

URBAN PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

Transforming Distressed Global Communities

Making Inclusive, Safe,
Resilient, and Sustainable Cities



Edited by
**Fritz Wagner, Riad Mahayni
and Andreas G. Piller**



TRANSFORMING DISTRESSED GLOBAL COMMUNITIES

This page has been left blank intentionally

Transforming Distressed Global Communities

Making Inclusive, Safe, Resilient, and Sustainable Cities

Edited by

FRITZ WAGNER

University of Washington, USA

RIAD MAHAYNI

Iowa State University, USA

ANDREAS G. PILLER

University of Washington, USA



Routledge

Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2015 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © Fritz Wagner, Riad Mahayni and Andreas G. Piller 2015

Fritz Wagner, Riad Mahayni and Andreas G. Piller have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the editors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

The Library of Congress has cataloged the printed edition as follows:

Transforming distressed global communities : making inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable cities / edited by Fritz Wagner, Riad Mahayni and Andreas G Piller.

pages cm. -- (Urban planning and environment)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4724-1064-1 (hardback)

1. City planning--Social aspects--Case studies. 2. City planning--Environmental aspects--Case studies. 3. Sustainable urban development--Case studies. 4. Urban renewal--Case studies. 5. Quality of life--Case studies. 6. Sustainable living--Case studies. 7. Community life--Case studies. I. Wagner, Fritz W. II. Mahayni, Riad G. III. Piller, Andreas G.

HT166.T734 2015

307.1'216--dc23

2015008095

ISBN 9781472410641 (hbk)

ISBN 9781315550121 (ebk)

Contents

<i>List of Figures and Maps</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xxi</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxiii</i>
1 Introduction	1
<i>Robert K. Whelan</i>	
2 Berlin: Resilience and Transformation	9
<i>Robert Mugerauer</i>	
3 Marseille: France's Great Port City Comes Back from the Brink	31
<i>H.V. Savitch, Doddy Aditya Iskandar, and Charles Wharton Kaye-Essien</i>	
4 Liverpool Story: Growth, Distress, Reinvention, and Place-Based Strategy in a Northern City	51
<i>David Shaw and Olivier Sykes</i>	
5 The Evolution of City-Wide Master Plans in the Context of Urban Shrinkage	73
<i>Robin Boyle and Robert Mehregan</i>	
6 Houston: A Livable City without Zoning?	101
<i>Zhu Qian and Elise M. Bright</i>	
7 The Transformation of a Mid-Sized Metropolitan Area in Canada: The Case of the Québec City Region	117
<i>Mario Carrier and Marius Thériault</i>	
8 Rio de Janeiro: Urbanistic Challenges/Experiments for a City at a Crossroads	139
<i>Pedro Novais</i>	
9 In the Wake of Katrina: Case Studies in Planning for a Healthier and More Sustainable New Orleans	161
<i>Robert W. Becker and Jane S. Brooks</i>	

10	Distressed City: The Challenges of Planning and Managing Megacity Jakarta <i>Christopher Silver</i>	183
11	“Green, Global, and Connected”: Can Sydney Solve its Metropolitan Governance Problems? <i>Heather MacDonald</i>	211
12	A Transformational Path for Cape Town, South Africa <i>David Dewar</i>	231
13	Twilight in Delhi: The Failure of Slum Rehabilitation Programs in Creating a Healthier City <i>Manish Chalana and Susmita Rishi</i>	245
14	Planning the Recovery: Dubai’s Search for a New Model <i>Adnan Husnéin and Surajit Chakravarty</i>	265
15	Rapid Urbanization and Healthy Cities and Healthy Villages Programs in the Eastern Mediterranean <i>Kaiumars Khoshchashm</i>	277
16	Integrated Urban-Rural Planning in China: The Case of Zhenjiang <i>Weiping Wu, Min Zhang, Jianjie Shi, and Jingyu Tu</i>	303
17	Visions of New Urban-Rural Relations and Alternative Definitions of Well-Being in Rapidly Urbanizing China: The Case of Chengdu, Sichuan <i>Jiawen Hu and Daniel Benjamin Abramson</i>	317
18	City Life in Modernizing Societies <i>Daniel J. Monti Jr</i>	339
19	Best Practice Methods for Cities: State of the Art <i>Eugenie L. Birch, Susan M. Wachter, and Alexander Keating</i>	353
20	Conclusions and Lessons Learned <i>Fritz W. Wagner, Riad G. Mahayni, and Andreas G. Piller</i>	375
	<i>Index</i>	379

List of Figures and Maps

Figures

3.1	Trend of population growth	33
3.2	Office construction in EuroMed: 1994–2012	41
3.3	Trend of population growth in Marseille and similar global industrial and port cities (1960–2010)	43
3.4	Trend of immigrant population	45
3.5	Immigrant population figures by nationality	46
7.1	Evolution of household burden for food, housing and transportation from 1997 to 2007 in the Québec City CMA	131
10.1	The flood of 2007 is regarded as the city's worst ever	184
10.2	Jakarta as the colonial port of Batavia was a water-oriented city from its founding	191
12.1	Diagram of development constraints	236
12.2	A conceptual synthesis	243
13.1	Image showing the edge of the Nallah with the slum in the foreground and the apartment blocks in the background, Bawana	255
13.2	Image showing prefabricated mid-rise apartment blocks being constructed as part of the Phase II & III development of Savdha Ghevra	256
13.3	Image showing back-to-back stacked plots, with one or two storey construction in Savdha Ghevra, Phase I	257
13.4	Image showing lack of infrastructure in Bawana; sewage water collected an open area	258
15.1	Urban population growth in high-income (solid line) and low-income EMR countries (dotted lines)	282
15.2	The EMR's population trend in urban and rural areas	282
15.3	PM ₁₀ levels by region, 2008–2012	286
15.4	Schematic of the Healthy Villages approach	294
16.1	Rate of urbanization in Zhenjiang, 1990–2010	308
19.1	Mapping global knowledge creation	355

Maps

3.1	Map of Marseille, its neighborhoods and the EuroMed area	34
3.2	The EuroMed area	35
3.3	Average number of housing units built per year	42
5.1	Map of nine selected shrinking cities	74
5.2	Vacant parcels Detroit, near east side, 2010	80
5.3	Future land use, neighborhood cluster 4, middle east central	81
5.4	Land use zoning, Detroit, near east side	82
7.1	Map of 14 large- and medium-sized census metropolitan areas (CMAs) in Canada	118
7.2	Urban areas and main transportation resources in the Québec City CMA in 1996	128
7.3	Motorization: Average number of cars per household in 2006, Québec City CMA	133
7.4	Average greenhouse gas emissions for daily trips of motorized households in 2006, summarized by household according to home location	136
10.1	Peta Jalur Busway	189
11.1	The Global Corridor (2013)	214
11.2	Real median rents in Sydney, 2006–12	216
12.1	Emerging metropolitan corridors in Cape Town	239
13.1	Map of Delhi Metropolitan Area showing the location of Turkman gate, Yamuna Pushta, Bawana, and Savdha Ghevra	253
16.1	Location of Zhenjiang and its administrative jurisdiction	307
16.2	Planned spatial structure for local economy in 2030	312
16.3	Planned land use in 2030	313

List of Tables

3.1	Development results in EuroMed	40
5.1	Data on shrinking cities	75
5.2	Date of plan preparation and adoption	77
5.3	Summary of the selected master plans	78
6.1	Commuting to work, workers 16 years and over	111
6.2	Comparison of three super neighborhoods	112
7.1	Population variation from 1996 to 2011 in the largest Canadian metropolitan areas	119
7.2	Variation of total employment from 1996 to 2011 in the largest Canadian metropolitan areas	119
7.3	Variation by major sectors of activity from 1996 to 2011 in the largest Canadian metropolitan areas	120
7.4	Variation of total employment from 2001 to 2011 in the category “scientific and technical professional services” in the largest metropolitan areas	121
7.5	Variation of economic indicators from 1996 to 2011 in the largest Canadian metropolitan areas	121
7.6	Variation in the migration patterns from 1996 to 2011 in the largest Canadian metropolitan areas	122
7.7	Variation of the population from 1996 to 2011, according to age group in the largest Canadian metropolitan areas	123
7.8	Population, modal shares (commuting trips) and median commute distance in the eight largest Canadian metropolitan areas in 2006	126
7.9	Evolution of modal shares and distances for commuting trips from 1996/2001 to 2006	126
7.10	Development of highway infrastructure in the Québec City CMA from 1960 to 1999	127
7.11	Evolution of population, income and housing from 1996 to 2006 in the Québec City CMA	129
7.12	Evolution of motorization, mode shares, trip purposes and length from 1996 to 2006 in the Québec City CMA	132
7.13	Evolution of trips using city buses (RTC only) and cars, all purposes, from 1991 to 2006	134
7.14	Evolution of daily greenhouse gas emissions from daily mobility of persons from 1996 to 2006 in the Québec City CMA (Monday to Friday)	135
8.1	The use of analogy to describe the urbanistic problem solving process	148

15.1	Rural population, 1950–2020	280
15.2	Urban population, 1950–2020	280
15.3	Total population at mid-year, 1950–2020	281
15.4	Water availability and use in selected EMR countries	284
15.5	Water supply and sanitation coverage in selected EMR countries	284
15.6	Ratio of PM ₁₀ measured in representative cities in the EMR compared to WHO's Interim 1 target	286
16.1	Administrative units and population in Zhenjiang, 2010	307
16.2	Urban rural income ratio of Zhenjiang and neighboring cities, 2010	309
16.3	Zhenjiang's indicators of urban development, 2001–10	309
16.4	Urban land use pattern in Zhenjiang, 2010 (km ²)	311
17.1	Income per capita in urban and rural Chengdu	322
19.1	World, urban, and rural population 1950–2050	354

Notes on Contributors

Daniel Benjamin Abramson is Associate Professor of Urban Planning and Design and a faculty member of the China Studies program at the University of Washington. He holds degrees in history, architecture, and urban planning from Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Tsinghua University, Beijing. Abramson has organized and published on numerous community planning and design projects, conferences, research, and publicly-engaged teaching and field studios in international and cross-cultural settings. He received a Fulbright for post-earthquake reconstruction planning research in Sichuan (2010), and he currently holds a part-time annual visiting lectureship at Sichuan University in Chengdu for teaching and research on rural and peri-urban community resilience. His projects in China, Japan, Canada, and the US address the incorporation of human and community well-being in neighborhood revitalization, preservation of place identity, disaster recovery, and hazard mitigation.

