

Adam, Brigitte; Baudelle, Guy; Dumont, Marc:

Spatial doctrines of urban development – persistence and change in the course of time

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0156-1119033>

In:

Gustedt, Evelyn; Grabski-Kieron, Ulrike; Demazière, Christophe;
Paris, Didier (eds.) (2022): Cities and Metropolises in France and Germany.
Hanover, 40-57. = Forschungsberichte der ARL 20.

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0156-11198>



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Brigitte Adam, Guy Baudelle, Marc Dumont

SPATIAL DOCTRINES OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT – PERSISTENCE AND CHANGE IN THE COURSE OF TIME

Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 France: a long-standing, constantly renewed tradition of centralised government that does not prevent doctrinal evolution
 - 2.1 A centralised system
 - 2.2 The technical planning phase and its doctrines (1945-1982)
 - 2.3 A decentralisation phase since the beginning of the 1980s
 - 2.4 Two new doctrines: priority geography and competitiveness (1980-2000)
 - 2.5 Empowering territories in the face of ecological imperatives
- 3 Germany: the adjustment of spatial doctrines on the way towards a joint national approach to urban development
 - 3.1 The beginning of modern urban development in Germany
 - 3.2 Reconstruction, functionality and urban expansion
 - 3.3 The era of urban renewal and planning euphoria
 - 3.4 From ‘planning by projects’ towards sustainable urban development
 - 3.5 The Leipzig Charter against the background of different urban challenges
- 4 Conclusion
- References

Abstract

In the field of urban and regional planning, France and Germany have shown several analogies since the beginning of the modern age. However, there is still a difference between more centralised governance processes (France) and a stronger position of the municipalities (Germany). But the planning strategies of France and Germany have moved closer together. A comparison covering about 100 years must differentiate between German planning strategies in East and West Germany for a considerable period.

Urban planning has been influenced by similar models like the Athens Charter or the Leipzig Charter. The latter, a European document, was renewed in 2020. Furthermore, in both countries, similar paths can be identified: the pursuit of a strong technical focus, the tendency towards sustainable development, more flexibility, the growing importance of integrated policies and the challenges of urban sprawl. Main doctrines like integration, participation and future orientation have accompanied urban and regional planning in Germany as well as in France.

Keywords

Integration – sustainable development – competitiveness – participation – open spaces

1 Introduction

This chapter aims to identify the doctrines that guided urban development at the central level in terms of both spatial and urban planning.

A doctrine can be defined as a set of beliefs or principles reflecting a conception of society and often completed by rules of thought or conduct. A doctrine is a matter of principles and part of an ideology. In this respect the planner Françoise Choay (1965) identified two main models: the culturalist model that refers more to the past and another progressive and modernist model. All doctrinal bodies use a variety of reference frames (Faludi/van der Valk 1994; Scholl/Elgendy/Nollert 2007; Adam/Fritzsche 2017; Baudelle/Gaultier 2018): sustainable urban planning (Carriou/Ratouis 2014), cohesion, diversity, attractiveness, competitiveness, urbanity, polycentrism, urban renewal, compactness, integrated urban development, cooperation, spatial equity and even territorial equality – France thus at one time had a *Ministère de l'égalité des territoires* (Ministry of Territorial Equality, 2012-2014), a claim that was wilfully mocked (Estèbe 2005).

This contribution summarises the main principles that have guided French and German planning since the end of the Second World War and addresses issues such as the dissemination of models and the possible chance of convergence between the two countries, possibly as a result of European integration.

2 France: a long-standing, constantly renewed tradition of centralised government that does not prevent doctrinal evolution

2.1 A centralised system

In France, the crucial role of central government has never been questioned. This is path dependent, due to the deep historical rooting of the relations between national and local levels in the field of urban planning, particularly since the 19th century (Oblet 2005). The lack of any local decision-making process before the 1980s explains the long-standing state power in defining urban planning tools and significant planning policies that shape urban development, even if they were not designed directly for this purpose. Various Five-Year Plans implemented during the post-war decades have aimed to restore production and infrastructure and modernise the production system. In this context, cities were conceived as tools to strengthen national productivity, forcing them to adapt their structure.

At the end of the war, city development was highly supervised by the state with a famous regional policy, the so-called *aménagement du territoire* (spatial planning) (Jean/Vanier 2009; Desjardins/Geneau de Lamarlière 2016), before the progressive decentralisation of planning power from the beginning of the 1980s onwards. This is a rare case in Europe of highly deliberate and iconic, successive policies from the middle of the 20th century (Caro/Dard/Daumas 2002; Alvergne/Musso 2003) to a relatively recent period of strong transformation.

2.2 The technical planning phase and its doctrines (1945-1982)

There are two main phases (Desjardins 2017). The first ran until the early 1980s, dominated by the planning regime, technical and strong-willed, strengthened by the creation of the *Délégation interministérielle à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'attractivité régionale* (DATAR – Interministerial Delegation for Spatial Planning and Regional Attractiveness) in 1963. Following the famous pamphlet by Gravier (1947), the objective was above all to rebalance the national territory in favour of the provinces. This effort was to be based inter alia on the structuring of an 'urban framework' (Hautreux/Lecourt/Rochefort 1963), especially by the eight famous so-called *métropoles d'équilibre* (balancing metropolitan areas). Actually, this attempt was not really central as urban development policies were mainly devoted to the implementation of three successive paradigms: infrastructure, modernisation and productivity.

Infrastructure policies were prioritised as in the 1950s most cities had only basic infrastructure for water supply, wastewater treatment or waste management, and few urban departments had the capacity to manage them. Modernisation was viewed as a wider paradigm including the broad scope of housing and experimentation with industrialised construction processes such as the so-called *politique dite des modèles d'innovation* (innovation model policy) (Direction de la Construction 1974). Finally, at a time of full growth (Fourastié 1979), the paradigm of productivity thoroughly shaped urban development, aiming at expanding CBDs in the old historic centres through so-called urban renewal policies which involved demolishing insalubrious central areas.

