, optimized 'whole'. This can therefore undermine the value and role of 'interstitial' spaces in the city, which "represent what is left of resistance in big cities – resistance to normativity and regulation, to homogenization and appropriation" (Nicolas-le Strat, 2007: 314) – both in spatial and social terms. These spaces of resistance are not necessarily confined to event-driven social action (such as occupations or protests), and they are very much part of many people's 'everyday'. In the global South, these 'interstices' are what define many urban spaces and extend to the use of technology. The informal urbanization that typifies urban growth in cities in Africa relate to how people house themselves and pursue their livelihoods.

Thus, from a research perspective, there is a need to consider cities as collectives of places embedded with meaning. The question at this point can be: how can this be steered – or maybe hacked - in more transformative, adaptive, socially sustainable and place-intelligent trajectories? How do we uncover these stories through research and learn from them? The value of case-based, contextually embedded research that focuses on the interactive agency between technology and people is invaluable.

There are two related tensions that surface with regards to the relationship between the fantasy smart city, and the somehow neglected but richer 'analogic' city through which people move and pursue their lives. The one relates to the contrast between the pre-designed and programmed spaces of consumption and prioritization of the knowledge-based economy and the incremental and messy continuous unfolding of the 'real' city. The second refers to city as an imagined future of

order, seamlessness and low friction mobility that contrast the contingency and emergence of present urbanity. In 'interstitial spaces' technology appropriation towards resilience is strongly informed by livelihood conditions and strategies. They are strongly tied to place. This requires an interrogation of the uniqueness of place and the stories that inform the qualities that contribute to such. Uncovering these 'lateral' and contextually-rich technology appropriations can and should be looked at as alternative approaches to the mainstream smart city. Documenting place-responsive practices contributes to re-thinking urban spaces under a more socially sustainable (and socially-intelligent) light. The sustainable smart city cannot ignore the power and relevance of context. Scarce attention to local values, culture, knowledge and indeed space can result into making the machine-space rigid, blunt and insensitive; as argued by Sassen: "What stands out is the extent to which these technologies have not been sufficiently 'urbanized'. That is, they have not been made to work within a particular context" (Sassen, 2011). What this paper has been arguing throughout is a need to fundamentally flip the perspective on shaping and developing the smart city. This involves valuing specific civic knowledge, character, issues and resources, down to the hyper-local dimension, and using these to drive and direct innovation. It means informing 'smart' from within the city, rather than relying on a 'in-the-box' product-based version of it.

## References

- Ballard, R., Dittgen, R., Harrison, P., & Todes, A. (2017). Megaprojects and urban visions: Johannesburg's Corridors of Freedom and Modderfontein. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, 95(1), 111-139.
- Benedikt M. (Ed.) (1991), *Cyberspace First Steps*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Bolter J.D. and Grusin R. (1999) *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Boyer M.C. (1993) "The city of illusion: New York's public places", in Knox P. (ed) *The Restless Urban Landscape*, Prentice Hall
- Caprotti F. (2014) *Eco-Cities and the Transition to Low Carbon Economies*, London: Palgrave Pivot
- Caragliu A., Del Bo C., and Nijkamp P. (2011), "Smart Cities in Europe," *Journal of Urban Technology* 18: 2 (2011) 65–82.
- Chaturvedi A. (2018) "Did you know which are the top 3 smart cities in the world?", last accessed February 2019 <https://www.geospatialworld.net/blogs/top-3-smart-cities-world/>
- Cloke P., May J., and Williams A. (2017) "The geographies of food banks in the meantime", *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol 41 (6), 703-726
- Cowley, R., Joss, S., & Dayot, Y. (2018). The smart city and its publics: insights from across six UK cities. *Urban Research & Practice*, 11(1), 53-77.
- Das, D. (2015). Hyderabad: Visioning, restructuring and making of a high-tech city. *Cities*, 43, 48-58.
- Datta, A. (2015). A 100 smart cities, a 100 utopias. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 5(1), 49-53.

Datta, A. (2018). The digital turn in postcolonial urbanism: Smart citizenship in the making of India's 100 smart cities. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 43(3), 405-419.

Dear M. (1995) "Prolegomena to a Postmodern Urbanism", in Healey P, Cameron S, Davoudi S, Graham S, Madani-Pour A (eds) *Managing Cities: The New Urban Context*, Chichester: Wiley

de Waal M. and de Lange M. (2019) Introduction—The Hacker, the City and Their Institutions: From Grassroots Urbanism to Systemic Change, in de Lange M. and de Waal M. (Eds) *The Hackable City: Digital Media and Collaborative City-Making in the Network Society*, Singapore: Springer

Forbes (2018) "The smartest cities in the world in 2018", last accessed February 2019  
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/iese/2018/07/13/the-smartest-cities-in-the-world-in-2018/#32249d2efc0c>

Foth, M. (2016) "Why we should design smart cities for getting lost", *The Conversation*, 7 Aug 2016, <http://theconversation.com/why-we-should-design-smart-cities-for-getting-lost-56492>, last accessed December 2017

Graham, S., and Marvin, S. (2002). *Splintering urbanism: networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition*, London: Routledge.

GSMA Connected City website, <http://www.gsma.com/connectedliving/gsma-connected-city/>, last accessed November 2013

GSMA Smart Cities Index website, <http://smartcitiesindex.gsma.com/indicators/>, last accessed November 2013

Hitachi Smart Cities – Living in a Smart City, <http://www.hitachi.com/products/smartcity/smart-life/index.html>, last accessed November 2013

Hollands R.G. (2008) "Will the real smart city please stand up?", *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 12:3, 303-320

Hollands R.G. (2015) Critical interventions into the corporate smart city, *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 8, 61–77

Ierek (2018) "List of top 5 smart cities in the world", last accessed February 2019  
<http://www.ierek.com/news/index.php/2018/05/19/list-top-5-smart-cities-world/>

Innovate UK: "A glimpse at Cities of the Future" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TG74dkrrE7I>, last accessed February 2019

Lamba N. (2013) "Innovative Parking Plan Could Help Clear Birmingham's Traffic and Skies", *Building a Smarter Planet Blog*, <http://asmarterplanet.com/blog/2013/01/22902.html>, last accessed November 2013

Living PlanIT (2011) *Cities in the Cloud - A Living PlanIT Introduction to Future City Technology*, [http://www.livingplanit.com/resources/Living\\_november\\_PlanIT\\_SA\\_Cities\\_in\\_the\\_Cloud\\_Whitepaper\\_Website\\_Edition\\_\(2011-09-10-v01\).pdf](http://www.livingplanit.com/resources/Living_november_PlanIT_SA_Cities_in_the_Cloud_Whitepaper_Website_Edition_(2011-09-10-v01).pdf), last accessed November 2013

Loukaitou-Sideris A. (2012) Addressing the Challenges of Urban Landscapes: Normative Goals for Urban Design, *Journal of Urban Design*, 17:4, 467-484

Menon A. (2013) "The Smart City Council – Accelerating an Exciting Growth", in Cisco Blogs, last accessed February 2019 <https://blogs.cisco.com/news/the-smart-city-council-accelerating-an-exciting-future>

Minton A. (2009) *Ground Control: fear and happiness in the twenty-first-century city*, London: Penguin Books

Mora L., Bolici R. and Deakin M. (2017) The First Two Decades of Smart-City Research: A Bibliometric Analysis, *Journal of Urban Technology*, 24:1, 3-27

Mora, L., Deakin, M., and Reid, A. (2018). Strategic Principles for Smart City Development: A Multiple Case Study Analysis of European Best Practices. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.035>

Nicolas-le Strat P. (2007) "Interstitial Multiplicity", in Petcou C, Petrescu D and Marchand N (eds) *Urban/Act*, Montrouge: aaa – PEPRAV

Odendaal, N. (2014) "Space matters: the relational power of mobile technologies / *O espaço importa: poder relacional das tecnologias móveis*". In *URBE: Brazilian Journal of Urban Management*, Vol. 6, No 1, pp. 33-45. January 2014.