Robert W. Becker has been the CEO of City Park for 10 years and has been credited with dramatically improving the park's financial condition and developing a new vision for the Park's future. Since 2005, his focus has been on the restoration of the Park following the catastrophic damage sustained during Hurricane Katrina and implementation of the Park's Master Plan. Prior to his work in City Park, Becker was the General Manager for Audubon Zoo and Park and was the Director of the New Orleans City Planning Commission. Becker is a Fellow of the American Institute of Certified City Planners and an adjunct professor at the University of New Orleans. He has received numerous awards throughout his career, including the 2010 National Planning Award for a Hard Won Victory honoring the park's recovery effort. He has a BA in History from the University at Buffalo, an MA in Urban and Regional Planning from the University of Iowa, and a PhD from the University of New Orleans in Urban Studies.

Eugenie L. Birch (FAICP) is the Lawrence C. Nussdorf Professor of Urban Research and Education, Chair of the Graduate Group in City and Regional Planning, and co-Director of the Penn Institute for Urban Research at the University of Pennsylvania. She has been active in the field of city planning's professional organizations and in academia in the United States and abroad. In 2000, she was elected to the College of Fellows of the American Institute of Certified Planners and made an honorary member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. Birch has been a member of the Planning Accreditation Board, serving as its chair from 2004 to 2006, as well as President of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, President of the Society of American City and Regional Planning History, and co-editor of the *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Some of her current projects include the Sustainability Community Indicator Catalog with the Partnership for Sustainable Communities and APEC's Energy Smart Communities Initiative Knowledge-Sharing Platform. She is the co-editor with Susan M. Wachter of *The City in the Twenty-First Century* book series, published by the University of Pennsylvania Press; their latest work, *Informal Real Estate Markets*, will be published in 2015.

Robin Boyle is Professor of Urban Planning and Chair of the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at Wayne State University (WSU) in Detroit, Michigan. He is currently co-directing the WSU Detroit Revitalization Fellows Program, serves on the WSU Standing Committee on the Environment, and has recently served on two WSU presidential initiatives: a Midtown (Detroit) Task Force and the review of the Urban Research and Outreach mission for WSU. His research interests have focused on large cities and their economic condition. He was co-principal investigator on a US Department of Labor School-to-Work Grant and was co-investigator for a US Economic Development Administration study of economic planning policies across the nation. At the local level, he has attracted external funding for research into the impact of an aging society and how to adapt the built environment to assist “aging in place.” He was until recently co-chair of the Detroit chapter of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and currently serves on the board of the Michigan Suburbs Alliance. Boyle is an elected member of the US Urban Affairs Association and for the past six years has served as Chair of the Planning Board for the City of Birmingham, MI.

Elise M. Bright is Professor in the Master of Urban Planning program at Texas A&M University. A graduate of Harvard and A&M, she has published numerous book chapters and articles on livability and related topics and has presented her work at conferences around the world. Her book *Reviving America's Forgotten Neighborhoods: An Investigation of Inner City Revitalization Efforts* (2000) won the Paul Davidoff Award for Best Book in Social Justice. She enjoys putting her ideas into practice by completing plans for small communities, and this work has been recognized numerous times by the American Planning Association.

Jane S. Brooks (FAICP) holds the Jean Brainard Boebel Chair in Historic Preservation in the Department of Planning and Urban Studies at the University of New Orleans, where she has been a faculty member since 1976. She established the Historic Preservation Planning concentration in the planning program and serves as its coordinator. She has been an active member of the Executive Committee of the Louisiana Chapter of the American Planning Association for many years and served on the Editorial Board of the *Journal of the American Planning Association*. She has been involved in numerous research and professional practice activities with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Lila Wallace Foundation in such areas as waterfront revival, park planning, and revitalization of New Orleans neighborhoods and downtown. In support of post-Katrina planning in New Orleans, she served as a member of the American Planning Association's Planning Assessment Team, as a member of the Urban Design Sub-committee of the Mayor's Bring New Orleans Back Commission, and as a planner in development of the Citywide Unified New Orleans Plan. A native of New Orleans, she holds degrees in landscape architecture from Louisiana State University and the Harvard University Graduate School of Design.

Mario Carrier is an urban planner and sociologist, and holds a BA in Sociology, an MA in urban and regional planning, and a doctorate in economic sociology from the Laval University. He was a professor in the Department of Management Science at the University of Quebec in Abitibi-Temiscamingue (UQAT) between 1992 and 2001, where he directed the Desjardins Chair in Development of Small Communities from 1996 to 2001. Since 2002, he is professor at the Graduate School of Urban and Regional Planning (ESAD) and member of the Center for Research in Planning and Development (CRAD) at Laval University. His

research focuses on regional economic development, innovation networks of enterprises, territorial governance, and instruments of public policy related to development issues, planning, and environment.

Surajit Chakravarty holds a PhD in Policy, Planning and Development from the University of Southern California. His research interests include planning for multicultural cities, urbanization in comparative international context, economic development, ethnic enclaves, and public space. He is currently working as an Assistant Professor of Urban Planning at ALHOSN University, Abu Dhabi.

Manish Chalana is Assistant Professor of Urban Design and Planning, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture, and a member of the South Asia Studies Faculty at the University of Washington, Seattle. He holds a Master's degree in architecture from the School of Planning and Architecture, New Delhi and a Master's degree in landscape architecture from Pennsylvania State University. His doctorate in planning is from the University of Colorado. Dr Chalana's research focuses on planning history, historic preservation planning, and international planning and development, particularly in his native India. His current projects focus on sustainability and rural planning in the Himalayas and the impacts of globalization and urbanization on historic neighborhoods and low-income communities. He has published book chapters on these topics and journal articles in *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, *Journal of Architectural Education*, and *Preservation Education & Research*, among others. He is currently developing a book manuscript on historic preservation planning in India.

David Dewar is currently Emeritus Professor and Senior Research Scholar at, and Life Fellow of, the University of Cape Town. He was previously Professor of Architecture, Planning and Geomatics at that institution. He is author or co-author of 11 books and over 280 monographs and articles on issues relating to urban and regional planning. He also consults widely in Southern and Eastern Africa on these issues. He has received numerous awards for both his academic and professional work, including a lifetime achievement award from the South African Planning Institute (SAPI), an Honorary Life Membership of the Urban Design Institute of South Africa (UDISA), and the Mayor of Cape Town Medal.

Jiawen Hu received her PhD in the Built Environment from the University of Washington, before which she studied landscape architecture, law, and economics in Peking University, China. She has studied post-earthquake reconstruction in Sichuan, land use rights, and the legal aspects of landscapes. She is particularly interested in the interweaving social phenomena of health, healing, and the ethos of the rapidly urbanizing Chinese society. Her current research involves human spatial strategies for psychological and spiritual well-being, especially the experience of therapeutic landscapes in the context of contemporary China.

Adnan Husnéin is Assistant Professor of Urban Planning at ALHOSN University, Abu Dhabi. He chaired the newly established and only undergraduate urban planning program in the United Arab Emirates from 2006 to 2011. Dr Husnéin holds a PhD in Urban Design and Planning from the University of Washington, Seattle. His research interests have focused on clarifying the events and ideas that surrounded the foundation of the modernization process and its impact on the traditional built environment. Another area of research interest focuses on the emerging modern metropolis in North Africa and the Middle East.

Doddy Aditya Iskandar is currently a visiting assistant professor in economic development at Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University. He received his PhD in Urban and Public Affairs from the University of Louisville with an emphasis on urban planning and development. He also holds a Master of Community Planning degree with specialization in physical planning and economic development from the University of Cincinnati. Prior to joining the doctoral program at the University of Louisville, he was a lecturer in the Department of Architecture and Planning at Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia. His research interests are infrastructure planning and policy, urban politics, comparative urban development, and regional economics. He worked as an associate researcher for almost eight years and was involved in various urban and regional development projects, coastal development and management, infrastructure planning and development, and regional strategic planning in Indonesia. He also worked as a trainer in various training programs to increase the local government's planning and budgeting capacity.

Charles Wharton Kaye-Essien is a PhD Fellow in the School of Urban and Public Affairs at the University of Louisville. He holds an MPA from the University of the Western Cape, South Africa and an MA in Development Management from the Ruhr University of Bochum, Germany. His research interests focus on urban development in the Global South, public policy and program evaluation, low-income housing, energy policy, and environmental sustainability. He is a former German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) fellow, and he is the author of *Beneficiary Participation in Community Based Development and Property Rights Security and the Profitability of Microenterprises* (2012).

Alexander Keating is Senior Project Manager in the New York City Department of Transportation. He was previously Project Manager for Global Initiatives at the Penn Institute for Urban Research (Penn IUR) where he oversaw multiple research projects on sustainable urban development examining issues of urban resilience, food security, participatory governance, and city-to-city best practice knowledge transfer. Prior to joining Penn IUR, Keating worked on urban planning, policy, and research initiatives addressing urban resilience in the context of chronic violence around the world. In particular, Keating conducted an in-depth study examining the role of urban design and planning in mitigating intercommunity violence in Belfast, Northern Ireland in 2009 with the assistance of the Forum for an Alternative Belfast (FAB) and Queens University Belfast. Keating's subsequent comparative research in this area underlines the iterative process through which urban conflict, violence, and insecurity shape community identities, social relationships, and urban design and development outcomes. Keating received his MA in Politics from the University of Edinburgh in 2007 and his MCP from MIT's Department of Urban Studies and Planning in 2010.

