ST. PETERSBURG INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC FORUM

JUNE 21–23, 2012

Securing the Future

RETHINKING EUROPEAN CITY IDENTITY IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

Panel Discussion

JUNE 22, 2012 — 16:45–18:00, Pavilion 3, Amphitheatre

St. Petersburg, Russia

2012

Moderator:

Vladimir Knyaginin, Director, Center of Strategic Studies 'North-South'

Panelists:

Josep Acebillo, Professor, Academy of Architecture in Mendrisio, University of Lugano; Principal Architect, AS office

Mikhail Blinkin, Director, Institute for Transport Economy and Transport Policy, Member of the Public Chamber of Russia, Member of Skolkovo Urban Council

Werner Dornscheidt, Chief Executive Officer, Messe Düsseldorf

Federico Parolotto, Senior Partner, Mobility in Chain

Mikhail Piotrovsky, General Director, State Hermitage Museum

Georgy Poltavchenko, Governor of St. Petersburg

Grigory Revzin, Urban Council Member, Skolkovo Foundation

Front row participants:

Peter van Berkel, GM and Lighting Sector Leader, Philips

Alexander Puzanov, General Director, Institute for Urban Economics Foundation

David Stokes, Director, IBM Central and Eastern Europe

V. Knyaginin:

Ladies and gentlemen, we are beginning our panel discussion.

I would like to invite our main participants onto the stage. Sergey Vyazalov, we will be starting with you; Georgy Poltavchenko had to leave us, unfortunately, to deal with governmental business with our President. The next participant in our discussion is Josep Acebillo, a person who is known the world over, including in Russia. He was the Chief Architect of the City of Barcelona, and it is with his name that Barcelona's greatness as a worldwide urban planning centre is largely associated. Mikhail Piotrovsky, General Director of the State Hermitage Museum, needs no introduction: he is the head of the country's largest museum, which is one of the world's best and most famous. Grigory Revzin, an architecture critic and a member of the Urban Council of the Skolkovo Foundation, is our guest from Moscow; I hope we will be able to discuss the paths of development of two large Russian cities today. Federico Parolotto is Senior Partner at Mobility in Chain. Mr. Parolotto's interests are largely connected with how today's mobile lifestyle changes the architecture of cities, changes consumption style, affects development, often makes our existence more difficult, and ruins the urban environment. Werner Dornscheidt is President of Messe Dusseldorf. In global centres like Dusseldorf, the urban community must often not only care for the city's historical heritage, but take on a certain mission to create certain meanings. Mikhail Blinkin, another of our guests from Moscow, is one of our leading experts in transportation and city planning as a whole. Tomorrow Mikhail will host a discussion dedicated to the 'Big Moscow' project. Now, when we are discussing the future of St. Petersburg, it is important to us to see what our colleagues from Moscow are doing and in which direction they are moving, in order to correct our own plans and projects.

Our discussion's remaining participants are in the audience. David Stokes is the Director of IBM Central and Eastern Europe. I hope he will present his concept of an IBM city. Peter van Berkel is from Philips. Alexander Puzanov is the General Director of the Institute for Urban Economics Foundation.

Before I ask Sergey to begin his introduction, I would like to pick out the three points that will determine the course of our discussion today.

Firstly, many cities have announced that they are beginning to implement the Cities 3.0 project. Even Herman Gref, our country's leading banker, who represents one of Europe's largest banks (Sberbank) brought a real manifesto onstage not long ago, calling on us to work for the creation of Cities 3.0. All of our cities, especially the large ones, are in an era of transition.

The second item, which is important to St. Petersburg, is that we have to understand how cities with colossal historical heritages are changing. How can we preserve the heritage we have been granted for future generations, while simultaneously addressing tasks aimed at updating cities and at their innovative development?

The final point is a question. How can we help cities find a harmonious balance between the past and the present and move towards the future? What technological and social instruments may be used in order to do so? What principles and priorities should we be governed by in selecting projects and programmes?

Mr. Vyazalov, in your opinion, what is currently the most important thing for large modern cities that are moving into the future? How do we want to see St. Petersburg, which may have the richest historical inheritance of any city in Russia? There may be no other such significant, sizeable historical centre anywhere in Europe.

S. Vyazalov:

Ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, thank you for coming here in such large numbers.

We are very pleased that this topic is of interest not only to the inhabitants of our city, but also to society at large in the country and the world over. The rebuilding of the centre of St. Petersburg has always been a focus of the authorities: during the Soviet era, the Central Committee of the Communist Party gave it some thought. However, I need to say honestly that a programme that could have truly addressed

the problem of the city centre was never adopted. We have signed an agreement with UNESCO; we have certain international responsibilities; we have a preservation area. Even so, the centre is gradually falling apart. The moment has come when we need to deal properly with what we have. I can make this comparison: it is as if a young student has inherited an antique apartment from his grandmother, but he does not have the money for the upkeep.

If we do not start rebuilding the centre, if we do not facilitate its harmonious development, the time for it may pass us by, and we may not be able to hand that centre down to our descendants in the way that we should. We had a difficult task ahead of us when we created the programme for the reconstruction of the city centre. We needed to combine federal budgetary funds, which are allotted for certain monuments in the city centre, with monies from the local budget, which sets aside a significant amount for engineering infrastructure and the reconstruction of bridges, roads, and buildings, with funds from the investors who have recently been active in St. Petersburg.

