8. Towards a Situated Agenda

In the context of overall population growth and a shifting proportion of population from the rural areas to the urban, various rationales of urban development, including "everyday" construction and appropriation practices, have to be seen as constitutive of urbanisation. While urbanisation strategies conforming with the state-led agenda for urban development have received considerable support and attention, everyday practices of Bahir Dar's urbanisation so far fell short of attention and are hardly considered by measures accompanying urbanisation. Accordingly, this chapter discusses the empirical findings from the case study on Bahir Dar to explore how the local contingencies found in the sub-cases can contribute to an informative basis for situated urban development (see chapter 2.2.). Dealing with the processes, needs and impacts of urbanisation means considering everyday practices as well as furthering and improving institutional approaches. Based on the description of Bahir Dar's "idiom of urbanisation", this chapter questions whether the universal aims underlying the state-led development agenda (see chapter 5), not only in Bahir Dar, but for all Ethiopian cities can sufficiently address locally specific needs in the context of urbanisation. As the findings of this research suggest that current development bears the danger of furthering segregation (see chapter 7), this chapter argues for adopting an inclusive approach to urban development in Bahir Dar.

8.1 Bahir Dar's Idiom of Urbanisation

The account of Bahir Dar's urbanisation presented here is a flexible narrative, which can be amended and re-written based on new insights. Discussed against Roy's "idiom of urbanisation" (see Roy 2009 and chapter 2.2) it can be expanded and revised. Urbanisation is therein the term used to describe institutional or individual rationales that encompass formal and informal activities of city building on various materials, social, economic and cultural levels. While the formal/informal dialectic can be considered key-features of the rationales of urbanisation in Bahir Dar, the account has been expanded to include modernity, urbanity and

citizenship as further spheres of negotiation within and among planning and everyday urbanisation (see chapter 7.2). Bahir Dar's urbanisation, hence, has multiple rationales, which reflects in the variety of structures and urbanisms found in the town today.

After the parallel development of a market town, monastic life and the Woyto villages in today's location of Bahir Dar, key elements in the urbanisation process for the city can be identified from the establishment of urban administration and selected basic infrastructure by the Italians (see chapter 5.2). Following this, the installation of the textile mill through a reparations payment and the plans for the development of a hydropower centre on the basis of Guther's Master plan triggered large-scale land speculation and a wave of settlement (see chapter 5.3). Thereby, the determinations of the plan are reflected in today's basic layout of the city, although its proposals regarding infrastructure services such as sewerage and exact road patterns were not implemented. The modernist vision on architecture was not able to substantially re-shape local incremental building practices, as many endured during the establishment of the modern city and have continuities until today. Population influx to Bahir Dar continued over the decades. Based on informal land claims and informal or traditional building practice the city grew beyond the intentions of the formal plans. Therein rural-urban migration is only one of various factors of urban growth, filtering into those neighbourhoods with a high permeability. The findings from the city centre (see chapter 7.1.1) and the university (see chapter 7.1.4) thereby suggest that there are strong inequalities among population groups entering Bahir Dar, regarding the assistance and, thus, the opportunities they encounter in the city. Thereby, for many of those not tended to by institutional structures, informal opportunities act as a means of gaining (an irregular) income in Bahir Dar. The city offers easily accessible opportunities and chances arising from density and interaction as well as jobs in the micro-economy. Small-scale building in traditional styles and taking low-level economic opportunities represent common ways of urbanisation that have not sufficiently been accounted for in their own right. Therein, securing subsistence levels and family assets recur as a narrative for living in the city in the urban village and downtown. Living here offers better opportunities than available in the countryside, and in contrast to the formal requirements for access to housing, settling here was easily possible. Urbanisation in Bahir Dar is thus not unplanned, but is in large parts not planned by state authority.

Today, the state-lead urban development agenda with implementation agency through the Regional Urban Planning Institute stands alongside a spectrum of everyday practices of urbanisation, which differed degrees of acknowledgement in urban policy and planning practice. Thereby, urbanisation is made up of professional urban planning activities and everyday practices of the population, in which urban growth and transformation as "urban development" are part of a larger urbanisation process. These, however, are not conducted randomly in an eclectic mix

of practices, but can rather be described as a combination of planning and everyday rationales of urbanisation that include both tactical elements and forecasting practices. Thereby, the relation of statutory planning and everyday practices and their role in accessing and administering urban resources is a central subject constituting the production of urban structures. Within this, it is acknowledged that administration, politics as well as entrepreneurs are engaged in a mix of formal and informal activities constituting urbanity and are therefore agents of urbanisation.