Kaiumars Khoshchashm worked for some 37 years with the World Health Organization (WHO), holding various positions in the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Africa, including coordinator of the Healthy Cities initiative in the Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR) of WHO, Representative and Head of the Office of WHO in Pakistan, and Regional Advisor for Environmental Health in WHO EMRO and Southeast Asia. Since retirement in 2001, he has worked as a senior consultant for WHO strategic cooperation with countries in the Middle East. He has a BSc in Civil Engineering from the University of Manchester, England and an MSc in Environmental Health Engineering from the University of California, Berkeley.

Heather MacDonald is Head of the School of Built Environment in the faculty of Design, Architecture and Building at the University of Technology, Sydney, where she has lived since 2008. Her most recent book (with Alan Peters) is *Urban Policy and the Census* (2011). Her current research projects include an analysis of the impact of planning regulations on housing affordability in Australian cities and an investigation of ethnic discrimination in the private rental housing market in Sydney. Other recent research on the consequences of housing foreclosures, the impact of affordable housing on home values, and the role of the census in early twentieth century planning has been published in *Urban Studies*, *Housing Policy Debate*, and the *Journal of Planning History*.

Riad G. Mahayni is Professor Emeritus of Community and Regional Planning at Iowa State University and former Chair of the Department. He previously taught at the University of Rhode Island, where he chaired its Urban Affairs Program. Dr Mahayni worked as the Technical Coordinator of the Makkah (Mecca) Region Planning and Development Project, Saudi Arabia, with Dar Al Handasah Consultants. He also served on the City Council of the city of Ames, Iowa for two consecutive terms. His research interests include planning theory, planning methods and techniques, comprehensive planning, planning in developing countries, and transportation planning. He is a Fellow of the American Institute of Certified Planners and a member of the American Planning Association and the Phi Beta Delta Honor Society of International Scholars. Dr Mahayni has published numerous articles and planning studies. His articles have appeared in the Journal of American Institute of Planners, Journal of Planning Education and Research, Traffic Quarterly, Journal of Social Sciences, Kuwait, and Journal of Public Works Management and Policy.

Robert Mehregan is a recent graduate of Wayne State University's Master of Urban Planning program, and he has a special interest in alternative transportation planning. When asked about what first drew him to planning, he said that as a child he loved to explore his neighborhood on his bicycle but quickly found that he was limited by the lack of sidewalks connecting his neighborhood to the rest of the city. As he grew older and began to discover other cities outside of his hometown, he fell in love with the ease of travel and exploration that was afforded by those cities with a well-rounded intermodal transportation system. This love was furthered even more when he attended Westminster College in Salt Lake City Utah for undergraduate studies and was fully immersed in an environmentally conscious urban environment that truly valued all modes of transportation. When he isn't tinkering with the chain tension on his own bicycles, Rob volunteers at the local non-profit community bicycle clinic, teaching inner city youth proper bicycle maintenance techniques.

Daniel J. Monti, Jr is Professor of Public Policy Studies at Saint Louis University. He is the author of over 40 scholarly articles and six books on subjects ranging from educational reform and inner-city redevelopment to youth gangs and American urban history and civic culture. Professor Monti is an expert on community development and the public contributions of private enterprises. His research led to his creation of InnerCity Entrepreneurs, a Boston-based technical assistance program for small businesses that are attempting to grow, which has been utilized nationally, has been used to help tenant-managed public housing organizations, and spawned gang intervention strategies for school students. A former Woodrow Wilson Fellow, Professor Monti has consulted with private companies and agencies of the federal government.

Robert Mugerauer is Professor and Dean Emeritus in the Departments of Architecture, Urban Design and Planning, and adjunct in Landscape Architecture and Anthropology at the University of Washington. He first advocated an environmental hermeneutics with “Language and the Emergence of Environment” in *Dwelling, Place, Environment* (1985), then followed with *Interpretations on Behalf of Place* (1994) and *Environmental Interpretations* (1996). He has worked on urban space and everyday lifeworlds with “Insinuating a Better Way of Life: Making Do in the Everyday Spaces of Buenos Aires” (2010) and “Tradition, Tourism, and Technology: Local and Scientific Knowledge and Action in Freiburg in Breisgau” (2008) and on urban ecology in “Towards a Theory of Integrated Urban Ecology” (2010), “The City: A Legacy of Organism-Environment Interaction at Every Scale” (2011), and “Resilience as a Goal within Social Ecology” (2012). His current research applies continental thought and dynamic complexity to urbanism and issues of well-being: “Anatomy of Life & Well-Being: A Framework for the Contributions of Phenomenology and Complexity Theory” (2010) and “Design with Complexity: The Emerging Paradigm Shift for Ecological Design” (2012).

Pedro Novais is a professor in the Instituto de Pesquisa e Planejamento Urbano e Regional at the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Brazil. He obtained a degree in architecture from the College of Architecture and Urbanism at UFRJ in 1982, a Master in Urban and Rural Planning degree from the Technical University of Nova Scotia, Canada in 1994, and a PhD in Urban and Regional Planning from the Instituto de Pesquisa e Planejamento Urbano e Regional at UFRJ in 2003, with studies at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris, France in 2001. His research examines the interface between architecture, urbanism, and urban and regional planning, with an emphasis on the sociology of science and of professional practice.

Andreas G. Piller is a Master of Planning graduate at the University of Washington focusing on land use and transportation. He has a BA in Urban Planning from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and has worked in the Transportation Department at the City of Bellevue, Washington since 2011. He was part of the core project team that developed Bellevue’s Transit Master Plan, adopted in July 2014, and also contributes to the City’s pedestrian and bicycle planning efforts. He worked with Fritz Wagner as a graduate assistant on *Community Livability* (2012) and contributed a chapter about the history of streetcars in Seattle to the book *Back to the Future: A History of Transit Planning in the Puget Sound Region* (2013).

Zhu Qian is an associate professor in the School of Planning at the University of Waterloo, Canada. He teaches courses related to urban form and internal spatial structure in metropolitan Canada and urban China. His research focuses on comparative urban planning and policy, urban restructuring, land use policies, and urban form in both China and the United States. His recent research projects have been supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Susmita Rishi is a candidate in the Interdisciplinary PhD program in Urban Design and Planning at the University of Washington, Seattle. She is trained as an architect and holds a Master of Architecture degree (Community and Urban Design) from Pennsylvania State University. Her research interests include politics of citizenship, governance, inequality, and

informal urbanism in the urban Global South. Her dissertation research explores subjective understandings of value in the self-built and appropriated spaces of informal settlements.

H.V. Savitch is Brown and Williamson Distinguished Research Professor in the School of Urban and Public Affairs at the University of Louisville, Kentucky. He is a former co-editor at the *Journal of Urban Affairs* and former President of the Urban Politics Section of the American Political Science Association. He has published 11 books or monographs on various aspects of urban development, public policy, and regional governance. His co-authored volume *Cities in the International Marketplace* (2002) received the best book award in the urban field by the American Political Science Association. His more than 80 articles have appeared in leading journals, collected works, and research outlets. He has been the recipient of awards which have allowed him to do extensive research in France for more than 20 years. These research assignments include an award by the National Center for Scientific Research (Bordeaux) and a Fulbright Award at the Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l'Homme (Aix-en-Provence). Most recently, Savitch was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Chile, in Santiago.

David Shaw is an academic with over 25 years of experience working predominantly in Africa and the United Kingdom. For the last 15 years he has been based at the University of Liverpool and was for 10 years the Head of the Department of Civic Design, the oldest planning school in the world. While his key research interest is in spatial planning, focused particularly on rural planning and environmental management, he has developed a keen interest in observing and engaging with debates on how Liverpool and its city region can continue its renewal. He therefore has been Chair of the Merseyside Rural Leader Programme for the last 10 years, which aims to provide support and create a context within which urban regeneration can occur. His current research focuses on the notion of territorial cohesion and the way that land-sea interactions are critical for land-based development.

Jianjie Shi is a senior urban planner, research fellow, and Vice Director at the Urban Planning Bureau of Zhenjiang Municipality, China. She was rewarded as Science and Technology Youth Leader of Jiangsu Province's "333 high-level talent training project," Academic and Technology Leader of Zhenjiang, and Youth and Middle-aged Expert with Outstanding Contributions of Zhenjiang. She obtained her Master of Urban Planning degree at Nanjing University in 2003. Her main fields of research are integrated rural and urban planning, urban planning policy and administration, urban special and feature space planning, and urban information systems. Recent research and urban planning projects include the integrated urban and rural planning, urban spatial structure, and master planning of Zhenjiang.

Christopher Silver (FAICP) is Professor and Dean of the University of Florida's College of Design, Construction and Planning. He has spent 18 years researching urban development and decentralization in Indonesia, where his international experience began in 1989 with a Fulbright Senior Lectureship at the University of Indonesia, and in 1992 and 2004 at the Institute of Technology Bandung. He is the author or co-author of five books, including *Planning the Megacity: Jakarta, Indonesia in the Twentieth Century* (2008) and *Planning and Decentralization: Contested Spaces for Action in the Global South* (2008), as well as numerous articles, chapters, book reviews, paper presentations, and speeches. He is currently completing a monograph tentatively entitled, *Four Centuries*

of Water Management in Jakarta: Toward Sustainability in a Megacity. He has held major positions in several national professional organizations, including co-editor of the *Journal of the American Planning Association*, president of the Society for American City and Regional Planning, president of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, chair of the International Division of the American Planning Association, and current editor of the *Journal of Planning History*. He is recipient of The Laurence Gerckens Prize for 2007 for Sustained Excellence in the Teaching of Planning History.