We invited specialists in various areas into that arena. I would like to thank them from the bottom of my heart for having agreed to participate in that discussion. Afterwards, we would like to make use of their thoughts and best practices to create a target programme and begin to implement it in the near future. Thank you.

V. Knyaginin:

Sergey, I find I cannot keep silent after this introduction of yours, the rules notwithstanding. A year ago, one of the city's leaders said that we do not need a strategy, that everything had already been done by Peter I, and that the framework he created holds St. Petersburg up. In your view, is it possible to talk about having a St. Petersburg 3.0? Are we going to have a new version of St. Petersburg, or is our task to preserve the heritage and interweave everything new into the current fabric of the city without changing it radically?

S. Vyazalov:

Certainly we cannot abandon what has been done, but we do believe that our task is to transform the existing environment after having made it as pleasant as possible for the city's residents and guests.

V. Knyaginin:

I see. Then I will yield the floor to Josef Acebillo.

I have already said that the renovation of Barcelona's historical centre is connected to a considerable extent with the name Josef Acebillo. How do you view the development of a city? To what extent should that development affect the city's historical heritage? Is that heritage a burden to us or an element of support as we move forward? What is the most important point when creating development plans for cities like St. Petersburg?

J. Acebillo:

In the first place, I would like to note that the situation in St. Petersburg differs from the situation in the large cities that interest me, such as Venice, Istanbul, and Rome. We should take into account what kind of vision we can propose, what we can do on a worldwide scale to address the problems facing St. Petersburg and other large world cities. In the second place (and this is a very interesting topic to me as a professor of architecture), the preservation of the things that already exist is usually more important to people than are new developments. Preserving the pre-existing and developing new things are the two sides of our work. Some say we cannot work in the historical centre because there is a certain lack of legal protection; at the same time, there are laws that are already in force in that area.

At one time, the Renaissance arose in response to what had happened in the Middle Ages. When Michelangelo began restoration works in Rome, an argument arose between him and the Vatican as to whether to restore or preserve the ruins of ancient Roman buildings. I believe that this is a starting point for a discussion of St. Petersburg. Many centuries ago, Shakespeare wrote, 'What is the city but the people?' A historical centre should serve the people. We cannot allow people to be

in thrall to the historical centre. I am not saying that a historical centre needs to be turned into a simple tool, but we need to relate to it based on the interests of the citizenry. We should not be saying that everything was better in the past than it is now; we should not get stuck in the past. Currently in architecture and construction, the method of recurring use, or recycling, is being applied. A reinterpretation of historical places in the context of modern life is arising.

Unfortunately, I do not know St. Petersburg as well as I would like to, but I have been to your city more than once, and I believe that it is not being preserved too badly. It seems to me that in St. Petersburg, certain buildings need to be torn down; the old architecture needs to be replaced. Some diseases cannot be treated without surgery, without organ transplants. I am not talking about the large-scale demolitions which, unfortunately, happened often not long ago. But I do not know how else to transform a city except to ask the question: what do we absolutely have to preserve, and what can we modify or replace? I believe that this is a key point.

In Barcelona's industrial region, we have implemented the so-called 22@Barcelona project. When we want to make a modern centre out of an industrial area, something has to be sacrificed. The same thing happened in New York City's Silicon Alley and in the centre of Tel Aviv. There was a need for restoration, but there was no money for it, either private or public. And the centre of Tel Aviv is the accomplishment of all of humanity, so the absolute highest of qualifications were needed there. It was decided that a certain number of new buildings would be added in order to pay for the preservation, restoration, and recycling of the old ones. You can do things in such a way that activity continues in a city centre. Yesterday I rode around St. Petersburg on the ring road and saw that the city has run wild. That is bad. If the culture is concentrated in the historical centre and the musculature is on the periphery, that is the worst situation for the future of the city. Certain measures need to be taken. The future should not be feared. You need to make it easier for the private sector to come into the historical centre, to speed up the metabolism of a city's historical centre, in order to improve the transportation and energy supply systems.

We cannot devote a historical centre to cultural events alone: that would be a huge mistake. There should be a certain population density in a historical centre; there should be accessible, modern residences, with heating facilities, and so on. That means we are talking about serious reconstruction of buildings. It should not be forgotten that a historical centre provides excellent opportunities for various organizations. St. Petersburg has a huge number of cultural institutions: the Hermitage, the theatres. You need to think about how that concentration of culture can give birth to innovation.

You need to act in accordance with three principles – tolerance, talent, and technology – the 'three Ts'. This is true for all cities. If you do not apply these three principles, the historic centre will be paralysed. Venice, for example, is only good for tourists; just 62,000 people live in the centre there. That model will not work at all for your city. You need to realize that the most dynamic district of a city is its centre, that that is the place where the most potential lies. Otherwise, you lose the battle for the future.

If you are going to go outside the 'old city walls' to conduct various events, both large and small, if you are going to pull some kinds of activities from the centre, the city loses. That happens all over the world. A return to the centre is a 21st-century urban method, just as the departure beyond the city limits was the 20th-century method. You have to return to the centre; you have to give it a chance again. A centre that was ultra-modern 200 years ago should become modern once more.

V. Knyaginin:

Thank you, Mr. Acebillo.

After such an energetic talk, it is hard for me to go on to the other participants, but we will continue nonetheless.