Hence, an initial spatial planning doctrine was conceived as early as the 1950s in the context of increasing regulatory planning supported by new laws, resulting in the widespread imposition of *Plans d'urbanisme directeur* (PUD – Urban Master Plans) soon renamed *Plans directeurs d'urbanisme* (PDU – Urban Master Plans). These plans were guided by three principles. First, the specialisation of space, resulting from the zoning rules of the 1930s, which led to the designation of *Zones à urbaniser en priorité* (ZUP – Prioritised Urban Development Zones) in the outskirts (1958-1969). France particularly adhered to the Athens Charter's functionalist principles, building 800,000 dwellings in nearly 200 ZUPs which succeeded the large multifamily housing estates (the so-called *grands ensembles*) already mainly made up of towers and blocks of flats, unlike the Northern European countries which were dominated by single-family housing programmes (United Kingdom, Benelux, Federal Republic of Germany, Nordic countries). Centralisation coupled with powerful standardisation and helped by the industrialisation of construction probably explains this zeal. Following the same logic, numerous industrial areas, shopping centres and university campuses were planned. This widespread zoning principle seems to have been inspired by the German *Zonung* allocation, a vision established by the first land-use plans (*abgestufte Bauordnungen*) (Gemünd 1913), like Franz Adickes' 1891 plan for Frankfurt. Today, already in terms of growing cities, this principle is confronted with a critical view that aims at more diversity and flexibility.

The second doctrine at work in urban planning led to a decoupling between urbanity and mobility, which was due to a vision of mobility that aimed to achieve a more efficient process of modernisation (Wiel 2005; Mangin 2004). Bypasses were planned in each city following a new model in line with the Buchanan report (1963), in addition to a very important road and rail policy (especially in Greater Paris for the latter).

Finally, the modernist state doctrine promoted new urban ‘centralities’, leading to contrasting policies towards the historic centres: for some sanctuarisation and heritage promotion (so-called *secteurs sauvegardés* [protected area] policy), for others radical urban renewal by slum clearance and concrete-dominated platforms over underground car parks (the so-called *urbanisme sur dalle* [urban design on slabs]) to establish new *cités administratives* (administrative cities) and Central Business Districts (CBDs) such as La Part Dieu in Lyon or Meriadeck in Bordeaux.

These specialisation doctrines also guided spatial planning policies on a wider scale. For example, the New Towns Model inspired by the United Kingdom and Northern Europe gave rise to the unilateral foundation by the central state of eight New Towns in the mid-1960s: five in Greater Paris, three in certain *métropoles d’équilibre* (Lille, Lyon, Marseille) and one near Rouen, initially remaining faithful to zoning and traffic separation principles. These New Towns also served as laboratories for the 1967 *loi d’orientation foncière* (LOF – Basic Land Act) (Vadelorge 2014), which in the 1970s led to the establishment of the first master plans for the metro areas, the highly technical *Schéma directeur d’aménagement et urbanisme* (SDAU – Master Plan for Development and Urban Planning) designed by central state services without consulting the municipalities, which had neither power in urban planning nor engineering resources. There was no further consultation with the first intermunicipal bodies created in 1967 in Lille, Lyon and Marseille. Spatial planning was exclusively based on demographic and econometric growth models.

At the same time, growth and regional policy favoured Fordist-type productive expansion at all levels of the urban system. Since the 1950s, the state had supported the spontaneous process of industrial deconcentration in search of a cheap and non-unionised workforce outside congested Greater Paris, soon followed by a determined manufacturing decentralisation policy run by the DATAR (Saint-Julien 1982; Baudelle/Fache 2015). This policy led to the establishment of new automobile assembly plants in western cities (Le Mans, Rennes, Seine Valley) and in the north-eastern industrial areas affected by the mining recession. This policy has strengthened the spatial division of labour between the capital city (largely monopolising executive tasks and headquarters) and the provinces (confined to low-skilled jobs).

In the 1960s and 1970s the doctrine led to other national development policies, such as tourist resorts sometimes being created ex nihilo both in the mountains (Les Ménuires) and on the seashore (La Grande-Motte), and to new huge industrial port areas (Dunkerque, Fos-sur-Mer, Le Havre, Saint-Nazaire) (De Roo 1988; Baudelle 2008).

Industrial expansion, migration to the cities, the policy of decentralising service jobs, and the dramatic development of schools, hospitals and cultural infrastructure explain why medium-sized cities (20,000-200,000 people) experienced the most growth between 1954 and 1975 at a time when the increase in the urban population was two to three times faster than in subsequent periods. In the 1980s, the expansion of higher education (new polytechnics, engineering schools, universities and campuses) and the feverish development of science parks (Certain, 1988) widened the geographic spread of the momentum.

2.3 A decentralisation phase since the beginning of the 1980s

The second phase is characterised by a gradual transformation of roles in planning and the emergence of a first-generation governance regime (multiplication of intervention scales, enlarged and more complex system of stakeholders). This step matches the 1982-1983 power shift which strengthened municipal abilities in urban planning and the prerogatives of the departments (councils) and *régions* with a move to elected assemblies. Recently (2014 and 2016), two important acts (MAPTAM and NOTRe)¹ have increased the strategic competences of *régions* and so-called metropolises in local development, perhaps along the lines of the German model (powerful *Länder* [federal states], *Metropolregionen* [Metropolitan regions]), in order to foster bodies of European rank and to implement principles of territorial equality and territorial solidarity.

2.4 Two new doctrines: priority geography and competitiveness (1980-2000)

The very interventionist state vision aimed at guaranteeing the equality of territories in support of an isotropic doctrine persisted until the beginning of the 1990s, leading indirectly to dramatic urban sprawl boosted by the equal accessibility principle, which included the accessibility by road (especially by the motorway network) of any place. But this doctrine was not immune to two major rising concerns that changed the previous territorial differentiation principle: on the one hand social mix, and on the other hand competitiveness conceived as an extension of the paradigm of productivity.