Odendaal, N. (2016) "Getting Smart about Smart Cities in Cape Town: Beyond the Rhetoric", in Marvin, S., Luque-Ayala, A. and McFarlane, C. (eds.) in *Smart Urbanism: Utopian Vision or False dawn?* London: Routledge.

Robinson, J. 2006. *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development*. Questioning Cities. London ; New York: Routledge

Rose, G. (2017). Posthuman agency in the digitally mediated city: Exteriorization, individuation, reinvention. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 107(4), 779-793.

Sassen S. (2011) "Talking back to your intelligent city"  
<http://whatmatters.mckinseydigital.com/cities/talking-back-to-your-intelligent-city> , last accessed April 2013

Schneider Electric (2014) "Go Green in the City – Smart Cities", last accessed February 2019 <http://2014.gogreeninthecity.com/smart-cities.html>

Shapiro A.L. (1995) "Street Corners in Cyberspace", *The Nation* 3-7-1995

Sethi S. (2014). What on earth is a 'smart city'? (online). Business Standard. Available from: [http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/sunil-sethi-what-on-earth-is-a-smart-city-114071801449\\_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/sunil-sethi-what-on-earth-is-a-smart-city-114071801449_1.html), last accessed May 2015

Söderström O., Paasche T. & Klauser F. (2014) "Smart cities as corporate storytelling", *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 18:3, 307-320

Sorkin M. (1992) *Variations on a theme park: the new American city and the end of public space*, New York: The Noonday Press

Sorkin, M. (2009) "The end(s) of urban design", in: A. Krieger & S. Saunders (Eds) *Urban Design*, pp. 155–182, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Team Ambrosus (2018) "Enabling the smart city revolution", Ambrosus Blog, last accessed February 2019 <https://blog.ambrosus.com/enabling-the-smart-city-revolution-e4968dcaad2e>

The Trussell Trust mid-year stats: <https://www.trusselltrust.org/news-and-blog/latest-stats/mid-year-stats/>, last accessed February 2019

Walker J. (2018) "The Bus Is Still Best", The Atlantic: <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/10/bus-best-public-transit-cities/574399/>, last accessed March 2019

Watson, V. (2014). African urban fantasies: dreams or nightmares?. *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(1), 215-231.

Wilson E. (1995) "The Rhetoric of Urban Space", *New Left Review* 209



## From 'Smart in the box' to 'Smart in the city' – rethinking the socially sustainable smart city in context

Alessandro Aurigi – University of Plymouth, UK – alex.aurigi@plymouth.ac.uk

Nancy Odendaal – University of Cape Town, South Africa – nancy.odendaal@uct.ac.za

### Biographical notes:

**Alessandro Aurigi** is Professor of Urban Design and Associate Dean: Research at the University of Plymouth, UK. He was previously Head of the School of Architecture, Design and Environment at Plymouth. He also worked at Newcastle University where he was Director (Head of Department) of Architecture, and as a lecturer at UCL (UK). His research focuses on the relationships between our increasingly digital society and the ways we conceive, design, and manage urban space, to enhance and support place quality. Alex is a member of the Peer-Review College of the AHRC, and has published widely on the topic of digital technology and urban space, including the volumes *Making the Digital City* and *Augmented Urban Spaces* (Ashgate), and recently *Digital and Smart Cities* with Katharine Willis (Routledge).

**Nancy Odendaal** is Associate Professor in City and Regional Planning at the University of Cape Town. Her research focuses on three interconnected areas of enquiry: infrastructure development, technology innovation and socio-spatial change in cities. She has published extensively on smart cities, with her research focused on the interface between new technologies and marginalised spaces. Previously, Nancy was based at the African Centre for Cities (at the University of Cape Town), where she coordinated the expansion of the Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS), and managed an Africa-wide project on curricula reform of city and regional planning education. She is the co-chair of the Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN) and incoming chair of the AAPS. Nancy is a member of the editorial boards of the *International Journal of E-Planning Research* and *Urban Geography*. Together with other African academics, she co-edited a volume entitled *Planning and the Case Study Method in Africa* (Palgrave).

# From ‘Smart in the box’ to ‘Smart in the city’ – Rethinking the Socially Sustainable Smart City in Context

## Abstract

*This paper focuses on the importance of framing and conceiving smart urban initiatives and schemes in a highly context-sensitive way, and argues that place-based approaches are essential for enhancing the social sustainability of smart cities. It does so highlighting how such perspective is often ignored by discourses and visions that favor generalized and socially skewed ways of framing the ‘city’ as well as the citizens who are expected to become ‘smart’ and benefit from high technologies. These, the paper argues, leave out the important nuances and social and spatial ‘interstices’ that make places unique, and by doing so weaken the ability of smart to be inclusive and afford a rich landscape of technological appropriation making cities more resilient.*

## Introduction

The smart city narrative has recently become closely associated with the concept of sustainability. Early warning systems and control room monitoring enabled through sensor technology make an important contribution to mitigation and anticipation of the shock impacts of climate change. Smart grids and water monitoring systems enable resource efficiency and feedback loops. Whilst the operational elements of smart cities are largely uncontested, there nevertheless exists a need to shine a sharper light on the long-term sustainability of digital urbanism. Concerns have emerged regarding the packaged smart city: the delineated norms and standards, technological fixes and comprehensive marketing solutions to complex urban problems, promoted by multinational software and hardware firms. In this paper, we refer to this prevalently pre-packaged, product-like version of the smart city, as the ‘smart in a box’ and interrogate the social sustainability of technology-driven solutions to complex social issues. In writing this paper we aim at looking at a number of initiatives, most of which have been reviewed before, but in a way that frames and highlights a different interpretation of this phenomenon and argues for the ‘smart city out of the box’ or a ‘smart *in* the city’ approach to incorporating digital technologies and media into context-sensitive city making. The central position of the paper is that this is significantly more socially sustainable. While we posit a particular argument with regard to how we think about technology-embedded urbanism, our intention is to provide an alternative lens to analyzing and understanding the nature of smart urbanism. Foregrounding the technical aspects of smart, we argue, makes the qualities of place and the human agency that crucially contribute to city-making invisible. Revealing and re-affirming these and their role through research, and then re-embedding them into smart urbanism practice, is fundamental to constructing a socially sustainable vision of the future city.

The paper structure unfolds as follows: we begin discussing what is often a pre-packaged, generalized and idealized interpretation of what the city (and the smart city) is. This is referred to across this paper as the ‘smart city in a box’ to highlight the over-simplification of the civic concept and the standardization of issues in much of the smart-related discourse and practice. We provide a critique that questions notions of citizenship and social sustainability embedded in the assumptions that drive many of these initiatives. The increasingly ubiquitous nature of the smart city narrative – its policy mobility and application to many parts of the global North and South - necessitates a global perspective. The purposeful inclusion of literature on the global South has implicit and explicit aims in this regard. We argue from a standpoint of multiple urbanisms, where qualities such as informality and urban inequality emphasized in the literature on cities in the global South, are acknowledged as issues that resonate globally. More explicitly, we recognize that the work on cities of the global

1 South provide valuable insights into the many challenges and potential solutions that potentially  
2 enable more socially sustainable cities. In short, a global focus that learns from the north and south  
3 provides a more robust resource for exploring what a socially progressive and sustainable smart city  
4 could look like. We further conclude on the implications this work would have for future research on  
5 sustainable smart cities.  
6  
7  
8