I would like to yield the floor now to Grigory Revzin, who is representing Moscow. Mr. Acebillo just cited the 'three Ts' rule. In Richard Florida's book *The Rise of The Creative Class and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, the author basically sets out the principles for the development of modern

cities. Of course, it is true that Florida wrote a new book not long ago in which he gives a fairly pessimistic evaluation of the current condition of cities. He says that everything that has been done over the last 20–30 years will have to be rebuilt, and that the cities created in the past 20–30 years will not be immune.

In Russia, two cities are striving for global status: Moscow and St. Petersburg. Two capitals, the old and the new. Mr. Acebillo said that the points of growth should also be located in the centre; that some things should be left unchanged, while others, so to speak, need to undergo surgery. It seems to me that in Moscow, everything went under the knife: it is a completely updated city. St. Petersburg is better preserved. Which way should we go with that, do you think? How should these cities be developed? Is there a difference between Moscow and St. Petersburg? How can these cities be turned into global ones?

G. Revzin:

I am going to speak as a frightened Muscovite. Moscow has gone through the reconstruction of the city centre that Mr. Acebillo talked about. I can recall, with a certain amount of horror, the discussions that took place in Moscow in 1993 and 1994. The same things were said: that fresh strength needed to be brought to the historical centre, that the centre was dying, that we needed modernization, or that we needed to tear something down, replace something. The same threat is hanging over St. Petersburg. We are already hearing words to the effect that we need to replace some things. Some people are thinking, "Are they going to tear some things down now?"

You say that the path Venice took is not suited to St. Petersburg. There are people for whom the path Venice took is not valid anywhere. In the year 2000, I was in Venice with Vladimir Lisin, who was rebuilding Moscow. The two of us were riding on a boat along the Grand Canal, and he said, "What in the world is this? These buildings are ill; everything is falling apart. They should bring Mospromstroy and Mosinzhstroy here. We would tear everything down and remake it all. It would be a

stunning modern city." Barbarians who are prepared to descend upon any historical city in the name of modernization are one of today's major dangers.

Today we are discussing a programme to invest approximately RUB 300 billion in St. Petersburg. The danger is not just that there are architectural and development organizations that are professionally bent on destroying historical cities. There are also business structures that have come together which do not know how to do things any differently, just as water cannot flow upwards: if there is something valuable, they are going to use it. Currently, we do not have models other than the one that came together in Moscow. That was the model Russia was able to develop; that was the one it implemented. Take Ostozhenka, where they used the method of preserving the historical environment of the city using ultramodern technologies. Today, 15% of the historical buildings remain, while the remaining 85% are new structures. The historical district of Ostozhenka no longer exists; something else has appeared in its place. Is that a plus for the city or not? I do not know.

There are huge differences between Moscow and St. Petersburg. St. Petersburg is a city that has tourists. In Moscow, there is a real population of 15 million, and it sees one million tourists annually. There are five million people living in St. Petersburg, but it gets ten million tourists a year. There is legislation on preservation, but everybody tries to work out how to get around it. But what is preservation but a means to remove something from the effects of the laws of economics? If paintings are given to a museum, they do not exist for the market. If buildings have preservation status, they are not sold or renovated. The idea of preservation is specifically to exclude them from that process. If we start thinking about how to get around the laws and rent the buildings out a little bit, those buildings will disappear. This is a hopeless situation.

Moreover, we have to realize that the idea of being able to stand against the market with the help of the preservation laws in our country is quite improbable. Moscow's experience shows that the market will win. We do not respect our own laws; that is

how we are made. This means that we need to invent a new, non-developer-oriented, effective business model that will allow the historical centre to develop.

What can be done? There is a process through which all the cities in Europe in which there is respect for the law have passed. We allow small businesses into the city for the purpose of rebuilding and restoring the buildings and using them as hotels, restaurants, and so on. That is quite an effective method. Capital construction is prohibited within the historical centre: there can only be restoration, reconstruction, and repair. Truthfully, I am a stranger to St. Petersburg. I am looking at it from the outside. It seems to me that the St. Petersburg architectural school is not up to the standards of the historical greatness of this city. If we do not apply that kind of moratorium, we will ruin the city. Modern architecture should not be allowed in the centre.

But if we simply prohibit it, the prohibitions will be violated anyway; nothing will come of them. What should be done? In the first place, it seems to me that we need to propose alternative construction centres for developers. Mr. Acebillo talked about historical industrial zones. They are not part of the historical centre of St. Petersburg, but they are located nearby: along the Obvodny Canal and on Vasilevsky Island. That is an excellent area of activity for a private developer, while for the city it is a burden; they are neighbourhoods which need to undergo intensive renovation.

In the second place, new projects for growth are needed. We have had enough of this parasitism on old historical treasures. You think you can put a Gazprom tower in the beautiful historical centre, and that it will look majestic. But you are only going to make the residents unhappy with you. You cannot consolidate public opinion around renovation of the historical centre that seems to be taking place for the sake of modernization, but that will actually lead to a conflict situation between the citizens and the government.

But the main thing, since we do not seem to be very good at observing the laws, should be a special institute that acts in accordance with the accepted ideology of the preservation, restoration, and reconstruction of the city. Mr. Acebillo talked

about Tel Aviv's experience; I would like to cite the experience of Jerusalem. In 1988 a state corporation for the development of the historical centre was created there. Over a 15-year period, it performed an ideal reconstruction of those historical quarters which were destroyed by the war. Now it is a stunning city.