There was increasing worry over the impoverishment of large housing estates that resulted from the increase in owner occupation of single-family dwellings in suburban developments by the middle and upper classes. In the early 1980s, this engendered a new generation of urban policies focusing on social mix. This spatial doctrine led to the 'priority geography' of the *Politique de la Ville* (Town Policy), actually devoted to the regeneration of the most deprived peripheral neighbourhoods. This focus explains the first break in the principle of the hitherto equality standard of spatial development

1 *Loi de Modernisation de l'Action Publique Territoriale et d’Affirmation des Métropoles* (MAPTAM – Law on Modernisation of Public Territorial Action and Affirmation of Metropolises 2014) and *Loi portant Nouvelle Organisation Territoriale de la République* (NOTRe – Law on the New Territorial Organisation of the Republic 2015).

with the introduction of the principle of *positive discrimination* inspired by the United Kingdom ‘Educational Priority Areas’ and the US ‘area approach’. Combining economic (employment), social (education, security) and urban (housing, equipment) perspectives, this policy has extended the zoning vision of spatial planning through the definition of priority areas where the state concentrates financial allocations. Aiming to achieve *développement social des quartiers* (district social development), then *développement social urbain* (urban social development), this generously funded priority geographical approach is now superimposed as a world apart from other planning policies. Its culminating point was the 1994 pact of recovery with the implementation of numerous so-called *Zones franches urbaines* (ZFU – Urban Free Zones), *Zones de revitalisation urbaine* (ZRU – Urban Revitalisation Zones) and *Zones urbaines sensibles* (ZUS – Sensitive Urban Zones).

In 2000 this ultra-zoned policy gave way to so-called ‘integrated urban development models’ betting on a leverage effect via the new massive intervention doctrine *Grands projets urbains* (GPU – Major Urban Projects, 1991-1994) and then *Grands projets de ville* (GPV – Major Urban Projects, 2000-2006). The rise of intermunicipal cooperation since 1999 has strengthened the principle of fiscal solidarity between municipalities in the same agglomeration.

The 1990s witnessed both the emergence of sustainable development as a new principle of urban regulation (see Kanning/Scholles/Mancebo 2022) and the promotion of competitiveness in the context of increasing interurban competition (Motte 2006), also influenced by European policies within institutional adaptation processes (Dühr/Stead/Zonneveld 2007). At the same time the central state has suffered from a loss of legitimacy due to its relative powerlessness in the face of the economic crisis and the accentuation of socio-spatial inequalities, resulting in the rescaling of public action (Brenner 2004). The tightening of European competition regulation leading to a virtual ban on state aid to large companies has also considerably limited traditional state capacity for the spatial redistribution of activities based on regional planning grants (so-called *Aides à finalité régionale*). Consequently, the support for competitiveness provided by the 2007-2013 cohesion policy has made the 71 *pôles de compétitivité* (competitiveness clusters) the main regional policy tool in France.

2.5 Empowering territories in the face of ecological imperatives

The new cohesion policy acknowledged the major role of (larger) cities in wealth creation. More broadly, it sustained the principle of an integrated and place-based approach, so that differentialism rather than equality was at the heart of the 2020 creation of the new *Agence nationale de la cohésion des territoires* (ANCT – National Agency for Territorial Cohesion), a European-inspired lexicon. Its creation targeted the integrated implementation of territorial and urban growth policies, through the merger of several national institutions: the former *Commissariat général à l'égalité des territoires* (CGET – General Commission for Territorial Equality) that replaced the former *Délégation interministérielle à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'attractivité régionale* (DATAR – Interministerial Delegation for Spatial Planning and Regional Attractiveness), the *Établissement public national d'aménagement et de restruc-*

turation des espaces commerciaux (Epareca – National Public Body for the Development and Restructuring of Commercial Areas) and the *Agence du numérique* (AdN – Digital Agency) responsible for broadband infrastructure, mobile phone networks and digitalisation. The goal was also to strengthen the relationship with other major agencies in the field of housing (*Agence nationale de l'habitat* – ANAH), urban renewal (*Agence nationale pour la rénovation urbaine* – ANRU), the environment (*Agence de l'environnement et de la maîtrise de l'énergie* – ADEME) and spatial planning (*Centre d'études et d'expertise sur les risques, l'environnement, la mobilité et l'aménagement* – CEREMA). Moreover, the founding of ANCT confirmed the principle of a differentiation of territories that put an end to the utopia of territorial equality in favour of tailor-made programmes.

So European political orientations have played a central role in the rise of a capacity and capability building paradigm and the opening of a new arena of complex relations between *régions* and official integrated metro areas (so-called *métropoles*, intermunicipal cooperation bodies). This concern for self-government, more technical than inspired by any political philosophy (Lopez/Pellegrino/Coutard 2019), has occurred in the context of the decline of state interventionism and increasing ecological concern about climate change, declining biodiversity, and economically counterproductive and ecologically unsustainable suburbanisation. Beside the aims of social cohesion and diversity (challenging urban ghettos), the struggle against urban sprawl in favour of the environment was strengthened by the Grenelle Acts (2009-2010) which established new spatial planning principles (green and blue belts) through application of the EU's environmental guidelines on ecological and biodiversity corridors, making this regulation the new priority of city planning. In addition, a coercive containment of urban development aimed at re-aggregating mobility and urbanity has been introduced, for example by imposing public transport infrastructure on any new mall or business centre project².

