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VOLUME FIVE, SPECIAL EDITION
Spatial Governance: Bridging Theory and Practice

Each year, plaNext aims to publish two volumes; one of which presents a collection of original works following an open call, and the other presents a selection of articles from the AESOP-YA conference of the previous year. Representing the latter, the 5th Volume of plaNext stems from the 10th AESOP-YA Annual Conference, “Spatial Governance: Bridging Theory and Practice”, held in Ghent (Belgium), March 2016. Invited authors’ contributions went through a rigorous peer-review process in which, Prof. Yvonne Rydin – keynote speaker of the annual conference – from University College London and Dr. Dana Shevah - member of YAN Coordination Team in 2016 – acted as guest editors.

This special edition presents a selection of articles elaborating different planning practice and spatial governance dynamics through a variety of case studies from Central and Western European, Central and Northern African and the Balkan countries. It bunches together critical views of young academics regarding the ways which current spatial governance practices continue to take place in different scales and to extend which they respond to contextual variations in different parts of the world.
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Editorial: Negotiating Urban Space: Initiatives and Innovations in Spatial Governance

Dana Shevah
Technion – Israel Institute of Technology
shevahd@gmail.com

What is so special about the pair of words ‘spatial planning’? Is there any difference when we just say ‘planning’, without adding the word spatial? After all, planning in its essence is spatially bounded. Planning thought and action are depended upon space, namely: cities, regions, metropolitan areas, neighborhoods, shanty-towns, streets, highways, roads, forests, nature reserves, and even the sea shores. Planning as a discipline and as a profession was developed as an integral part of modernity, which has created functional systems, such as planning, that operate according to technocratic principles, i.e., efficiency, bureaucracy, hierarchal chain of authority, which is a-personal and legitimate by the laws of the states (Bauman, 2002). For many decades, planning was motivated by efficiency and actions based on factual knowledge (Friedmann & Hudson, 1974). However, reality proves that scientific and allegedly ‘objective’ knowledge is incapable to ensure the desired outcomes, especially when social relations are involved (Davidoff, 1965; Morris, 1996).

The evolution of the ‘cultural turn’, back in the 1990s, directed planners’ attention towards cultural aspects (Soja, 1999), adding new and more relevant definitions, such as identity, diversity and difference (Fincher & Jacobs, 1998). More specifically, the technocratic modus operandi of planning had slowly changed. Planning researchers and theorists were interested in exploring social phenomena, which were created and driven against the background of race, social, religious, gender or political affiliation, and the ways in which they raise questions regarding identities, meaning, power-relations and every-day life practices (Huxley, 2002; Qadeer, 1997; Watson, 2002). Therefore, planning's vocation had transformed; the emphasis was directed upon the importance of the local community’s needs and preferences, and the necessity to explore space within its local context (Sandercock, 2003; 2004b; Watson, 2006). This shift has marked one of the most eminent gaps between planning theory and planning practice, which exists nowadays.

Critical thinking has stimulated the debate about which knowledge is relevant for planning (Bertolini, 2009), whose knowledge? By whom and for what purpose? (Fenster & Yacobi, 2005; Sandercock, 2004a). This debate has also focused on the ways in which planning produces knowledge about society (Ethington, 2007), and outlined the characteristics and qualities of different kinds of knowledge, such as, scientific, intuitive, professional, ethical, technical, emotional, tactic, objective, etc. (Boelens, 2010). The understanding that planners should learn about the different aspects of places (Healey, 1999), and the different uses and
meanings people bestow to their daily routines (Healey, 1998), allowed to evaluate and re-examine the traditional planning's mission of creating change (Anhorn, 2006).

The institutional spatial planning that operates in the name of experts and for the population required a switch in perception, turning the spotlight to people rather than just to places (Upton, 2005). The recognition that the planning activity occurs within the interface of knowledge and action has contributed to spatial planning, in that greater emphasis is paid upon the process not merely on the outcome (Campbell, 2012). Rather than being rigid and technical, spatial planning, according to Nyseth, Ploger & Holm (2010), is temporary and fluid. Hillier (2008) provides an interesting view of contemporary planning and professional tasks: "I regard planning and planners as experiments or speculations entangled in a series of contingent, networked relationships in circumstances which are both rigid (e.g. legally constrained) and flexible, where outcomes are violated, where problems are not 'solved' once and for all, but which, over the ‘lifetime’ of a strategic plan, are constantly recast by changing actors, situations and preferences, to be reformulated in new perspective" (p.26).