If RUB 300 billion is really going to be invested in St. Petersburg, a state corporation for the reconstruction of the city centre needs to be created. The private developers should conduct their activities in the outskirts. We need to support private projects for the development of areas that are an alternative to the centre.

The government should control not only adherence to the laws, but those who are called on to adhere to them. That is our country; that is how it is built: we are not law-abiding. If the government does not keep a close eye, we will not follow the preservation laws, and we will lose the historical centre of St. Petersburg.

V. Knyaginin:

If we take on the burden of our heritage, it is difficult to do anything but polish up what we have inherited. Incidentally, Mr. Piotrovsky, as far as I know, the Amsterdam branch of the Hermitage is housed in an old hospital or shelter. Not far from the centre, but in a far from prestigious place, you created a museum that is one of the most visited in Amsterdam today. The events that are held there attract a good deal of attention.

M. Piotrovsky:

We recently opened an exhibition on the Impressionists and the French Salon.

V. Knyaginin:

All of Amsterdam was waiting for that Impressionist exhibition; for them, that is a significant event. These kinds of initiatives enliven the centre and make cultural life richer. In your view, who might be able to act as an agent of the centre's development? If you subscribe to Grigory's very harsh assertions, new forms of development for the historical centre will be virtually inaccessible to us.

What can be done by a state-owned corporation which is boxed in on all sides by regulations and prohibitions? It can only repair old things and restore the things that have not been completely destroyed. But what about new things? Could the Hermitage or other, similar, large cultural players fill the role of that kind of agent?

M. Piotrovsky:

As far as Amsterdam is concerned, that is a historical building. Internal reconstruction was done there in the 1930s, so we can also do anything we want on the inside. On the other hand, on the outside, we changed the colour of the window frames three times so that they would be as they would have been in historical Amsterdam. There was also a fire in part of the General Staff building of the Hermitage in St. Petersburg in the 1920s, so we used two colours in the hall we created there. You have to search for models.

St. Petersburg has already demonstrated that the historical centre can be preserved. The question is not one of the region's fate; there has been no regional fate. We know a lot of tricks you can use to preserve the centre of St. Petersburg, up to and including moving the capital to Moscow. We say, "We have a city–museum," and then usually you hear someone say, "But you cannot live in a museum!" In a modern museum, you can live quite well. A modern museum is a shining example of an economic, political, and social scheme that works well. I am talking here about large museums with worldwide significance.

They give examples of how to select projects, of what specifically should be built. I do not know what to do in a city if you want to build something. At a museum, there is a commission that works out what that specific museum needs, clarifies what can be purchased and what should not be purchased, and determines what any money can be spent on and what is not needed at all. That cannot be calculated mathematically; it is about knowledge of the humanities.

The 'Big Moscow' project has been mentioned; not long ago, we developed the 'Big Hermitage' concept. It is a dynamic scheme, and it works: there is something in the centre, something in the outlying areas, something on the Internet, and something in

other places; various preservation methods are used. That kind of system already exists in a great many museums. It can exist on a citywide scale as well.

One other thing is the brand, the honour of the name. There are serious companies (although it is true that there are not very many of them now), there are good developers that think more about keeping their good name than about how and what to earn today. For St. Petersburg, it is very important to preserve the honour of its name. People should not think about what they can see from their windows, but about what they can see when they walk down the street. This is why you cannot build the Gazprom tower and other related facilities.

There many other beneficial things related to the field of humanities knowledge and experience. You all know Palace Square. It is the only square left in St. Petersburg. There are no others; they are full of cars and all the other stuff. It is like Siberia's curse in Russia: everyone covets Siberia, because it is rich. The Square is the only empty space in the city, and they always tell us, "There is no transportation there; nothing needs to be blocked off, so you can do anything you want there." We fight this. In some cases we win; in others, we get what has been done again now for Scarlet Sails.

Many have the eternal desire to turn Palace Square into a stadium. We need to define its function. Palace Square should not be a stadium; there are other arenas for that purpose. But the best option, of course, would be to build a stadium, throw all our efforts into it, and hold much of what they want to hold on Palace Square in that stadium instead. Palace Square is a place for parades and strolls. Near us in the centre of the city, something like Peterhof is coming into existence: gardens, and palaces standing in those gardens. That is also a certain kind of recipe that can be used and perpetuated.

I have one more point, which I have already talked about: we need to return the city to what it was rather than preserving it. St. Petersburg is a city of military culture. Moscow is small churches on every corner. St. Petersburg is military buildings. It is so many officers walking down the street that they make up one out of every five

people you see. Ours is an imperial city. This means people who wear uniforms, not the regiments serving in individual units and command offices.

But we want to take the Museum of the Guards out of Palace Square. I write a letter every day about the planned closure of the Military Historical Museum of Artillery, Engineers, and Signal Corps and the Central Naval Museum, which they want to combine with Moscow's Central Museum of Armed Forces. There are many things that cannot be described using arithmetic which need to not only be preserved, but placed at the foundation of a functioning model of the city. This model will also be attractive to tourists (and actually we do not have that many tourists; the number is off by four million) and to residents. Tourists will appear when people start to come here in order to live the same life that our city's residents live.

We know approximately what real Petersburgers need. And the style and spirit of a modern museum in its true sense is one of the best reference points for that.