### 9 **Problematizing Sustainable ‘Smart’**

10  
11 Defining what a smart city is or might be is an exercise that can range from the apparently obvious  
12 to the near impossible. The vast amount of publicly available information about smart city-related  
13 concepts, products and envisaged solutions mirrors the utopian hype that Graham and Marvin  
14 (1996) critically described as characterizing the emergence of urban advanced telecommunications  
15 and cyberspace at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Much of this presents a generic concept of the smart  
16 city as an urban revolution in the making. While concepts of smart do not necessarily entirely or  
17 exclusively align with views of ‘digital’ urbanism (see for instance Caragliu et al, 2011), any quick  
18 Internet or literature search will reveal how the role of ICTs dominates how the phenomenon is  
19 described. This ‘revolution’ seems always to be enabled by a series of technological products – be  
20 them infrastructural or software-based ones – and ‘solutions’ that can be superimposed on and  
21 merged with elements of the built environment in both newly and appositely built towns, or as  
22 retrofits to existing cities. The visual language of corporate smart city visions reveals an ‘ideal city’  
23 that forms a coherent whole, seamlessly connected through ICT infrastructure and run on big data.  
24 Recently the development of check boxes of codes and standards further perpetuates the  
25 ‘city/neighborhood in a box’ idea. This pre-packaged city concept vastly contrasts with the messy  
26 textures of the real city. The ubiquity and homogeneity of the visual language of these visions (Rose,  
27 2017) highlights how particularly stark the contradictions between what is idealized and what is real  
28 are. These are stronger for cities which do not conform to the one-size-fits-all large, hi-tech  
29 metropolis model offered, and are even more blatant in the global South. Furthermore, the language  
30 of smart is often used to market edge cities/neighborhoods that perpetuate urban sprawl. These  
31 urban fantasies, as Watson (2014) refers to them, are not only indicative of exclusionary urban  
32 development, but also real estate interests driving a spatial vision that defies sustainable and  
33 compact urban development (Ballard et al, 2017).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 More critical accounts of the phenomenon have of course highlighted how diverse and complex this  
42 landscape is. Various typologies have evolved in the corporate and governance spheres of what  
43 smart cities are capable of, and should be addressing. Three trends in contemporary discussions in  
44 the media and literature are discernable (Odendaal, 2016). The first is a seemingly more direct  
45 engagement with the social and cultural coordinates of urbanity. In many cases this is marketing  
46 language used to augment corporate agendas, a visual language that emphasizes global connection  
47 and a ubiquitous urban vision of enhanced efficiency and seamless service delivery. The second is an  
48 engagement with natural sustainability and specifically climate change (Cowley et al, 2018),  
49 reinforcing the relationship between resilience, early warning and disaster management and  
50 intertwining with the ‘eco-city’ concept (Caprotti, 2014). The third shift is an explicit  
51 acknowledgement of other infrastructure services (Odendaal, 2016). The relationship between ICT  
52 and other utilities has always been implicit. Municipal utility billing systems rely heavily on  
53 centralized information capture and processing for example. Explicit references to technology  
54 enabled management of services and digital innovations such as smart grids focus on the  
55 interrelationship between utility parts. What emerges is a narrative that suggests comprehensive  
56 city making through technological connection; a “modern infrastructure ideal” (Graham and Marvin,  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

2001) where the connection between the technical and the social, the technical and the natural, and between infrastructure functions all contribute to seamless and efficient urban systems.

To make sense of tentative and partial accounts of this range of work and approaches, Mora et al (2017) offer – through a bibliometric longitudinal analysis of research – an extremely useful overview of the status and directions of the debate, beyond the hype easily found on the Web. This on the one hand confirms the strong role of what the authors call a ‘corporate’ tech-driven model of the smart city, which “fails to account for the social and cultural challenges that smart-city developments pose in anything but technological terms” (p.19). However, a strand of mainly academic literature pointing at a ‘holistic’ and ‘human-centric’ interpretation of the phenomenon and its opportunities is identified as a promising counterpoint to technocratic rhetoric.

Adding to, and complementing those observations, the point this paper wants to highlight is that the prevailing discourses on the smart city, certainly the ones with a commercial, technocratic root but also part of the scientific, R&D and critical accounts, whilst perhaps calling for a degree of connection with an often generic concept of ‘community’, tend to encourage thinking which is not as deeply engaged with the local context where smart ‘concepts’ are proposed and applied. Furthermore, it can be argued that the specific challenges and opportunities offered by place need to be brought into the fold, and require contextually embedded responses if any smart solutions are to be socially sustainable. The ‘smart city’ is too often framed as a general construct responding to generalized challenges and conditions – and often offering generalized products as ‘solutions’ to these. This in turn makes smart urbanism much less of a re-invention of place and more of a re-mediation (Bolter and Grusing, 1999: 182) and technological fixing of take-for-granted and partial views of what the city is and what its citizens do and need. Smart seems – in other words – much more of a hi-tech endowment of the status quo, and confirmation of a recent middle-class oriented drive toward urban development and management trajectories, than a movement supporting any major re-invention of how we conceive urban space and more generally inhabitation. We argue that this leaves little room for the structural changes and fresh thinking necessary to enable social and ecological sustainability. At worst, the smart city policy discourse can become a smokescreen that distracts from the more immediate issues facing a city (Watson, 2014). Furthermore, the generic problem formulation, and codified smart solutions that emanate from such analyses, leave little room for local innovation. This can be observed in the ways both the ‘city’ and its problems, and life within it – so the ‘citizens’ – are interpreted within much of the debate. In order to formulate sustainable smart city responses that are cognizant of the structural parameters of urban spaces as well as the local conditions that inform citizen-led responses, we argue for a more textured understanding of the ‘analog’ city and its relationship to technological evolution.

### **Constructing the (Smart) City**

Digital technologies, hardware sensors and devices, software and big data – the fundamental components of smart urban systems – promise ways to understand and manage increasingly complex systems. Their affirmation calls for the ‘city’ to be interpreted as a critical, over-complex entity, which changes very rapidly and has become about unmanageable through traditional approaches. The spatial problem, therefore, focuses on the expected trajectories of sprawling, growing large urban centers. This is an approach that transcends and somehow precedes smart city debates and has been noted in a more general sense by Robinson (2006) who argues that “Because the analysis of global- and world-cities theorists have come to rely on identifying the significance of cities to only certain elements of the global economy, cities that are poorer, marginal to key

1 globalizing economic sectors or, as Manuel Castells (1983) puts it, 'structurally irrelevant' receive  
2 very little attention in this approach" (p.99). But this fits particularly well the logics of corporate  
3 smart urbanism, as economies of scale coupled with the ability to conceive easily transferable  
4 systems and 'solutions' are a key enabler of a prospected commercial offer. Therefore the city is  
5 conveniently problematized through the need to find ways to cope with large scale and growth, and  
6 the prospect of managing future 'megacities' as a consequence of unstoppable urbanization tends to  
7 be the vastly prevalent interpretation offered of the urban condition. This involves dealing with  
8 'more': more energy consumption, more vehicular traffic, more pressure on natural resources, more  
9 people including any perceived strain from immigration - and so on. The spectre premise of mass  
10 urbanization is repeated in the introductions to most documents marketing smart technologies for  
11 cities (see for example Team Ambrosus 2018 on the Ambrosus.com blog). The 'usual suspects' of  
12 highly ranked smart cities - Singapore, Barcelona, New York, Amsterdam and London - together with  
13 purpose-built new towns like Songdo or Masdar (Forbes, 2018; Ierek, 2018; Chaturvedi, 2018) are  
14 provided as models for construction of smart cities elsewhere and for the ideas they can embed.  
15  
16  
17