This special issue includes a section of articles that poses fundamental questions regarding how spatial planning is operated today. Four out of five articles present detail account of 'bottom-up' initiatives from different geographical locations and different social, cultural, economic and political contexts across the world, i.e., Germany, Africa, Egypt, and Spain. These case studies and practice experiences stress the power of the 'public', which are citizens and ordinary people in shaping space; they themselves plan and implement their ideas and initiatives. Another paper draws upon the current conditions of the housing market, and the housing policy in Serbia, a post-communist country, indicating on the evidences of socio-spatial inequalities, demonstrated by housing shortage, gentrification, and residential segregation.

Spatial Governance: Debating the Theory-Practice Gap

The 10th AESOP Young Academic conference was held in Ghent, a city with a long tradition in spatial planning, both in theory and practice. Ghent is known as a city that frequently explores and implements innovative planning ideas: from mobility circulation programs and pedestrian areas in the city center, to more recent waterfront renewal plans, port city relations, bicycle circulation plans, promotion of environmental health issue, touristic programs, urban heat adaptation and flood protection.

The conference theme, "Spatial Governance: Bridging Theory and Practice", reflects the main research and educational focus on planning theory and governance in daily practice, adhering to the planning paradigm of 'undefined becoming' through co-evolutionary planning tactics, which have already been applied in climate change, energy transition, urban revitalization and network economy through urban living labs and research. This topic, a subject of discussion for many years, is increasingly important as planning intrinsically deals with uncertainty, environmental change, declining power of governments, financial limits, citizen empowerment and questions of social justice, responsibility and legitimacy. The consequent transitions towards adaptive planning, the integration of resilience thinking and the increasing interest in self-organization and bottom-up planning, all ask for a new definition of the role of academia, which is considered to the be the major contributing force of societal transitions. We had the opportunity to direct the attention towards new types of governance and ways of knowledge development in spatial planning contributing to innovations, in planning thought and in practice as well. In particular, the conference tracks
were interested in exploring how new research approaches move beyond the classical gap between theory and practice, by using mixed-methods, dealing with real-life problems and situations, working with diversified stakeholders in the urban sphere and the complex urban arena.

The call for abstracts invoked unprecedented interest among young academics; 83 abstracts were submitted, and 34 applicants were selected after a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation process. We have had the honour and the unique opportunity to learn from four leading and internationally known scholars: Prof. Karsten Zimmermann, Prof. Yvonne Rydin, Prof. Wilem Salet and Prof. Haim Yacobi. The conference was opened with a public debate, from both academia and planning policy practitioners. Each of the keynotes have enriched the conference participants, as they had given lectures from their own specific expertise, namely, Prof. Karsten Zimmermann talked about governance and spatial planning, debating whether it is a fruitful or rather irreconcilable combination; Prof. Rydin presented a multi-case study research from a relational perspective, through an exploration which uses analysis of urban energy initiatives; Prof. Wilem Salet provoked the very basic notion of spatial planning, wondering about the possibilities to add spatial quality to the engines of society; Prof. Haim Yacobi shared his research experience from Jerusalem and opened up a discussion about planning, protest and the making of a neo-apartheid city.

The papers were divided into four thematic groups, in accordance to four specific tracks: (1) Metropolitan governance, regional planning and planning cultures, led by Prof. Karsten Zimmermann; (2) Strategic planning by public and private actors, urban and regional development, led by Prof. Wilem Salet; (3) Environmental governance, energy and resilience, led by Prof. Yvonne Rydin; (4) Social and political justice, power relations, and urban conflicts, led by Prof. Haim Yacobi.

Moving Beyond the Classical Gap: Contents of the Special Volume

This special issue, the 5th volume of plaNext, presents a selection of articles that outline the 'power from below', in different contexts and from different geographic scales, discussing and analyzing new planning practices and the adaptive dimension of spatial governance. Prof. Yvonne Rydin acted as a Senior Guest Editor. Her professional experience, methodological rigor and careful guidance throughout the review process are highly appreciated.