Olivier Sykes is based at the University of Liverpool. His research focuses primarily on Europeanization, comparative planning, and urban policy. Within these broad areas his publications have focused on the impacts of EU concepts, legislation, and programs on the practices of spatial planning in EU member states and how these might be conceptualized and assessed; approaches to planning and urban regeneration in different countries (including towards culture-led regeneration and urban transport); and internationalization of planning practice and education. He is involved in transnational research projects and is a member of the editorial boards of *Town Planning Review* and *Urban, Planning and Transport Research*. The main focus of his teaching is international planning studies, comparative planning and urban policy, European spatial planning and regional development, planning theory, and the institutional and governance frameworks for planning in the UK. In 2014 he was awarded the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP) Excellence in Teaching Prize and was invited as a Visiting Professor to the Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne.

Marius Thériault is a geographer. After a Bachelor's degree at the University of Quebec at Rimouski, he earned a Master's degree and a doctorate from Laval University. After 21 years as a professor of geography at Laval University, he joined in 2000 the Graduate School of Urban and Regional Planning (ESAD). Performed at the Centre for Research in Planning and Development (CRAD) and the Centre for Research in Geomatics (CRG) at Laval University, his research interests include real estate markets, urban transport, accessibility to services, quality environment, geomatics, and land use. The results of his research have appeared in some 50 scientific journals and several published books on urban dynamics in French and English. In recent years, he was the French editor of *The Canadian Geographer* journal.

Jingyu Tu is a Master's candidate in Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning at Tufts University. She holds a Bachelor's degree of Engineering from the Urban Planning and Design Department in Nanjing University, China. Her research interests focus on urban development issues in China as well as urban redevelopment in the United States.

Susan M. Wachter is the Albert Sussman Professor of Real Estate at The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, the Director for the Wharton GeoSpatial Initiative and Lab, and the co-Director of the Penn Institute for Urban Research. She also co-directs the Spatial Integration Laboratory for Urban Systems at the University of Pennsylvania. Wachter serves on the Board of Editors for various publications including the *Journal of Housing Economics*, *Housing Policy Debate*, the *Journal of Real Estate and Finance*, and the *Journal of Real Estate Research*. She has been President of the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association and has served on the Global Urban Development Advisory Board, the National Research Council Review Board on HUD Research, the Advisory

Board for Regulatory Research with the National Association of Homebuilders, the Board of Directors for the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association, and the Blue Ribbon Committee on Housing Finance. She is the co-editor with Eugenie L. Birch of *The City in the Twenty-First Century* book series, published by the University of Pennsylvania Press; their latest work, *Informal Real Estate Markets*, will be published in 2015.

Fritz W. Wagner is Director of the Northwest Center for Livable Communities, Research Professor in the Department of Urban Design and Planning, and former Chair of the Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of Washington. Dr Wagner also taught at the University of New Orleans, where he served as Director and founding Dean of the College of Urban and Public Affairs for 20 years. Dr Wagner's interests range from land use/legal aspects of urban planning to health policy across urban and rural communities in developed and developing countries. He is a Fellow of the American Institute of Certified Planners, member of the American Planning Association and Urban Affairs Association. Dr Wagner has published numerous articles on urban planning and co-edited four volumes on urban revitalization, including *Urban Revitalization: Programs and Policies* (1995), *Managing Capital Resources for Central City Revitalization* (2000), and *Community Livability* (2012).

Robert K. Whelan is retired as Clinical Professor of Public Affairs at the University of Texas-Dallas. He is co-author of *Urban Policy and Politics in a Bureaucratic Age* and author of numerous articles and papers. His major current research interests are downtown revitalization and comparative urban politics, especially Canada and Western Europe.

Weiping Wu is Professor and Chair in the Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning at Tufts University and a senior fellow in the Council for Emerging Market Enterprises at The Fletcher School. She is a former editor of the *Journal of Planning Education and Research* and a visiting Zijiang Chair Professor at East China Normal University in Shanghai. Her research focuses on migration and urbanization, university-industry linkages, and China's urban development. She is the author or co-author of *The Chinese City* (2012), *Pioneering Economic Reform in China's Special Economic Zones* (1999), and *The Dynamics of Urban Growth in Three Chinese Cities* (1997) and co-editor of *Facets of Globalization* (2001) and *Local Dynamics in a Globalizing World* (2000).

Min Zhang is Associate Professor of Human Geography and Urban Planning at Nanjing University. She has published some 50 articles, book chapters, and an edited book. She has led many projects funded by local governments and the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC), including "Urban cultural spaces: Application of new cultural geography," "Production of metropolitan's consumption spaces in China: Social stratification, everyday lives and cultural-political dynamics," "Regional cities and towns development and planning in Yangtze River Delta," and "Integrated urban-rural planning of Zhenjiang Municipal Area." Her fields of research include urban and regional planning theories, urban geography, and new cultural geography, among others. Recent research activities focus on the cultural and political meanings, influences, and dynamics of urban consumption spaces, which are mainly based on the exploring of different social groups' everyday lives in China cities today.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Preface

The editors and contributors to this book are part of a far-flung network of scholars and practitioners who have two things in common: they are committed to describing and analyzing the ways in which people from different cultures and countries make urban communities more livable, and they all know Fritz Wagner. That includes Wagner's able co-editors, Riad Mahayni, who attended the University of Washington in the early 1970s and had a long and productive tenure at Iowa State University, and Andreas Piller, who attended the University of Washington in the early 2010s and served as a graduate assistant to Wagner's previous edited volume, *Community Livability*.

Over the course of their careers, Professors Wagner and Mahayni have made the study and creation of more livable urban places their special mission. Over the years, Wagner has expanded his network of like-minded urban planners and social scientists, attracting a diverse array of people to his cause and herding them in such a way as to bring some of the best of what they have to offer to bear on this central and compelling problem.

Transforming Distressed Global Communities is an excellent companion piece to *Community Livability*, which Wagner co-edited with Roger Caves a few years ago. Several of the authors to the first volume also appear in this book. (I have graduated from writing the preface to also co-authoring a chapter in the current volume.)

The knowledge these authors have of particular urban areas across the globe is impressive. They know how these places have developed and how people live there and use them. Their sensitivity to the unique cultural and political differences that make managing these places a challenge is apparent. With the likely exception of this writer, you would be hard-pressed to devise a better collection of experts on how to make urban places healthier, more humane, and livable. We are in good company. You are being well served.

It occurs to me that Wagner's collaborators have assembled a collection of essays on cities and urban life in different parts of the globe that would inform students from a variety of disciplines: urban planning, political science, public administration, and sociology foremost among them. I will be using both of his books in my classes on urban theory and planning. They will complement any textbook (including my own) that focuses mostly on cities in more developed societies. They also will improve these textbooks by providing much more detailed accounts of urban people and places in cultural settings very different from those in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe.

Transforming Distressed Global Communities is a good book. I wouldn't wait for the movie, but I would recommend it to anyone who cares about the urban world we all share.

Daniel Monti

This page has been left blank intentionally

Acknowledgments

In producing this book we could not have done it without the fine contributions of our authors. They have added significantly to the field of knowledge and have enhanced our understanding of developing healthy and livable communities. Moreover, it was a great pleasure to work with them. We also thank Bob Whelan and Dan Monti for their introduction to the topic, Don Miller for his recommendation of Ashgate to publish this volume, and Craig Ratchford for his assistance coordinating the early stages of this effort. Lastly, we thank our respective departments at the University of Washington and Iowa State University for their support.

Fritz W. Wagner, Riad G. Mahayni, and Andreas G. Piller

This page has been left blank intentionally

Chapter 1

Introduction

Robert K. Whelan

The subject matter of this book is challenging, complex, and timely. Transforming distressed communities into more healthy and humane places is one of the many difficult tasks facing the global urban community. The growth of cities is a notable worldwide trend. In 2008, a majority of the world population became urban for the first time in human history. Urban growth, often accompanied by competitiveness among cities, has both positive and negative consequences.

Following the economist Jeffrey Sachs, sustainable urban development has three components. First, the urban environment must allow productivity. People and businesses need a place where they can thrive economically. Second, cities must be places of social and political inclusion. Discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, gender, race, or some other such quality prevents sustainability. Finally, there is the most common sense aspect of sustainability for planners: environmental sustainability. Cities must make two kinds of environmental efforts: they must reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions, and they have to adapt to changing environmental conditions. All cities must prepare for rising temperatures, and coastal cities must also prepare for rising sea levels. In short, cities must be resilient (Sachs 2015: 9–12).

The chapters in this collection address the threats that cities face in a variety of ways, and the authors suggest many possible solutions to these problems. Policymakers and individual readers would do well to heed the advice offered by the authors.

Berlin, Germany is an appropriate starting point for considering a variety of the issues addressed in this volume, as Robert Mugerauer does in Chapter 2. Berlin is a city that is well-known to most, whether through direct experience, its storied history, or popular culture. We are acquainted with Weimar-era Berlin, thanks to the writing of Christopher Isherwood, and its translation to stage and screen as *Cabaret*. Wartime and Cold War Berlin are familiar from popular spy and mystery writers, such as Len Deighton, Philip Kerr, and John le Carré. We are fortunate to have a thorough one volume history of the city in English (Richie 1998). And our academic colleagues have contributed studies of the major recent challenges facing Berlin, including reconstruction after World War Two (Diefendorf 1993) and rebuilding after the reunification of East and West Germany (Colomb 2012, Strom 2001). Mugerauer boldly juxtaposes the concept of “transformation” against that of “resilience.” He concludes that Berlin is a city of transformation, but it has notable resilient features. In Mugerauer’s view, transformation and resilience must be balanced. A brief summary cannot do justice to a provocative paper; suffice it to say that Mugerauer provides an excellent, brief historical review of the phases of Berlin’s urban development through these two lenses. His discussion of post-1980s development includes both alternative planning and the role of international speculative capital.