18 These cities are clearly different from each other, but they all respond to a characteristic in common:  
19 they are seen and represented as successful, growing cities (or ready to grow in the new towns case)  
20 which face a series of possible issues with resources, capacity, pollution and the management of  
21 mobility. They need to act to avoid becoming victims of their own success and the consequences of  
22 over-population and an erosion of safety, environmental quality and more generally quality of life.  
23 More than an opportunity to conceive new forms of urbanism then, and with them new economic  
24 models, smart technologies are presented as a necessary set of remedies for protecting the city and  
25 equipping it to grow in a controlled and safe way. The case for the smart city is therefore often made  
26 by employing emergency discourses, which depict the urban condition as critical if not actually  
27 terminal, and highlight the desperate need for urgent technological fixes. Cities are described as "ill-  
28 equipped to deal with the shift in population and lack the necessary scale of infrastructure required  
29 to support it" (Living PlanIT, 2011). Anil Menon argues on the CISCO blog that "With limited  
30 resources, obstacles that range from traffic congestion and pollution to infrastructure constraints  
31 and overcrowding are increasingly amplified – all of which requires a paradigm shift in how we  
32 approach and manage these types of situations" (Menon, 2013). Similarly, Schneider Electric argues  
33 on its website that "Cities face huge challenges: congestion, pollution, blackouts, crime, debt and  
34 rising costs - while competing with each other for investment, jobs and talents. Cities need to  
35 become smarter: more efficient, sustainable and liveable" (Schneider Electric, 2014), and GSMA  
36 remarks that "To ensure that the cities of the future are safe and healthy places to live and work,  
37 smart city initiatives are being established globally" (GSMA Connected Living website).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The global reference in the GSMA and other mainstream smart narratives is not incidental, and  
46 suggests a global homogeneity of issues and the consequent suitability of global solutions. As the  
47 adoption of a rhetoric of urban crisis due to exponential growth, coupled with the challenges of  
48 climate change adaptation and monitoring, suits the smart city discourse so well, the sprawling  
49 mega-cities of the South can also naturally provide both a critical-mass market and a test bed for  
50 these technologies. The smart city phenomenon is no longer simply a Northern idea. The corporate  
51 mobility of the notion of smart, together with other fashionable terms such as 'eco' and 'world-class'  
52 provide politicians and investors with the motivational discourses to justify smart city initiatives. The  
53 Modi regime in India has engaged in creating 100 smart cities in India in 10 years. The language  
54 resonates with that used in the global North. Smart cities are defined as "cities that leverage data  
55 gathered from smart sensors through a smart grid to create a city that is livable, workable and  
56 sustainable" (Sethi, 2014). Private companies such as IBM and Cisco are touted to invest in smart  
57 grid infrastructure while the government of Singapore is claimed to be interested in supporting the  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 construction of 10 smart cities on the Delhi-Mumbai industrial corridor. The *Business Standard's*  
2 Sunil Sethi (2014) speaks of it as a "... fuzzy, New Millenium fantasy", with technology hubs such as  
3 Bangalore and Hyderabad's technology districts coexisting with slums and *chawls*.

4 However, references to social sustainability and contextual engagement are tenuous. The emphasis  
5 tends to be on improved quality of life, an emphasis on climate change and the fact that  
6 vulnerability to floods and storms in over half of developing world is a reality, as well as the need for  
7 improved governance (Odendaal, 2016). Technology is the simple, as the panacea for social and  
8 environmental ills. The inherent assumption is that the economic benefits of ICT-enhanced service  
9 improvement and delivery will eventually distribute to the poor. Efficiency seems to be the key for a  
10 better life for all, in an over-expanding city. We – it is argued – are living in cities which are  
11 fundamentally out of control, and that is becoming a terminal condition. Such a dystopia can be  
12 counter-balanced by the soft utopia of smart fixing. As Söderström et al (2014) argue in their  
13 revealing analysis of IBM's Smarter Cities' discourse: "'smarter cities' is a mild utopianism: it  
14 promises efficiency rather than paradise on earth" (p.316). Digitally-assisted urbanity brings with it  
15 the benefits of the de-materialization of otherwise polluting processes (as Benedikt had argued in  
16 1991 in his celebration of the emergence of 'cyberspace'), universal services, and above all expert  
17 systems which assist living and moving, and manage the otherwise spiraling out of control issues.  
18 The analysis on strategic trajectories for smart city developments carried out by Mora et al (2018)  
19 tends, if anything to generally confirm the presence of such bias. Particularly, what is described in  
20 the so-called 'classification system 2' of smart city initiatives, which lists the main application  
21 domains observed across a series of case studies analyzed by various authors, aligns with a picture  
22 which is skewed towards the idea of a successful, growing and increasingly hard to manage urban  
23 center. Prevalent are applications focusing on the management of resources, efficiency  
24 improvements, service delivery, safety and the valuing of cultural heritage. Whilst none of these is of  
25 course wrong per se, and all are needed in a general sense, the near absence from such picture of  
26 different initiatives trying to address other, socially relevant themes is something to reflect upon.  
27 The discourse of the growing and almost runaway urban machine in need of fixing does help  
28 shrouding and distracting attention from other, though radically different, perspectives. Before  
29 discussing these we also need to look at the problem from another viewpoint. Interpreting the city  
30 as rapidly urbanizing, growing and being subjected to increasing consumption and mobility issues  
31 and a desire for control, safety and cleanliness, also implies a relatively narrow focus on who the  
32 'citizens' are, how they use and inhabit their urban places, and what issues matter to them.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **Who Are the Smart Citizens?**

45 Robert Hollands (2008) outlines how wide and complex the range of interpretations of the 'smart  
46 city' concept can be. But he also remarks how this ends up being generally simplified and its aims  
47 seen as very much aligned with a gentrified vision of urban economic development, all geared  
48 towards certain classes of citizens. Instead of representing a change of direction, an innovative view  
49 and approach, it can very much mirror and reinforce the trend:  
50  
51  
52

53 The smart/creative city can become not only more economically polarized, but also  
54 socially, culturally and spatially divided by the growing contrast between incoming  
55 knowledge and creative workers, and the unskilled and IT illiterate sections of the  
56 local poorer population (Peck, 2005; Smith, 1996). Urban gentrification in this  
57 regard, refers not just to housing and neighbourhoods as it once did (see Butler,  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1997), but increasingly to consumption, lifestyle and leisure in the city (see Chatterton and Hollands, 2002) (Hollands, 2008: 312).

Such a vision of a dominant – and somehow desirable – category of highly skilled, exigent and mobile city dwellers and indeed visitors, with specific lifestyle and ‘quality of life’ needs, has been repeatedly highlighted by various authors (see for instance Sorkin, 1992 and Wilson, 1995) critiquing an increased commodification of public space beyond – and before – any smart urbanism discourses. These new mobile middle classes with disposable income and a need for “the finest features and benefits (...) history, culture, safe neighbourhoods, good housing, shops and education, and progressive local government” (Boyer, 1993: 125), bring with them a skewed view of what themes are important and what urban environments can do for their citizens. Anna Minton, another author who has extensively commented on the control and commodification of UK cities, has referred to the Business Improvement District (BID) model as a leading, key example of such trend. This model implies the prioritization of certain needs which are seen as coherent with the shopping-related needs of urban users: “The first layer on which the whole structure depends is the creation of a clean and safe environment, so just as man needs to breathe and eat to survive, these parts of the city need to be clean and safe. The next layer is ‘transport and access’, the level up is ‘marketing and branding of the area’ and the apex is the creation of a ‘memorable experience for visitors’” (Minton, 2009: 43)

