Vashishth Doshi – Essay post Presentation (Feb 05, 2025 – 15-minute Cities) | vbd@andrew.cmu.edu

The Concept of 15-Minute Cities: A Reflective Essay

In an era of rapid urbanization and growing environmental concerns, the concept of 15-minute cities has emerged as a compelling vision for sustainable urban development. This essay will explore the evolution of this idea, its core principles, and the broader societal implications it carries in light of the readings and class-work.

From Historical Roots to Modern Discourse

The notion of compact, walkable neighbourhoods is not entirely new. Ancient cities like Rome and medieval European towns were often designed with pedestrian accessibility in mind. However, the industrial revolution and the subsequent rise of automobile culture led to a dramatic shift in urban planning, favouring sprawling suburbs and car-dependent lifestyles, as explained from the historic transition into the idea of 15-minute city designs (Aamer & Doshi, 2025).

The 15-minute city concept, as we know it today, was popularized by Professor Carlos contextual to Paris around 2016 (C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group & C40 Knowledge Hub, 2020). It builds upon earlier ideas like New Urbanism and Transit-Oriented Development, but with a more specific focus on time and accessibility. We had a discussion on the peculiarity of the initial motivation Moreno displays for Paris to be a locally active and accessible city – because it already is. Pedestrian friendly features, promotion of local businesses and multi-use structures on most streets already allow for Paris to be an example of such a city, instead of a case for betterment. Of course, Moreno's idea was stringent to perfect levels – but as all 'ideals' should be interpreted, I believe the perfect 15-minute city lies somewhere in between today's realities and Moreno's ideal vision – instead of the perfect definitions. The COVID-19 pandemic has since accelerated interest in this model, as people reconsidered the importance of local amenities and community connections. We began class with discussions on the ideas of freedom, convenience and the built environment to gauge a baseline to prompt discussions through the next 80 minutes.

Freedom in 15-Minute Cities

The principle of freedom within the 15-minute city model transcends simplistic notions of mobility. At its core, it redefines agency by decentralizing access to essential services, liberating residents from car dependency, and redistributing time spent on commutes to meaningful activities. Carlos Moreno's vision emphasizes "freedom to" rather than "freedom from"—the capacity to access work, education, healthcare, and leisure within a short walk or bike ride (Manzini, 2020). This shifts urban planning from prioritizing vehicular movement to enabling diverse, human-centered interactions.

Critics conflate the concept with restrictions, fearing confinement to hyperlocal zones. However, as seen in Paris and Barcelona, 15-minute policies expand freedoms: pedestrianized streets reclaim public space for community use, while mixed-use zoning lets residents choose how to spend time (e.g., working locally or remotely) (C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group & C40 Knowledge Hub, 2020). Jane Jacobs' advocacy for vibrant, walkable neighbourhoods underscores that density fosters serendipitous encounters, strengthening social bonds and individual autonomy (Doshi, n.d.). Importantly, freedom here includes economic agency—small businesses thrive when foot traffic replaces car-centric sprawl, as demonstrated by Barcelona's "superilles", which reduced car dominance by 60% while boosting local commerce (Manzini, 2020).

Convenience as Urban Efficiency

Convenience in 15-minute cities merges practicality with quality of life. By clustering amenities within a 15-minute radius, cities reduce the friction of daily tasks: 63% of residents in walkable neighbourhoods report easier access to groceries, healthcare, and parks (Doshi, n.d.). Post-pandemic, cities like Melbourne and Portland formalized "20-minute neighbourhoods," where 80% of non-work needs are met locally through strategic zoning reforms. Mixed-use districts blend housing, retail, and green spaces, cutting commute times and fostering community resilience—a sharp contrast to suburban "food deserts."

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated this shift, exposing the fragility of fragmented urban systems. Cities such as Bogotá rapidly expanded bike lanes and pedestrian zones, reducing travel times by 30% while improving air quality. Digital tools further enhance convenience: Barcelona's "WeMi" platform connects residents to localized care networks and co-working hubs, illustrating how hybrid physical-digital ecosystems streamline daily life

(Manzini, 2020). However, equity remains critical—inclusionary zoning in Johannesburg and Los Angeles ensures low-income groups benefit from proximity, preventing gentrification-driven displacement.

Density as a Catalyst for Vibrancy

Density in 15-minute cities is not mere overcrowding but human-scale concentration that enables accessibility. Jane Jacobs argued that density, when paired with diversity, creates "eyes on the street," enhancing safety and social cohesion24. Barcelona's "superilles" (superblocks) exemplify this: by restricting cars and redistributing 70% of road space to pedestrians, these blocks increased park access by 40% and boosted local business revenue (Manzini, 2020).

Optimal density (50–150 residents per hectare) supports diverse amenities without compromising live-ability. For instance, Paris mandates ground-floor retail in residential areas, ensuring streets remain active and services proximate (C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group & C40 Knowledge Hub, 2020). Environmental benefits are equally significant: dense, transit-oriented neighbourhoods reduce per capita emissions by up to 50% compared to suburban sprawl (Centre for Liveable Cities, 2019). Yet, critics caution against homogenization—successful models like Shanghai's Great City Plan balance high-density living with green corridors and modular housing, proving that thoughtful design can harmonize ecological and social needs (C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group & C40 Knowledge Hub, 2020).

