

Ada NAWROCKA¹

DESIGN AS A CATALYST OF URBAN TRANSFORMATION: THE HIGH LINE IN NEW YORK, ITS GLOBAL REINTERPRETATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR POLISH PLANNING PRACTICE

This paper explores design as a catalyst of urban transformation and as an epistemic instrument within contemporary planning culture. Using New York's High Line and its global reinterpretations – including The Bentway in Toronto, Cheonggyecheon in Seoul, Nordhavn in Copenhagen, and King's Cross in London – the study traces a paradigmatic shift from design as aestheticization to design as mediation and co-production. These cases demonstrate how urban design operates not only through form-making but through iterative processes of governance, observation, learning, and negotiation. The empirical part situates these ideas within the Polish context through the case of Kraków's *Wesoła* district – the example where statutory and strategic planning instruments (MPZP and Masterplan) were intentionally interwoven through participatory design. The *Wesoła* Masterplan (2024) translates global principles of critical design and operational urbanism into local practice, creating a “living laboratory” of adaptive governance, affective mapping, and co-creation.

The paper concludes that the most transformative potential of design today lies not in producing new forms but in cultivating the city's capacity to design itself – a planning culture based on reflection, experimentation, and shared knowledge.

Keywords: design-as-process; planning culture; High Line; urban living lab; sustainable development; regenerative urbanism; transfer of air rights

1. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary spatial planning is increasingly departing from a classical, control-oriented model based on maintaining spatial order and implementing local regulations. That model – whose principal aim was to “master the future” through prescriptive plans and drawings – proves inadequate in the face of today's multilayered climate, social, and infrastructural crises [Healey 2010]. In its place emerges a more

¹ Wydział Budownictwa, Architektury i Inżynierii Środowiska, Politechnika Bydgoska im. Jana i Jędrzeja Śniadeckich, ORCID: 0000-0001-8895-4332

relational and processual paradigm in which the city is understood not as a finished product but as an ongoing process of negotiating values, interests, and visions of the common good.

Within this shift – from plan as schema to planning as a learning process – design plays a pivotal role. It is no longer a terminal aesthetic gesture; rather, it acts as a medium of collaboration: a tool of mediation, a catalyst for consensus (or the revelation of conflict), and a language through which the city speaks about itself [Boelen 2015; Washburn 2013; Papanek 2021]. This shift in planning culture connects urbanism with design, legal, and social practices, redefining the role of the designer from maker of forms to organizer of processes and relations.

These transformations are particularly well illustrated by New York’s High Line – one of the most influential urban projects of the early twenty-first century – in which design not only reshaped public space but also initiated a complex sequence of legal, social, and economic changes. The High Line became a prototype of operational urbanism – understood as a practice that binds together actors, regulations, and imagination [Forsyth 2024].

Against this backdrop, the article poses two core research questions:

- a) In what ways did the High Line reframe relations among design, urban policy, and real-estate economics, particularly through the application of the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)?
- b) To what extent – and in what forms – do similar design logics appear in other cities worldwide, and what does their comparison reveal about the trajectory of contemporary planning culture?

Addressing these questions helps outline a new framework that understands design as a critical and epistemic process in which making space is simultaneously a social and political inquiry.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study combines a case-study approach with comparative analysis.

2.1. High Line Case Study

The analysis draws on source materials concerning the High Line’s planning and design processes: documents of the New York City Department of City Planning, the Zoning Resolution, the report *Reclaiming the High Line*, materials by Friends of the High Line, and scholarly publications [Washburn 2013; Nelson i in. 2012].

The case study focuses on the role of design throughout the process – from civic action to the adoption of legal regulations and the implementation of the TDR instrument. The analysis is monographic, covering historical background, legal conditions, planning instruments, and spatial and social outcomes.

2.2. Comparative Analysis

The second level of inquiry is a comparative analysis of six contemporary urban projects in which design acted as a catalyst for urban transformation rather than a purely decorative tool of aestheticization. Case selection was based on procedural – not formal – similarity. The projects examined are:

- a) **The Bentway (Toronto, Canada):** curated design under infrastructure.
- b) **Cheonggyecheon Stream Restoration (Seoul, South Korea):** renaturalization as state narrative.
- c) **Sewoon Maker City (Seoul, South Korea):** reactivation of inner-city making.
- d) **Nordhavn (Copenhagen, Denmark):** integration of energy and spatial planning.
- e) **King's Cross Regeneration (London, UK):** design leadership and mediation between public and private interests.
- f) **SUPERTRENTO (Trento, Italy):** a participatory design laboratory.