This rise of environmental considerations means the decline of some long-standing city planning theories (Ascher 2000). To stimulate local capacities, subsequent generations of calls for projects have sought to encourage city governance while maintaining state intervention in specific areas, such as the core of shrinking medium-sized cities as illustrated by the 222 *Actions cœurs de villes* (Heart of Town – City Centre Actions) launched in 2018 or, again, the regeneration policies for the poor suburbs now implemented via highly integrated instruments such as the *Programmes d'investissement d'avenir* (PIA – Future Investment Programmes). This '*gouverner à distance*' ('remote government') (Epstein 2005) is changing the techniques of central state monitoring of local urban-planning, decision-making processes.

In the end, French central planning remains true to a traditional governance, dominated by instrumented rationality: top-down decision making, central control, closed action, single authority, directive leadership style, formal policy goals, system behaviour determined by components and representative democracy (Allmendinger 2017). Locally, by contrast, governance is shifting towards collaborative planning, which

2 *Loi pour l'accès au logement et un urbanisme rénové* (ALUR Act – Law on Access to Housing and Urban Renewal) 2014, Article 157.

involves experimentation, discursive design processes, and planning as a communicative process incorporating the construction of various arenas (Healey 1992). It is thus becoming ‘collaborative complex adaptative system (CAS) planning’, including interdependent networks, distributed monitoring, an open system, divided authority, guided interactions providing opportunities, elected agents and resources, a generative leading style, the realisation of collective action, and system behaviour determined by interactions and deliberative democracy (Booher/Innes 2018).

3 Germany: The adjustment of spatial doctrines on the way towards a joint national approach to urban development

3.1 The beginning of modern urban development in Germany

The Athens Charter (1933) has to be mentioned as the central idea that forms the modern city all over Europe. In times of polluting industries, urban functions were to be separated – probably beyond what the Modernists advocated (Gintrand 2020). Rapid industrialisation at the beginning of the 19th century required action to regulate and to compensate the negative consequences, to provide housing and to develop transport infrastructure. Living conditions within the especially highly industrialised German urban agglomerations deteriorated with more and more air pollution and less open and green spaces to relax in and rehabilitate from the hard work. Therefore, at the beginning of the 20th century, open spaces emerged in Germany as a structuring and compensating element of urban planning. Urban agglomerations began to expand beyond their administrative borders. Exhibitions on urban development took place in 1910 in Düsseldorf and Berlin. They brought the idea of regional parks and green corridors from the USA to Germany. Robert Schmidt, a famous German engineer and planner, realised these ideas for the enormously industrialised Ruhr area and set up a network of green open spaces to limit further uncontrolled industrial land use (KVR 1995; Reiß-Schmidt 1996). Another example is the Cologne greenbelt. Promoted during the 1920s by Cologne’s mayor (Konrad Adenauer), Fritz Schumacher planned green areas to protect open spaces and to integrate sport facilities (Bauer 2014). In general, ideas at the time were based on a much older tradition of urban parks that could be traced back to earlier centuries (DGGL 2018).

Furthermore, the growing industrialisation of cities required housing and an expansion of settlement areas. Since the beginning of the 20th century, new models of urban development had emerged and were realised in German cities. They were influenced by the English idea of the Garden City (Koch 1984; see Figure 1). One of the first foundations of a garden city with a strong combination of production and housing was found in Dresden-Hellerau (Lindner/Lühr 2008).

An additional relevant orientation was established by the architectural *Bauhaus* movement, an academic school with a strong position at the University of Weimar (later on in Dessau). Architects, planners and artists created new ideas. They influenced architecture as well as urban development by using the new opportunities offered by industrial production. Along with other models, they paved the way for large housing estates (Baumann 2007).



Margarethenhöhe was one of the early German garden cities. The settlement was initiated and supported by Margarethe Krupp in order to build a liveable environment for working-class people. New housing estates, founded by industrial employers, are among the typical elements of urban development found during the period of growing industrialisation.

Figure 1: Margarethenhöhe Essen / Source: Brigitte Adam 2017

These approaches are visible parts of today's cities and urban regions in Germany. Moreover, they reflect two very important characteristics of urban development as stable doctrines: integration and an orientation towards the future. Integration is particularly manifested as cross-sectorial planning while the future orientation can be seen in attempts to conserve open spaces and to react to obviously unlimited population growth. These doctrines accompanied urban development in Germany over the following decades – modified from time to time in order to adapt them to the changing conditions of each new period.

A third doctrine of urban development did not yet exist at this point: participation in dialogue- and process-oriented planning. At the beginning of the modern age, urban development and planning were exclusively seen as technically determined ideas and affairs.

3.2 Reconstruction, functionality and urban expansion

After the Second World War, two politically different German republics arose. While West Germany's constitution gave a lot of responsibility to the local level, the German Democratic Republic was centrally organised. In total, there was a gigantic lack of housing. In both countries the *gegliederte und aufgelockerte Stadt* (segmented and dispersed city) became the leading model for reconstructing cities. Not far from the ideas of the beginning of the 20th century, green settlements with less multi-storey buildings were created. In this way, particularly in the eastern part of Germany, large housing estates were constructed following the idea of functional separation (BBR 2000).

Old housing stock was rebuilt or radically renewed. Representative axes and open squares became typical new elements of the East German cities. Particularly in West Germany, even soon after the Second World War, the model of the car-oriented city became important. Many cities had been completely destroyed (e.g. Kassel) and could be rebuilt in a new modern form suitable for the growth in car transport (Reichow 1959).

At first, all these reconstructions happened more or less as top-down planning initiatives. But at the end of the 1950s, urban planning in West Germany became a public political affair that gained more and more public interest. The third element of German urban development doctrines became visible: participation. Already in 1955, a conference with the motto *Der Stadtplan geht uns alle an* (the urban plan concerns us all) attracted great attention. This was a signal. Citizens had to be directly involved in planning processes (Albers/Wékel 2008: 28).

