Smart Design Policies

2024, Volume 1, Number 1, pages 15–22

Original scientific paper

Human-Centric Smart Cities for Inclusive and Ethical Urban Development

* **Rokhsaneh Rahbarianyazd**

Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Alanya University, Alanya, Türkiye

[1] E-mail: rokhsaneh.rahbarianyazd@alanyauniversity.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO:

Article History:
Received: 8 October 2024
Revised: 11 December 2024
Accepted: 25 December 2024
Available online: 27 December 2024

Keywords:
Human-Centric Smart Cities,
Ethical Urban Policies,
Inclusive Urban Spaces,
Adaptive Governance,
Data Privacy.

ABSTRACT

The rapid development of smart cities, driven by digital infrastructure and data-centric systems, offers innovative solutions to urban challenges but often neglects critical ethical considerations such as inclusivity, equity, and privacy. This study integrates a literature-based policy analysis and selective case studies from Amsterdam, Tokyo, Medellín, and Toronto to explore the human-centric approach to smart city development. The findings reveal fragmented regulatory frameworks, gaps in adaptive governance, and varying levels of inclusivity in current initiatives. A framework of best practices is proposed to embed ethical principles, equitable access, and sustainable policies into smart city projects. By emphasizing community engagement, data transparency, and adaptability, this research underscores the necessity of aligning technological advancements with human-centric values to ensure long-term urban sustainability and equity. The study provides actionable insights for policymakers, researchers, and urban planners seeking to bridge the gap between aspirational visions and tangible outcomes in smart city design.

SMART DESIGN POLICIES (2024), ***1***(1), 15–22.
https://doi.org/10.38027/smart.v1n1-3

www.smartdpj.com

*** Rokhsaneh Rahbarianyazd:**
Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Alanya University, Alanya, Türkiye
Email address: rokhsaneh.rahbarianyazd@alanyauniversity.edu.tr

How to cite this article: (APA Style)
Rahbarianyazd, R. (2024). Human-Centric Smart Cities for Inclusive and Ethical Urban Development. *Smart Design Policies*, *1*(1), 15–22. https://doi.org/10.38027/smart.v1n1-3

1. Introduction

The concept of the smart city emerged in parallel with intensified global urbanization, technological breakthroughs, and an increasing need to optimize resources within increasingly congested cityscapes (Townsend, 2013; Batty, 2018). Governments, private enterprises, and civil society organizations worldwide have embraced this idea, envisioning a future in which digital tools—such as sensor networks, big data analytics, and real-time information platforms—transform conventional municipal services into more efficient, responsive, and sustainable systems (Bibri & Krogstie, 2017; Kitchin, 2014). By leveraging these technological advancements, it becomes possible to streamline traffic flows, reduce energy consumption, mitigate pollution, and improve the delivery of social services. In

theory, the smart city notion promises not only more effective governance but also a higher quality of life for citizens.

Yet, even as these possibilities unfold, there is growing concern that a narrow focus on technology may overshadow the human-centric values crucial for long-term social welfare (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019). Historically, urban development has often been driven by large-scale infrastructural and economic considerations, relegating social, cultural, and ethical nuances to a secondary status. In modern smart city initiatives, these concerns can be further amplified by the complexity and pervasiveness of digital systems. Issues such as algorithmic bias, unequal access to the internet, and inadequate privacy safeguards can disproportionately affect those who are already socially or economically vulnerable. Consequently, while digital systems have the potential to revolutionize urban life, they can also unintentionally reinforce existing disparities or introduce new ones if not guided by carefully crafted, people-centered policies.

In response, contemporary scholarly discourse increasingly underscores the human-centric ethos in smart city development as a critical counterbalance to purely technology-driven models (European Commission, 2020). This concept posits that smart city projects must first and foremost protect the well-being, rights, and needs of diverse urban residents, especially marginalized groups who might lack full access to advanced technologies. A human-centric perspective requires comprehensively examining how digital tools are deployed: who is included in the decision-making process, which communities gain from these tools, and how emergent social or ethical dilemmas might be preemptively addressed through regulation and participatory governance.