Comparing these processes reveals shared features of a new planning culture: processuality, iterativity, co-creation, and the coupling of legal and affective tools. Methodologically, the article aligns with practice-led research [Boelen 2015], in which design is a form of inquiry – an approach to investigating social and spatial relations through action.

2.3. Research Methodology and Limitations

The research adopts a qualitative, interpretive approach characteristic of urban design research and practice-led research, treating the design process as a mode of knowing [Boelen 2015; Forsyth 2024]. It is based on document analysis, case analysis, and comparative interpretation. The objective is not quantitative hypothesis testing but a deepened understanding of relations among design, planning, and urban transformation.

Methods comprised:

- a) a critical literature review in spatial planning, design theory, and operational urbanism, including canonical works [Healey 2010; Washburn 2013] and contemporary reinterpretations [Boelen 2015; Awan 2023; Forsyth 2024];
- b) a High Line case analysis grounded in municipal documents (Zoning Resolution, Friends of the High Line reports, court decisions, planning studies), design sources (Diller Scofidio + Renfro; James Corner Field Operations), and scholarly literature;
- c) a comparative analysis of six cases across cultural and geographical contexts (Toronto, Seoul, Copenhagen, London, Trento), selected by procedural criteria: processuality, co-creation, mediation, and institutional innovation;
- d) a synthesis of actionable insights for Polish planning practice based on translating concepts and tools from global to local contexts (e.g., urban living lab, governance canvas, design as project mode).

The study is qualitative and exploratory. Its findings are not universally generalizable – owing, among other factors, to the specificity and diversity of institutional contexts – yet they provide a basis for further comparative research and for testing methods in planning practice. The adopted methodology – document analysis, consultation processes, and case studies of design interventions – has been applied experimentally to the Kraków district of Wesoła, conceived as a laboratory of urban change.

Despite its limitations, the approach enables the reconstruction of spatial transformation logics, the identification of recurring mechanisms of mediation and innovation in urban planning, and the formulation of recommendations for Polish practice – especially regarding integration of strategic tools (masterplan) and regulatory instruments (Local Spatial Development Plan, MPZP) in the spirit of design-critical urbanism and an operational approach to the city.

3. CASE STUDY: THE HIGH LINE IN NEW YORK

3.1. Project Origins and Key Actors

The High Line did not emerge from a municipal program but from grassroots civic initiative. In the 1990s, the steel West Side Line viaduct on Manhattan’s West Side – an out-of-use industrial railway – was slated for demolition. Joshua David and Robert Hammond founded Friends of the High Line (FHL) to save the structure and transform it into a new kind of public space: a linear park embedded in dense urban fabric.

From the outset, the project was narrative in character: it articulated an alternative future for the district that might escape the conventional logic of gentrification and developer-led uniformity [Washburn 2013: 97–100]. FHL gained support from residents as well as from cultural and planning communities, including Amanda Burden, later Chair of the City Planning Commission.

In 2001, *The New Yorker* ran *Walking the High Line*, illustrated with Joel Sternfeld’s photographs, triggering global attention. FHL then partnered with the Design Trust for Public Space and began preparing the *Reclaiming the High Linereport*, which soon became the project’s reference document.

3.2. Design and Law: Transfer of Development

The key instrument enabling implementation was the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR). Under this mechanism in American planning law, owners may transfer unused development rights from one parcel (the “sending site”) to another (the “receiving site”) to compensate for foregone development potential [Nelson i in. 2012: 25–28].

For the High Line, TDR was embedded in the Special West Chelsea District, established in 2005 under Article IX, Chapter 8, Section 98 of the New York City Zoning Resolution. This allowed property owners beneath the viaduct to sell their air rights to developers on nearby parcels, retaining financial benefits without needing to build on the rail corridor itself.

This solution acted as a “pressure valve” among the interests of the city, developers, and FHL: rather than fighting over demolition, a market in air rights reconciled the protection of public space with investment logic. Design – the visual and affective narrative of a green park on a viaduct – legitimized legal decisions and mediated between regulation and urban imagination [Washburn 2013: 141–149].)