Marseille, France is likely not as well-known to most readers as Berlin. The only cultural reference that comes to mind is the city as an entrepôt for drugs in the movie *The French Connection*. There is not much written in English about the city, but two sources

that come to mind are a brief chapter by Andre Donzel (1990) and the city's inclusion in Savitch and Kantor's 10 city study (Savitch and Kantor 2002). Hank Savitch is a leader in the study of urban politics, and he is an extremely astute student of French urban policies. We are fortunate to have his contribution on Marseille (with his co-authors Doddy Iskandar and Charles Kaye-Essien) in Chapter 3 of this volume. The city was in a state of decline for many years. Savitch et al. introduce the concept of High Impact, Crucial Area Development (HICAD), as applied to an area called EuroMéditerranée that is located near the port. In brief, the authors explain how EuroMed, a public corporation, was able to recast the city's image, apply targeted resources, connect important areas of the city, and build upon successes. Overall, the authors conclude that the intervention was positive for Marseille, and the strategies may well be useful for other cities.

Similarly, Liverpool, England has gone through cycles of growth, decline, and re-emergence over more than 250 years. David Shaw and Olivier Sykes describe and analyze this process in Chapter 4. As a port city at the center of the Industrial Revolution, Liverpool grew from 20,000 in 1750 to 376,000 in 1850, reaching a high of 870,000 residents in the 1930s. The population then fell to 430,000 by the year 2000. Aided by regional policy and regeneration programs from the United Kingdom and European Union, as well as by designation as the European Capital of Culture in 2008, Liverpool has experienced a renaissance in the twenty-first century. The authors discuss this history in the context of place-based policies. Particular attention is given to the Atlantic Gateway strategy, a partnership that is redeveloping the city's old dockland areas, the significance of which is placed into the larger metropolitan and regional context. The authors conclude that "Liverpool provides a powerful and hopeful example of public action ... and human resilience in the face of distressing urban conditions."

Unlike the stories of resurgence being written in Marseille and Liverpool, many of the cities once at the heart of American industry continue to experience ongoing decline. Robin Boyle and Robert Mehregan appropriately employ a different approach in their study of city plans in the context of urban shrinkage in the United States. In Chapter 5, the authors study 13 American "Rustbelt" cities, primarily in the Midwest. All are declining cities, which the authors identify as those cities whose populations were smaller in 2010 than in 1950. The emphasis of the chapter is on the analysis of written city plans. Some of the responses to decline are very creative; for example, Youngstown, Ohio incorporates new zoning districts that allow vacant land to be used for non-traditional purposes, such as urban agriculture and wetland or environmental remediation. More commonly, however, cities' plans deny that they are declining. Boyle and Mehregan note that "the attraction of returning to a normality of growth is powerful, perhaps even overwhelming." Notably, as late as 1994, Detroit's application for a federal Empowerment Zone grant was entitled "Jumpstarting the Motor City."

At the opposite end of the spectrum from these "Rustbelt" cities is Houston, Texas. In Chapter 6, Zhu Qian and Elise Bright discuss Houston's efforts to increase livability in the absence of a comprehensive zoning ordinance—a feature that distinguishes Houston from virtually all other major American cities. The authors provide a thorough explanation of the Houston planning context, noting that while the city may lack zoning, it has an extensive array of city plans that guide development, and the city's development ordinance regulates land use in a manner that would be familiar to other cities. Other notable plans include a thoroughfare and freeway plan, a strategic transportation plan, and an urban corridor plan that the city initiated in 2006. Qian and Bright present three case studies of Houston neighborhoods: River Oaks exemplifies a planned neighborhood, which uses

deed restrictions to maintain its upscale character; Montrose is a gentrifying neighborhood; Independence Heights is a traditionally African-American neighborhood with a mix of residential and commercial uses. The authors conclude with a note of optimism: "Given Houston's special land use controls for urban development, the city probably has more opportunities to create livable, heterogeneous, diverse, and mixed-use neighborhoods."

Like Houston, it is difficult to view Québec City, Canada as a distressed community. In Chapter 7, Mario Carrier and Marius Thériault place the city into the comparative context of Canada's 14 metropolitan areas. They find that the city has grown, but the pattern is not exceptional in relation to other mid-sized Canadian metropolitan areas. In Québec City's case, the economy has experienced diversification based on the mid- to high-tech sectors. In conjunction with the city's traditional bases of government, insurance, and tourism, the unemployment rate has been the lowest among Canadian CMAs. But the authors see a number of challenges for the area: an aging infrastructure and population, a housing shortage, low land-use density sprawl, and transportation systems and a labor market divided by the Saint Lawrence River. Many of these problems are also found in other cities examined throughout this volume.

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil faces major and perhaps more obvious planning challenges. As of this writing, it seems that Rio may be headed for urban planning disaster as its ambitions outstrip its capacities. The 2014 World Cup in Brazil took place without major incident, but not without considerable skepticism domestically and internationally in the preceding months—up to the very day of the opening match. With the 2016 Summer Olympic Games two years away, an official of the International Olympic Committee has expressed doubt that facilities will be ready unless a major international effort is made to salvage the Games. Protests in Brazil have centered on the costs of preparing for these events, in contrast to making investments that would address the problems of informal and low-income communities in host cities. Pedro Novais grounds his discussion of Rio de Janeiro in Chapter 8 within this context. To Novais, Rio's fundamental challenge of socio-spatial inequality makes Rio a distressed city. Like Dewar in Chapter 12, Novais is critical of earlier modernist planning efforts. He emphasizes two major planning efforts. First, he looks at the Rio Cidade program, which began in the 1990s with construction projects in several city neighborhoods. Second, he analyzes several large-scale planning efforts—first unsuccessful, then successful—to bring the Pan-American Games and the Summer Olympics to the city. Novais concludes that the city needs new ways of thinking if it hopes to alleviate distress.

Following Hurricane Katrina in 2005, no one would quarrel with the inclusion of New Orleans, Louisiana in a book about distressed cities. After the storm, academics descended from all over North America to write about the rebuilding process. Most of these outsider accounts are inadequate and superficial. There is one excellent detailed account of the planning process by Olshansky and Johnson (2010). Insider accounts are a mixed bag: some are egotistical, some historical, and some thoughtful. (These brief remarks do not include work by journalists, novelists, and so on.) We are fortunate to have the informed perspective of participant-observers Bob Becker and Jane Brooks in Chapter 9. Their analysis of post-Katrina New Orleans looks at neighborhood recovery and open-space planning in the context of sustainability. Part of the chapter considers three neighborhoods as case studies to demonstrate the variety of experiences among neighborhood recovery efforts. Gentilly suffered extensive damage, and the uneven recovery realized there resulted from residents' lack of economic resources. The Warehouse District experienced relatively little damage, received substantial public investment, and benefitted from increased density.

The new Musicians Village neighborhood, located in the Upper Ninth Ward, demonstrated non-profit leadership in creating new housing. The other main part of the chapter presents a case study of City Park. Lessons learned from the park's recovery include the importance of having a master plan, the need for specific goals and missions, the good fortune of having a loyal staff, the capacity and willingness to accept help, and the requirement of steadfastness. Bob Becker is too modest to mention that it also helps to have a City Park director who is visionary, resourceful, and totally committed. Becker and Brooks conclude that New Orleans "has attempted to use the lemon of Hurricane Katrina to produce the lemonade of sustainability practices and healthy lifestyle opportunities."

Christopher Silver addresses Jakarta, Indonesia in Chapter 10 of this volume, presenting a situation that is, to me, positively frightening. Silver is one of our most accomplished and eminent planning historians, and he has previously published an excellent history of the development of Jakarta during the latter half of the twentieth century (Silver 2008). He introduces his chapter in this volume by describing the devastating floods of January 2007 and delineating the interconnected crises in water management, transportation, and the provision of infrastructure, which reaffirm planning and management failure. Jakarta is one of the world's five largest metropolitan areas, and its planning challenges are immense. Traffic congestion is horrible, and the busway and rapid transit response has been inadequate. Heavy rainfall results in regular flooding that is exacerbated by pump failures, rivers clogged with solid waste, and development that has eliminated green spaces that previously absorbed the rainfall. Efforts to ameliorate these problems have been insufficient. Governance changes since 2000 brought decentralization and more citizen participation. What frightens me is that, with increased urbanization worldwide, it will become ever more difficult to achieve sustainable urban development. There will be more cities with stories like Jakarta's, and some of them will be in the developed world.

Sydney, Australia is another city not typically associated with distress. To me, Sydney conjures up images of a warm climate with people enjoying beaches, a successful summer Olympics, and infrastructure that is recognized worldwide. Yet in a well-organized Chapter 11, Heather MacDonald argues that the city's aspiration to be "Green, Global, and Connected" is limited by weak metropolitan governance. MacDonald sees housing affordability as a particular problem. This is exacerbated by overloaded public transportation, congested highways, and expensive toll roads. MacDonald notes planning failures in the provision and funding of infrastructure, geographic and market constraints on land mobility, complex planning processes, and public opposition to infill development. In improving metropolitan planning, better coordination among state agencies is needed, especially in making infrastructure decisions. MacDonald's solution is the adoption of a growth management program, aimed at sustainable development goals. Much of her argument will resonate for readers in the high-income, developed world.

Cape Town, South Africa is a city with serious developmental difficulties. David Dewar's thoughtful Chapter 12 sets out differences and similarities from the cities of the industrialized northern hemisphere. Dewar places the city's planning efforts into the context of two dominant ideologies: "the planning and design ideology of modernism and the political ideology of apartheid." These ideologies shaped familiar spatial patterns—those of sprawl, separation, and fragmentation. In turn, these spatial patterns aggravate problems of inequality and poverty. Dewar defines four issues as central to creating a transformational path for Cape Town. The first is controlling sprawl and creating a balance among different types of landscapes. A second issue is the promotion of targeted intensification of mixed-use development and improved public transportation. Embracing an urban model of

development is the third planning challenge. Finally, Dewar suggests that informality should be embraced in a positive sense. His suggested transformational path holds more promise than the usual incrementalism.

