ABSTRACT In this Anthropocene times, the conviction that science would emancipate humanity from the chains of superstition and medieval obscurity (Ferry, 2011) gave way to forms of urban and landscape planning disconnected from the biophysical and cultural context like many modernist urbanization, frequently extensive, and industrialization, like in agriculture, livestock, forestry, natural resources, etc. Throughout the 20th century, and particularly towards the last decades, this large-scale alienation of the context became a source of troubles as progress and modernization meant an illusion of independence toward the cultural and “natural” functioning of the landscape. The *tabula rasa* tendency of modernization encouraged practices of image - objectual urban and landscape planning static in time that are unable of generate dynamics in order to react and take advantage of the intrinsic natural and social energies of each place. Today, the riverfronts of contemporary cities often represent a boundary between extremely artificial and natural realities, systems with different entropies. But these are also areas of mediation, which have to address deep conflicts between static artificial structures (e.g. buildings, ports, recreational areas), and dynamic natural structures (e.g. dunes, marshes, salt marshes, barrier islands, beaches). This space, vital and extraordinary, is sometimes reduced to a line, as in the case of riverports, or to a zone made up elements of both worlds, as in the case of a developed beachfront, a riverside park, or a port of anchorage. In the line of thought of the idea of “Openness”, a few authors have recently suggested concepts to the modern Urban Planning bodies, providing examples such as *Critical Regionalism* (Frampton, 1983), “*Paisagem Global*” (Global Landscape, Teles, 1994), *Landscape as Urbanism* (Waldheim, 2006), *Terra Fluxus* (Corner, 2006), “*Rehabilitación*” (Latz, 2007), “*Proyecto à Vela*” (“Landscape like sailing a yacht”, Nunes, 2010). These proposals are characterized for being dynamic and flexible in their ways of thinking cities, capable of adapting to contingent urban phenomena in an efficient, sustainable and resilient manner throughout time. The aim of this communication is to present 6 case projects, which put into practice concepts of Designing for openness and which are dynamic and flexible throughout time, namely the Riverfronts of the cities of Lisbon and Figueira da Foz (Portugal), Wroclaw and Warsaw (Poland), Toblino and Padova (Italy). The urban planning here derives from an awareness that cities and river landscapes are not static objects; they are extremely dynamic systems that evolve throughout time and which find it difficult to identify with finished planning images or objects. There is also recognition that cities cannot cancel the natural and cultural processes that are inherent to the landscape and the manner in which they function, without becoming unsustainable.
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