3.3. Rezoning and Spatial Strategies

Preparing the Special West Chelsea District took more than three years and led to substantial amendments to zoning provisions. The main elements included:

- a) creating a High Line Transfer Corridor to enable transfers of development rights between 19th and 30th Streets within a band roughly 30 meters wide;
- b) introducing a mixed-use structure – combining residential, commercial, and cultural programs while preserving West Chelsea’s artistic character (inclusionary zoning with a 20% share of affordable units);
- c) regulating building envelopes (heights, setbacks, access to light) to protect the park experience.

The process exemplified institutional urban design – negotiated alignment of norms and interests.

3.4. Design Phase and Implementation

In 2004, the design competition was won by James Corner Field Operations, Diller Scofidio + Renfro, and Piet Oudolf. Their concept imagined the park as a “self-seeded city” – a space fusing industrial heritage with a new urban ecology.

In parallel, the Zoning Resolution amendments were finalized, and in 2005 the city acquired the viaduct (via a no-cost transfer from CSX Transportation). The first section opened in 2009, with subsequent segments in 2011 and 2014.

The outcome was spectacular: 2.33 kilometers of continuous green public space with more than 500 plant species forming a new ecological layer for the city. Equally significant, however, was the procedural dimension: the High Line altered how a city learns to plan itself [Boelen 2015; Forsyth 2024].

3.5. The High Line as a Laboratory of Planning Culture

From a planning-theory perspective, the High Line exemplifies reflective urbanism [Washburn 2013: 150–152] – a practice in which design helps pose better

questions about urban futures rather than simply provide ready-made solutions. The process is iterative and transdisciplinary:

- a) bottom-up mobilization generates a vision;
- b) public institutions learn legal flexibility;
- c) design integrates economic, social, and symbolic rationalities.

The use of TDR demonstrates that urban innovation can be systemic rather than merely formal – designing institutional frameworks as well as spaces. In this sense, the High Line became an “urban laboratory” experimenting with a new model of co-governance (urban design leadership) [Brown 2024]. As Papanek [Papanek 2021: 231] observes, “good design not only solves problems; it helps us understand them.” The High Line thus stands as a prime study in contemporary planning culture: design as an instrument of knowledge, not solely of form.

4. DISCUSSION—DESIGN AS AN URBAN TRANSFORMATION PROCESS

4.1. From the High Line to a New Planning Paradigm

Over the past two decades, an expanding array of urban projects has shown design not as aestheticization but as a strategy for organizing urban processes. The High Line inaugurated this paradigm, catalyzing a planning culture that is bottom-up, experimental, and integrative of policy, law, and imagination [Washburn 2013: 97–152].

Design ceased to be a final product and became a language of negotiation among heterogeneous actors – communities, investors, authorities, and the natural environment. This shift aligns with global trends that Albrechts [Albrechts 2021] and Healey [Healey 2010] term “strategic and reflective planning,” wherein the city is not an object of management but a process of co-creation and learning. In this view, design is an epistemic instrument: it not only transforms space but also creates a shared language for describing and understanding change.

4.2. Reverberations of the High Line Model

The Bentway (Toronto): The space underneath.

Beneath Toronto’s Gardiner Expressway, The Bentway – 1.75 km of public space developed incrementally since 2015 by The Bentway Conservancy in partnership with the city and private actors – positions design as a curator of social processes. Rather than a fixed form, it foregrounds cultural and infrastructural programming that activates space through events, exhibitions, and temporary interventions [Marsden 2022]. This is design “underneath” – operating in the shadow of infrastructure, turning marginal space into an urban stage and serving as a laboratory of inclusivity and negotiated visibility for marginalized groups.

Cheonggyecheon (Seoul): Re-nature as state narrative.

The removal of a 5.6-km elevated highway and the restoration of the Cheonggyecheon stream (2003–2005) created a new ecological and symbolic axis for Seoul. Initiated by Mayor Lee Myung-bak, it represents a top-down reinterpretation of the High Line model: the state “returns the river to the city,” crafting a metropolitan development language through the aesthetics of water, cooling, and community [Cho 2023]. While the project delivered measurable climate benefits (microclimate, biodiversity), it has been criticized for a “spectacle of renaturalization” and gentrifying effects [Guillet 2014].