Manish Chalana and Susmita Rishi's Chapter 13 about Delhi, India relates well to the earlier chapters on Jakarta and Rio de Janeiro. The authors examine India's approaches to slum rehabilitation over the last 40 years and national efforts at urban revitalization since the 1990s. Some of the problems cited will be familiar to readers of earlier chapters: extremely rapid growth in the context of a lack of planning (and fragmentation and a lack of coordination when planning was undertaken); inadequate public transport; inadequate infrastructure in such basic areas as clean water supply. As in Cape Town, Jakarta, and Rio, the informal sector has provided the most significant response in Delhi. Developed world donors, such as the World Bank, have insisted on the usual neo-liberal responses to problems. Like Rio, Delhi aspires to world-class status, demonstrated by a desire to host major sporting events like the Commonwealth Games. Chalana and Rishi observe that "Delhi has continued to rely on an outdated model of eviction-demolition and peripheral location when dealing with slums." Like Dewar, these authors believe that the informal sector must be utilized effectively before Delhi can become sustainable—not to mention "world-class."

A fascinating contrast can be found in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, addressed by Professors Husnéin and Chakravarty in Chapter 14. Dubai's "success" story is based on an entrepreneurial approach. According to the authors, the Dubai model has three key components: real estate investment, good quality infrastructure, and liberal cultural practices. Dubai's response to the real estate crisis has been more real estate development, with aviation and tourism providing support. The authors note that the response to real estate's decline included some regulation and some planning. In the end, Husnéin and Chakravarty question speculative real estate investment as the best economic development strategy. The authors suggest some reasonable, viable alternatives to this approach.

The main problem of the Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR) is the polar opposite of New Orleans and Jakarta. While the latter sometimes have too much water, the arid EMR lacks sufficient water. In Chapter 15, Kaiumars Khoshchashm of the World Health Organization (WHO) tells us about the Healthy Cities and Healthy Villages Initiatives of the WHO. A decline in infant mortality brought rapid population growth to the EMR. Moreover, rapid urbanization brought with it problems of water shortage and safety, solid waste management, and air pollution. The initiatives enjoyed greater success in the wealthier countries in the region, but the lack of autonomous local government, in the Western sense, has been a major barrier to success.

The case of Zhenjiang, China is not well-known in the US planning community. In Chapter 16, Wu et al. make us aware of urban-rural challenges facing China. In 2012, China's population became majority urban for the first time in the country's history. Planning in China takes place in the context of master plans, and while urban and rural areas were traditionally addressed as distinct from one another, recent legislation now emphasizes the integration of planning for central cities with their surrounding areas. Zhenjiang has a population of some 3.11 million people, more than 10 percent of whom are migrants. Zhenjiang's urban-rural plan has admirable goals: raising income levels and equality, extending service provision and infrastructure, and promoting the social security system. At this time, planning in Zhenjiang is focused primarily on physical planning. Looking to the future, the authors are most concerned about the exclusion of migrants' concerns and issues from the formal planning process.

Chengdu, the capital of Sichuan Province in China, is a city of 14.1 million people. In Chapter 17, Hu and Abramson analyze the city's efforts to deal with urban-rural tensions. China's urban system has many policies that differ from Western urban practice. These include the need for households to register as urban or rural with the national authorities and a different system of land administration for urban and rural areas. Chengdu has devised a number of policies that are meant to alleviate these tensions, especially in the provision of infrastructure. In particular, local residents are allowed to play a meaningful role in the planning process.

In Chapter 18, Daniel Monti offers some provocative thoughts in reflecting on urban life in India and Latin America. Monti poses three questions about community creation: "Who can be a member? How closely do people follow the rules? And how accountable are they to each other?" Monti concludes that family-based caregiving in India may compare favorably with similar efforts in the United States. In Latin America, citizen involvement has increased. Monti suggests that voluntary organizations, families, and other non-governmental organizations may offer better possibilities for improving city life for migrants in developing countries than traditional, top-down urban planning.

Whereas the other chapters in this volume examine the experiences of particular places, Eugenie Birch et al. provide a different perspective in Chapter 19. Their question is how cities transfer best practice knowledge in facing the challenges of rapid urbanization. The chapter is based on a two-year study conducted for the Rockefeller Foundation. The authors look at three types of measures: critical success factors, benchmarks and performance indicators, and randomized controlled trials. Future challenges include the need for coordination and more standardized measures. These issues must be addressed in moving towards sustainability in cities.

The chapters in this book are exacting and stimulating. Students, scholars, and practitioners can learn much from the authors. The practical solutions offered throughout constitute a major contribution.

References

- Colomb, Claire. 2012. *Staging the New Berlin: Place Marketing and the Politics of Urban Reinvention Post-1989*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Diefendorf, Jeffry M. 1993. *In The Wake of War: The Reconstruction of German Cities After World War Two*. New York City: Oxford University Press.
- Donzel, Andre. 1990. Regeneration in Marseilles: The Search for Political Stability. In *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*, edited by Dennis R. Judd and Michael Parkinson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 277–292.
- Olshansky, Robert B. and Laurie A. Johnson. 2010. *Clear as Mud: Planning for the Reconstruction of New Orleans*. Chicago: APA Press.
- Richie, Alexandra. 1998. *Faust's Metropolis: A History of Berlin*. New York City: Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Sachs, Jeffrey D. 2015. *The Age of Sustainable Development*. New York City: Columbia University Press.
- Savitch, H.V. and Paul Kantor. 2002. *Cities in the International Marketplace: The Political Economy of Urban Development in North America and Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Silver, Christopher. 2008. *Planning the Megacity: Jakarta in the Twentieth Century*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Strom, Elizabeth A. 2001. *Building the New Berlin: The Politics of Urban Development in Germany's Capital City*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Chapter 2

Berlin: Resilience and Transformation

Robert Mugerauer

Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to investigate not only the well-being of Berlin—that is, of its inhabitants and ecological systems—but the issue of how we might legitimately go about making such an assessment. Here we encounter the underlying question of what kind of a thing a historical, great city might be that it could be resilient or transformed. These are not so much problems to be solved, but puzzles to be entered into, described, analyzed, and interpreted. Specifically, the chapter will (1) describe and interpret several dimensions of recent changes in Berlin's built environment and open spaces, (2) probe the extent to which this empirical work benefits from applying the ecological concepts of resilience and transformation, and (3) reciprocally, test the validity of that distinction by using historical urban findings. To be clear: the assumption is that there are neither simple “facts” about Berlin that appear innocent of theory and research practices, nor that theory and practice appear from out of nowhere to be applied to phenomena as a procrustean bed. Thus there is a critical but positive “hermeneutical circle” in simultaneously applying and testing the usefulness of the ecological distinction of “resilience” versus “transformation” to urban environments to (a) see how the categories might explain the development of Berlin over successive regimes and (b) use the evidence and findings to modify, reject, or accept the use of these categories for urban planning.

Applying Ecological Concepts to the City

Resilience

Most urban environments, especially those with a long history, are far too complex to treat in any simple way without reductions that obliterate much of what needs to be understood. This certainly is the case with Berlin, even though it is not an ancient city. Given the ecological definition of resilience as the ability of a dynamic system that has undergone perturbances to return to its original stable state (Holling 1973), at the most general level, we could inquire as to whether a settlement in the Spree valley has demonstrated this characteristic. In the original glaciated plains and valleys vegetated respectively with indigenous oak-hornbeam woods and pinewoods, and with a high water table with numerous bogs, settlement began in the early thirteenth century. For the purposes of examining urban environments in the context of urban planning, rather than detailed changes in biotopes, five major modern urban regime changes can be distinguished in Berlin:

1. That of the mid-nineteenth century residential city of almost half a million residents, which grew rapidly with industrialization, enhanced by its distinction as the

- imperial capital of the first unified German nation state in 1871 and the state's comfortable relation to capitalism;
- 2. That of the Weimar Republic of the 1920s, when Berlin's population was approximately 3.8 million;
- 3. That during the 12-year reign of National Socialism's intended 1,000-year Third Reich;
- 4. That in the post-World War II, Cold War period, with West Berlin as part of the Federal Republic of Germany (*Bundesrepublik Deutschland*);
- 5. That from 1989 to the present, with Berlin reunited after the fall of the Wall and German reunification.

Here it seems obvious that the ecological concept of resilience is not of much use. It is almost entirely empty of meaning to say that a settlement in the Spree valley has been resilient because there have been a continuous succession of regimes, through which almost all the vegetation has, at one time or another, been dramatically changed through urban environmental modification or fundamentally obliterated by the bombing of World War II. As to the inhabitants, during that phase many thousands were deported and murdered under National Socialism, and many of the remaining were killed in the war that ravaged the city. What would be that which supposedly was resilient? A generic settlement at a geographical location measured by latitude and longitude?

Here we encounter fundamental issues. In ecological thought a stable state refers to the stable state of a kind of ecosystem. That is, the question is one of system identity. One way to think of this is relatively simple: such systems would include lakes and woodlands. For example, if a lake is perturbed so as to shift from clear to murky—a flip from an oligotrophic regime with low phosphorus, low algae, and rooted aquatic plants to an eutrophic regime with high phosphorus and high algae—the question is how long it would take, and under what circumstances, to return to the original behavior regime (Holling 1996, Mugerauer and Liao 2012). Of course, it is possible that the system is not resilient and dissipates or dies. Yet another possibility is that, as is characteristic of some open dynamic systems, far from equilibrium, a system may jump across a threshold, without smooth linear change, to another regime altogether, with dramatically different system behaviors (Walker and Salt 2006, Mugerauer and Liao 2012). This is what is meant by ecological transformation. Thus a grass-dominated savannah may become shrub- or tree-dominated, or a tropical forest may become grassland. On a given site, one ecological regime might be succeeded by another, different one—perhaps with the replacement of almost all of the biotic components.

