

Simone Tulumello (ICS-ULisboa), Alessandro Colombo (Università degli Studi di Bergamo) | *Inclusive communities, exclusionary city, planning N/A? Mapping condomínios fechados quasi-quantitatively in Lisbon, Cascais (and Barreiro)*

This chapter will engage the dichotomy inclusion/exclusion from an essentially spatial perspective. The object of analysis will be the paradigmatic urban form of (allegedly) ‘inclusionary community’, the gated community (GC), and its Portuguese version, the *condomínio fechado* (CF; literally ‘enclosed condominium’). An urban entity become normalised in the post-WWII-USA, the GC is an (alleged) ‘safe space’ (Epstein, 1998) for, or more appropriately a ‘self-enclosure’ (Tulumello, 2015) of, middle- to high-class (sub)urbanites. The relation of GCs with desires for being ‘included’ in an homogeneous community of equals as well as the effects thereof over patterns of urban exclusion and segregation, have been explored at length (e.g. Low, 2003; Petti, 2007). In Portugal, CFs have emerged relatively late, since the 1980s, showing many spatial and social similarities, but also peculiarities, with respect to the US prototype (Raposo, 2008).

This chapter will contribute to the debate on GCs/CFs from a twofold perspective. On the one hand, it will present a ‘quasi-quantitative mapping’ (see Tulumello, 2017) of CFs in Lisbon, Cascais (and Barreiro, where none were found); and use it to discuss patterns of urban fragmentation linked to CFs’ proliferation in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area. And, second, it will focus on the role of spatial planning – and of its ‘absence’ or reluctance to steer urban development – in opening and closing the space for CFs. In conclusion, this will allow to (re)think on the way planning policy is intertwined with spaces of urban inclusion/exclusion.

The provisional structure of the chapter is as follows:

1. Introduction: mapping urban inclusion/exclusion
2. Inclusive community, exclusionary city? From gated communities to *condomínios fechados*
3. Planning N/A: from ‘informal’ CFs to planning law amendments of the 1990s
4. Notes on methodology: mapping quasi-quantitatively
5. Mapping CFs in Lisbon, Cascais (and Barreiro)
6. Conclusions: (un)planned spaces of inclusion/exclusion

References

Epstein, D. (1998) Afraid/Not. Psychoanalytic Directions for an Insurgent Planning History. In Sandercock, L. (ed.), *Making the Invisible Visible. A Multicultural Planning History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 209-226.

- Low, S. (2003) *Behind the Gates. Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*. NYC: Routledge.
- Petti, A. (2007) *Arcipelaghi e Enclave. Architettura dell'Ordinamento Spaziale Contemporaneo*. Milano: Bruno Mondadori.
- Raposo, R. (2008) Condomínios Fechados em Lisboa: Paradigmas e Paisagem. *Análise Social*, 43(186), 109-131.
- Tulumello, S. (2015) From 'spaces of fear' to 'fearscapes': Mapping for re-framing theories about the spatialization of fear in urban space. *Space and Culture*, 18(3), 257-272.
- Tulumello, S. (2017) Semi-quantitative mapping in comparative case-study research: Resources, constraints and research design adaptation. *LSE Field Research Method Lab*, 7 February, <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/fieldresearch/2017/02/07/semi-quantitative-mapping-in-comparative-case-study-research/>.