The paper of Anais De-Keisjer presents an analysis of water services in Bujumbura, Burundi's capital, through a Just-City lens. Anais presents mapping of different actors, such as, the local government, public utilities, civil society, private sector and NGO's, focusing on their role in water system governance, and analyzing justice issues in urban development processes. Her paper addresses marginalized societies, asking who wins and who loses in a multi-actor system, and what can urban practitioners and professionals do, in order to lessen the disadvantages of the disadvantaged. Drawing upon the work of Watson (2002), Anais uses a post-colonial critique on Fainstein's (2010) concept of the Just City, addressing local realities of a southern city, and debating how informality in a southern context challenges notions and conceptions of universality and western-knowledge. The strength of her work is derived from an in-depth analysis of a single case study, which uses different research inquiry tools, such as, document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and field research; highlighting informality and its effect on different urban scales like the household level, the neighborhood level, and the city level. By approaching varied challenging issues, such as citizenship, the right to the city, power relations, environmental degradation, and public health, the paper critically reflects on the performances, strategy and attempts of the citizens
to fill the voids created by the formal water system governance. Her critical stance delicately observes daily life, adding images that illustrate how everyday politics involved in the provision of water vary at different level of society. The article summarizes several suggestions and some action-oriented recommendations in relation to household water supply in Bujumbura.

The article authored by Antonic Branislav discusses housing governance in Serbia, which is a post-communist country. It provides a broad historical overview of housing policies and politics in Serbia, highlighting the creative role of housing agencies. Branislav tackles the pressing issue of affordable housing in Serbia by outlining the underused and substandard housing in rural areas, the devastated multifamily housing in towns and small cities, the noticeable pressure on housing in major cities, and the illegal housing in Serbia's suburbs. The article highlights the lack of a coherent housing policy in Serbia, of which local housing agencies are still rare organized independently and without regulations by local authorities. Under such hostile conditions, this paper compares post-socialist and socialist models regarding the Serbian housing governance, and offers a basic model for housing institutions that is more appropriate to the current conditions in modern Serbia. The new type of model connects between housing governance and territorial planning. The focused reflection on Serbia's housing conditions while following the changes that had occurred over the years, is germane to other post-socialist European countries, and reflects a rise of socio-spatial inequalities in terms of housing shortage, gentrification, and residential segregation.

Elina Kranzle's article draws upon the economic crisis that characterize European cities and how it has led to austerity policies such as foreclosures, welfare and pensions cuts, and regarding urban development: commodification of public spaces. The emergence of squares, and the privatization of empty parking lots and green spaces are evidence of the hegemonic urban development regime that transforms public spaces into a commodity. The central argument of her paper is that urban austerity regimes have turned public spaces, a common good, into a commodity. Nevertheless, bottom-up initiatives in public spaces express discontent of citizens to the economic and political systems, allow reactions, which emphasize the role of public spaces not just at the geographic dimension, but as having a societal role as well. Civic initiatives represent the contestations over the right of the citizens to participate and determine how and by whom public spaces are appropriated. In addition, these bottom-up initiatives also represent the demand to the right to the city. Case-studies from Berlin and Madrid exemplify two European cities that aspire to become global. The renovations of two squares in Madrid's city centre illustrate the rationale of control and commercialization, namely by excluding the local population, reducing the functionality of public spaces, while maximizing the municipality's profitability. In Berlin, the Potsdamer Platz is used as an example that shows how public space transforms into a new business quarter, occupied and owned by global economic giants: Sony, Daimler and A&T. The analysis of the case studies from both Madrid and Berlin, reveal how citizens re-appropriate public spaces that in turn pose an alternative to the hegemonic urban development rationale. As Kranzle summarizes: "while their (the citizens) actions take place on the local level, their aspiration is founded on values of self-organization, cooperation and equality, and thus the city is not just where capitalism take place, but also where imaginations of a different society are lived". Besides the illuminating description and analysis of each case-study, Kranzle contributes to the theoretical debate on participation. By using the models of Tonkiss (2013) and Bonet I Marti (2012), the paper outlines how the production of space occurs from below and the power of 'irruptive participation' that effects governments' reactions and spatial patterns as well.
The article "Urban Trojan" authored by Mohamed Elazzazy and Ahmed Zaazaa, reports on and analyses four different interventions in deprived areas within Egypt, following the revolution of the 25th of January 2011. These initiatives represent 4 case-studies, which are labeled as "urban social innovations". They differ in scale, agenda and structure, and cover a wide spectrum of stakeholders starting from individual initiators, community-based leaders, to NGOs. The authors are interested to understand how to execute urban social innovations, while evaluating the barriers and possibilities of working with and without public authorities. Drawing upon Jessy Marsh work (2015), the selected case-studies are categorized into 3 action-based models. The first model, "working in shadow", addresses a situation of which the initiator of urban social innovation seeks to execute a project without including public authorities. The analysis of the Mozza project, a street art work led by a local female artist, shows how a wall painting of a group of women sitting in a traditional café', next to a café' in historic Cairo, raised the awareness to a gender issue, while provoking the café' as a male dominant space. Another example of this model is the Highway road in El Me'temdeya, where the local community raised funds to create an access to and from an informal neighborhood that was confined because of the transportation works of the ring-road during 1990s. The second model, "depending on a hero", identifies a situation, when an initiator cooperates with a mayor or a key person from the Egyptian institutional system, to support and promote the project's execution. The Maspero area upgrading project, is an example of a collaboration between researchers, local community and a key person from the local government. This deprived area is inhabited by 3500 low-income families living in substandard housing conditions. The residents of Maspero area are threatened by government aspirations to transform the area into a Central Business District that would force them to relocate elsewhere. The third model: "infiltrating the cracks", emphasizes a situation of collaboration between local initiators, public authorities and the local community. The Al Athar Lina project, which focuses on the upgrading of El Khalifa neighborhood in old Cairo, represents the collaboration of various stakeholders in a heritage conservation project, allowing the local community to appreciate the monuments as a resource rather than a burden. Besides the fascinating examples that the authors have chosen to report on, their central contribution lies in the ways of analyzing the case studies. Focusing on two key aspects: (a) the effectiveness of the initiatives and the attempts to dissolve the boundaries between the initiators, the local community and the public authorities, and (b) the sustainability of the initiatives and their potential for future initiatives to take place.