Nevertheless, during the 1960s in both parts of Germany, cities grew and expanded outwards without any marked protest. Large housing estates as satellite towns with high residential towers and integrated infrastructure were constructed. These approaches followed the idea of industrialised urban development that had been created in the 1920s. The leading model behind the movement was *Urbanität durch Dichte* (urbanity by density). In West Germany, single-family houses also developed at the periphery (BBR 2000). A strong belief in processes of growth supported the orientation towards the future.

3.3 The era of urban renewal and planning euphoria

The present planning system and planning strategies are mainly based on urban development in West Germany. In 1960, the parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany passed the *Bundesbaugesetz* (Federal Building Code). Later on, in 1971 the *Städtebauförderungsgesetz* (Urban Renewal and Development Act) came into force. In line with the Athens Charter, the *Bundesbaugesetz* focused on a planning strategy based on the idea of functionally oriented land-use planning, which consists of two steps with a difference in precision. The sequential approach had characterised land-

use planning activities since the 1930s (Heigl 1984). Now these steps were established by law. The *Städtebauförderungsgesetz* was aimed at the urban regeneration and modernisation of housing estates. At first entire districts were replaced by new modern constructions and urban structures. This resulted in old central cores disappearing and being lost for the future (see Figure 2). People received new homes instead of conserving and modernising the existing ones, in some cases historic structures (Zöpel 2011). With very negative connotations, these forms of urban development were called *Flächensanierung* (large-scale redevelopment of urban areas).

Cities continued to be developed in a car-oriented manner and large housing estates were given fresh impetus – in West as well as East Germany, whereby at least from the 1970s car-based mobility increased considerably (Albers/Wékel 2008: 39).



Newly built during the 1970s, combined with an extensive and ambitious plan, linked with the environment, functionally oriented on trade and business; housing estates to compensate for the gaps were built outside the centre.

Figure 2: The city centre of Bad Godesberg / Source: Brigitte Adam 2019

Following the first big urban renewal projects and *Flächensanierung* in West Germany, people began to demonstrate and protest against the destruction and neglect of traditional buildings and structures (Der Spiegel 1980). West Germany went through a period when ordinary people outside the German parliament became strongly involved in decision-making processes. The urban development laws and planning

processes provided opportunities for more public participation. In 1976, the *Bundesbaugesetz* established participation as the first of what were to be two participation steps.

In the meanwhile, planning methods were developed. In addition to the growing role of participation, urban planning was established as a multidimensional, future-oriented concept, and cross-sectorial planning was extended and included e.g. financial planning. So-called *integrierte Stadtentwicklung* (integrated urban development) as a comprehensive, informal programme for urban development – passed by local parliaments but extending beyond law-based land-use planning – completed the urban development approach. Along with a set of planning methods, integrated urban development planning became a system consisting of (Albers/Wèkel 2008): stocktaking, monitoring; forecast scenarios; concepts, objectives; combined formal and informal approaches; and guaranteed planning objectives.

Planning appeared as a complete solution. It was a new kind of technically determined approach. Research and an extensive (monitoring and prognosis) database gained great influence over integrated programmes and land-use planning. The requirements of citizens seemed to be calculable – was this a step backwards in times of a politically interested public and participation? Without providing an exact answer: this was the beginning of the dialectical development of the aforementioned planning methods and the convictions behind them during the following periods of urban development. The three main doctrines (integration, participation and future orientation) (also identified by Faludi/van der Valk 1990) were adapted to the conditions of each epoch.

3.4 From ‘planning by projects’ towards sustainable urban development

Soon, the lack of predictability of calculations and trends became visible. People did not act in the manner that had been planned, certain multi-storey housing estates of the 1970s remained without sufficient demand and prognoses on the requirement of natural resources, e.g. energy or drinking water, later proved to be absolutely unrealistic. In addition, the whole system of comprehensive integrated planning was threatened by the shrinking financial basis of the municipalities (BMVBS/BBSR 2009).

The notion of comprehensive monitoring and planning was rejected. A new approach was born: ‘planning by projects’ or ‘projects instead of planning’. Again, participation gained a very high status in urban development and planning, but problems involving the reduced emphasis given to the future orientation and the isolated view of project planning rapidly required correction. Karl Ganser, head of the international Emscherpark construction exhibition (1989-1999), modified German urban development by establishing so-called *perspektivischer Inkrementalismus* (perspective incrementalism). This referred to a kind of project planning embedded in a framework of comprehensive and future ideas for the whole city or urban region (Reicher/Niermann/Schauz 2011). During the Emscherpark exhibition, this model of planning was implemented as a big project to revitalise the old industrialised and structurally weak Ruhr area. Planning was not only combined with building but also with festivalisation projects.

Time passed, Germany was reunified and in 1992 the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development delivered a new basic idea for politics and planning: sustainable development. During the 1980s the *Bundesbaugesetz* was reformed into the *Baugesetzbuch*. The former *Bundesbaugesetz* (General Urban Development Law) and the *Städtebauförderungsgesetz* (Special Urban Development Law) were condensed. At the end of the 1990s, the objective of sustainable urban development was included. Sustainable urban development requires the equal integration of ecological, social and economic affairs (and therefore automatically a cross-sectorial view) with a strong focus on participation, dialogue processes and future orientation. Moreover, urban development has moved towards the idea of multifunctional urban districts with short and walkable connections (BMVBS/BBR 2000).

The 'career' of sustainable development led to a further elaboration of integrated urban development. Its new focus could be seen as a synthesis of isolated project planning, on the one hand, and the former comprehensive approach that regarded planning or planners as all-knowing, on the other hand. The 'new' integrated urban development was recognised as an informal and future-oriented urban development strategy interacting with formal building laws. Monitoring and prognosis regained a stronger position. Munich, for example, has a monitoring system for sustainable development and Berlin combines data and strategies to form a climate urban development plan (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung 2011). Moreover, people are increasingly persuaded that data are not only numbers but might also be derived from local urban development monitoring. Citizens can also be experts. Research – studies or model projects – supports planning instead of absolutely determining it (Albers/Wékel 2008: 30).