Furthermore, the literature indicates that data protection and privacy represent pivotal dimensions of a human-centric smart city (Kitchin, 2014). As municipal services adopt increasingly data-intensive solutions—such as facial recognition, geospatial tracking, or predictive analytics—residents' personal information becomes a valuable resource, potentially exposing them to surveillance or commercial exploitation. A human-centric policy approach insists on explicit consent frameworks, transparent data usage agreements, and robust accountability measures. Cities like Barcelona and Amsterdam have experimented with guidelines outlining ethical data collection, open data portals, and public oversight committees, signifying a collective step toward more transparent and responsible data governance.

Beyond privacy, inclusivity and equity remain paramount to human-centric urban strategies (UN-Habitat, 2020). While the expansion of high-speed internet and digital services brings new opportunities to many, communities lacking reliable connectivity risk deeper social or economic exclusion. In practice, bridging this digital divide may require subsidized broadband, community training programs, accessible online services, and universal design principles for all public-facing technology. Without these targeted interventions, low-income households, older adults, or persons with disabilities may be unable to benefit fully from smart city innovations in sectors such as e-health, e-education, or teleworking platforms.

Closely related to inclusivity is community engagement, which emphasizes the active participation of local stakeholders in shaping smart city agendas (Townsend, 2013). Where conventional urban planning might center on expert-led processes, the human-centric approach encourages civic collaboration, crowd-sourced ideas, and open forums for dialogue about emerging technologies. For instance, policy frameworks might incorporate e-participation platforms, participatory budgeting tools, or neighborhood advisory committees designed to ensure that policy decisions reflect the diverse perspectives within a city. Researchers also note that true engagement transcends one-off consultations, requiring ongoing iterative conversations so that communities can adapt technology solutions to changing realities.

Another essential dimension of a human-centric approach is adaptability (Bibri & Krogstie, 2017). Cities are dynamic ecosystems, subject to rapid economic changes, population movements, and unexpected challenges, as exemplified by global health crises or climate-related disasters. Hence, smart city policies must be flexible enough to adjust to these shifts, rather than locking municipalities into rigid infrastructures. In practical terms, adaptability might entail modular digital platforms that allow incremental upgrades, agile governance structures that frequently reassess strategic objectives,

or policies that include built-in sunset clauses and review periods. This capacity to evolve with emerging technologies and socio-political contexts is especially crucial for ensuring that investments in digital infrastructure do not become obsolete or misaligned with public values.

Despite the evident necessity of these human-centric principles, many scholars identify a persistent gap between rhetoric and real-world implementation (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019). While official statements frequently tout smart cities as inclusive, community-focused, and adaptable, actual policy documents may exhibit a fragmented approach that addresses technology readiness in detail but gives limited attention to ethical norms, stakeholder collaboration, and user-centered design. Fragmented regulations, overlapping authorities, and disparities in resource allocation can further complicate efforts to integrate ethical concerns into technology projects. In certain cases, private-sector interests or international marketing objectives overshadow local community needs, leading to tensions around data ownership and commercialization.

To bridge these gaps, some municipalities have begun to develop comprehensive ethical frameworks and guidelines. At the international level, institutions like the European Commission (2020) have published guidelines for trustworthy AI, championing transparency, accountability, and fairness. Meanwhile, the United Nations has increasingly emphasized inclusive digital transformation in urban development (UN-Habitat, 2020). These broader frameworks, however, must be tailored to fit local contexts, norms, and administrative capacities. A universal regulation might not address the nuanced challenges facing rapidly growing megacities in the Global South, nor might it resonate fully with the infrastructural and legal realities of cities in more developed contexts.