Overall, the state-city relations in urbanisation vary from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, as their development can be connected to specific circumstances of context according to when they developed in (see chapter 7.1). The discussion of the neighbourhood's spatial structures generated through planning or informal building has to be reviewed in relation to the historical background against which they were created. From the sub-case studies, each site had a very distinct set-up and consequently four different neighbourhood typologies could be identified. The historical mixed-use, the residential area, the urban village and the learning compound thereby expand the typologies of condominium housing, expansion areas, commercial development and industrial areas, legitimised by current planning policies. In these areas the co-actors of everyday urbanisation are distinct according to location (see chapter 6.2) and span from residents, via investors (including ex-pats and those sending remittances), to state institutions (such as the university) and traditional systems of elders. These actors mostly pursue highly individual motives of engaging in/with the urban environment, while each of the neighbourhood had certain rationales of urbanisation that have to be considered typical for the site. The everyday rationales of urbanisation in Bahir Dar vary in scale and quality, as well as materiality and purpose. The investigations prove the dynamic of urbanisation to be far more entangled and multi-directional than the currently still dominant narrative on transition from rural to urban suggests. Within Bahir Dar's "idiom of urbanisation" (see chapter 2.3), urban planning and everyday urbanisation in Bahir Dar cannot conceptually be separated, they have to be viewed as part of a larger institutional ecology involved in urbanisation, which produces parallel orders, leaps and has fallbacks. However, also power relations between statutory planning and everyday practices vary between the locations. As the development of Bahir Dar's neighbourhoods is path-dependent, the relations between urban planning and everyday urbanisation lead to differing actor constellations concerning urbanisation in the four sub-case areas. Rationales of planning and everyday urbanisation are generally competing against and among each other. Prevailing practices from both fields can, hence, be considered equal rationales, but vary their relation and dominance according to local neighbourhood.

Consequently, in this situation of competition, not all practices of urbanisation can be considered equally favoured in the realm of urban development. Across all four sub-case sites it could be observed that rationales of everyday urbanisation conforming to the urban policy's notion of "modernity" are supported by current

policy, while especially incremental strategies of urbanisation are vulnerable to displacement in the ongoing re-construction of the town (see chapter 7.2). Distinct types of urbanism, such as seen in the city centre and in the village like sub-case, are marginalised. Herein, the concepts of formality and informality defining the everyday activities in the micro-economy and in incremental building are blurred, subject to temporary interpretation and strongly linked to short-term advantages in practice regimes.

This stands in contrast to the official normative of the "developed city", for which the ethics underlying the principle can be named as organizing the urban through infrastructure, ubiquitous and standardized services, passive consumers, sovereign power, and equal accessibility of land. The increased statutory planning activities following the decentralisation of spatial planning responsibilities to the regional level and the set-up of an urban policy by the EPRDF are intended to order the existing urban structures according to developmental aims formulated in the PASDEP (Ministry of Works and Urban Development 2007). Thereby, actors of state-led planning now include the Regional Urban Planning Institute, the sectoral planning offices, the municipality of Bahir Dar, the rural planning authorities, regional government, national government and the National Urban Planning Institute, but also institutions such as the churches, Bahir Dar University, local economy and industry.

The BDIDP has been introduced into a situation in which urban planning administration has a relatively recent tradition. Responsibility for the formulation of standards in urban policy is still in the process of decentralisation and the responsibilities for spatial planning are distributed across different administrative levels (national, regional and municipal), while at the same time a strong competition in spatial planning can be observed across the sectoral institutions. The regional planning institutions, such as the RUPI in Bahir Dar have the mandate to set up the plans, but do not have sovereignty over the other sectoral offices and cannot oblige them to align their plans. Meanwhile the implementation of the IDP actually requires functional sectoral planning in order for it to be integrated on a higher spatial and administrative level. The parallel development of both has to be considered very challenging and opens opportunities for alternative modes of negotiation. Hence, administration and politics have set up the IDP to co-ordinate and negotiate a variety of interest, but de-facto follow differing interests on differing scales of planning.