The article by Ingrid Sabatier and Stephan Schwarz, "Self-organized urban space without profit", subscribes this special issue from a practitioners' perspective. The paper explores the interdependency between urban crisis and the subsequent self-organized urban reactions. Four case-studies of self-organized projects in Berlin are described in detail. The paper follows the circumstances which have allowed the creation of urban reactions in a self-organized manner, the characterization of their processes and their outcomes, highlighting the impact of self-organized initiatives on formal local planning structures. The bottom-up reactions of citizens display an individual solution and form the effect on local planning structures, while addressing societal questions. Each of the reported case-studies, exemplifies different type of self-organized initiative: protest movement against private investor operate as part of urban development project; temporary occupation and use in inner city areas as pillars for contest over and attempts to preserve the non-commercial character of urban space; spatial appropriation of vacant buildings; and spatial entrepreneurs that produce experimental form of a new type of production of urban space. The analysis of the case studies outlines the ways in which planning authorities reacts and adjust to such self-organized initiatives: in somewhat slow and vacillatory manner. Nonetheless, the four case studies stress the potential of co-production approaches to urban space. The articles
demonstrate that bottom-up urbanism, which is seemingly referred in academic writing as 'Do It Yourself urbanism' (DIY), is a successful alternative to top-down urban development approach. However, Sabatier and Schwarz, as practitioners of planning, claim that while DIY urbanism, and more specifically, self-organized initiatives are broadly and thoroughly discussed in theoretical terms, are less obvious and clear, involving and facing complicated challenged in practical implementation.

The 'infill' between Theory and Practice in Spatial Planning

In this special issue we have gathered together a range of articles from different geographical, cultural and political contexts that provide insights to the intentions, processes, outcomes and education of governing urban and regional space. The case-studies and examples presented in the issue stress that it is not enough to identify the gaps between theory and practice in spatial planning, but rather, it is essential to critically reflect on both theoretical conceptualizations and practical solutions that have been adopted in attempting to fill these gaps. The articles also stress the emergence of 'soft-spaces with fuzzy boundaries' that have led to new and varied spaces of conflict and resistance (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2010). Such spaces are characterized by new spatial imagination promoting new informal planning spaces located outside the formal planning system and new networked forms of governance seeking to work outside rigidities of statutory planning (Olesen, 2012).