In response to these complexities, the present article synthesizes academic scholarship, policy documents, and illustrative examples from specific cities. Our goal is to examine how well current smart city initiatives align with human-centric ideals and to identify both promising practices and persistent blind spots. By merging a literature-based policy analysis with selective case studies, the study offers insights into the multifaceted nature of designing and governing urban digital ecosystems. The intention is to provide policymakers, researchers, and community leaders with evidence-based arguments and strategic considerations for embedding ethical values and inclusivity at every stage of smart city development.

Through this examination, the study seeks to clarify the practical steps that can guide a transition from technologically driven projects to more holistically planned urban innovations—ones that actively safeguard human rights, encourage inclusive participation, and remain nimble enough to adapt to evolving urban conditions. In doing so, the study argues for a reshaping of the smart city discourse: one that sees technology as a facilitator rather than an end in itself, and that recognizes the capacity of digitally enhanced cities to either perpetuate socio-economic divides or remedy them, depending on the policy choices and governance models adopted.

By advancing such a human-centric framework, the study highlights the real possibility of bridging the gap between aspirational visions and tangible, equitable outcomes. As the following sections will illustrate, the path to truly people-focused smart cities is complex—requiring close scrutiny of policy intentions, governance practices, and actual impacts on diverse communities. With the aim of moving beyond fragmented or superficial engagements, this article suggests that an integrated, ethically attentive, and adaptive policy approach can help realize the true potential of the smart city paradigm for current and future generations.

2. Materials and Methods

A two-pronged methodology was employed:

Literature-Based Policy Analysis: A systematic review of peer-reviewed articles, policy briefs, and white papers published between 2010 and 2024 was conducted. Databases included Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, using keywords such as “smart cities,” “ethics,” “inclusivity,” “human-centric,” and “data governance.” Documents were coded for themes including data privacy, stakeholder engagement, infrastructural adaptability, and equity considerations (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014).

Selective Case Study Review: Four cities (Amsterdam, Tokyo, Medellín, and Toronto) were chosen based on their diverse socio-political contexts and varying degrees of smart city maturity. Official municipal documents, strategic plans, and publicly available reports were examined to identify policy directives and classify them according to ethical dimensions (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019; Bakici, Almirall, & Wareham, 2013). All reviewed materials were categorized in spreadsheets according to emerging themes and policy objectives. Throughout this process, the study sought both best practices and persistent challenges, culminating in a set of synthesized findings.

3. Results

3.1 Fragmented Approaches to Ethics and Inclusivity

A core finding of the literature and policy documents was a fragmented regulatory landscape. While global organizations like the European Commission (2020) provide overarching ethical frameworks (e.g., "Trustworthy AI" guidelines), national and municipal policies often focus narrowly on infrastructure or data protection without explicitly addressing broader social equity needs (Kitchin, 2014).

Table 1: illustrates a classification of common policy components encountered, showing that inclusivity and adaptability remain less frequently and less comprehensively addressed than technical aspects:

Policy Component	**Prevalence**	**Characteristic Examples**
Data Security & Cybersecurity	High	Encryption standards, cybersecurity protocols
Infrastructure Development	High	Broadband expansion, IoT sensor deployment
Privacy & Data Protection	Moderate	GDPR-inspired legislation, anonymization guidelines
Community Engagement Mechanisms	Low	Occasional advisory councils, limited e-participation
Inclusivity & Accessibility	Low	Disability-focused design, bridging the digital divide
Ethical AI & Algorithmic Governance	Very Low	Few pilot initiatives; no unified regulatory framework

Table 1. Classification of frequently observed smart city policy components based on the literature and analyzed documents. Despite general references to "smart citizens" or "digital participation," there is a gap in operationalizing such terms. This discrepancy results in scattered or tokenistic engagement mechanisms that do not effectively represent marginalized populations (Bibri & Krogstie, 2017; Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019).