In the context of Bahir Dar's rapid urbanisation, tactical approaches are dominant and informality is more commonly redefined and utilised as a tool of intervention, also by state institutions. Especially on sites facing high development pressure and unclear planning specifications, such as the lakeshore, politics and investment are engaged in practices of situated administration of resources in formal or informal manners. With the political priorities on development through tourism, investors in this sector can approach administration directly and are fa-

voured in access to resources, including land and infrastructure provision. Low and middle-income residents are displaced to the less central and accessible locations on the outskirts on the grounds of such evasive negotiations (Ajala 2008; Achamyele Gashu 2014). Thereby the negotiation practice differs from the proposals of public negotiation in the IDP (Interview Gorgens 2013), just as Jenkins and Eskemose suggest with their concept of "Realpraxis" (Jenkins and Eskemose 2011: 14). There are few tools for civil decision-making in place and participation and hence transparent decision-making is still easily excluded from the planning procedures. Consequences against such practice are not to be expected, as the IDP is not legally binding, there are no sanctions in place in case of infringement.

Not all types of development project enjoy such legitimisation. While local authorities in Bahir Dar now refer to traditional, spontaneous or dilapidated structures as "informal", federal organisations continue to label these as "slums" (see chapter 1). By doing so, this analytical stance emphasises difference between desired developments and non-conforming structures. Currently the municipality itself treats Kebele housing structures in the city centre as undesired, labels them as hazardous living conditions and does not engage in improving working conditions. Instead the city prioritises the establishment of formal structures and legitimises the spatial and social marginalisation of incremental building and small-scale economics. Current urban planning is also not inclusive towards informal urbanisation based on social norms and regulations of tradition. Many of the low-income urbanities are displaced in the name of development.

Many of the low-income neighbourhood structures and practices could also be viewed as traditional building or municipal housing, but lack resources to negotiate such formalisation. The current generalist planning principles, but also the investment practices evading community interests hence implicitly promotes tendencies of economical segregation in the development of Bahir Dar.

However, since the arrival of Italian occupation and the subsequent introduction of generalist planning ideals to further development under Emperor Haile Selassie, in which tradition the current government's idea of the "developed" city also stands, the understanding of "good urban development" is not rooted in the same cultural context for the variety of actors and (mundane) planners involved. The modernist developmental normative of the IDP is reflected in the underlying patterns of land-use planning and relies on ideas of divided functionalities of residential and commercial zones. The urban layout is functionalist and the zoning assumes separate commercial and housing zones. By land-use definition in the BDIDP, the commercial development has the backing of administration to overrule existing mixed-use structures in the city centre and expand onto already otherwise occupied land. The line defining a right to dwell in the city is thereby not so much down to compliance with the law, but rather to compliance with political ideas of modernity and the socio-economic capital to be able to negotiate these requirements. Here everyday practice has hence not been recognised by institutional

planning and is subject to being overruled on the claim of being illegitimate. The administration and politics are thereby leaving the question open of how to gain a livelihood in the condominiums if the industrial set-up underlying this spatial division of residence and labour does not materialise according to the state-directed economy. The empirical planning material on this issue suggests. however, that statutory planning, investors, entrepreneurs and civilians as well as representatives of international donor organisations are socialised to such distinct understandings of what "good" service provision and urban structure should look like. In current urban development, tools for incremental development and in-situ-upgrading of existing structures have been disregarded in anticipation of industrialisation and on the grounds of housing provision through the state with the national condominium housing programme. The judgements made on requirements of urban development and structural investment are universalist and measure all infrastructure provision, building typologies and land-use specifications to a defined standard.

However, the developmentalist stance on urban development has risks. The anticipated investment in the industrial zones has not been modelled on realistic figures. Based on forecasting the expansion areas and industrial zone were developed, where industrial growth and housing demand were anticipated by the statutory plans – yet have not properly met the actual requirements of investors, nor of local residents.

8.2 Implications for Urban Development

In Bahir Dar regulations on urban development construct state legitimacy in the field of urbanisation. It is expressed in the delegation of planning responsibility to the Regional Urban Planning Institute, the choice of the IDP as an instrument of zoning and guiding development, the regular re-definition of building standards, as well as surveys in cooperation with international NGOs and developmental corporations.

Thereby current urban policy does not distinguish between different contexts of planning but rather supplies standardised development aims, focused on the condominium houses, centrally monitored infrastructure delivery, and commercial development in the city centres. State-lead urban development and the technological impetus regarding the underlying principles of the IDP remain publicly undisclosed and, hence, undisputed. Policy documents remain vague on the fact how planners assume that their values of the "developed" city as presented in the PASDEP (Ministry of Works and Urban Development 2007) prove better than that of other planning ethics. The public professional discourse is, thereby, inhibited by restrictive media policies and sanctions against publicly voicing critical opinions. The transfers of planning ideas into urban policies is, consequently, not perpetually questioned and updated in confrontation with existing practices of urbanisa-

tion. Meanwhile, the findings of this thesis suggest that ideals of the "developed" city actually do not prove better in improving living conditions than more relational principles, of what Jenkins and Eskemose (2011: 14) call "Realpraxis", in which the interplay of formal and informal actions shapes an operational system (see chapter 2.2). Living situations in the urbanising context can, hence, be improved by providing a specified set of planning tools and practical interventions to address the basic needs in the specific neighbourhood set-ups of Ethiopian towns and Bahir Dar, specifically.