These principles aim to create urban environments where residents can meet most of their daily needs within a 15-minute walk or bike ride from their homes. This includes access to workplaces, schools, healthcare, shopping, and recreational facilities. Later we also explore the radial distance perceived ideal for some of these amenities important to daily lifestyle sourcing a wonderfully explained diagram from 'Towards an Urban Renaissance' (Aamer & Doshi, 2025).

Questions of social dynamics and human interaction with the built environment:

Amidst our discussions, we touched on several noteworthy points, from global perspectives, with participant bringing to the table their context in arguing for or against

these. The gamified discussion (*Cards Against Humanity*, n.d.)that followed allowed a free flow of ideas and brought out ideas which helped understand the two sides of walkable cities.

1. Social Togetherness: By encouraging more pedestrian activity and local interactions, these cities can foster stronger community bonds and reduce social isolation. We heard examples from Pakistan, where this was possible, but also in some regions impossible considering issues of safety and demographic dynamics. I interpret that as urbanism of this kind being a design principle as these developing countries shift gears, but accommodating these for regional culture and demographics.

2. Convenience and Quality of Life: Reduced commute times and easy access to amenities can significantly improve work-life balance and overall well-being. Examples of Europe outlined access and easier dynamics while conducting everyday chores like grocery shopping.

3. Urban Rejuvenation: This model can breathe new life into neglected urban areas by promoting mixed-use development and local economic activity. The Downtown Partnership of Pittsburgh was discussed with this regard.

4. Environmental Sustainability: Reduced car dependency leads to lower carbon emissions and improved air quality. This brought in discussions regarding American cities – where examples explained how some residences are decidedly away from everyday activities of work and sustenance and can only be accessed using cars.

5. Health Benefits: Increased walking and cycling can improve physical health, while reduced stress from commuting can enhance mental well-being.

6. Economic Efficiency: Local businesses can thrive with a steady stream of nearby customers, potentially leading to more diverse and resilient local economies. This ties into interdependencies of various stakeholders of an economy. The greater the interaction between all of them, the greater their motivation for expanding economic activity taking everyone along – promoting the idea of unified development and reducing inequality.

The Other end of the Spectrum:

However, the concept is not without challenges. Critics argue that it could lead to urban fragmentation or exacerbate existing inequalities if not implemented carefully. During the course of discussions, we found challenges to these ideals that tied back into the freedom discussions. Important to note for American contexts was how society identifies freedom as attached to their usage of a car and ideas on how this is a result of the way the American economy is designed to promote vehicle adoption and what to do to try and change that. There are also concerns about the feasibility of retrofitting existing car-centric cities to this model. We explored NIMBYism – and how that perspective is fair for all purposes.

Not-In-My-Back-Yard concerns reflect local resistance to infrastructure projects perceived as disruptive despite broader societal benefits. Residents often cite fears of declining property values, increased traffic, noise pollution, or neighbourhood character changes when opposing public transit expansions, homeless shelters, or renewable energy installations. For example, Sydney's 2019 light rail protests spotlighted tensions between urban mobility needs and small business disruptions (C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group & C40 Knowledge Hub, 2020). While some concerns stem from legitimate quality-of-life impacts, we discussed in classes and noted how critics argue NIMBYism entrenches inequality by concentrating essential services in disadvantaged areas. This paradox—supporting public goods while rejecting local implementation—challenges equitable urban development and climate resilience goals (Montgomery, 2013). The discussion in this regard tied back to discussions around the game and developed a conversation of how society functions across a spectrum. Where should we draw a line for the greater good versus one's independent choice and whose decisions decides that?

Food for thought

In conclusion, the 15-minute city represents a bold reimagining of urban life, prioritizing human-scale development and local community needs. As cities worldwide grapple with issues of sustainability, live-ability, and resilience, this concept offers a compelling vision for the future of urban planning. Already a design principle, as cities across the world undergo rejuvenation and sustainable reformation efforts, this discussion was food for thought on how urban design practitioners and policy-makers should shape a conversation and engage with participatory practices to accommodate for the differing

viewpoints we found from class. As with all practices that transition into newer ideals through such transformative concepts, I took back the importance of a willingness to challenge longstanding assumptions about how cities should function, contextual to local practices and community perspectives in and every level of projects of change.

References:

Aamer, R., & Doshi, V. (2025). *15 Minute City - Class Presentation*. https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1yV3cDA9I444B_wvXwofTGSIFlgHs7AvvO6xSBLQfR-0/edit?usp=drive_link

C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, & C40 Knowledge Hub. (2020). *How to build back better with a 15-minute city*.

Cards Against Humanity. (n.d.). Retrieved February 22, 2025, from https://www.planningpeeps.com/uploads/7/1/4/3/71430203/big-awesome-file.pdf

Centre for Liveable Cities. (2019). *Revisiting the 2000 Watt Society - An Innovative Tool for Sustainable City Planning*.

Doshi, V. (n.d.). *Draft-Talking Points for social togetherness arguments*. Retrieved February 22, 2025, from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ACJ-FPBGUY1fbpUlZ1qMtQgV2-yxrQRE/view?usp=sharing

Manzini, E. (2020). *Livable Proximity - Ideas for the City that Cares*. Bocconi University Press.

Montgomery, C. (2013). *Happy City*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.