The reassuring and business-friendly features of a service-rich, clean and safe environment, with good transport links and offering a ‘memorable experience’ to citizens who very much behave like visitors, are in fact largely echoed by smart city technology offerings, and celebrated by the related commercial literature. The prevalent, mainstream visions of smart urbanism involve an urgency to address the needs for cleaner and environmentally more sustainable towns, though with a marked focus on high-middle class expectations whilst – as previously noted by Hollands (2008) – celebrating the role of cities as centers of attraction of highly-skilled, wealthy and mobile urbanites involved in a growing knowledge economy. Hitachi’s Smart Cities website for instance warns about “the growth of slums, air pollution, the difficulty of acquiring fresh drinking water, the treatment of waste water and sewage, energy supplies, traffic congestion, and waste disposal”. It however presents solutions evoking a series of scenarios about ‘Living in a Smart City’ which are strongly skewed towards the needs and expectations of a mobile and wealthy middle class. These range from “Freedom to Work When and Where you Want” to “Convenient Vehicle Use as Part of the Community” and “Well-balanced Lifestyles in Tune with How People Live” (Hitachi website). Similarly, GSMA’s Connected City initiative and exhibition claims to address “making homes and cars smarter, travel swifter, shopping easier and urban living safer and more environmentally friendly” (GSMA website). GSMA also keeps a ‘Smart City Index’ categorization and ranking, which interestingly is based on indicators named “Smart Mobile Services”, “Business, Economic and Mobile Cluster Impact”, “Smart Mobile Citizens” and “Mobile Infrastructure” (GSMA Smart City Index). Another notable example is the impressive Living PlanIT documentation on what has been defined as the blueprint for an ‘urban operating system’. This also makes explicit reference and places great emphasis on the importance for cities to foster knowledge economies, and how smart urbanism can be central to it, arguing for “strategies to increase the sophistication of their populations to service and attract advanced industries” (Living PlanIT, 2011: 4).

Such rhetoric bases its strength on offering a simplistic but easy to communicate message about the smart city. This is so effective that even non-commercial, government-funded bodies promoting research and development have readily adopted it. In its much-diffused short animated video introduction to the theme, titled ‘A Glimpse at Cities of the Future’ (Innovate UK, YouTube content), Innovate UK ends up echoing and promoting commercial smart urbanism clichés. This is done by offering a vision of the future ‘city’ which is generic and entirely dominated by examples of

technology deployed to assist lifestyles of a consuming middle class living in individual houses, concerned with shopping and aspiring to a sanitized, safe and socially homogenous environment.

The smart city of the future is therefore described through the following imagery:

time	Imagery
0:25	Well-dressed couple enjoying what is hinted at being a somehow 'smart' penthouse or luxury flat while relaxing on sofa
0:48 – 0:53	Panoramic view on modernist-looking city. Skyscrapers and tidy riverside park with people relaxing and walking
1:01	Generic residential buildings with solar panels on roofs
1:03	Trafficked urban bridge with wind turbines embedded in main structure
1:07	Fairly abstract picture of (seemingly) solar generators in generic luxury condo complex with many well-kept flower beds
1:17 – 1:27	Smart high street: shopping mall-like imagery with shops organized in levels, galleries and escalator-based vertical circulation. White lady trying dress combinations in front of a smart mirror in a shop. White mother with child on lap entering another shop through automatic doors
1:36 – 1:43	Self-driven taxi/pods picking up well-dressed people
1:56 – 2:02	Robotic pizza delivery cart/pod delivering food to contemporary terraced house
2:13 – 2:18	Organic-shaped buildings in clean, park-dominated city. Flying drone either delivering something or maybe patrolling area, whilst happy-looking family of three talks with policeman (Figure 1)

Amongst other things it is revealing how this whole 'city of the future' picture very much resembles an idealized and sanitized version of the city of the present, or better of the BID-like component and commercial development aspirations of a certain view the city of the present. It is also strongly exclusive towards a specific 'model' citizen and some of their most banally perceived needs like safety, shopping, buying take-away food and having energy aplenty. Virtually no problematization, critique and re-invention of lifestyles as well as urban morphology, inhabitation, work, models of service delivery etc is offered in such vision which is nevertheless supposed to somehow communicate and summarize combined academia and industry R&D efforts. What could be expected to be daring and perhaps quite 'lateral' in setting down ideas for imagined futures, particularly as it comes from a research publicly funded agency, ends up being socially narrow and conservative, only trying to feel futuristic through an elementary declaration – through imagery – of the presence of high technology in modernism-inspired, generic environments. It can be argued that – beyond its hi-tech content and promise – the prevalent way the smart city is imagined and marketed tends to share and reinforce the same bias towards control, branding and a relative insensitivity to local contexts that a certain type of economic development-driven production of physical urban spaces has shown in the past few decades. What is being portrayed as a technological revolution does not seem to be underpinned by any particular idea for a progressive model, either in socio-economic organization or indeed civic design. Hollands's observations fundamentally still stand, though in a different, evolved and more technologically sophisticated landscape.

**Figure 1:** Smart city imaginary in Innovate UK's short video. *Source: Innovate UK YouTube channel*

What is most problematic with this narrow, sanitized interpretation of the future city, is its exclusionary rhetoric. Smart city-in-the-box solutions that envisage a seamless urban experience from the connected home, to the use of Wi-Fi-enabled transport to the hyper connected workplace, assume a particular digital citizen that bears little resemblance to those living at the margins. The



1 digital fantasy can easily translate into an analogic nightmare for some. Examples from the global  
2 South are again quite fitting and perhaps the most blatant in terms of showing how socially skewed  
3 smart visions can be. As shown in Datta (2015; 2018) and Das's (2015) ongoing work on the smart  
4 city programme in India, there are important questions to be asked regarding citizenship and  
5 exclusion (Datta 2015; 2018). Not only do smart city interventions have little contextual relevance  
6 but they also have impacts on livelihoods in inequitable conditions. The largely infrastructure-led  
7 approach to the implementation of smart city programmes runs the risk of perpetuating inequality,  
8 at worst, but misses an opportunity to use technology to enhance livelihoods, at best. The  
9 relationship to informality, hence a significant aspect of 'context', for example, is largely unexplored,  
10 yet the footloose nature of technology enables an intimate relationship between livelihoods and  
11 smart appropriation (Odendaal, 2014). Thus, the relationship between smart city and responsive  
12 place making has transformative potential, yet has recently become a code for particularly reductive  
13 trends of area-based regeneration and master planning.  
14  
15

16 The smart city can therefore be a simple, digitally-enhanced way of re-packaging and re-mediating  
17 recent forms of commercial urbanism by providing new ways to boost a certain vision of the city and  
18 its 'users' further. The 'smart citizen' uses the city in a way that implies high levels of mobility, and  
19 the need for ubiquitous services to support such mobile and knowledge-based occupations. It is  
20 assumed that the smart citizen is very conversant with high and mobile technology, can afford all  
21 sorts of hi-tech gadgetry, and is willing and expecting to interact with advanced systems of data  
22 feeding and reporting. It is also assumed that such citizens are themselves highly mobile and  
23 potentially disloyal – they can move somewhere else easily – hence behave as the paying customers  
24 of the city. The latter is therefore driven to provide them with the control, services, safety and  
25 cleanliness they expect, which is why it needs to become smarter. Most proposed projects do not  
26 question any of the typical high-middle class models of living, or address alternative views. For  
27 instance, the motor car and its presence in the city is never particularly put in doubt or challenged,  
28 but is remediated by technologies that offer enhanced ways to use it. These can for instance  
29 envisage ride-share mechanisms on autonomous vehicles, a 'smart' vision critiqued as still less  
30 efficient than buses (Walker, 2018), or easily find parking spaces (see for instance Lamba, 2013), in  
31 the attempt of making individual vehicles appear more socially and environmentally acceptable.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **Getting Out of the Smart Box**

38  
39 How do we then re-focus and widen our understanding of what the smart city could be – and what it  
40 could address and re-invent – moving away from the dominance of the visions discussed so far? As  
41 Hollands (2015: 70-71) points out (referring to Hill, 2013) what we need could be “to shift the debate  
42 about smart cities towards the *raison d'être* of cities— the people and citizens who live in them”,  
43 and away from an assumption of high technology being the main – or even sole – agent within an  
44 otherwise static view of the city as a platform functional to the over imposition of high tech devices  
45 and networks. This implies first of all widening the range of urban issues and the views of what  
46 matters in the shaping and re-shaping of urban environments. We need to get out of the simplistic  
47 'smart box' as described above and be more inclusive of city types and issues.  
48  
49  
50