As the governmental urban policy suggests, the urban context encountered in fieldwork in Bahir Dar is clearly in need of improving living conditions for many of the urban dwellers and the anticipated population growth. However, the different relations between planning and everyday urbanisation leave certain population groups in disadvantaged positions of negotiation (as described in chapter 8.1) that need to be overcome in order to prevent segregation. New arrivals with low education levels are not considered in current urban planning and access to house ownership and condominiums is only granted after two years of residence. On the basis of the findings, it further has to be assumed that new forms of identities will shape through globalisation, digitalisation and urbanisation in Bahir Dar, which have currently not been considered in planning typologies and whose needs are not possible to anticipate without dialogue with those representing these new interests. These recursive practices need to be part of the conceptual accounts.

Overall, it seems that the current aims of urban policy are focused in such a way that it does not suit the scale and priority of intervention necessary to improve living conditions in for many of the residents in the existing residential areas. Especially the low-income population needs strategies to accompany the ongoing changes through urbanisation beyond plans that respond to their living situation by re-settlement or eviction. While there is a practical share of everyday urbanisation in urban development in the form of formal development and investment and active participation in the redistribution of urban resources, small-scale ordinary practices have to enter the planning conceptualisation in order to prevent a displacement of these largely self-reliant structures and practices. The findings of this research should, therefore, feed into a policy that moves away from the assumption that non-governmental organisations systematically contest state governance and rather works towards a synergetic constellation, in which governmental policy is strengthened by agency. According to Meagher, an important condition for this is that the informal actors control strategic resources and can link these to higher decision-making levels in the economy and the state (Meagher 2011: 68-69). The recurring dualities in conceptualising urbanisation hence need to be dissolved in order to develop practice strategies to deal with highly tactical and flexible rationales. Bahir Dar – as all Ethiopian cities – faces the particular challenge of having to provide these without a stable tax base. Due to tight resources, projects are not strategically coordinated, but administration is on call and acts on third party in-

itiative or urgency. Under these conditions, an integrated view of urbanisation as being constituted by planning as well as everyday practices seems vital, as administration will not be able to manage the challenges arising in rapid urbanisation without cooperation. It needs to be widely accepted that the actors of everyday practices of urbanisation can take on responsibilities that are relevant for the future of the city. Planning directed by the sovereign can, therein, create synergies with a broad spectrum of popular rationales and needs. Statutory planning can, meanwhile, take a co-ordinating role and is considered vital in the process of urban development due to its political mandate to implement.

The above in mind, looking at Bahir Dar's particular "idiom of urbanisation" (see 8.1.), it needs to be asked what sense the strategic emphasis of the IDP on avoiding fragmentation and prioritising tourist sites make in a rapidly urbanising city with the given diversity of urbanisation rationales. Instead, informal, traditional and vernacular types of urbanisation need to be demystified, by specifying the ordinary and included in development strategies. Just as they have done in the past, the small-scale structures will have to cater for a large proportion of housing in the present and near future, and the scarce resources will have to be administered through community channels. The accounts of "everyday urbanisation" that encompass informal, traditional, agricultural and clan-related elements need to be evaluated alongside the economic criteria for land-use decisions and strategy formulation in the multiple levels of urban development. The small-scale structures need to be acknowledged as the origin of the historical neighbourhoods, arrival sites for low-income settlers and placed in the heart of urban development strategies. To do so, it is suggested to develop practical initiatives to address an amplified range of issues related to urbanisation. Thereby, a shift away from generalistic norms to a pluralistic set of projects developed from local contexts is advised. Urban development strategies need to overcome the focus on standardised housing and commercial development to open it for relational suggestions that need to be negotiated with an amplified range of local stakeholders.