V. Knyaginin:

The 'preservationist party' has the upper hand for now, it seems to me. I really like what Mr. Acebillo talked about: a living city with new architectural phenomena. I understand Grigory: new architectural phenomena do not measure up to the environment into which they have been inserted; that is our worst misfortune. But life goes on; St. Petersburg is striving for the status of a global city. The G20 meeting is going to be held here in the autumn. We have a series of international events here; business is growing; companies with worldwide significance come to us.

All of this requires that people be highly mobile. If we have high mobility, we get heavy car traffic. Often, it is cars and roads that determine the topography and architecture of modern cities. It would be impossible to ignore this demand without causing the city to cease to exist.

Mr. Parolotto, in your view, how can the development of a global city be reconciled with the creation of a relatively conservative and peaceful environment for its residents? How can a city be made convenient for human existence? We

understand that transportation problems have become key for modern cities. How can they be solved? Maybe you could talk about St. Petersburg as well, although you have not seen much of it.

F. Parolotto:

Thanks for the question. There are a couple of things I would like to say. The first is that I do not know St. Petersburg that well, but it is definitely a beautiful city. When you come to this place and you look around, you can see a world-class city, astonishingly beautiful and vibrant. Having said that, I arrived on the high-speed train from Moscow, and when you step out of the station, what you see is a huge traffic junction that takes up all the available space, and the sense of arrival in a city transforms into the initial nightmare of how to get around this place.

I think that this issue is an issue that has to be tackled, and some cities have been tackling it over the last 10 to 15 years. Clearly, one issue is that there are too many cars in the city centre. Mobility and traffic are two completely separate elements, even more so today when we are entering a revolution, which has already happened in some parts of the world: there is a progressive blurring of transport options. If you go to Berlin today, for example, you can, if you have a subscription, pick up a car on the street. You check with your smartphone where the car is, you can even choose whether you want a convertible or a smaller car, and then you open the door with a code, and you use it, and you pay by the minute.

It means that the private-public divide is coming to an end, and younger generations do not feel that the car is such a relevant element as it used to be. People are much more willing to give up their cars than their smartphones. What I am trying to say here is that we should really understand that private mobility and car mobility requirements in cities should be reduced. This does not mean that it should not exist: the reality, if you live there, is that it is very difficult. Either you stay within the city, or it becomes very difficult to go outside and run the sort of contemporary mobility that is required to work within a modern, contemporary city.

I do not think we should be saying, "Let us have a car-free city centre." But we have to bring the density down. I am sure that Professor Blinkin, who is a guru of transport – I am actually very happy to be here with him today – will have a lot of things to add on that subject. But the fact that you come to Russian cities like Moscow and St. Petersburg, and there are no parking fees, is a little unusual. You can park everywhere for free, and it is like fish in the sea: you can take as many fish as you want from the sea. Free parking seems like that, you can park as much as you want, and everybody feels that they can do it. The reality is that I think that should change. If you arrive in a car, you occupy six metres of space. If you arrive on foot, you occupy one metre. That difference should turn into costs. It does not mean that you cannot use your car, but if you use your car, you are using a system which has a higher impact, and you have to pay for that.

I think that regardless of the conservation/revision solution, what is important is that we address public space in a completely different way. We have to free up space for other forms of mobility, for pedestrian connectivity, and that will radically change how the city works. There's no need to talk about polycentric cities, that's something that may happen in 50 years; we are talking about something that can happen very soon. I believe we have a change of the tide, thinking about the experience that we have had in Milan, which has the kind of aggressive environment, traffic-wise, that you might experience in Russia. Very recently, a referendum was held for a congestion charge system around town. If you like, it is a tax: tourists are forced to pay if they are driving into town, similar to London or Stockholm. Even in a car-dominated environment like Milan, the population said "Let us change it"; 95% said, "Let us introduce the charge." I think this is a sign that the times are changing.

Parking is always as a political issue. Everybody is afraid of introducing charging, because it is seen as unpopular, but I am pretty certain that if this kind of solution or discussion was taken to the town, into St. Petersburg, it would be taken on board by the population. I feel that in Russia – I am better able to talk about Moscow – there is this desire for more free public space, for reducing the car presence, for

pedestrian connectivity. The successes of some areas in Moscow like Gorky Park or Red October are planned around this desire for a new lifestyle.

I think that this strategy of introducing more mixed mobility – car-sharing, bicycle-sharing – introducing more efficient public transport and roads with separate lanes, and the introduction of some sort of punishment on car usage will definitely change our cities, and will introduce a much better quality of living very quickly.

V. Knyaginin:

There are statistical data on all global cities. The number of pedestrian areas is falling. In New York, they conducted special research and documented the problem: they prohibited car traffic in parts of the centre, but people are still enduring traffic jams. Do you seriously believe that in our lifetimes, the transportation problem will be solved by sacrificing some part of our architectural heritage?

F. Parolotto:

I think that you can reduce car density. The modal share of cars in St. Petersburg in 1999 was 4%. I guess now it might be around 26% or 27%, and I am sure that car ownership has exploded too. That has happened in the span of 13 years. I believe that if you introduce some form of taxation for private vehicles within the city centre – now we are talking about the city centre of St. Petersburg – you can reduce the density of cars. When you reduce the density of cars, you introduce a new quality in cities. You can reduce the space given to cars, you can expand the platform, you can add another form of mobility.