51 Discussing a series of major challenges faced by urban designers – and urban landscapes –  
52 Loukaitou-Sideris (2012) remarks how “most urban development happens within the context of a  
53 market-driven urbanism that often produces 'over-scaled, sterile places or mildly greener versions of  
54 conventional development'” (p.468). But this is seen as making such exercises relatively irrelevant  
55 and “unable to inventively confront the morphological, functional, and human needs of cities and  
56 citizens” (Sorkin, 2009: 155). In identifying a series of important challenges for urban designers,  
57 Loukaitou-Sideris looks at US towns and highlights themes, which have in common the need to look  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 at diversity – between and within cities themselves – and at shaping such places in as inclusive ways  
2 as possible. Cities are therefore seen as facing sometimes opposite development trajectories, with  
3 an emphasis on the differential challenges posed by both “edgeless” and “shrinking” cities (473), the  
4 latter a model in various ways relevant to a multitude of urban centers in both the global North and  
5 South which have very little to benefit from ‘solutions’ thought and tailored for their sprawling and  
6 economically growing counterparts. Similarly the issue of the presence of informal “ethnoscapes”,  
7 “traditionally inhabited by the poor” and “separated from the flashy landscapes of the formal city”  
8 raises the observation that “By and large, contemporary urban design practice has not used culture  
9 as a determinant of design. While modernism’s ‘universality’ has been condemned, local and cultural  
10 idiosyncrasies have often been ignored” (471). As soon as our gaze moves away from the pre-packed  
11 smart discourses, back to looking at the city – and in this example urban design theory – the need to  
12 enrich, expand and re-focus our consideration of what smartness could and maybe should be for  
13 emerges. This re-focusing starts from place and its complex and rich dimensions.  
14  
15  
16

17 It is interesting therefore how Hollands himself (2015) when considering alternative and more  
18 inclusive and sustainable approaches to smartness, highlights examples all based on highly local,  
19 contextual factors and involving community-based ideas. What is probably the most relevant aspect  
20 of those choices is exactly the fact that high technology is just an ingredient in the projects, not  
21 necessarily the main one and certainly not the motivator or the generator of the vision, which is  
22 based on local participation and agency on changing place, and cooperative re-invention of aspects  
23 of urban living. Moreover, the examples tend to be somehow bespoke, hyper-local and dependent  
24 on contextual conditions and opportunities.  
25  
26

27 These considerations are important as they can further extend and enrich the strategic principles  
28 identified by Mora et al (2018) further reinforcing the role of place as both generator and main focus  
29 of a more sustainable smart city. The needs to build strategic frameworks, widening participation  
30 and collaboration, and combine top-down with bottom-up logics can be confronted with a series of  
31 more ‘existential’ questions and challenges about the smart city. Is high technology being leveraged  
32 to face and re-invent urbanity on key themes or does it simply provide some tech-fix to the status  
33 quo? What do smart city efforts really understand of the city they are dealing with? Are they  
34 stemming from and valuing local resources (human, cultural, natural etc) to provide endogenous,  
35 sustainable and sensible ways to produce, inhabit and manage the city? Are local energies and  
36 agency included? And who/what has agency above all, assuming that technology cannot and should  
37 not be seen as the sole factor of change? Communities of course have an important role (see, for  
38 instance, de Lange and de Waal, 2019), yet working in an integrated way on technology, people and  
39 indeed physical space – so on multi-dimensional notions of place – seems key to an alternative way  
40 of seeing smartness.  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Towards Sustainable Smart Places**

46 We are mindful of the potential for smart technologies to enable innovation in urban efficiency,  
47 which is something stemming from a longer-standing legacy. As Dear has noted, Modernist planning  
48 discourse at the beginning of the twentieth century “had been realigned to emphasize ‘unity’,  
49 ‘control’ and ‘expert skills’” (1995: 31). The belief in technology as a vehicle towards salvation in  
50 troubled times is clearly part of this and perhaps one of the most enduring Modernist sensibilities.  
51 Environmental emergencies have presented many layers of challenges for which some infrastructure  
52 solutions could play a role. An example is the central operations center in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, a  
53 visible example of IBM/municipal collaboration towards producing early warning systems in  
54 anticipation of climate change events. Following a flash flood in 2007 that took the city by surprise,  
55 the company, together with CISCO and the local authority developed an integrated disaster response  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 and monitoring system that integrates 32 agencies and services and relies on 400 active cameras in  
2 the city for continuous surveillance. But these things do not come as neutral and un-problematic. As  
3 in most socio-economically divided cities, the concern is that only well-off neighborhoods benefit  
4 and that it is an interim measure that detracts from real infrastructural problems. An interesting  
5 example of this that we have come across concerns that all-important aspect of smart living which is  
6 crime protection and personal safety. Our 2015 research visit to Brazil, part of an ESRC/Newton-  
7 funded RCUK-CONFAP International Network project titled 'Augmented urbanity and smart  
8 technologies: how "smart" are our cities becoming?' highlighted how strongly related perceptions of  
9 crime and the development of 'smart' projects were in that country. The Vigilante app  
10 ([www.vigilanteapp.com.br](http://www.vigilanteapp.com.br)) was a prominent startup-generated project on crowdsourced crime  
11 mapping, presented as one of the elements of a 'bottom-up' smart trajectory. It offered an  
12 interesting and more transparent alternative to the centralized surveillance control centers present  
13 in many Brazilian cities. This was initially piloted in the city of Salvador de Bahia during 2015, though  
14 now is commercially offered to a wider Brazilian audience. The app aims at enabling the general  
15 public to collaboratively report and geo-locate disorderly, criminal or 'problematic' occurrences in  
16 their city, constructing a publicly available online map of these. When this was demonstrated to one  
17 of the authors, however, the image of Salvador resulting from the app was almost reversed – in  
18 terms of safety and needs to improve – to what local common knowledge suggested. The majority of  
19 crimes and problems reported were located in well-off areas of the city, with the favela-dominated  
20 neighborhood in North-West Salvador showing very few issues (Figure 2). This was clearly not  
21 purposefully designed by Vigilante, yet it might suggest a non-surprising differential adoption and  
22 handling of the tool, which would be prevalently appealing to, and used by, middle class citizens  
23 concerned for their safety. Such a preponderance gives them a privileged position in leading on the  
24 perception of crime, and on where to intervene on it, within the city. Moreover, some of these tools  
25 – another one being developed at the time was called 'Onde Fui Roubado' ('Where I Was Robbed') –  
26 embedded specific choices like the reporting of robberies only. As these happen and are reported  
27 mainly where there is wealth that can be stolen, they can also heavily contribute to distort the  
28 resulting image of the city.