In order to improve living-conditions in the diverse neighbourhood contexts, the urban development strategies to be formulated need to refocus away from overall aims and provide contextualised strategies for the local situation. The effects of general urbanisation are local and need to be addressed locally to consider upgrades of living conditions and capacities available for implementation. Acknowledging the common practice of negotiation in questions of urban development, the role of third party interests, such as those of the donors and investors, needs to be discussed far more critically for the outcome of spatial structures. In order to asses these interests, they will have to be set against a thorough development agenda that needs to exceed the current content of the BDIDP regarding development patterns, as well as the diversity in building typologies regarded as desirable in urban development. The development agenda should be based on wide public participation and decision-making. The empirical findings from this case study dis-

play that a desire to participate in "development" is inherent in everyday strategies. However, it is currently assumed that planning enacted by the sovereign has power over the other forms of urbanisation and their legitimisation (see chapter 8.1). The question in Bahir Dar is, hence, not only how the poor in informal structures can be protected from being displaced but rather how low-income, as well as middle-income groups, can secure their food supply, businesses and homes in the face of competing interests and lacking representation. It is, therefore, suggested that not all tools for urban development in the sense of an inclusive city lie in the hands of the administration. Factors such as infrastructure, internet, communication technology, professional networks, concentration of people as service customers and, thus, resource accumulation are special features and services that the city has to offer and for which people move. What they promise is access to knowledge, marketing opportunities for goods and the possibility of diversifying a livelihood based on a variety of natural and urban resources and agriculture as well as the possibility of appropriating a space to accommodate these activities and stay. Providing and establishing opportunities in urban development should therefore pick up on these opportunities for personal development and qualification possibilities. These skills provide a basis for establishing livelihoods. The parties involved in such practice, thereby, need consideration as actors of urban development. On these grounds, a recommendation is given to systematically include a larger variety of rationales of everyday urbanisation into urban development, and particularly low income-related ones. The accounts of "everyday urbanisation" need to encompass informal, traditional, agricultural and clan-related elements that can be evaluated alongside the economic criteria for land-use decisions and strategy formulation in the multiple levels of urban development, aiming for inclusiveness. Thereby, the description of "everyday urbanisation" as mundane practices of urbanisation beyond the formal planning agenda is crucial for conceptualising and addressing the widened spectrum of urban lifestyles. Here the neighbourhood typologies identified in chapter 6 can serve as a basis for formulating differentiated and contextualised intervention strategies to improve livelihoods for a wider spectrum of the urban population. Resulting from the identification of the addressees of urban planning, in conjunction with the identification and distribution of local resources, functional spatial designs incorporating the needs of varying livelihood strategies need to be developed. In Bahir Dar questions of income, access to basic infrastructure, equal opportunities, diversity, social connectivity and exchange, transparency, access to education, access to housing and security of shelter, freedom of movement, freedom of communication and food security repeatedly occurred in the accounts of the residents; such aspects of forming systems have to be considered in urban development. At the same time, urban structures in Bahir Dar will have to accommodate a greater variety of lifestyles as the urbanisation process advances. To ground urban planning in the local rationales in Bahir Dar, it is, therefore, not the planning tool of the BDIDP itself that needs revision, but rather a discussion

on the inherent normatives that needs to be initiated. Thereby, urbanisation needs to be a key-topic on which to ground the plan's paradigm. So far, this negotiation on Bahir Dar's future has not been sufficiently transparent and open. The following chapter will, hence, propose the concept of "inclusive planning" to counter tendencies of segregation in urbanising Bahir Dar by opening the discussion on local urban development aims.

8.3 Inclusive Planning

Conceptualising rationales of planning and everyday urbanisation as, at times, complementary and, at times, conflicting reveals possibilities for synergetic constellations between different actors in urbanisation based on criteria of distributive justice. Thereby, it is not the aim to make the urbanisation process governable from the top down but rather to improve the livelihood situation of residents by starting from the status quo, including the engagement of a range of actors from the statutory and non-institutional spectrum, addressing the effects of the urbanisation dynamic. However, it remains unanswered so far, how these discrepancies in underpinning ethics between the stakeholder parties can be bridged to overcome the level of "problem-solving" in favour of strategic and yet feasible planning towards a "better future". As described, the stakeholder parties need to agree on a "common good" for urban development in the wider sense. Thereby, the question stands as to how values of normative ethics can be socio-culturally constructed and how common planning ethics can be negotiated among the spectrum of stakeholders in Bahir Dar. It is unlikely that this will be possible under the currently favoured proposals of the "developed" city, because of the fact that it is a "theory out of place". Its "translation" into an operational system as a means of laying it down can, thereby, not replace the negotiation of an underlying shared normative ethic of urban development. In an understanding of urbanisation as an "idiom" (Roy 2009), which views the construction of the urban as an assemblage, urban studies acknowledges, that there are diverse interpretations and representations of a "good city". Urban development, thereby, implies that there is a negotiation of a widely accepted social contract according to which planning interventions can take place. Thereby, the evidence from the sub-cases suggests that Bahir Dar, yet, has to uncover conflicting interpretations of the current development normatives, which it has so far not explicitly negotiated among all affected stake-holders parties.