I am not saying that we are going to be paralysed, and cars will not be around, and everybody will walk freely. Traffic congestion is far from over, and we are far from being beyond the motor age. What I am saying is that there are ways of treating city centres now that can be applied immediately in St. Petersburg, and which could be an immediate relief to traffic and citizens. That has been applied in Milan – you now have to pay EUR 5 if you want to come into Milan – and there was a decline of 35% in traffic access. It does not mean that you do not go into the city centre, it is just

that you find alternative means of getting there which are more convenient. That is what I am talking about, not saying, "Let us change and introduce a fantastically high tariff."

V. Knyaginin:

Mikhail, Federico called you the 'transport guru', thereby partly introducing you already. In Moscow, there are separate lanes for different types of traffic, and paid parking is already in existence (not officially, but *de facto*: it is practically impossible to park in the centre of Moscow without paying). The situation is not pleasant, and something has to be done.

What kind of recipes are there, if we are talking about global cities? Is there a way out of this? Or are we going to have to resign ourselves to it? What radical solutions do we have to adopt in order to adapt cities to fulfil global functions? In the 'Big Moscow' you present, these problems have only been compounded.

M. Blinkin:

Formally, there are four options. Let us draw a simple matrix, showing the preservation of a city's historical and cultural identity on one axis and convenience of transport options on the other. Certain cities can respond, "Yes, our historical and cultural identity has been preserved, and it is easy to get around." Mr. Acebillo represents the city I like most from that point of view: Barcelona. The only other city with which it can be compared is Amsterdam. Does it have a historical and cultural identity? Yes. What about driving? In Barcelona, the average speed is 35 kilometres per hour: more than adequate. In comparison, the speed in Moscow is 18 kilometres per hour.

There is another option: we ignore the transportation problems and the city development problems in general and preserve the city the way it is. This is the case in Venice and Florence: the 'yes–no' scenario. The practice of the 'no–yes' scenario is widespread: we sacrifice a lot, but we can drive around easily.

The problem is that Russia's practice in the past twenty years falls into the 'no–no' square of this matrix. To hell with identity! To hell with transportation convenience! We build anywhere we can break ground, and we park anywhere you can fit four wheels in. You suggest a choice, but I say, "What choice is there? There is only the fourth square!"

Shakespeare said, "What is the city without the people?" But no one has ever said, "What is the city without the cars?" I would like to quote Lee Iacocca, the great car manufacturing manager who headed Ford and Chrysler. In his memoirs, which he wrote as an old man, he said, "I have read the Constitution very carefully, but I have never found that it contains the right to drive a car. That is not a right; it is a privilege." Privileges have to be paid for. Humanity has never thought up another option.

I have a selection of photos: the area around Oper Frankfurt; the Palais Garnier in Paris; *conservatoires* in European cities... and then the area around the Mariinsky Theatre and the Moscow Conservatory. I will give them to the organizers. I do not want to upset Petersburgers, so I will give an example from Moscow: there, Pyotr Tchaikovsky works as a car park attendant. He sits there in statue form, and the cars all sit around him.

In the modern view, a city centre is a place where it is convenient to walk, where motor vehicle access is restricted. That is an axiom. Humanity will not deprive me of my car in the foreseeable future: I need it for recreation, shopping, and so on. You do not need to drive a car in the centre of town. Can that be achieved? Of course! In Milan, the public holds cars twice as dear to their hearts as do the people of St. Petersburg. The Italians love cars; the Germans absolutely adore them. But visit the centre of Dusseldorf or Milan. What is the car situation like there in comparison to that in St. Petersburg? It is completely different.

In a city's historical centre, we must also address the problem which my foreign colleagues call the 'the last mile'. You have got a person to the city centre by rail or subway, and he needs to walk the last kilometre, the last mile. When I walk through Moscow, or, like today, through St. Petersburg, that last mile gives me no pleasure;

just the opposite, even. If I see architecture and greenery, walking is easy and pleasant. But when I am walking and have to thread my way through parked cars, it is hard to even walk a hundred metres. We absolutely must address that task; we simply cannot do anything else.

There is another task. There is a classic example: the city of Boston underwent a major renovation. There is greenery there, and women strolling and pushing prams. They took a massive overpass out and ran part of the traffic underground and the other part towards the bay. But in Moscow, we destroyed the gorgeous boulevard along Leningradskiy Prospekt and made it into a kind of highway, even though that is not what it is called formally. In Boston, the centre has not been taken away from the people. We cannot escape that either.

Finally, the last thing we need to do is more urgent for St. Petersburg than it is for Moscow. The centre of our city, in addition to all its other functions, is a transit area. We travel from one distant district to another through the centre of the city. We drive heavy lorries through the city centre. We maintain cargo-heavy industries in the city. The number of lorries in both Moscow and St. Petersburg, in comparison with that in any European city, absolutely shocks newcomers. Why are there so many lorries in the city? That is yet another problem we have.

V. Knyaginin:

Thank you, Mikhail. We will have the opportunity to put part of your presentation on the Forum's website so that it will be accessible to everyone who is interested in that problem.

Mr. Dornscheidt, what is a comfortable urban environment? Can comfort for residents be combined with the global functions of a city? What do we need to do to support the global functions of our cities without losing their uniqueness?

W. Dornscheidt:

Thank you very much. I have been invited in my capacity as the director of one of the largest trade fair sites in Germany.

I prepared a presentation on the Internet from a historical point of view, but there is probably no reason to give it now. I have two photos I would like to show you. They are of cities with beautiful historical centres and chaotically growing suburbs. Cities like that need a certain, specific development plan. For example, the port district of Dusseldorf has been gentrified over the past ten years. New residential buildings were built there; offices appeared, as did cafes and restaurants, which are very beneficial to trade fair activities. The district is densely and somewhat asymmetrically built, which creates an excellent impression.