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 **Figure 2:** Crowd-sourced reporting of crime in Salvador, Brazil. *Source: Vigilante App*

37  
38 Questions therefore remain on how distributed the benefits of smart technologies are. Material  
39 solutions such as smart grids and water consumption monitoring devices provide innovative  
40 operational solutions but largely bypass those falling outside the ambit of networked infrastructure.  
41 Interestingly, the popular literature on smart cities tends to favor a networked approach also.  
42 However, smart city-in-the-box solutions that envisage a seamless urban experience, from the  
43 connected home, to the use of Wi-Fi-enabled transport, to the hyper connected workplace, assume  
44 a particular digital citizen that bears little resemblance to those living at the margins. Here we refer  
45 to the edges that are often rendered invisible in mainstream infrastructure policy and practice. It  
46 could be the immigrant communities that live in overcrowded rooms or those sleeping rough on  
47 Northern city streets or the many that live in informal settlements in Southern cities. But it is  
48 imperative to note how such 'margins' have been expanding rather than contracting as any trickle-  
49 down economic vision, 'smart' or otherwise, might suggest, and now include more urban dwellers  
50 who might have been previously identified as part of the middle classes. As noted by Cloke *et al*  
51 (2016, p.704) evidence of increases in food insecurity – and the consequent use of food banks by  
52 growing chunks of the population of 'First World' countries – is widely discussed and documented  
53 for a range of countries in North and South America, Asia and Europe. In the UK, the Trussell Trust  
54 food bank network reported constantly raising demand in use from 2013, with a further 13%  
55 increase in April-September 2018 respect to the same period in 2017 (Trussell Trust website). In  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 many cities of the global South the margins are more immediately discernable as the informal  
2 economy provides livelihoods for job seekers unable to find employment, and lack of housing  
3 opportunities in sprawling cities result in shack settlements. These margins, whether they constitute  
4 the majority or not, are largely disconnected from the smart dream.

5 Not only these are disconnected, but local sense of place is underplayed and possibly assumed to  
6 blend in with digital visions. There are two dimensions to this problematic tunnel vision. The one is  
7 that the formulation of 'the problem to be solved' is at best, narrow, and at worst, simply wrong.  
8 Problematising urban growth falls into the age-old trap (reflected in early urban planning history) of  
9 assuming that the city can be 'tamed' through scientific rationality and imposition of generic  
10 predetermined models. Local context is ignored, thereby bypassing endogenous urban character and  
11 potential solutions. Recent work on Indian smart urbanism raises the ethical and moral challenges  
12 associated with the deployment of smart cities in the global South in particular (Datta, 2015).  
13 Examples of these are the social costs incurred in the construction of smart neighbourhoods or  
14 cities, leading to displacement of people, and material impacts in terms of public spending that  
15 should prioritise immediate basic infrastructure such as water and sanitation. Poor urban dwellers  
16 seldom benefit from grandiose urban visions such as that portrayed in the smart city narrative.

17 The second dimension that we critique more specifically is the loss of potential to enable truly  
18 sustainable, resilient cities that respond to local dynamics of place. The two issues of social exclusion  
19 and de-contextualization come together and highlight the importance of urban space and place and  
20 the need for considering and including interstitial spaces. Smart city technologies, allow and  
21 encourage – under logics of efficiency and rationalization of movement – point-to-point interest. The  
22 efficiency of digitally enhanced navigation – and even more so the possible advent of the  
23 autonomous vehicle – replaces the serendipitous, inefficient appreciation of interstices and the not  
24 necessarily negative chance of getting lost and discovering something or someone, as argued by  
25 Shapiro (1995) at the dawn of cyberspace-related debates, and more recently by Foth (2016). There  
26 is a desired 'seamlessness' that aims to reduce friction of movement and decision-making into a  
27 designed, optimized 'whole'. This can therefore undermine the value and role of 'interstitial' spaces  
28 in the city, which "represent what is left of resistance in big cities – resistance to normativity and  
29 regulation, to homogenization and appropriation" (Nicolas-le Strat, 2007: 314) – both in spatial and  
30 social terms. These spaces of resistance are not necessarily confined to event-driven social action  
31 (such as occupations or protests), and they are very much part of many people's 'everyday'. In the  
32 global South, these 'interstices' are what define many urban spaces and extend to the use of  
33 technology. The informal urbanization that typifies urban growth in cities in Africa relate to how  
34 people house themselves and pursue their livelihoods.

35 Thus, from a research perspective, there is a need to consider cities as collectives of places  
36 embedded with meaning. The question at this point can be: how can this be steered – or maybe  
37 hacked - in more transformative, adaptive, socially sustainable and place-intelligent trajectories?  
38 How do we uncover these stories through research and learn from them? The value of case-based,  
39 contextually embedded research that focuses on the interactive agency between technology and  
40 people is invaluable.

41 There are two related tensions that surface with regards to the relationship between the fantasy  
42 smart city, and the somehow neglected but richer 'analogic' city through which people move and  
43 pursue their lives. The one relates to the contrast between the pre-designed and programmed  
44 spaces of consumption and prioritization of the knowledge-based economy and the incremental and  
45 messy continuous unfolding of the 'real' city. The second refers to city as an imagined future of  
46

1 order, seamlessness and low friction mobility that contrast the contingency and emergence of  
2 present urbanity. In 'interstitial spaces' technology appropriation towards resilience is strongly  
3 informed by livelihood conditions and strategies. They are strongly tied to place. This requires an  
4 interrogation of the uniqueness of place and the stories that inform the qualities that contribute to  
5 such. Uncovering these 'lateral' and contextually-rich technology appropriations can and should be  
6 looked at as alternative approaches to the mainstream smart city. Documenting place-responsive  
7 practices contributes to re-thinking urban spaces under a more socially sustainable (and socially-  
8 intelligent) light. The sustainable smart city cannot ignore the power and relevance of context.  
9 Scarce attention to local values, culture, knowledge and indeed space can result into making the  
10 machine-space rigid, blunt and insensitive; as argued by Sassen: "What stands out is the extent to  
11 which these technologies have not been sufficiently 'urbanized'. That is, they have not been made to  
12 work within a particular context" (Sassen, 2011). What this paper has been arguing throughout is a  
13 need to fundamentally flip the perspective on shaping and developing the smart city. This involves  
14 valuing specific civic knowledge, character, issues and resources, down to the hyper-local dimension,  
15 and using these to drive and direct innovation. It means informing 'smart' from within the city,  
16 rather than relying on a 'in-the-box' product-based version of it.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 **References**

- 28 Ballard, R., Dittgen, R., Harrison, P., & Todes, A. (2017). Megaprojects and urban visions:  
29 Johannesburg's Corridors of Freedom and Modderfontein. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on*  
30 *Southern Africa*, 95(1), 111-139.  
31  
32  
33 Benedikt M. (Ed.) (1991), *Cyberspace First Steps*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press  
34  
35 Bolter J.D. and Grusin R. (1999) *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press  
36  
37 Boyer M.C. (1993) "The city of illusion: New York's public places", in Knox P. (ed) *The Restless Urban*  
38 *Landscape*, Prentice Hall  
39  
40 Caprotti F. (2014) *Eco-Cities and the Transition to Low Carbon Economies*, London: Palgrave Pivot  
41  
42 Caragliu A., Del Bo C., and Nijkamp P. (2011), "Smart Cities in Europe," *Journal of Urban Technology*  
43 18: 2 (2011) 65–82.  
44  
45 Chaturvedi A. (2018) "Did you know which are the top 3 smart cities in the world?", last accessed  
46 February 2019 <https://www.geospatialworld.net/blogs/top-3-smart-cities-world/>  
47  
48 Cloke P., May J., and Williams A. (2017) "The geographies of food banks in the meantime", *Progress*  
49 *in Human Geography*, Vol 41 (6), 703-726  
50  
51 Cowley, R., Joss, S., & Dayot, Y. (2018). The smart city and its publics: insights from across six UK  
52 cities. *Urban Research & Practice*, 11(1), 53-77.  
53  
54 Das, D. (2015). Hyderabad: Visioning, restructuring and making of a high-tech city. *Cities*, 43, 48-58.  
55  
56 Datta, A. (2015). A 100 smart cities, a 100 utopias. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 5(1), 49-53.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Datta, A. (2018). The digital turn in postcolonial urbanism: Smart citizenship in the making of India's  
2 100 smart cities. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 43(3), 405-419.