The basic picture is almost immediately complicated, however, by the realization that there are long-slow systems that shift between apparently alternative stable states wherein the latter do not describe two different sorts of things, but two phenomenally distinct phases of one kind of thing (Gunderson and Pritchard 2002). At the current stage of ecological science, we often lack the empirical information and theoretical-conceptual clarity to be able to discern the difference. Yet even this ever-vexing issue of biological kinds (and morphological development) seems simple compared to issues of identity for persons and cities, which would appear to have many more open possibilities for change and identity.

Applied to Berlin, one crucial empirical question is what, and to what extent, individual components have remained whose resilience might be discerned. For example, the bogs from the era of pre-habitation. Or more recently, some species that survived in the sites abandoned and thus protected between the end of WWII and recent redevelopment. Or perhaps the residents' oft-noted display of sharp wit and irreverent sense of humor (for

example, referring to the Kongresshalle as the “pregnant oyster”). But given the intent of National Socialism to utterly change the built and human features of the city (and the destruction resulting from bombing and ground fighting), the resilience of any features would have occurred by accidental circumstance or as the result of intentional resistance.

Transformation

Transformation, then, would seem a more promising ecological notion for understanding Berlin. Before focusing on a more detailed examination of the last two historical regimes, an overall argument can be made that transformation was attempted socially-politically-economically across the major five regimes. The creation of the Prussian nation state consolidated and held a highly heterogeneous sphere into “Germany” and transformed Berlin into an even more powerful national capital. To cite examples of open spaces: the grand boulevards, squares, and monuments created by the Prussian kings remained; the Royal hunting grounds, which already had been opened to the public in 1740 (such as the Große Tiergarten), were developed into landscape parks; and beautification projects touted ornamental green areas (Russell 1983). Then, just as in other industrialized cities, after the mid-nineteenth century, public health and planning factions pushed for *Volksgärten* (people’s gardens), including planting trees for fresh air and landscaping to facilitate pleasure strolls. After the turn of the century, in order to focus more on urban health, planners and social reformers generated the *Volkspark* (people’s park), intended as recreational-exercise grounds for sports and children’s playgrounds for the working class, especially in the areas of overly-dense tenements (*Mietskasernen*) (Ladd 1997, Lachmund 2013). Nature conservation, often achieved by setting aside nature reserves, as in the first third of the twentieth century, was largely a dimension of affirming and displaying landscape elements (i.e., monuments) considered exemplary of national or regional identity. This was a key argument in establishing the Grunewald as a “permanent forest” in 1915, following 11 years of “public protests mounted against projected city extensions and clearing measures and against the effect of urban water use on the forest’s ground water level” (Lachmund 2013: 28–30, Lekan 2004). The timing for such action was critical, for by then the Prussian state was already selling the forests surrounding the city to private real-estate developers who were busily creating suburbs (Lachmund 2013).

After World War I, the city was drastically perturbed (though that technical ecological term seems woefully inadequate to the tragedy). But amidst contending forces, the Weimar Republic emerged in the 1920s in a moment that was simultaneously hopeful and disenchanted. For example, the benefits of the openness of international travel and exchange and the (perhaps overestimated) erotic charge of the city’s nightlife were assimilated in large part via the *Neue Sachlichkeit*—a matter-of-fact attitude to the new social realities of the post-war situation and capitalism. It has been observed that “the sober appreciation and use of material and technical possibilities” were key drivers, not obstacles to the burst of artistic creativity that occurred (Willett 1984: 12). This certainly was the case with the multiple descriptions and re-descriptions that celebrated both the possibilities and rawness of the city—stressing its heterogeneity, energy, and constant motion, especially through the use of montage (Bienert 1992). As to open spaces, in addition to the lively social-political life in the streets and squares and imaginatively projected by avant-garde theater and cinema, with the establishment of Greater Berlin as an administrative municipality in 1920, new green parks and greenbelts were created, allotment associations and plots multiplied, and continued attention was given to preserving natural spaces, especially forests, at the

city's edges (Lachmund 2013). The ideas of conservation as preserving the natural heritage in Berlin in the 1920s "focused on sites considered particularly representative of the glacier-formed landscape of the Brandenburg region: fens, creeks, ponds, and a few sand dunes scattered around the metropolis ... Consequentially, the bogs in the Grunewald were the first sites in the Berlin area to be designated nature reserves" (Lachmund 2013: 30). Importantly, it was during this period of social reform that open green planning, as part of open-space planning, became institutionalized in the city (Lachmund 2013).

Weimar did not hold as a stable regime, instead giving way to the violent plan to transform not only Germany but much of Europe into a supposedly hyper-stable 1,000-year Third Reich. As to Berlin, the transformations are all too familiar and need not be repeated here. To pass over the human destruction out of respect, we can note the well-known urban environmental changes. Huge parade grounds, gigantic monuments, and administrative and civic buildings evoked—indeed, were intended to recreate or even surpass—the Roman Empire. Notably and problematically on political grounds, there was support for and thus resilience of the conservative nature-landscape attitude, affirming "homeland nature," a concept seemingly compatible with the racialized "blood and soil" ideology of National Socialism (Gröning and Wolschke-Bulmahn 1987, Lachmund 2013).

After World War II, two distinct yet inseparable regimes emerged. First, following the destruction of National Socialism, the international powers of the West and USSR aimed to establish new stable states quite distinct from what had gone before. In the West, that meant that Berlin was part of the Federal Republic of Germany during the Cold War period. Secondly, since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, as the city and country worked out the reunification of East and West Germany, a transformation occurred across competing communist and capitalist world systems toward an increasingly globalized capitalist environment (which substantially embraces both the former Soviet Union and China). Thus, a closer analysis of these two regimes can profitably disclose major features of Berlin's contemporary transformations and, in its finer-grained details, perhaps some of its resiliencies. There was both: (a) a continuation of the older ideas of nature conservation of ecological monuments as "landscape care" and of the engagement of multiple groups with diverse bio-political ecological agendas (Lekan 2004); and (b) the discontinuous shift to ecology in terms of systems dynamics and to speculative capital aimed at new, privileged "up-scale" groups.

Contrasting Local versus International Environmental Regimes: Resiliencies Amidst Transformations

Two Modes of Urban Ecology Following the Transformation after World War II: The Resilience of Local Ecologists and Alternative Activists

The material in this section is not intended to imply a general description of Berlin in this period. The city in its ecological, built, and political dimensions is so multifarious that only a bit of what is important and interesting can be considered. Even that limitation, however, allows us to examine the extent to which the concepts of transformation and resilience are fruitful. When Western Germany came under the control of the Allies at the end of WWII, Berlin was beyond the eastern boundary—that is, extra-territorial. Though the city was not given in its entirety to the Soviets, the Western-oriented sector was fully isolated from its

surrounding countryside. By force, then, a strong centripetal focus developed, even as it was critical for the city to stay connected to forces outside its borders.

Especially significant in terms of sense of place were activities by ecological groups and by neighborhood activists concerned with resident well-being. Berlin, as much of Germany, had a long-established interest in studying and planning the landscape—that is in the interface and interaction between cultural and biotic environments (Lekan 2004). Whereas the dominant tradition nationally had been to focus on monumental elements including those taken to characterize the German spirit, and since earlier regimes in Berlin had attended successively on royal parks, ornamental plantings, and then recreational spaces aimed at improving public health, Berlin academics, amateur scientists, and nature lovers had become especially accomplished at close studies of local features. Extensive longitudinal data had been collected concerning one of the traditionally central concerns of urban ecology: vegetative diffusion. Given its overly narrow scientific view and data collection and interpretation practices, the ecological work of the 1950s–80s was neither really saturated with the fuller theoretical view of co-constitution nor able to actualize its potential. It did however appreciate and affirm that there was not a separation but a continuum of so-called “nature” and “culture,” as the urban environment had clearly impacted the vegetation regimes for a long time (Lachmund 2013). The trajectory of work done before WWII did continue after the war—a resilient feature—because it had been significantly institutionalized in city planning and was carried on by strong surviving researchers such as Herbert Sukopp (who strongly called for an “urban ecology”), colleagues such as Alexander Kohler and Woffram Kunick, and a large, diverse set of amateur and professional naturalists conducting field work, as well as gardeners, hikers, interested nature lovers (Lachmund 2013).

Green planning was deeply organically ambitious. For instance, in a case of the Tiergarten—though not a matter of resilience in the ecological sense but of a more ambitious (and optimistic) recovery—plans in the late 1940s were “not intended simply to restore the prewar situation; they were intended to restore features of the alder swamp and the riparian forest that once had covered the area in which the park was located” (Lachmund 2013: 35). From 1949 to 1952, the policy and practices of “greening,” for example with open spaces and playing fields, functioned as a mode of restoring a sense of urban order in the midst of the ruined city. It also deployed many of the unemployed, providing a means to look to better times ahead (Lachmund 2013).

In addition to their detailed field observations and data rich surveys, the broad community interested in local biotopes advocated both for features historically acknowledged as characteristic of and crucial to the now-enclosed city (such as the substantial 32 km² Grunewald and its lakes, Tiergarten, and Botanical Garden in Dahlem) and for newly appearing elements. For example, there were significant areas that had been abandoned and, from the viewpoint of ecology, protected, which gradually were carefully documented, especially in the Schöneberg, Luisenstadt, Tiergarten, and Kreuzberg districts (Lachmund 2013). This was notably true of the abandoned Potsdamer Güterbahnhof and Personenbahnhof (also known as Gleisdreieck) and Tempelhofer Rangierbahnhof (or Südgeländer) railroad yards and facilities, where diverse flora and fauna were observed from the 1950s onward (Spirn 1984, Lachmund 2013). Similarly, the vast amount of rubble from the bombings was partially “disposed of” by simply shaping it into waste heaps, which then were left unattended. Ecologists noted that these areas (formally, ruderal areas [*rudus*: rubble]) were quick to re-vegetate and became wooded and filled with species often new to the city, such as insects or plants supposedly brought in by rail, road traffic, and birds. These

spaces were not only appreciated by botanists; they were also used by the homeless and by children as favorite play spaces (Lachmund 2013).

