10.22034/4.11.127

Revitalization School, *4*(11), 5-7, 2026

Editorial

Twenty Years Later: Rethinking the Balanced Renewal of Deteriorated and Dysfunctional Urban Fabrics

Twenty years ago1, the challenge of deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabrics was predominantly conceptualized as an issue of physical decay. Buildings had degraded, infrastructures had exceeded their operational lifespans, public spaces had deteriorated in quality, and urban environments were progressively losing their capacity to sustain the socioeconomic vitality of their inhabitants. Consequently, the prevailing response appeared relatively straightforward: identifying these deteriorated and dysfunctional areas, formulating renewal plans, mobilizing public and private resources, reconstructing the physical environment, and restoring the affected zones to a state aligned with contemporary urban planning standards.

Nevertheless, the experience of the past two decades demonstrates that urban decay and dysfunction are not exclusively physical conditions, just as urban renewal transcends mere construction processes. The persistence of deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabrics despite a multitude of plans, policies, projects, and investments necessitates a critical reassessment of the theoretical foundations underpinning urban renewal. The fundamental question is no longer merely how to renew these areas, but rather: when the drivers of decay and dysfunction are concurrently physical, social, economic, institutional, cultural, and spatial, what does renewal fundamentally mean?

Addressing this inquiry requires revisiting the developmental trajectory of the past two decades not merely for a purely descriptive historical overview, but rather to conduct a critical evaluation.

The initial phase of this trajectory was centered on the concepts of deterioration and dysfunction. Urban deterioration and dysfunction were primarily identified as spatially observable phenomena. The city appeared to encompass specific zones that were no longer capable of adequately fulfilling their anticipated roles and functions. Consequently, the analytical focus was predominantly directed toward the physical dimension: the age and quality of the building stock, street width, structural vulnerability, infrastructural deficits, and the inadequacy of public services and spaces.

This approach, while necessary, was inherently insufficient. A deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabric is not merely an agglomeration of vulnerable, aging building stock. In many instances, physical deterioration and dysfunction serve as the spatial manifestations of far more complex underlying processes. Physical decay can result from economic marginalization, social exclusion and deprivation, institutional fragility, tenure and residential insecurity, governance inefficiencies, disinvestment, demographic shifts, or the gradual spatial and functional decoupling of a district from the broader urban system.

Consequently, the second phase witnessed the emergence of urban renewal as a primary objective within urban policymaking and planning frameworks. Renewal initiatives sought to reverse the trajectory of decay and dysfunction through targeted interventions. However, across various contexts, renewal became increasingly and inextricably conflated with reconstruction, redevelopment, and purely physical transformation. The prevailing logic was often reductionist: if deterioration and dysfunction are spatially observable within the physical environment, then revitalization must be equally visible in the physical realm.

This approach undeniably yielded significant achievements. In certain neighborhoods and urban fabrics, infrastructure was upgraded, the building stock was retrofitted, public spaces were enhanced, and the physical safety of residents was substantially improved. Nevertheless, the outcomes simultaneously exposed the fundamental limitations of this paradigm. Physical transformation does not automatically translate into social amelioration, economic vitality, enhanced institutional capacity, or a strengthened sense of belonging. Paradoxically, in several instances, renewal interventions have catalyzed new forms of vulnerability: residential displacement, land value speculation, exacerbated service deficits, the erosion of local identity, social fragmentation, and ultimately, the substitution of one form of dysfunction with another.

At this juncture, the very conceptualization of urban renewal necessitated critical re-evaluation. Consequently, the third phase of this developmental trajectory emerged as a period of rethinking. Rethinking does not imply a repudiation of renewal; rather, it entails a systematic interrogation of its underlying assumptions, methodological approaches, and long-term socio-spatial consequences. This reflective paradigm poses critical questions: Have prevailing intervention models sufficiently grasped the

[Downloaded from jors-sj.com on 2026-11-07]

[DOI: 10.22034/4.11.127]

multidimensional complexity of urban deterioration and dysfunction? Has urban renewal been disproportionately reduced to mere physical reconstruction? Should the efficacy of a renewal initiative be quantified by the volume of reconstructed building stock, or by the long-term capacity of a neighborhood to sustain social cohesion, economic vitality, environmental quality, and collective identity?