3.2 Emerging Models of Inclusivity and Adaptive Governance

While fragmentation is prevalent, certain policy frameworks demonstrate **emerging inclusivity** (UN-Habitat, 2020). By focusing on universal design principles and bridging digital gaps, some cities aim to safeguard vulnerable groups from being left behind as technology advances (Batty, 2018). Policy directives in Amsterdam, for example, are grounded in "digital rights" that emphasize accountability and transparency, mandating open data sets and "algorithmic registries" (Amsterdam Municipality, 2021).

Medellín offers an alternative approach by integrating community needs, showcasing how local governments can invest in digital literacy, public Wi-Fi zones, and accessible transit solutions (UN-Habitat, 2020). The impetus for these strategies often arises from grassroots initiatives, underscoring the role of bottom-up pressures in shaping ethical citywide solutions.

3.3 Case Studies of Policy Application

Four cities—Amsterdam, Tokyo, Medellín, and Toronto—serve as illustrative examples of how ethical considerations materialize (or fail to) in practice.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Ethical Challenges and Policy Goals in Smart City Case Studies.

City	Focus	Policy Orientation	Challenges
Amsterdam	Transparency & Digital Rights	Emphasis on open data, public accountability	Ensuring universal access in marginalized areas
Tokyo	Economic Efficiency & Technological Showcases	High-tech infrastructure prioritized	Inclusivity overshadowed by large-scale events
Medellín	Social Innovation & Community Connectivity	Urban regeneration linked to tech interventions	Resource constraints in scaling successful pilots
Toronto	Private-Sector Partnerships & Data Governance	Attempts at responsible innovation frameworks	Public skepticism over surveillance and data use

Tokyo epitomizes a predominantly top-down approach, prioritizing economic efficiency for large-scale international events (Bakici et al., 2013). Although advanced systems improve traffic and transit management, outlying areas often do not benefit. Toronto, in contrast, struggled with controversies related to private-sector influence, demonstrating how high-profile smart city projects can stall due to data privacy and governance concerns (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019).

4. Discussion

4.1 Fragmentation and Silos

The findings from both the literature and the examined case studies highlight a recurrent challenge: fragmented policy development in smart city initiatives. Even as international organizations and consortia propose high-level ethical frameworks, there is often a noticeable disconnect at the city level. Policymakers tasked with deploying new technologies tend to focus on isolated domains—such as infrastructure, data governance, or social welfare—without fully integrating these realms into a cohesive strategy (Bibri & Krogstie, 2017). This disconnect can stem from multiple factors, including limited institutional capacity, departmental silos in local government, and varying degrees of awareness among stakeholders regarding the ethical implications of technology deployment.

Moreover, fragmentation creates barriers to coordination and resource allocation. For instance, a city's transportation department might prioritize sensor-based traffic management systems, while its social services department concentrates on digital inclusion programs. If these two agendas remain siloed, opportunities to share data ethically and design holistic public services go unexplored. As a result, the full potential of smart city technology for alleviating congestion, improving accessibility, and enhancing community well-being remains unrealized. The literature further suggests that this lack of horizontal integration can complicate long-term planning, as each department or stakeholder group may pursue technologies that are incompatible or duplicative, wasting valuable public resources and diluting the impact of well-intentioned projects.

From an organizational perspective, bridging these silos demands institutional mechanisms for inter-departmental collaboration—for example, cross-cutting committees or dedicated offices of digital innovation. Additionally, implementing frameworks that actively link ethical principles, privacy regulations, and inclusivity goals to each stage of technology adoption could ensure that local governments do not treat these concerns as afterthoughts. The best practices and guidelines offered by global bodies could serve as reference points for local administrations, but an explicit roadmap that enforces a unified vision at the municipal level remains critical. This roadmap would not only integrate the domains of infrastructure, data governance, and social inclusion but also ensure that each domain informs and bolsters the others under a shared ethical and human-centric rubric.