That which held such scientific ecological interest also critically contributed to the self-understanding and affirmation of the finite urban area as having distinction and importance insofar as it was uniquely constituted by the interaction of political and biological environmental processes. Both traditionally appreciated and newly emergent micro-biotopes were worth nurturing for their own sake and central to delineating the identity of the city. Though often the subject of significant differences among the various ecological interest groups, these biotopes were the basis for the emergence of strong local protection attitudes and often legislation, as the diverse ecologists (often in cooperation with city ecological planners) were usually united in opposition to the technically-oriented urban planners and the official city administration intent on development in a modernist mode. Thus Berlin's urban planning continued a notable ecological orientation that was not only resilient after WWII but intensified by the perceived importance of the little green space and few but distinctive biotopes present in the city.

At the same time, the post-war period evoked self-initiative in regard to social environments. The severe limitations of space and resources were in fact a positive challenge to a range of residents who were not enamored with the dominant world economic-political systems or official ways of ordering life. Many who were considered members of "marginal" groups devoted considerable energy and creativity to developing what generally has been referred to as "alternative" approaches to urban living. Though not at all constituting any coherent social structure, retirees, the unemployed, low income workers, immigrants (largely Turkish guest workers since the 1960s and 1970s), and an increased number of young people after the end of the 1970s—including students living in Berlin to avoid the draft, squatters, and artists—all focused on issues of housing, open space (especially for recreation), and an ecological way of building at the grass roots level, especially through processes that promoted serious resident participation in the city's rehabilitation planning (for example, see Ladd 1997: 105–110). This was not, of course, a resilience of a directly continuous local democratic system from before the war (since any such precedents had been wiped out), though it did draw on the leftist (if not anarchist) traditions of the population and the persistence of many sorts of non-conformists. Though too diverse to cover in this short chapter—and criticized by some as overly complicated or at times too formally aesthetic (Braunfels 1983: 15–17)—the spirit of the approach is clearly seen in connection with the International Bauausstellung (IBA, or International Building/Construction Exposition) of 1984–1987, where strong local concerns contrasted with the goals of the official Berlin administration. Because IBA itself was a multifarious set of phenomena that took place over a long period, the hundreds of exhibitions, publications, lectures, tours, designs, charrettes, and projects realized and unrealized "are not all one." Only one of the two main aspects clearly indicative of localism directing the official IBA goal of a "livable city" is examined here. Setting aside the "critical reconstruction" articulated by the architect Joseph Paul Kleihues, Planning Director of the New Building Department of IBA Berlin since 1979—who wisely counseled that "no-one can build for strangers" (Kleihues 1983: 7–8)—the following focuses on the "urban renewal without displacement" headed by Hardt-Walther Hämer.

Since Berlin was in fact an autonomous Land under the German governance system after the war, city politicians and thus professionals had substantial range in what they attempted to carry out. In line with the rest of the Western urban tradition of modernism that was dominant at the time, a major goal was development of industry and housing on

the city's edge and ceding to the importance of the automobile with ambitious inner-city highway and tunnel systems. The modernist emphasis on buildings in open spaces (of the sort advocated by Le Corbusier) had already been tried, perhaps more successfully by Hans Scharoun with the Philharmonic Hall given his unique, immediate intent to place art in "the middle" during the Cold War period and thus establish a new epicenter, and in the housing demonstration project in the Hansaviertel in the 1950s (Balfour 1990: 214–215, Till 2005: 42–43). Nonetheless, most of the professional work of modernist planning in Berlin was parallel to the urban renewal occurring in New York and across the United States, such that the proposed functional approach obviously involved cutting through green spaces and residential areas in the pursuit of its technical solutions (Lachmund 2013: 40–44). Another set of ideas considered by the Berlin Senate was to "create space within the city by densification instead of extending the developed area" by significantly compromising allotment gardens and other open spaces—a different path to the same sort of destruction of open living spaces (Lachmund 2013: 119).

In contrast to both the scientific ecologists and modernist planners, many leftist and liberal local political activists wanted development of adequate housing and neighborhood public spaces, rather than either preservation of "nature"—as occurred, for example, in the ruderal areas of rubble piles and abandoned railway yards regarded as important observation sites, as argued by the protesting ecologists such as Sukopp—or the "asphalt and concrete" expanses of the city planners (Lachmund 2013). Note, however, that the alternative approach did include a centrally important ecological component, but it differed from the traditional landscape aesthetic and from specifically scientific concern with the biotopes for their own sake. At times, then, the alternative planning was in opposition to other ecological groups if the latter argued too vehemently for non-development at the cost of possible socially-oriented projects, but it coordinated with them in opposing projects that would destroy the local bio-cultural character of neighborhoods (such as the highway projects that would have obliterated everything in their paths in the name of economics). Here the bio-ecologists and political activists agreed that Berlin's well-being, including the benefits of ecosystems and open spaces, was not only devastated by the war, but by the urban planning attitudes and projects that had commenced since then (Kleihues 1983).

The more purely local self-sufficient dimension comes to the fore in the way residents coped with the remaining environment of nineteenth century *Mietkasernen*. These large, cramped tenement buildings, many remaining from the 1860s and 1870s, were regularly without any adequate sanitary facilities. In the mid-1980s, only one half had toilets in the dwelling units, and of the "down the hallway" facilities, many had not been maintained over the previous five decades or longer (Personal field research 1984, Nakamura 1987a). There were 150,000 units which had either no toilet or no bath, and an additional 90,000 which had neither (Hämer and Krätke 1983). These buildings and their associated health-social problems were resilient: despite two world wars and the collapse of any industrial basis in West Berlin isolated against the Wall, the tenements remained as they had been, except that they were further deteriorated after an additional half-century of neglect. Here we have a reminder that resilience in itself is not inherently positive: it only indicates the persistence of a steady state, as also happens in Death Valley or an unrecoverable eutrophic lake, though it may not at all be deemed desirable on either dynamic biological or social grounds.

Though there were a few books on the topic of alternative, ecological planning and design in the United States in the 1970s, the theory and practical application of eco-urbanism were more well-established in Europe. Indeed, it was a revelation to at IBA 1984 see 10 m of conference tables covered with literature on the topic and to be given tours of

green roofs, sophisticated water retention and purification techniques suitable for greening urban courtyards, and urban agriculture projects (Kennedy 1984a, 1984b). Importantly, there was the compelling delineation of an alternative “aesthetic”—for instance in the graphics by H. Katzmann and B. Lötsch (Kennedy 1984a: 31) or by Gruppe Ökotop (Kennedy 1984b: 76, Kleihues 1987: 246) depicting the greening of rental blocks, which intended to make vivid the ordinary, everyday difference—and realistic feasibility of the emergent lifeworld as opposite from that of the dominant establishment.

A chance for a consistent, parallel engagement of alternative planning with the possible deployment of major resources was provided by the city and state governments. The 1984–1987 IBA was the occasion for imagining and planning redevelopment projects with the assistance of over 100 German architects and 50 international architects and planners, many of them leading post-modernists (Nakamura 1987b: 302). Though IBA was purely “advisory,” without any legal power to make binding decisions or undertake actual construction, it was highly influential (Russell 1983: 18). Though admittedly many of the model approaches were of limited success, there was continuity and persistence in developing and implementing the strategies (Hämer and Krätke 1983). Indeed, many of the pilot projects and designs generated during its tenure were in fact built and well-used. Activist architects and urban designers, students, artists, immigrants, and counter-culture residents energetically worked out details of how attractive buildings could be modulated by the alternative, rather than mainline, modes of thinking and use to achieve a healthier environment and increased resident well-being (Hämer and Krätke 1983). The more professionally sophisticated community members not only had ideas of their own, but substantially opened up to and engaged with other residents, such as the Turkish guest workers in Kreuzberg, to work out designs and building plans.

Given the still overly-dense built fabric and lack of recreational spaces, there was interest in pursuing more open green spaces in more positive forms of vibrant community- and eco-oriented courtyards in buildings that retained the traditional Berlin scale and interior spaces rather than modernist high-rises surrounded by “lawn” (Kleihues 1987). In Kreuzberg, Hämer and his colleagues were contending with the destruction of over 7,000 cheap apartments, public protest, and civil disobedience by squatting by mid-1981—often to prevent the “renovation by demolition” of derelict but rent-controlled buildings, which regularly were trashed by developers’ thugs so that the owners would be allowed to renovate the unit and charge much higher rent to the new tenants. For developers, “the existing buildings and certainly the present inhabitants [were] regarded as obstacles of the first order,” such that “their removal [was] generally a prerequisite for any renewal programme.” The counter strategy was to resist the profit-driven interests of business and the trajectory of private owners by arguing and demonstrating that it was socially and economically preferable to renovate dilapidated buildings, allowing the tenants who had already lived there for many years to remain, “retaining their accustomed environment and their social structure” (Hämer and Krätke 1983: 28).

The Kreuzberg local authority generated “Twelve Principles for Urban Renewal”—the political basis for “careful urban renewal”—which were subsequently adopted by the city housing and building authority and then passed by the Berlin House of Representatives in 1983. As documented in the well-promoted “Exhibition: Step by Step” (and later Kleihues 1987), Hämer (a short way to refer to the group consensus that emerged through work on hundreds of projects by thousands of participants) undertook the conceptual development and pilot projects to show that it was possible “to create a basis to [sometimes] enable agreements to be reached between the property owners, tenants,