Interim takeaway. Both cases reveal design’s duality: its capacity to build community and to generate new social tensions. Design is thus a political process, not merely an aesthetic one.

4.3. Design as Activation of Urban Ecosystems**Sewoon Maker City (Seoul):** Infrastructures of collaboration.

In central Seoul, the revitalization of the Sewoon complex – once an electronics hub – redefined “revitalization.” Sewoon Maker City (2015–2024) emphasized strengthening existing networks of making, craft, and micro-enterprise [Mun, Lee 2024], with design acting as collaborative infrastructure linking workshops, universities, and NGOs in a “maker city” model – an exemplar of practice-led urbanism.

SUPERTRENTO (Trento): Design as inquiry.

The Italian project SUPERTRENTO [Poggio et al. 2024] deploys a living-lab model in which residents co-produce urban scenarios (“Get informed – Imagine – Engage”). Here, design functions as a research tool rather than an executive one – structuring dialogue and prototyping urban experiments.

Interim takeaway. Sewoon and SUPERTRENTO mark a shift from spectacular to processual design: delicate urban acupuncture that fortifies existing ecosystems rather than replacing them..

4.4. Design as Governance**Nordhavn (Copenhagen):** A sustainability laboratory.

The transformation of Copenhagen’s Nordhavn into a “five-minute city” illustrates design as a vehicle for implementing public policy. The project integrates mobility, energy, and water systems in a unified, design-driven testbed [Haeusler, Schnabel 2023], functioning as a living laboratory where each spatial intervention is simultaneously a policy and social experiment.

King’s Cross (London): Design leadership and patient capital.

The regeneration of King’s Cross (2000–2020) exemplifies design-led governance, with design as a language mediating between public authorities, the developer (Argent), and local communities [Adams, Tiesdell, 2020; Brown 2024]. Beyond

a spatial plan, the project incorporated architectural quality control, sequenced delivery, and narrative stewardship – what the literature terms urban design leadership.

Interim takeaway. In Nordhavn and King’s Cross, design serves as an institutional mediator – a governance tool coordinating complex relations among policy, market, and society.

4.5. From Design-Led to Design-Critical Urbanism

For years, “design-led regeneration” implied that good form guarantees social good. Experience from projects such as the High Line and Cheonggyecheon shows that design can become a tool of exclusion as readily as emancipation [Wallace 2024]. Hence the growing emphasis on design-critical urbanism [Awan 2023] – design as a practice of questioning and exposing power relations. Critical design does not negate aesthetics; it politicizes it – asking who benefits from space, who finances it, and who is displaced. From this perspective, the High Line, The Bentway, and Sewoon are critical experiments that not only create new spaces but also render conflicts and social tensions visible.

4.6. Operational Urbanism – The City as a Learning Process

Contemporary urban-planning theory [BioMed Central 2023; Forsyth 2024] conceives of the city as a system capable of self-transformation. Operating at the intersection of technology, ecology, and participation, design becomes a feedback mechanism: testing, correcting, and iterating change. Thus projects such as Nordhavn (energy laboratory), SUPERTRENTO (co-decision laboratory), and The Bentway (cultural laboratory under infrastructure) exemplify operational urbanism, where the city is an ongoing experiment. Design becomes less a spatial discipline than an organizational and social competence. As Boelen [Boelen 2015: 47] writes, “design is a way of making the world that simultaneously investigates it.”

5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR POLISH PLANNING PRACTICE

5.1. From Static Plan to Planning Laboratory

The High Line and its contemporary reinterpretations demonstrate that twenty-first-century design has ceased to be an instrument of aestheticization and has become a language of mediation, integration, and inquiry. These projects reveal a decisive shift in planning culture: from control-based planning to curiosity-driven planning [Boelen 2015]. In practice, this reframes the city from something that is “designed” to something that designs itself through iterative processes of learning,

testing, and co-creation – a model we may call *design as project mode*. The city becomes a continuous laboratory of transformation where social, ecological, and affective knowledge is produced.

The following section situates this framework within the Polish context, using the Wesola district as a testing ground for these principles.