Spatial governance has different definitions and a variety of types, which all emphasize the way that rules, norms and cultures are structured, sustained, regulated and held accountable. However, contemporary spatial governance implies on redefinition of patterns of legitimacy and effectiveness of public action, redefinition of scales of public action, and co-evolution of the institutional context for public action (Gualini, 2006). The articles do not seek to fill the gaps between theory and practice; rather, their contribution is modest, yet significant. They stress the increasingly fragmented arena of spatial governance and its complexity, where 'no single actor or scale has the power or capacity to shape spatial structures of society on their own' (Olesen, 2012, p.912). Mostly, they attempt to bridge the gaps between theory and practice; their analysis and following critical reflections on the case studies fill in the identified gaps, and they explore new types of knowledge to overcome lacunae in formal knowledge (Bianchini & Ghilardi, 1997; Sandercoc & Attilli, 2010; Shevah & Kallus, 2015). The radical alternatives of bottom-up initiatives and innovations entail strategic goals to improve the quality of life and enhance the provision of public services. The exploration of, and the burgeoning critical reflection on how and in what ways urban space and places are being negotiated through spatial governance, are the endowments of the new generation of young academics and practitioners in revealing the interplay and the bridging the gap between theory and practice.
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In her 2010 book, The Just City, Susan Fainstein evaluates justice in her case-study cities (Amsterdam, New York and London) though a three dimensional analysis of justice (Equity, Diversity and Democracy). Her approach, popular among Western scholars, cannot be replicated as such in disadvantaged cities such as Bujumbura because of the important processes happening outside the formal institutional and policy frameworks. The main claim of this article is that justice cannot be evaluated in such contexts without taking into consideration the informal. Through a multi-scalar analysis of informality in household water provision in Bujumbura, the article assesses the importance of informality on the different dimensions of Fainstein’s Just City concept. Informality has to be included in the considerations if the concept of the ‘Just City’ is used as the analytical lens through which to make policy recommendations. This analytical lens then enables us to evaluate justice in - and rethink the governance of - urban systems with high degrees of informality, such as that of household water provision in Bujumbura.

**Keywords:** governance, just city, informality, water supply
Introduction

In Bujumbura, Burundi’s capital, the governance of urban systems is a complicated task. The city faces poverty, climate change, political tensions and a lack of basic services and it struggles with questions of justice on a continual basis. This is equally the case in relation to household water provision, despite statistics showing figures of access to the infrastructure as high as 80-98% (ISTEEBU, 2014; Manirakiza, 2012; Republic du Burundi, 2009; USAID, 2015). Many severe challenges can be identified. Some of the most striking challenges identified during the field research include: that there is insufficient water to meet the demand of the citizens; there are frequent breakdowns of the infrastructure due to a lack of maintenance and repair; as well as limited available resources requiring people to use alternatives to the centralised infrastructure. As marginalized societies carry a heavier burden to these challenges, questions of justice gain the foreground. Who wins and who loses in this system and what can urban practitioners and professionals do to try and lessen the disadvantages for those already less well off.

The concept of the Just City as developed by Susan Fainstein in her memorable 2010 book, *The Just City*, provides a useful analytical tool enabling the formulation of recommendations to reduce the extend of injustice in urban systems. But as she herself states “approaches to justice in the developed world cannot be simply reproduced in poor cities” (Fainstein, 2010) as the local socio-political and historical contexts have to be considered. Like supporting authors such as Roy (2005), this paper reinforces the argument that informality is of primordial importance when considering justice in cities of the South. It is currently unknown exactly how informality affects justice in cities. Therefore this article attempts to assess the effect of informality on the different dimensions of Fainstein’s Just City concept (Equity, Diversity and Democracy), through a multi-scalar analysis of household water provision in Bujumbura. Due to the fact that the everyday politics involved in the provision of water vary at different level of society, the analysis distinguishes between the household scale, the neighbourhood scale and the city scale.

This article is structured in the following way. First, it introduces the debates around the Just City accentuating the gap in relation to informality. It then describes the research design as well as how the data was collected and analysed. The subsequent section describes the formal policy and institutional framework in relation to household water provision. The core paragraph relates informality and the dimensions of Equity, Diversity and Democracy at the household, neighbourhood and city levels. Based on this analysis the article then suggests some action oriented recommendations in relation to household water supply in Bujumbura.

Postcolonial Critique on the ‘Just City’

Critical post-colonial academics demonstrated that many urban theories are unable to grasp informality or to adapt to local realities of the ‘South’ (Pieterse, 2011; Robinson, 2002; Robinson & Roy, 2015; Silva, 2012). They argue that existing urban concepts and theories are built on ‘Western’ knowledge and case studies, limiting their usefulness in such contexts (Watson, 2002). In her articles on *the usefulness of normative planning theories in the context of sub-Saharan Africa* Vanessa Watson (2002) questions the universality of three such concepts: communicative planning, the Just City and multisectionality. One of the main shortcomings she identifies is the absence of the consideration of informality (Watson, 2002). She highlights the importance of informality by describing the relationship between the state and citizens in sub-Saharan Africa as under-codified and under-regulated. Where each is
dependent on complex processes of alliance making and deal breaking, and particularly resistant to reconfiguration through policy instruments and external interventions (Watson, 2002). Informality is often identified as one of the main challenges of urban planning in African cities (Silva, 2012). Roy (2009) argues that a high degree of informalization in an urban system creates ‘the territorial impossibility’ of justice, highlighting that the aim of this analytical process is not to create territorial justice but rather to slightly lessen the existing territorial injustice. Both Watson and Roy argue that informal processes have direct implications in terms of poverty, inequality and insecurity, but also for other aspects of social and political life. The fact that informality has become the norm rather than the exception in relation to city development in many cities around the world accentuates the importance of considering it within discussions on the Just City and within the broader debates.