4.2 From Rhetoric to Implementation

A key tension identified in the literature is the discrepancy between aspirational language and practical execution. Terms such as "smart citizen," "digital participation," or "user-centric design" often appear in strategic documents and municipal manifestos, suggesting a progressive stance toward civic engagement and inclusivity (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019). However, local communities and researchers frequently report that such language does not translate into sustained, tangible mechanisms for public involvement. Instead, consultations tend to be sporadic—like isolated town halls or pilot projects—rather than embedded in the ongoing policy process.

Ensuring that rhetoric evolves into genuine implementation necessitates institutionalizing co-creation strategies and fostering digital literacy across all socio-economic segments (UN-Habitat, 2020). Co-creation, in particular, refers to the systematic inclusion of community members in formulating problems, co-designing solutions, and monitoring outcomes. This approach is most effective when local governments commit financial and human resources to support continuous engagement, rather than treating it as a short-lived experiment. Moreover, digital literacy programs must be extended beyond privileged groups to reach low-income neighborhoods, senior populations, and individuals with limited technological access. Such programs would enable citizens to leverage new technologies for their own benefit, ranging from e-government services to participatory budgeting platforms, thus reducing the digital divide and avoiding the entrenchment of existing inequities.

Another dimension of moving from rhetoric to implementation is accountability. Where policies or pilot projects underdeliver, city planners should be transparent about the lessons learned and actively incorporate community feedback to refine initiatives. This level of reflexivity not only builds public trust in governmental processes but also drives more efficient use of technology and resource investments. Ultimately, achieving success in bridging rhetoric and practice hinges on the synergy of policy, funding, and citizen empowerment, ensuring that no single stakeholder group dominates the narrative or skews priorities away from inclusivity.

4.3 Adaptive and Resilient Governance

In parallel, the literature underscores the importance of adaptability in the face of rapidly evolving technologies and changing urban conditions (Townsend, 2013). City systems—from transportation networks to social services—operate in fluid environments where a disruptive technology can emerge overnight, or where demographic shifts (such as population aging) can significantly alter service demands. Moreover, the advent of global crises, whether health-related or climate-induced, can drastically reshape municipal priorities and resources.

For governance structures to remain responsive to such shifts, policies must be designed with adaptability in mind. An adaptive policy framework might include periodic review processes, "living" strategic documents, or pilot projects that are deliberately time-bound, allowing city officials to measure outcomes, gather feedback, and pivot as needed. This approach contrasts with more traditional city planning, which typically unfolds through multi-year master plans that offer limited room for mid-course corrections. In a smart city context, it is crucial that large-scale technology deployments—such as AI-driven traffic systems or digital healthcare platforms—remain open to iterative refinements, ensuring that local conditions and user experiences continuously inform system updates.

Examples of such adaptability can be seen in Amsterdam's approach to algorithmic accountability, which involves transparent registers and citizen feedback loops. This enables the city to refine its algorithms in real time, addressing potential biases or inefficiencies that come to light. However, achieving true scalability for these adaptive measures remains a challenge, particularly when budget constraints or political changes disrupt long-term initiatives. City administrators must balance the need for stability in essential services—like water, electricity, and public safety—with the ability to adjust rapidly to emerging technologies and community preferences. Failure to strike this balance can result in expensive infrastructure investments that quickly become obsolete, or in agile solutions that fail to meet the basic needs of all citizens.

4.4 Ethics by Design

Finally, the principle of "ethics by design" lies at the heart of the human-centric smart city paradigm. Rather than retroactively attempting to rectify privacy violations, algorithmic biases, or exclusionary practices, the goal is to integrate ethical considerations into the very inception and design stages of any urban technology project (European Commission, 2020; Kitchin, 2014). This means that developers, policymakers, and community stakeholders collaboratively articulate the moral and societal implications of a new tool or system before it is even piloted.