5.2. A Polish Path – Wesola as an Urban Laboratory

In recent years, the Kraków district of Wesola has evolved from a conceptual testing ground into a real laboratory of urban transformation. Once envisioned as an “invisible city” – a suspended fragment between institutional past and undefined future – Wesola has become one of the first sites in Poland where the principles of design-critical and operational urbanism are being institutionally implemented.

Following multi-stage participatory consultations conducted between November 2020 and February 2021 [Kryglon i in. 2021] and the adoption of the Local Spatial Development Plan (*Miejscowy Plan Zagospodarowania Przestrzennego – MPZP*) in December 2021 (Urząd Miasta Krakowa, 2021), the area became subject to an integrated planning and design process culminating in the *Masterplan for the Creative District Wesola*, formally approved in late 2024 (Agencja Rozwoju Miasta Krakowa & Krakowskie Biuro Festiwalowe, 2024). This sequence – consultation, regulation, experimentation – illustrates a rare Polish example of a continuous planning cycle where civic knowledge, regulatory frameworks, and design imagination operate in feedback.

5.2.1. Living Laboratory

The 2024 Masterplan redefined Wesola as a *green creative district (zielona dzielnica kreatywna)*: an open, inclusive, and processual environment combining cultural, ecological, and experimental dimensions. This shift was grounded in extensive participatory research carried out under the coordination of the Krakow Festival Office (KBF) and the City Architect’s Bureau. The consultation report identified key collective values – *wytchnienie* (respite), *wspólnotowość* (community), *esperyment* (experiment), *dziedzictwo* (heritage), and *wielofunkcyjność* (multifunctionality) – which later structured the masterplan’s five guiding principles.

Rather than a conventional regeneration project, Wesola was conceptualized as a *laboratory of coexistence*, merging design practice with research and public education. Its governance structure – led by the City Architect, Agencja Rozwoju Miasta Krakowa (ARMK), and KBF – operates as a *quadruple-helix* platform integrating municipal institutions, universities, NGOs, and residents. This organizational model mirrors contemporary *urban living labs* in which spatial transformation becomes a collective epistemic process [Forsyth 2024; Healey 2010].

5.2.2. Design as an Epistemic and Affective Medium

The Masterplan explicitly embeds *soft mapping and affective diagnosis* into spatial policy. The design framework recognizes intangible dimensions – soundscapes, shade, smell, and emotional memory – as valid layers of planning evidence. This approach resonates with the article’s earlier proposition of mapping the *invisible city* through sensory and affective cartographies [Boelen 2015]. In Wesola, these are translated into concrete strategies: preservation of “quiet zones,” design of *gardens of repose*, and blue-green infrastructures that reinforce ecological continuity with the nearby Botanical Garden and the former riverbed of the Old Vistula.

5.2.3. Processual Design and Iterative Implementation

The Wesola Masterplan is structured as a ten-year staged process (2025–2035), with successive phases combining spatial adaptation, cultural programming, and infrastructural innovation. Early interventions – such as the establishment of the *Apteka Designu* (Design Pharmacy) and *Urban Forum* – already function as pilot nodes of operational urbanism. These initiatives prototype social and spatial innovations through workshops, temporary installations, and co-design experiments, embodying the logic of *design-as-research* [Forsyth 2024].

The iterative model aligns with the concept of *project mode* discussed earlier: each stage of transformation doubles as a research probe, generating feedback for the next. In this sense, Wesola exemplifies the *learning city* paradigm [Healey 2010; Forsyth 2024], where planning evolves through reflection and adaptation rather than prescription.

5.2.4. From Regulatory Plan to Reflexive Governance

By juxtaposing the MPZP’s prescriptive framework with the Masterplan’s adaptive and narrative layer, Kraków demonstrates an emergent form of *reflexive governance*. The MPZP delineates the legal envelope of transformation – protecting historic structures, regulating heights, and safeguarding greenery – while the Masterplan operates as a curatorial and experimental instrument translating policy into lived urban culture. This dual structure marks a significant methodological innovation within Polish planning practice: for the first time, the statutory and the strategic have been intentionally interwoven through design [Albrechts 2021; Forsyth 2024].