3.5 The Leipzig Charter against the background of different urban challenges

Integrated urban development was also the leading thesis of the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities. This charter on urban development was adopted by the EU Member States in 2007. It mirrored the spatial doctrines (integration, participation and future orientation) and put them into the current European context. Its main objectives were to further self-determination and the participation of citizens, and to promote multifunctional structures, the qualification of public spaces and the integration of deprived urban districts.

Ten years after German reunification and after many efforts to modernise and to renew the cities in the eastern part of Germany, shrinking processes (also in big cities, e.g. Leipzig or Dresden) have led to a joint programme at national level and at the level of the German federal states: *Stadtumbau* (urban redevelopment). Urban redevelopment is intended to strengthen inner cities by reducing apartments, mainly those built from prefabricated slabs (*Plattenbauten*) on the edges of cities. In the meanwhile, cities in West Germany had to face similar problems. The programme was therefore extended all over Germany. In order to receive local financial support, an integrated urban development concept had to be presented.

The millennium heralded the turnaround. Since then, Germany's big cities have begun to grow again. Today, Leipzig is one of the cities with the highest population growth rates. One of the biggest challenges of today is to offer affordable housing especially in the fast-growing cities. After decades of growth, the per capita living floor space is now shrinking in the largest German cities (Statistisches Bundesamt 2019). Nevertheless, there are still shrinking towns in Germany, above all small towns in rural areas, but also larger ones in old industrial areas.

Another major programme, called *Soziale Stadt* (Social City – an urban redevelopment programme), aims to improve deprived parts of the city. Observing and monitoring the city reveals problematic and growing divergences between urban districts. A very strongly integrated approach is intended to help stabilise and improve the situation in these deprived urban neighbourhoods. Social, environmental and housing issues are considered simultaneously. Action plans are implemented as cross-sectorial approaches with direct local participation (Franke/Löhr/Sander 2000). Once more, financial support is dependent on the development of integrated concepts.

The above-mentioned programmes (*Stadtumbau* and *Soziale Stadt*) are part of the German urban planning and urban development assistance initiative of the federal government and the federal states, intended to support urban development at the local level. They were initiated in 1971 in the context of the *Städtebauförderungsgesetz* and are continuously adapted to changing problems. Since 2007, they have been integrated into the *Nationale Stadtentwicklungspolitik* (National Urban Development Policy) that combines efforts at all administrative levels and involves people and stakeholders in planning and implementation, e.g. by carrying out model projects (Nationale Stadtentwicklungspolitik 2021).

Climate change also requires answers in the field of urban development. At the moment, there are signs of a tendency to enrich – without in any way replacing – the sustainable development concept with a concept of future-compliant 'resilient cities' (Fekkek/Fleischhauer/Greiving et al. 2016). Although the resilient city is more strongly linked to climate change and to climate disasters, it does not change the focus on integration. Furthermore, the importance of green and open spaces has to be recognised as a key factor of success. The recent objective of climate protection and adaptation to climate change goes back to the roots of modern urban development in Germany. In 2017 the German urban development ministry published the *Weißbuch Stadtgrün* (Green Spaces in the City White Paper). The White Paper presents the result of an extensive dialogue process involving many different stakeholders. The preparation and implementation of the White Paper were accompanied by research projects for which the BBSR is responsible. In spite of strong population growth in many cities, green and open spaces have to be conserved and qualified. Along with positive effects on the city, climate green cities increase their attractiveness and their liveability. Moreover, cities need a balanced distribution of green spaces. Again, the social aspect of green areas is being clearly considered in urban development.

4 Conclusion

The comparison between France and Germany reveals similar trends and clear similarities in city planning due to the dissemination of reference frames and models, at least between France and the former Federal Republic of Germany. The main doctrines like integration, participation and future orientation have accompanied urban planning in both countries throughout the course of modern urban planning. On both sides of the Rhine, urban development has developed from an approach based on the functional view of the Athens Charter towards a more specific and collaborative planning approach. Of course the German Democratic Republic (GDR), which adopted Soviet planning principles, remained on a different path until reunification.

Since the 1990s, sustainable development has become a main focus. In recent years, urban development has increasingly evolved as a collaborative framework for national and local levels – and for private actors as well, but without any real neoliberal shift comparable to the UK or USA.

Not surprisingly, differences arise due to the more centralised approach in France compared to federal Germany. Planning at the level of the German federal states always has to let the municipalities exercise their right to control land-use planning. However, the *Baugesetzbuch* is put in place by the German parliament and is binding for all German municipalities. The national level has been seen to play an active role, which is often understated when viewed from France. In similar terms, the decentralisation of town planning in France must not be underestimated by German observers.

Questions remain about the impact of the European Union. The Leipzig Charter seems to have been more influential in Germany than in France, where the Aalborg Charter is more frequently referred to. Can we nevertheless foresee a Europeanisation process in planning through the convergence of objectives? For example, the European Union wants ‘to reach the state of no net land take by 2050’ (EC 2011: 15), an objective taken up by the French 2018 *Plan biodiversité* (Biodiversity Plan), the government think tank *France Stratégie* (Fosse 2019) and an instruction addressed to Prefects in 2019 (Cavailhès 2019). It is likely that such orientations will bring about a convergence of development strategies and urban planning tools in France and Germany, inter alii.

References

- Adam, B.; Fritzsche, S. (2017): The European City – a Model for Future Urban Development and its Elements, *Die Erde*, 143 (1-2), 105-127.
- Albers, G.; Wékel, J. (2008): *Stadtplanung. Eine illustrierte Einführung*. Darmstadt.
- Allmendinger, P. (2017): *Planning theory*. London.
- Alvergne, C.; Musso, P. (2003): *Les grands textes de l'aménagement du territoire et de la décentralisation*. Paris.
- Ascher, F. (2000): *Ces évènements nous dépassent, feignons d'en être les organisateurs*. La Tour d'Aigue.
- Baudelle, G. (2008): «Construire ensemble les territoires»: les transformations récentes du modèle français d'aménagement. In: Arnould P.; Baudelle G. (eds.): «Construire les territoires». Paris, 145-158. = *Historiens & Géographes* 403.