The trade fair site is closely tied to the city. Dusseldorf's Chief Burgomaster is also the Head of the city's Chamber of Commerce. Transportation flows are quite intense. To remove vehicles from the city centre, we, for example, built a great many underground car parks that are used freely by the people living in those districts. There are green spots everywhere. We also built our own road to provide us with lorry access: it connects the autobahn with the expo complex.

Now I will talk about tourism. Tourism is very important: it brings in money; it provides an image of the city to people abroad. In Dusseldorf, the tourists are divided more or less equally into ordinary tourists and business tourists. But business tourism brings much more money into the city. For example, visitors to our trade fairs need very good hotels. They bring the city many millions of dollars, which may be used to restore buildings.

The architecture that dominates our centre continues outside of the centre, unlike what is happening in Dresden. There they have a very attractive centre, but there are buildings on the edges that make no impression whatsoever. It is probably necessary to arrange things so that the city centre and its outlying areas are connected to each other. That is the main idea I wanted to get across to you.

I do not agree with all the comments that have been made. For example, I do not agree that all public events can be held at a stadium. A stadium is a place for sports competitions and concerts. If they are held regularly, you can set up a certain plan for a stadium. In Dusseldorf, we have a huge arena with a retractable roof; you can see it in the photo. They play football there, and they have concerts in the breaks

between football matches. The stadium has a huge advantage in the form of the roads that lead from it to the autobahn. The stadium's parking areas can be used by visitors to our exhibitions and trade fairs. All of these facilities are located in the centre: these are the most expensive plots in the city.

As you can see, industry can be interwoven with the interests of a city and its residents. Everyone who lives in the area of the trade fair site supports our activity. It seems to me that everything that is good for the city is good for the trade fair site. I hope we can share the experience of our site's activities with St. Petersburg. The development of exhibition activities would bring huge advantages to St. Petersburg. In an attractive city, people are also going to be keen to attend exhibitions, and vice versa; visitors to exhibitions are going to be able to look at St. Petersburg when they come to the city.

V. Knyaginin:

Thank you, Mr. Dornscheidt.

I would like to yield the floor to David Stokes, a representative of IBM. David, our 'preservation party' has won the day and proposes state regulation as a major tool. Can we hope that modern technologies will give us a response to the challenges of modern life? Does your company, which is one of the largest in the IT field, have a city concept? Can we expect a fundamental renovation of cities in the near future? And which technologies, from your point of view, should we pay attention to due to the fact that they will be changing our lives to the largest extent?

D. Stokes:

Thank you very much for the question. First, I would like to say it is a great honour for us to be here with such cultural and architectural expertise. IBM perhaps brings a different but complementary viewpoint around technology. I say complementary, and I will explain this in a moment.

Probably some four years ago, we launched an important initiative which we called Smarter Cities. This was born out of the idea that technology and the physical world

were converging. The physical world was becoming more instrumented, and I think it is no surprise to anybody that we are all becoming more interconnected. But it was more than that. It really also pointed towards the immense analytical capability that existed in our world, and that gave us the opportunity to do things in a smarter way: not just to be able to analyse information, to be able to make better decisions looking at the past; but to be able to predict things, and I will talk about this in the context of a city in a moment.

This initiative really spawned a number of activities across the world, and we have engaged now in nearly 2,500 engagements or projects around the world, including here in Russia. Before I talk about the notion of how this can help cities, it is important to understand that our Forum here is also talking about globalization. Our view is that in an increasingly globalized, interconnected world, two factors will stand out in terms of the cities that will lead. The first one is talent and the ability to attract skills – I would say high-knowledge skills, creative skills – and also cities' ability to create and absorb innovation, whether those cities are in Europe, in Asia, or in the United States. Whether those cities have an immense cultural background or whether they are modern cities does not matter. The winning cities will be those that can attract those skills.

I think we will see over the next decade, certainly, tens of millions of highly-skilled, highly-knowledgeable workers migrating to where the opportunities are in the world. I think what is going to attract them is not just that there are jobs available. I think they will move to where the lifestyle in the city is one that is attractive for them to live and to work in. This is where the idea of building a smarter city comes in, being able to use the immense amount of data to really create better services and to create a safer lifestyle.

We think that there are four areas in which technology can be applied that are really essential to creating a smarter city. The first one is in the area of public safety: not just in creating a safe environment in terms of policing and so on, but also in terms of rapid response and emergency services as we have worked on with cities such as Madrid. The second area is in transportation. We have already heard about

transportation here, but it is the availability of data to be able to analyse where there are traffic hotspots, and where coordination can be provided between public transportation and private transportation that is relevant here. We are working at the moment with the city of Istanbul to analyse trends in terms of how the population is moving around the city, in order for them to be able to plan transportation in a better way. The third area is providing citizen-centric services. As we see the rise of the consumer in society, the same is true of citizens, and we need to be able to provide better tailored services to the citizens. Here, I am not just talking about education, although that is a very important part of it. Then finally, I am talking about health care. I think that one is going to be very key, but probably the most challenging area. Again, it is born in the availability of data: to have a data record around my health, my situation, and to be able to tailor health care services to the individual: that is what I think is going to attract high-knowledge workers to cities.