5.2.5. Implications for Design-Critical Urbanism

Wesola’s ongoing transformation thus extends the High Line’s legacy into a Central-European context: design as a language of mediation between law, imagination, and community. It provides empirical evidence that the city’s *invisible*

dimensions – memory, emotion, ecological rhythm – can be formalized within urban policy without losing their indeterminacy. As such, Wesola stands as both a *case and a method*: a living demonstration that experimental, reflexive planning can coexist with formal regulation [Awan 2023; Boelen 2015; Healey 2010].

5.3. Operational Methods – Tools for Processual Design

A comparative reading of the High Line, The Bentway, Sewoon, Nordhavn, King's Cross, and SUPERTRENTO yields a toolkit adaptable to Polish planning as components of *operational urbanism*:

- a) **Urban Living Lab.** A collaboration model linking universities, local government, designers, and communities. Instead of conventional consultations: a loop of testing, evaluation, and adaptation [Forsyth 2024] – planning not just for residents but with them.
- b) **Urban Time-Boxing.** Temporary interventions with limited time horizons (e.g., 6–12 months) whose permanence depends on evaluation outcomes – a cadence of learning rather than procedure (as in The Bentway) [Marsden 2022].
- c) **2×2 Design Scenarios.** Parallel ecological, social, economic, and cultural scenarios enabling participants to choose a direction of change rather than a single project – strengthening the city's reflective learning capacity (*design as research*) [Boelen 2015].
- d) **Pilot Micro-Zoning.** Instead of large, comprehensive plans: small test zones with differentiated functions (green, education, production, culture), allowing relationships to be studied and successes scaled (Sewoon Maker City) [Mun, Lee 2024].
- e) **Soft Urban Infrastructure.** Mapping intangible assets – social networks, emotions, memory, microclimate, sounds, data flows – integrated into planning processes, especially in “invisible” areas (e.g., Wesola).
- f) **Governance Canvas.** A workshop matrix of actor relations – public, private, civic, cultural – to identify tensions and synergies and design co-decision structures (King's Cross) [Brown 2024].

5.4. Toward a New Planning Culture – The Self-Designing City

Introducing these tools into Polish practice entails a shift from the *designed city* to the *self-designing city* – capable of reflexivity, experimentation, and responsiveness. It opens the way to a new planning culture that is reflective, critical, creative, and participatory. In this culture, design becomes a form of social knowledge – the means by which the city learns itself through actions, errors, and corrections. This is a design paradigm in which – as Papanek [Papanek 2021: 65] argued – “the designer does not solve problems but teaches us how to understand them better.”

Polish cities face a challenge similar to New York's in the 1990s: how to combine economic, social, legal, and symbolic logics in a single process of spatial transformation. *Design-critical urbanism* offers a response: a practice that not only creates new spatial forms but also renders visible the relations, emotions, and forces that shape them.

In this sense, the Wesoła case brings the discussion full circle – from New York's High Line to Kraków's living laboratory – demonstrating that the most transformative aspect of urban design today lies not in creating new forms, but in cultivating the city's capacity to design itself.

LITERATURE

- [1] Adams D., Tiesdell S. (2020). *Shaping Places: Urban Planning, Design and Development*, Routledge.
- [2] Albrechts L. (2021). *Strategic spatial planning re-examined*. *Planning Theory*, 20(2), p. 171–192.
- [3] Awan N. (2023). *Design-Critical Urbanism: Politics, Publics, and Infrastructures of Design*, Routledge.
- [4] BioMed Central (2023). *Urban Living Labs: Co-creating the City of Tomorrow*, SpringerOpen.
- [5] Boelen J. (2015). *The Politics of Things*, Valiz, Amsterdam.
- [6] Brown A. (2024). *Urban design leadership and reflective practice*, *Journal of Urban Design*, 29(3), p. 301–321.
- [7] Cho J. (2023). *Urban nature as state narrative: The Cheonggyecheon restoration and symbolic governance in Seoul*, *Cities*, 142, 104564.
- [8] Forsyth A. (2024). *Operational urbanism: Iterative planning and adaptive governance in the Anthropocene*, *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 51(2), p. 315–333.
- [10] Guillet F. (2014). *Spectacle or sustainability? The Cheonggyecheon debate revisited*, *Urban Studies*, 51(12), p. 2579–2597.
- [11] Haeusler M., Schnabel M. (2023). *The Five-Minute City: Urban Sustainability through Design Experiments in Copenhagen*, Elsevier.
- [12] Healey P. (2010). *Making Better Places: The Planning Project in the Twenty-First Century*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- [13] Marsden L. (2022). *The Bentway and the politics of infrastructural reuse*, *Canadian Architect*, 67(5), p. 30–39.
- [14] Mun S., Lee D. (2024). *Sewoon Maker City and urban cultural production*, *Cities*, 148, 104583.
- [15] Nelson A. C., Pruetz R., Woodruff D. (2012). *The TDR Handbook: Designing and Implementing Transfer of Development Rights Programs*, Island Press.
- [16] Papanek V. (2021). *Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change* (Revised ed.), Thames & Hudson.
- [17] Poggio T., De Rosa A., Viganò P. (2024). *SUPERTRENTO: Practice-led urban experimentation*, w: A. De Rosa (Ed.), *Design for Transformative Cities*, p. 203–219, Springer.