3 Dear M. (1995) "Prolegomena to a Postmodern Urbanism", in Healey P, Cameron S, Davoudi S,  
4 Graham S, Madani-Pour A (eds) *Managing Cities: The New Urban Context*, Chichester: Wiley

5  
6 de Waal M. and de Lange M. (2019) Introduction—The Hacker, the City and Their Institutions: From  
7 Grassroots Urbanism to Systemic Change, in de Lange M. and de Waal M. (Eds) *The Hackable City:  
8 Digital Media and Collaborative City-Making in the Network Society*, Singapore: Springer

9  
10 Forbes (2018) "The smartest cities in the world in 2018", last accessed February 2019  
11 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/iese/2018/07/13/the-smartest-cities-in-the-world-in-  
12 2018/#32249d2efc0c](https://www.forbes.com/sites/iese/2018/07/13/the-smartest-cities-in-the-world-in-2018/#32249d2efc0c)

13  
14 Foth, M. (2016) "Why we should design smart cities for getting lost", *The Conversation*, 7 Aug 2016,  
15 <http://theconversation.com/why-we-should-design-smart-cities-for-getting-lost-56492>, last  
16 accessed December 2017

17  
18 Graham, S., and Marvin, S. (2002). *Splintering urbanism: networked infrastructures, technological  
19 mobilities and the urban condition*, London: Routledge.

20  
21 GSMA Connected City website, <http://www.gsma.com/connectedliving/gsma-connected-city/>, last  
22 accessed November 2013

23  
24 GSMA Smart Cities Index website, <http://smartcitiesindex.gsma.com/indicators/>, last accessed  
25 November 2013

26  
27 Hitachi Smart Cities – Living in a Smart City, [http://www.hitachi.com/products/smartcity/smart-  
28 life/index.html](http://www.hitachi.com/products/smartcity/smart-life/index.html), last accessed November 2013

29  
30 Hollands R.G. (2008) "Will the real smart city please stand up?", *City: analysis of urban trends,  
31 culture, theory, policy, action*, 12:3, 303-320

32  
33 Hollands R.G. (2015) Critical interventions into the corporate smart city, *Cambridge Journal of  
34 Regions, Economy and Society*, 8, 61–77

35  
36 Ierek (2018) "List of top 5 smart cities in the world", last accessed February 2019  
37 [http://www.ierek.com/news/index.php/2018/05/19/list-top-5-smart-cities-world/  
38](http://www.ierek.com/news/index.php/2018/05/19/list-top-5-smart-cities-world/)

39  
40 Innovate UK: "A glimpse at Cities of the Future" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TG74dkrrE7I>,  
41 last accessed February 2019

42  
43 Lamba N. (2013) "Innovative Parking Plan Could Help Clear Birmingham's Traffic and Skies", *Building  
44 a Smarter Planet Blog*, <http://asmarterplanet.com/blog/2013/01/22902.html>, last accessed  
45 November 2013

46  
47 Living PlanIT (2011) *Cities in the Cloud - A Living PlanIT Introduction to Future City Technology*,  
48 [http://www.livingplanit.com/resources/Living\\_november  
49 PlanIT\\_SA\\_Cities\\_in\\_the\\_Cloud\\_Whitepaper\\_Website\\_Edition\\_\(2011-09-10-v01\).pdf](http://www.livingplanit.com/resources/Living_november_PlanIT_SA_Cities_in_the_Cloud_Whitepaper_Website_Edition_(2011-09-10-v01).pdf), last accessed  
50 November 2013

51  
52 Loukaitou-Sideris A. (2012) Addressing the Challenges of Urban Landscapes: Normative Goals for  
53 Urban Design, *Journal of Urban Design*, 17:4, 467-484

1 Menon A. (2013) "The Smart City Council – Accelerating an Exciting Growth", in Cisco Blogs, last  
2 accessed February 2019 [https://blogs.cisco.com/news/the-smart-city-council-accelerating-an-](https://blogs.cisco.com/news/the-smart-city-council-accelerating-an-exciting-future)  
3 [exciting-future](https://blogs.cisco.com/news/the-smart-city-council-accelerating-an-exciting-future)

4 Minton A. (2009) *Ground Control: fear and happiness in the twenty-first-century city*, London:  
5 Penguin Books

6  
7 Mora L., Bolici R. and Deakin M. (2017) The First Two Decades of Smart-City Research: A Bibliometric  
8 Analysis, *Journal of Urban Technology*, 24:1, 3-27

9  
10 Mora, L., Deakin, M., and Reid, A. (2018). Strategic Principles for Smart City Development: A Multiple  
11 Case Study Analysis of European Best Practices. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*,  
12 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.035>

13  
14 Nicolas-le Strat P. (2007) "Interstitial Multiplicity", in Petcou C, Petrescu D and Marchand N (eds)  
15 *Urban/Act*, Montrouge: aaa – PEPRAV

16  
17 Odendaal, N. (2014) "Space matters: the relational power of mobile technologies / *O espaço*  
18 *importa: poder relacional das tecnologias móveis*". In *URBE: Brazilian Journal of Urban Management*,  
19 Vol. 6, No 1, pp. 33-45. January 2014.

20  
21 Odendaal, N. (2016) "Getting Smart about Smart Cities in Cape Town: Beyond the Rhetoric", in  
22 Marvin, S., Luque-Ayala, A. and McFarlane, C. (eds.) in *Smart Urbanism: Utopian Vision or False*  
23 *dawn?* London: Routledge.

24  
25 Robinson, J. 2006. *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development*. Questioning Cities.  
26 London ; New York: Routledge

27  
28 Rose, G. (2017). Posthuman agency in the digitally mediated city: Exteriorization, individuation,  
29 reinvention. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 107(4), 779-793.

30  
31 Sassen S. (2011) "Talking back to your intelligent city"  
32 <http://whatmatters.mckinseydigital.com/cities/talking-back-to-your-intelligent-city> , last accessed  
33 April 2013

34  
35 Schneider Electric (2014) "Go Green in the City – Smart Cities", last accessed February 2019  
36 <http://2014.gogreeninthecity.com/smart-cities.html>

37  
38 Shapiro A.L. (1995) "Street Corners in Cyberspace", *The Nation* 3-7-1995

39  
40 Sethi S. (2014). What on earth is a 'smart city'? (online). Business Standard. Available from:  
41 [http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/sunil-sethi-what-on-earth-is-a-smart-city-](http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/sunil-sethi-what-on-earth-is-a-smart-city-114071801449_1.html)  
42 [114071801449\\_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/sunil-sethi-what-on-earth-is-a-smart-city-114071801449_1.html), last accessed May 2015

43  
44 Söderström O., Paasche T. & Klauser F. (2014) "Smart cities as corporate storytelling", *City: analysis*  
45 *of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 18:3, 307-320

46  
47 Sorkin M. (1992) *Variations on a theme park: the new American city and the end of public space*,  
48 New York: The Noonday Press

49  
50 Sorkin, M. (2009) "The end(s) of urban design", in: A. Krieger & S. Saunders (Eds) *Urban Design*, pp.  
51 155–182, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Team Ambrosus (2018) "Enabling the smart city revolution", Ambrosus Blog, last accessed February  
2 2019 <https://blog.ambrosus.com/enabling-the-smart-city-revolution-e4968dcaad2e>

3 The Trussell Trust mid-year stats: [https://www.trusselltrust.org/news-and-blog/latest-stats/mid-](https://www.trusselltrust.org/news-and-blog/latest-stats/mid-year-stats/)  
4 [year-stats/](https://www.trusselltrust.org/news-and-blog/latest-stats/mid-year-stats/), last accessed February 2019  
5

6 Walker J. (2018) "The Bus Is Still Best", The Atlantic:  
7 <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/10/bus-best-public-transit-cities/574399/>,  
8 last accessed March 2019  
9

10  
11 Watson, V. (2014). African urban fantasies: dreams or nightmares?. *Environment and*  
12 *Urbanization*, 26(1), 215-231.  
13

14  
15 Wilson E. (1995) "The Rhetoric of Urban Space", *New Left Review* 209  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65





Figure