- Baudelle, G.; Fache, J. (eds.) (2015): Les mutations des systèmes productifs en France. Rennes.
- Baudelle, G.; Gaultier, G. (eds.) (2018): Les nouvelles fabriques de la ville. Objets, référentiels et méthodes. Rennes.
- Bauer, J. (2014): Perspektiven der Freiraumvernetzung in Köln. In: *RaumPlanung* (172), 14-19.
- Baumann, K. (2007): Bauhaus Dessau. Architektur-Gestaltung-Idee. Berlin.
- BBR – Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (ed.) (2000): Urban Development and Urban Policy in Germany. An Overview. Bonn. = Berichte 6.
- BMVBS – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung; BBSR – Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung (eds.) (2009): Integrierte Stadtentwicklung in Stadtregionen. Bonn. = BBSR-Online-Publikation 37/2009.
- BMVBS – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung; BBR – Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (eds.) (2000): Nutzungsmischung im Städtebau – Endbericht. Bonn. = Werkstatt: Praxis Heft 2.
- Booher, D. E.; Innes, J. E. (2018): Planning with Complexity. An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy. London.
- Brenner, N. (2004): New State Spaces. Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood. Oxford.
- Buchanan, C. (ed.) (1963): Traffic in Towns: A study of the long term problems of traffic in urban areas. Report to the Ministry of Transport. London.
- Caro, P. Dard, O.; Dumas, J. (eds.) (2002): La politique d'aménagement du territoire. Racines, logiques et résultats. Rennes.
- Carriou, C.; Ratouis, O. (2014): Quels modèles pour l'urbanisme durable? In: *Metropolitiques*, 25.06.2014.
<http://www.metropolitiques.eu/Quels-modeles-pour-l-urbanisme.html> (25 June 2014).
- Cavailhès, J. (2019): Zéro artificialisation nette des sols en 2050?
https://politiquedulogement.com/2019/10/zero-artificialisation-nette-des-sols-en-2050/#_edn3 (25 May 2021).
- Certaines, J. (1988): La fièvre des technopoles. Paris.
- Choay, F. (1965): Urbanisme, utopies et réalités: une anthologie. Paris.
- De Roo, P. (1988): Atlas de l'aménagement du territoire. Paris.
- Desjardins, X. (2017): L'aménagement du territoire. Paris.
- Desjardins, X.; Géneau de Lamarlière, I. (eds.) (2016): L'aménagement du territoire en France. Paris.
- DGGL – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Gartenkunst und Landschaftskultur e.V. (ed.) (2018): Kulturelles Erbe „Gärten, Parks und Landschaften. München. = Themenbuch 13.
- Direction de la construction (1974): Modèles innovation 1973 [et] 1974. Paris.
- Dühr, S.; Stead, D.; Zonneveld, W. (2007): The Europeanization of spatial planning through territorial cooperation. In: *Planning Practice and Research*, 22(3), 291-307.
- EC – European Commission (2011): Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe. Brussels: 20.9.2011, COM (2011) 571 final.
[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/com/com_com\(2011\)0571_/com_com\(2011\)0571_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/com/com_com(2011)0571_/com_com(2011)0571_en.pdf) (28 May 2021).
- Epstein, R. (2005): Gouverner à distance: Quand l'Etat se retire des territoires. In: *Esprit* (11), 96-111.
- Estèbe, P. (2015): L'égalité des territoires: une passion française. Paris.
- Faludi, A.; van der Valk, A. (1990): De groeikernen als hoekstenen van de Nederlandse ruimtelijke planning doctrine. Assen.
- Faludi, A.; van der Valk, A. (1994): Rule and Order: Dutch Planning Doctrine in the Twentieth Century. Kluwer. Dordrecht.
- Fekkek, M.; Fleischhauer, M.; Greiving, S.; Lucas, R.; Schinkel, J.; von Winterfeld, U. (2016): Resiliente Stadt – Zukunftsstadt. Wuppertal.
https://epub.wupperinst.org/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/6614/file/6614_Resiliente_Stadt.pdf (8 January 2020).
- Fosse, J. (2019): Objectif 'zéro artificialisation nette': quels leviers pour protéger les sols? France stratégie. Paris.
- Fourastié, J. (1979): Les Trente Glorieuses, ou la révolution invisible de 1946 à 1975. Paris.
- Franke, T.; Lühr, R.; Sander, R. (2000): Soziale Stadt - Stadterneuerungspolitik als Stadtpolitik-erneuerung. In: AfK – Archiv für Kommunalwissenschaften. AfK. Grundlagen, Konzepte, Beispiele (39), 243-268.
- Gemünd, W. (1913): Die Grundlagen zur Besserung der städtischen Wohnverhältnisse. Berlin/Heidelberg.