Bringing this all together is going to be key. That is where the real differentiation will come. If you like, it is about bringing the systems together into a system of systems, and managing that holistically. The cities that do that, we profoundly believe, will be those that will be the winning cities as we go into the next decade and beyond. Technology will play a big part in it, but so too will leadership, and so too will a clear vision for a city to lead in the more globalized world that we live in today.

M. Blinkin:

I need to make an important comment after the speech by my colleague from IBM. Denos Gazis, the most prominent transportation specialist of the 20th century, worked with IBM for 20 years, from the beginning of the 1980s until his death in 2004. That alone explains the corporation's success.

V. Knyaginin:

It is good that you are seeing eye to eye, colleagues. Our discussion is drawing to a close. I hope that Alexander Puzanov will say a few more words, and then that the

audience will ask the participants in our panel discussion a few questions (if there are any, of course).

Alexander, we are discussing global cities, the urban environment. What municipal policy tools can be used in these cities in order to find a compromise between the interests of the developers, the government, and the residents?

A. Puzanov:

I would like to begin with the part of the answer that is contained in the question itself and which may seem obvious to some of us, but not to all of us by a long shot. It should specifically be a policy; it should be a complex process of goal-setting, execution, the development of a feedback mechanism, and so on. In brief, the relationship needs to be multidimensional and focused on many subjects. We have a complex task ahead of us, and in listening to this discussion, I have been reminded once again of its huge scale. We need to pay our debt to humanity, preserving historical heritage, while simultaneously making the centre of St. Petersburg into a product for export. A city needs to be attractive to tourists and to all the people who need that city.

We need to give impetus to the targeted development of St. Petersburg. I agree that the centre is not the only place that needs to be developed, but the impetus should originate specifically from the city centre. The city's individuality also has to be preserved and developed. It must not be erased.

I would also like to add that within a city, there are a multitude of economic entities, and at the same time, many types of planning are being carried out: socio-economic planning, territorial planning, public utility infrastructure planning, and budget planning. We do not know how to coordinate all those types of planning even in simpler situations, let alone in a unique city like St. Petersburg.

Finally, cities develop in as agglomerations: we have the historical centre of St. Petersburg and the suburbs with their monuments. In the eyes of many Russian citizens, they create a certain whole. We are often tempted to take a simple decision: to either completely prohibit something or, conversely, to open the gates

and let anyone at all in. There are no simple solutions here. We just need to honestly admit that to ourselves and start our long, careful, hard work.

Yet another of our misfortunes is that we do not know how to make use of conciliatory, coordinated procedures. There is a great danger in saying to ourselves, "We have such a unique object here; we need less democracy, fewer conciliatory procedures, and less local self-government." In my view, the example of Moscow that has been given here speaks to the fact that we will not achieve the desired results by walking that path.

Finally, I would like to say something about the people, since the city is the people. About ten years ago, I came to St. Petersburg fairly often. When I arrived, the first thing I would do would be to walk to the centre of town and look at people's faces. I have been in many cities where it is very difficult to walk in the part of the centre with historical value. I spent my childhood in a city like this, where there was a striking difference between the architectural environment and the people who lived in the city. We need to remember that when, for example, we propose not to build anything new in the city and create businesses in the industrial belt around it. Who will go there; where will those people come from? The task is a very complex one, and there are no simple solutions to it.

V. Knyaginin:

Thank you.

Colleagues, I was too optimistic when I hoped that we would have time left over for questions from the audience. Sadly, we have used up all the time allotted for the discussion. Mr. Vyazalov, please say a few closing words, and then with your permission, I will sum up the session.

S. Vyazalov:

Thank you. Colleagues, I am very grateful to all the participants in this discussion. We have not discovered anything new. All of the speakers have confirmed our concerns with regard to the fact that it will not be simple to implement this

programme. Moreover, all of the problems that have been discussed – the transportation issues, for example – require extraordinarily expensive solutions. Today we signed an agreement to build a new phase of the Western High-Speed Diameter, which will take a considerable load off the transport flows created by the seaport. The cost of the project is RUB 106 billion.

As far as the expenditure on bringing the city's utilities up to standard, moving people out of communal apartments, and building and repairing the bridges and roads are concerned, the total amount will reach a good deal more than the RUB 300 billion in the plan. It will come to trillions of roubles. Therefore, today we need to, at the very least, propose solutions that will allow us to solve these problems in the right way, preserve the historical centre, and make that centre more pleasant in order to leave the city for its inheritors in a state that will be remembered by many generations to come.

V. Knyaginin:

Friends, I am grateful to everyone who has taken part in this discussion; I am thankful to those present in the audience for listening to us so patiently. In conclusion, I would like to give you four brief points as your moderator.

First, our expectations for the future should be positive. The future should not be seen as a threat.

Second, every new thing created in a city like St. Petersburg (and apparently in any global city) must aspire to greatness. That is a challenge to those who strive to do anything in St. Petersburg. The inheritance we have received demands it.

Third, the city has to change, or there will be no development. The city cannot *not* change.

Fourth, we did not have a separate discussion of the topic carried in the name of our round table. However, the discussion showed that global cities acquire many similar features in the same way that people of the same age living in the same circles catch the same diseases. If St. Petersburg is to turn into a global city in the future, then unfortunately we will have to give up a part of our uniqueness. But our huge

cultural inheritance guarantees us a special place in the global card game of the future.

I would like to extend an enormous amount of thanks to the participants in our discussion. Thank you for your attention.