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**Defining The ‘Smart City’ – A Spatial Typology**

*Martin de Jong, Simon Joss, and Araz Taeihagh*

As widely acknowledged, the smart city has become a major 21st century urban paradigm. Yet, it often remains ill-defined. At times, it is described tautologically as consisting of ‘smart buildings’, ‘smart infrastructure’, ‘smart transport’, ‘smart governance’, ‘smart people’ etc. Scholars and practitioners have argued that, instead of getting caught up in definitional debates, attention should be paid to how the ‘actually existing’ smart city variously materialises in towns and cities across the world. Still, the question of how we conceptualise and define the smart city remains important.

In connection with research into the relationship between the smart city and 21st century capitalism, we opted to define the smart city from a spatial perspective. That is, in order to analyse how capital accumulation intervenes in, and is enacted through, the smart city, we identified six spatial manifestations, as summarised below. Each type not only represents a distinct spatial scale and urban configuration, but also particular combinations of actors engaged in the implementation of smart city missions. In short, we define the smart city as *digital-urban interventions that occur at different spatial scales and involve different configurations of actors and resources*, consisting of six main types:

|  |
| --- |
| **Six spatial manifestations of the smart city** |
| 1. Science parks and smart campuses
 | Clusters of research establishments, technology firms and educational organisations occupying small urban footprint – larger than a single plot/building block, but smaller than a neighbourhood. |
| 1. Innovation districts
 | Similar to type 1 with focus on knowledge, technology and creative industries but (a) with larger spatial footprint and more central location and (b) including mixed-used housing, retail and cultural amenities. |
| 1. Smart neighbourhoods
 | Digital interventions in bounded residential neighbourhoods, typically motivated by dual aim of implementing low-carbon energy transition and encouraging socio-economic regeneration. |
| 1. City-wide, metropolitan and city-regional smart city initiatives
 | City-wide or city-regional large-scale, systemic intervention relating to infrastructure (energy, transport, housing etc.) and/or e-government, often requiring substantial public-private partnerships. |
| 1. Urban platforms
 | City-wide application of mostly commercial digital platforms offering consumer services (ride-hailing, food delivery, lodging etc.), reliant on existing urban infrastructures, business partners and workers. |
| 1. Alternative smart city spaces
 | Critical interventions by urban activists into the corporate smart city, albeit typically ephemeral and punctual and often struggling to gain traction and go mainstream. |

For a full discussion of this spatial smart city typology, see section 3 (pp. 4-6) in the above cited article.