- GINTRAND, F.** (2020): De la charte d'Athènes : concept de fonction urbaine et zonage. *Chroniques d'Architecture*, April, 14.
<https://chroniques-architecture.com/de-la-charte-dathenes-concept-de-fonction-urbaine-et-zonage/> (28 April 2022).
- GRAVIER J.-F.** (1947): Paris et le désert français: décentralisation, équipement, population. Paris.
- HAUTREUX, J.; LECOURT, R.; ROCHEFORT, M.** (1963): Le niveau supérieur de l'armature urbaine française. Paris, Ministère de la Construction, Commission de l'équipement urbain. Paris.
- HEALEY, P.** (1992): Planning through debate: The communicative turn in planning theory. In: *Town Planning Review* 63 (2), 143-162.
- HEIGL, F.** (1984): Der Städtebau des 20. Jahrhunderts – vom idealen Plan zum idealen Konzept. Teil 1. In: *DBZ* (6), 791-800.
- JEAN, Y.; VANIER, M.** (eds.) (2009): La France, aménager les territoires. Paris.
- KANNING, H.; SCHOLLES, F.; MACEBO, F.** (2022): The sustainable and participatory city: a challenging concept! In: Gustedt, E.; Grabski-Kieron, U.; Demazière, C.; Paris, D. (eds.): *Cities and Metropolises in France and Germany*. Hannover, 145-161. = *Forschungsberichte der ARL* 20.
- KOCH, M.** (1984): Moderner Städtebau der 20er Jahre und seine ideengeschichtlichen Bezüge. In: *disP – The Planning Review* (75), 20-24.
- KVR – Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet** (ed.) (1995): *Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet. Wege, Spuren. Festschrift zum 75jährigen Bestehen des Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet*. Essen.
- LINDER, R.; LÜHR, H.** (eds.) (2008): *Gartenstadt Hellerau: Die Geschichte ihrer Bauten*. Dresden.
- LOPEZ, F.; PELLEGRINO, M.; COUTARD, O.** (2019): *Les territoires de l'autonomie énergétique: Espaces, échelles et politiques*. Londres.
- MANGIN, D.** (2004): *La ville franchisée: Formes et structures de la ville contemporaine*. Paris.
- MOTTE, A.** (2006): *La notion de planification stratégique spatialisée (Strategic Spatial Planning) en Europe (1995-2005)*. Paris-La Défense = *Recherche* 133.
- Nationale Stadtentwicklungspolitik** (2021): *In Städten gestalten wir unsere Zukunft!*
https://www.nationale-stadtentwicklungspolitik.de/NSPWeb/DE/Home/home_node.html (23 April 2021).
- OBLET, T.** (2005): *Gouverner la ville. Les voies urbaines de la démocratie moderne*. Paris.
- REICHER, C.; NIERMANN, L.; SCHAUZ, T.** (2011): Die Festivalisierungen der Internationalen Bauausstellung Emscher Park und ihrer Folgeformate im Ruhrgebiet. In: Altrock, U.; Kunze, R.; Schmitt, G.; Schubert, D. (eds.): *Jahrbuch Stadtregion 2011*. Berlin, 39-51.
- REICHOW, H.** (1959): *Die autogerechte Stadt. Ein Weg aus dem Verkehrs-Chaos*. Ravensburg.
- REIß-SCHMIDT, S.** (1996): Freiraum als regionale Infrastruktur im Ruhrgebiet. In: *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung* (4/5), 259-276.
- Saint-Julien, T.** (1982): *Croissance industrielle et système urbain*. Paris.
- SCHOLL, B.; ELGENDY, H.; NOLLERT, M.** (2007): *Raumplanung in Deutschland – Formeller Aufbau und zukünftige Aufgaben. Spatial Planning in Germany. Formal Structure and Future Tasks*. Karlsruhe. = *Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Städtebau und Landesplanung* 35.
- Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung** (ed.) (2011): *Stadtentwicklungsplan Klima*. Berlin.
- Der Spiegel** (1980): Sanierung haut den Gesündesten um. In: *Der Spiegel* (26), 22.06.1980.
<https://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-14326116.html> (7 January 2020).
- Statistisches Bundesamt** (ed.) (2019): Städte-Boom und Baustau: Entwicklungen auf dem deutschen Wohnungsmarkt 2008 – 2018. In: *Pressemitteilungen des Statistischen Bundesamts* (12), 04.12.2019.
https://www.destatis.de/DE/Presse/Pressemitteilungen/2019/12/PD19_N012_122.html;jsessionid=CD217058221BB38FE6A0408748EFFCFB.internet722 (12 December 2019).
- Vadelorge, L.** (2014): *Retour sur les villes nouvelles. Une histoire urbaine du xxe siècle*. Paris.
- Wiel, M.** (2005): *Ville et mobilité, un couple infernal? La Tour d'Aigues*.
- Zöpel, C.** (2011): 40 Jahre Städtebauförderungsgesetz – ein Grund zum Feiern? In: *Ministerium für Wirtschaft, Energie, Bauen, Wohnen und Verkehr des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen* (ed.): *Bericht zur Stadtentwicklung 2011. 40 Jahre Städtebauförderung in Nordrhein-Westfalen. Erfahrungen und Perspektiven*. Düsseldorf, 15-16.

Authors

Dr. Brigitte Adam, after studying spatial planning in Dortmund (Dipl.-Ing.), she worked as a ‘scientific employee’ at Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg and then as a ‘technical employee’ at the City of Bochum. Since 1992, she has been working as a scientific project manager at the BBSR, and since 2016, she has been responsible for urban monitoring and urban greenery in Division SU 6 Urban, Environmental and Spatial Monitoring. She has taught at various German universities on methods and problems of urban and regional planning (for instance as a visiting professor in summer semester 2001 at the Technical University of Munich).

Guy Baudelle is Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Rennes-2, European Chair Jean Monnet and President of the Institute of Urban Planning of Rennes. His present research fields include regional planning and urban development in France and the European Union, and spatial foresight. He has been the director of several international and national research programmes (DATAR, Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development). He was also Director of the Scientific Committee for the National Research Agency.

Marc Dumont is Professor of Urban Planning at Lille University, a researcher at Territories, Cities, Environment and Societies (TVES lab.) and leads the Urban and Regional Planning Institute of Lille (IAUL). Since 2001, his work has focused on metropolitan and territorial policies, and the dynamics of peri-urban areas. He is Co-Chair of the Metropolitan Transitions (I-Site Lille Nord-Europe University Foundation). Since July 2021, he has presided at the Association for the Promotion of Teaching and Research in Urban Planning and Development (APERAU Internationale).