An ethics-by-design approach requires multi-level collaboration among city officials, private sector partners, and civil society organizations. For instance, municipalities might institute ethics review boards responsible for vetting major technology projects, or they might mandate standardized ethical impact assessments alongside traditional cost-benefit analyses. Such procedures offer a structured way to evaluate whether proposed technologies align with broader social priorities, such as data privacy, equal access, and cultural sensitivity. Additionally, this approach can help mitigate algorithmic biases by setting forth guidelines for transparent data collection, model training, and performance audits—especially relevant when AI tools are used to allocate public resources or enforce regulations.

Nevertheless, realizing ethics by design is no simple feat. It demands sustained political will, financial resources, and technical expertise. Partnerships with academic institutions and civil society groups can strengthen these endeavors by lending specialized knowledge and bolstering public oversight. In turn, private companies must be incentivized or required to comply with ethically robust standards, which may challenge existing business models centered on data monetization. Despite these hurdles, the literature consistently identifies ethics by design as a fundamental prerequisite for ensuring that smart city initiatives truly serve their communities rather than merely introducing advanced but inequitable tools. As local governments embrace ethically conscious governance, they open the door to fostering long-lasting public trust, reducing societal harm, and building urban environments that genuinely reflect the needs and values of their residents.

5. Conclusions

This article underscores that while many smart city policies address technical and security-related aspects, human-centric values like inclusivity, adaptability, and robust data ethics often remain peripheral. The success of next-generation urban environments hinges on integrating ethical principles at every layer of planning and governance.

Recommendations:

1. Consolidated Policy Frameworks: Encourage multi-level harmonization of ethical standards, ensuring local governments have clear, actionable guidelines.
2. Focused Inclusivity Measures: Provide targeted investments in broadband infrastructure and digital literacy programs, prioritizing underserved populations.
3. Adaptive Policy Mechanisms: Institutionalize review cycles and agile policymaking processes to keep pace with rapidly evolving technologies.
4. Transparent Data Governance: Mandate publicly accessible registers and enforce rigorous consent frameworks to build trust and accountability.

By centering technological advancement on the collective well-being of citizens, human-centric smart city models can foster equitable**,** adaptive, and ethically responsible urban environments. Future research should further develop standardized metrics to measure inclusivity, privacy, and adaptability outcomes, thereby guiding municipalities toward increasingly coherent and impactful smart city strategies.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to extend their appreciation to the reviewers of the Journal of Smart Design Policies for their insightful and constructive comments, which have significantly enhanced the quality of this article. Additionally, AI tools such as Quillbot and ChatGPT were utilized to assist in organizing grammar and improving the text's fluency.

Funding
The author declares that no specific funding was received for this research.

Conflicts of Interest
The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

Data availability statement
The data that support the findings of this study are available from the author upon reasonable request.

Institutional Review Board Statement
Not applicable.

References
Amsterdam Municipality. (2021). *Digital City Strategy*. Amsterdam City Council. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-012-0084-9

Bakici, T., Almirall, E., & Wareham, J. (2013). A Smart City Initiative: The Case of Barcelona. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 4(2), 135–148.

Batty, M. (2018). *Inventing Future Cities*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11923.001.0001

Bibri, S. E., & Krogstie, J. (2017). Smart Sustainable Cities of the Future: An Extensive Interdisciplinary Literature Review. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 31, 183–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2017.02.016

Cardullo, P., & Kitchin, R. (2019). Being a "Citizen" in the Smart City: Up and Down the Scaffold of Smart Citizen Participation. *GeoJournal*, 84, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-018-9845-8

European Commission. (2020). *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI*. Publications Office of the European Union.

Kitchin, R. (2014). *The Data Revolution: Big Data, Open Data, Data Infrastructures & Their Consequences*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473909472

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Townsend, A. M. (2013). *Smart Cities: Big Data, Civic Hackers, and the Quest for a New Utopia*. W.W. Norton & Company.

UN-Habitat. (2020). *Smart Cities: A New Paradigm for Urban Innovation*. UN-Habitat.