This critical reflection culminates in a foundational postulate: the renewal of deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabrics must be fundamentally balanced.

The paradigm of "balanced renewal" is rooted in the recognition that urban environments operate as highly complex systems wherein physical, social, economic, institutional, cultural, and environmental dimensions are inextricably interdependent. An intervention that enhances one dimension while simultaneously undermining another cannot be deemed genuinely successful. New physical structures cannot compensate for residential displacement. Upgraded infrastructure does not necessarily offset the erosion of established social networks. Land value appreciation does not inherently equate to an enhancement in urban quality of life. Furthermore, an aesthetically pleasing public realm fails its objective if the residents no longer foster a sense of place attachment or belonging towards it.

Consequently, balanced renewal necessitates a fundamental transition from unidimensional interventions toward a more integrated comprehension of urban change.

However, balance must not be construed as a static equilibrium. Urban fabrics are inherently dynamic; the objective is neither to freeze a deteriorated and dysfunctional fabric in its present state nor to preserve every legacy element without exception. Conversely, the goal is not to impose an entirely novel spatial order upon the city in disregard of existing communities and historical continuities. The core theoretical and empirical challenge lies in cultivating a dynamic dialectic between continuity and change. At this juncture, the critical analytical distinction between rethinking and transformation assumes vital significance.

Rethinking is an epistemological and methodological stage; it systematically scrutinizes the premises of existing policies and interrogates what necessitates reform. Transformation, conversely, is the stage wherein these reformulated principles are translated into an alternative mode of urban practice. Without rethinking, transformation risks reproducing historic failures under the guise of new terminology. Without transformation, rethinking remains confined to theoretical discourse.

Accordingly, this developmental trajectory can be conceptualized as follows: Deterioration and Dysfunction; rightarrow; Renewal; rightarrow; Rethinking; rightarrow; Balance; rightarrow; Transformation.

Crucially, however, this trajectory does not denote a strict historical linearity wherein each phase entirely supersedes its predecessor; rather, it articulates a process of gradual maturation in urban thought and practice. Deterioration and dysfunction expose the problem. Renewal offers an initial response. Rethinking interrogates the adequacy of that response. Balance establishes a more comprehensive organizing principle for intervention. Finally, transformation translates this principle into policy, planning, and tangible urban action.

Thus, the theoretical imperative of balance becomes most evident when considering the relationship between the existing urban fabric and the necessity of change. Every deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabric encapsulates elements that demand transformation alongside elements that merit continuity. Certain structures may be structurally deficient and require demolition, whereas others may possess significant historical, cultural, or social value. Some spatial patterns may restrict accessibility, while others accommodate invaluable forms of collective urban life. Similarly, certain local economic activities may be fragile, yet others sustain the essential livelihoods of residents.

Accordingly, a balanced approach necessitates differentiation rather than homogenization. An urban area should not be perceived as a monolithic entity requiring a singular solution. Instead, a spectrum of diverse interventions may be requisite: conservation, rehabilitation, adaptation, reconstruction, redevelopment, enhancement of public spaces, infrastructure modernization, social support, facilitation, empowerment, economic revitalization, structural and institutional reform, or the establishment of a "safe neighborhood core" as a strategic mechanism to overcome renewal stagnation.

This principle subsequently redefines the role of the urban planner. The planner is no longer merely an architect of future physical forms. Rather, they transition into an interpreter of urban complexities, a mediator among conflicting interests, and a strategist for long-term transformation. The mandate is not solely the production of a blueprint, but the cultivation of conditions wherein physical, social, economic, and institutional changes can mutually reinforce one another.

Twenty years later, perhaps the most profound lesson in urban renewal is this: the problematic of deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabrics cannot be resolved merely through isolated renewal projects; rather, it demands a comprehensive renewal system. Such a system must synthesize diagnosis, policymaking, planning, financing, governance, implementation, monitoring, and learning. It must acknowledge that the success of renewal cannot be evaluated exclusively at the point of project completion. The true litmus test commences post-implementation: Do the original residents remain? Has the quality of life improved? Have local economic opportunities been bolstered? Is social cohesion preserved? Has the area become more resilient? Did the intervention contribute to mitigating inequality, or did it merely transfer urban value from one demographic to another?