- [18] Wallace M. (2024). *Design and Exclusion: Critical Perspectives on Urban Regeneration*, Policy Press.
- [19] Washburn A. (2013). *The Nature of Urban Design: A New York Perspective on Resilience*, Island Press.

PRIMARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (LOCAL SOURCES)

- [1] Agencja Rozwoju Miasta Krakowa & Krakowskie Biuro Festiwalowe. (2024). *Masterplan dla Dzielnicy Kreatywnej Wesola: Koncepcja funkcjonalno-przestrzenna*. Kraków: Urząd Miasta Krakowa.
- [2] Kryglon E., Chrzanowski M. A., Wiśniewska M. (2021). *Raport z konsultacji społecznych dotyczących zagospodarowania obszaru „Wesoła – rejon ulicy Kopernika”*, Kraków: Urban Lights / Inquisio.
- [3] Urząd Miasta Krakowa, Wydział Planowania Przestrzennego. (2021). *Miejscowy plan zagospodarowania przestrzennego obszaru „Wesoła – rejon ulicy Kopernika” wraz z Prognozą oddziaływania na środowisko.*, Kraków.

DESIGN JAKO KATALIZATOR TRANSFORMACJI URBANISTYCZNEJ: HIGH LINE W NOWYM JORKU, JEGO GLOBALNE REINTERPRETACJE I IMPLIKACJE DLA POLSKIEJ PRAKTYKI PLANISTYCZNEJ

Streszczenie

Artykuł podejmuje problematykę designu jako katalizatora transformacji miejskiej oraz jako narzędzia epistemicznego w ramach współczesnej kultury planistycznej. Analiza, oparta na przykładzie nowojorskiego projektu High Line oraz jego globalnych reinterpretacji – w tym The Bentway w Toronto, Cheonggyecheon w Seulu, Nordhavn w Kopenhadze oraz King’s Cross w Londynie – ukazuje paradygmatyczne przesunięcie od designu rozumianego jako estetyzacja ku designowi pojmowanemu jako mediacja i współtworzenie. Przytoczone przykłady dowodzą, że projektowanie urbanistyczne funkcjonuje nie tylko poprzez kreowanie form przestrzennych, lecz także poprzez iteracyjne procesy zarządzania, obserwacji, uczenia się i negocjacji. Część empiryczna osadza te idee w polskim kontekście, analizując przypadek krakowskiej dzielnicy Wesoła – przykładu celowego powiązania instrumentów planowania ustawowego i strategicznego (MPZP i Masterplan) oraz projektowania partycypacyjnego. Masterplan dla Wesołej (2024) stanowi próbę przełożenia globalnych zasad designu krytycznego i urbanistyki operacyjnej na grunt lokalny, tworząc „żywe laboratorium” adaptacyjnego zarządzania, mapowania afektywnego i współkreacji. W artykule wykazano, że najgłębszy potencjał transformacyjny współczesnego designu nie polega na tworzeniu nowych form, lecz na rozwijaniu zdolności miasta do projektowania samego siebie – poprzez kulturę planowania opartą na refleksji, eksperymencie i współdzielonej wiedzy.

Słowa kluczowe: design jako proces, kultura planowania, High Line, laboratorium miejskie, zrównoważony rozwój, urbanistyka regeneratywna, transfer praw powietrznych