The fundamental change in approach, therefore, needs to consider the wider underpinnings of planning systems. In order to yield the principles, which basically form the pre-conditions for suitability to their context of implementation, the analysis of context is vital. According to the findings from this research, Bahir Dar, needs to diversify its planning to suit a broader public interest. It needs to uncover its decision-making processes and make them transparent and accessible

to a wider spectrum of interests, especially from the lower-income groups left out of current considerations.

While the "developed" city's community support in Bahir Dar is in question and deserves further explicit description in the form of state-subject relations, debates on the empirical data will also need to establish, which guiding principles can make the negotiation of a "common good" for Bahir Dar's urban development possible. In the course of urbanisation, the distribution of limited resources among the various livelihood typologies requires decision-making and co-ordination, if criteria of inclusivity are to be considered. To do so, the consideration of categories such as gender, religious or ethnic categories in urban development need to be looked into. Spatial segregation and, thus, unequal social and economic access of different population groups to and distribution of resources among the neighbourhoods need to be prevented. Hence, urban development should take a stance on furthering social and economic cohesion within the city. Thereby, cultural valorisation practice towards difference in everyday life and in building needs to accompany the already established ideas of equality in the existing planning documents and reach also to the most marginalised groups. Picking up the suggestions from chapter 2.2, it is here suggested that inclusiveness be introduced as a development principle. Aiming for inclusiveness means urban development practice needs to be reformed with an inherent demand for granting decision making to local stakeholders. The definition and re-definition of government tasks needs to be undertaken in negotiation with the local population and non-governmental organisations. Thus, by creating a situated agenda and taking the everyday realities and differing practices identified through the description of everyday urbanisation into consideration, a step towards legitimising planning legislation as relevant for the majority can be undertaken. On the basis of the inclusion as the urban development agenda, the widely spread practices of urbanisation can work towards distributive justice. Unlike the "developed" city, the idea of including the ordinary can be based on principles of "equity, respect and inclusiveness" (Winkler and Duminy 2014). The idea is to strongly aim at overcoming principles of inequality and segregational tendencies. Unlike the "developed" city, which is universalist in its proposals for infrastructure supply and construction, the proposal is for a relativist normative ethic that calls for situated improvements based on local negotiation of priorities. Introducing inclusiveness as an evaluating criterion is proposed to counter current tendencies of economic segregation in urban development. Inclusiveness has potential as a characteristic, by which the relation of the urbanisation rationales from planning and everyday urbanisation will be re-configured to accommodate a wider diversity of interests than current land-use determinations can provide.

Addressing spatial set-ups that are not related to industrial understandings of division of labour and residence require an institutional framework more suitable for decision-making at the local level. This analytical viewpoint must, thereby, lead to a new set of policies, plan implementation and thus urban development projects

that are not based on "theories that are out of place" (Myers 1994: 209), but instead are rooted in urban studies that draw from the full range of practices in the respective cities (Robinson 2006: 164). Urban settlement development must not lead to the disconnection of housing typologies and urban structures from the need for "ephemeral, fluid and invisible" social and economic interactions of the inhabitants (Kihato 2007: 215 and Simone 2004). In other words social, cultural and economic systems of existing and projected neighbourhoods should be recognised as assets and therefore be incorporated into urban development considerations. As described above (see chapter 8.1), planning in Bahir Dar is seldom in partnership with everyday urbanisation and the modern development it postulates refers to an ideal, which is an exception to the social and economic systems of urbanisation relied on by the wider population. In order to arrive at a point where administrative forces increasingly work with and not against such incremental structures, and where urban development can be understood as a "collective governance effort" (see Healy 2012: 192), urban development itself needs to be revised, turning away from following outside prescriptives towards negotiating a local planning ethic (see chapter 8.2). Partnership between statutory planning and everyday urbanisation entails a shift towards responsibility for grass-roots initiatives and civil actors. Thereby, change can be initiated by small-scale pilot-projects that seek to create synergetic constellations between public interest, administrative capacity and local resources. Proposals for such a contextualised approach in Bahir Dar will be given in the concluding chapter 9.