These inquiries compel us to systematically reconsider the temporal dimension of renewal. Urban transformation is not a singular

[Downloaded from jors-sj.com on 2026-11-07]

[DOI: 10.22034/4.11.127]

event; it is a protracted process. A project may reach completion within a few years, but its ramifications can persist for decades. Consequently, the future of renewal policy will increasingly rely on adaptive approaches frameworks capable of learning from intervention outcomes and iteratively recalibrating their actions over time.

The "Theory of Balanced Renewal2" provides a framework for such a long-term perspective. This concept does not claim to offer a universal formula; rather, it serves as a fundamental principle for evaluating decisions. Whenever an intervention induces physical improvement at the expense of social displacement, the balance is lost. Whenever economic development eradicates cultural identity, the balance is lost. And whenever conservation impedes necessary adaptation to emerging needs, the balance is once again lost.

The objective is not to force a binary choice between conservation and development, transformation and continuity, public interest and private investment, or physical improvement and social development. Instead, the objective is to forge a constructive dialectic among these elements.

Twenty years after the onset of extensive debates regarding the renewal of deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabrics, this field stands at a critical intellectual threshold. The central question is no longer whether renewal is necessary; in most contexts, its imperative is overtly evident. The more profound inquiry is determining what paradigm of renewal can cultivate a better urban future without reproducing the failures of the past.

The answer perhaps lies in the transition from conceptualizing renewal as a finite, episodic project to understanding it as a balanced, long-term process. It must be a process whose aim is not merely physical reconstruction, but the elevation of comprehensive urban capacities; one that emphasizes coordinated and integrated transformation over isolated interventions; and one that, rather than relying on predetermined solutions, leverages flexible strategies inherently adaptable to the dynamic, shifting conditions of each city.

Deterioration and dysfunction were the pre-conditions that initiated this discourse. Renewal emerged as the initial primary response. As the limitations of this response became apparent, rethinking became imperative. Balance provides the foundational principle for constructing a more comprehensive approach, and transformation remains the challenge that now lies before us.

Consequently, the future of deteriorated and dysfunctional urban fabrics does not depend solely on the volume of our physical construction, but rather on our astuteness in navigating change. The central challenge is to transform without destroying; to renew without displacing; to develop without erasing identity; and to intervene without undermining the socio-cultural systems that make urban life possible.

Twenty years later, the question of urban renewal must be posed anew not because renewal has failed, but because the city has evolved, our knowledge has expanded, and the sheer complexity of urban deterioration and dysfunction can no longer be ignored. The next generation of renewal, therefore, must transcend mere physical reconstruction.

It must be balanced renewal.

Endnote

1. The structural transformation of neighborhood renewal marked by a transition from a road- and highway-centric redevelopment paradigm to an authentic neighborhood renewal approach within deteriorated urban fabrics emerges as a novel perspective in urban regeneration. This innovative framework was operationalized in the Khoob Bakht neighborhood (District 15, Tehran) through the "Special Renewal Plan," which was formulated at two distinct scales: the detailed urban plan and the neighborhood landscape design.

For further details, refer to: Mansouri, S. A., & Khani, A. (2007). The Special Renewal Plan for Deteriorated Urban Fabrics [in Persian]. Tehran Urban Renewal Organization and Raypour Publications: Tehran, Iran.

2. Andalib, A. (2017). The Theory of Balanced Renewal of Deteriorated Urban Fabrics. Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University & Secretariat of the Support Committee for Theorizing, Criticism, and Debate Chairs. Tehran, Iran. [In Persian].

Alireza Andalib
Department of Urban Development, Faculty Civil Engineering, Architecture and Art, Science and Research Branch, IslamicAzad University, Tehran, Iran
andalib@srbiau.ac.ir

COPYRIGHTS
Copyright for this article is retained by the authors with publication rights granted to Revitalization School journal. This is an open access article disributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE
Andalib, A. (2026). Twenty Years Later: Rethinking the Balanced Renewal of Deteriorated and Dysfunctional Urban Fabrics. *Journal of Revitalization School*, *4*(11), 5-7.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22034/4.11.127
URL: https://jors-sj.com/article-1-127-en.html

[Downloaded from jors-sj.com on 2026-11-07]
[DOI: 10.22034/4.11.127]