Within urban informality debates, informality is often seen to reside either in filling the void left by the formal systems or as an inherent part of the formal system. Roy (2005) argues that while planning for social justice in cities, it is crucial to consider urban informality and the processes and structures outside the planner’s realm of control (Roy, 2005). This, in part, as informality is produced by the state, means that there is a need to confront urban system builders on how informality builds up in the system and the consequences it has on justice.

Susan Fainstein’s Just City framework offers action-oriented guidelines to planners on how to achieve more just cities. It focuses on both process and outcome and points to the complexities of justice, its multidimensional character and the tensions and trade-offs that exist between the different components of justice. She identifies equity, democracy and diversity as the three main components of justice through which urban policies and systems can be evaluated. Due to her choice of ‘wealthy, formally democratic Western countries’ (Fainstein, 2010, p. 5), one of the main limitations of her work is the context dependency of the list of recommendations she develops. Hence, like many other ‘Western’ concepts the Just City cannot escape a post-colonial critique. However, despite the context dependency of the policy recommendations Fainstein argues that planning processes and practice around the world should be devoted to justice. So, a contextualised adaptation of the concept can enable the formulation of case and context specific recommendations. In order to provide such case and context specific recommendations the paper will first analyse justice based solely on the formal policy framework. Then it will analyse the effect of informality on justice in order to compare the two. The following section discusses the research design and methodologies, in order to give an overview of how the data was collected, interpreted and analysed. It will also discuss the scope of the research in addition to its limitations.

**Research Design and Methodology**

**Strength of a single case, in depth analysis**

An in-depth analysis of a single case allows the combination of a variety of sources, types of data and research methods (Denscombe, 2007). Through document analysis and semi-structured-interviews with selected stakeholders, the research aspires to understand relationships, experiences and processes occurring in the provision of household water in Bujumbura. This way an in-depth understanding of informality and its effect on the different dimensions of the just city can be achieved. This then enabled the formulation of policy recommendations.

The argument presented in this paper is constructed as follows. First the ‘just city’ analysis is carried out at the three different levels using the formal elements at hand: the national water
law (PNEau) and identified stakeholders. Then the evaluation is repeated based upon the day-to-day experiences of the stakeholders. Then finally the paper discusses the gap between the two and how it relates to informality.

On the household level data were collected through in-depth interviews in ‘problem areas’. The households were selected in two steps. First ‘problem areas’ were identified that could provide the most extreme cases of dependence on informal systems to access water. This was done with the help of a professor of human geography that had done research on water access in the city. Once the general areas were identified, voluntary households sought and semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted. At the neighbourhood level the collected data from the households was complemented by semi-structured interviews with the kiosk and standpipe managers, local sales persons as well as ‘Chef de Zones’ - the local representatives on the administrative level. The city level analysis leans on document analysis of the national water strategy and official reports, complemented by semi-structured expert interviews with four representatives from the city’s water authority (REGIDESO) with varying responsibilities.

In total 18 household and 16 expert interviews were held during field visits in March 2015 and February-March 2017. While the household and neighbourhood levels bring insights into informality as a citizen’s strategy to fill the void left by the formal system, the city level brings insights into the state’s own informality. The latter is used as a political tool through which even the state can by-pass the formal requirements (this ‘informality of the state’ has been widely discussed by Roy (2009)).

The limitations of the approach

This research aims to illustrate the effect of informality on justice in order to support the claim that informality cannot be ignored in discussions of urban development. The specific terms used in this paper are now presented. Considering the considerable debate on informality, in this work it is considered in relation to the formal policy framework, in this case the PNEau. This provides a contextualised definition of informality. The only informality under analysis here is in the provision of household water in Bujumbura. This limits the work solely to the study of the provision of household water, but can contribute to the larger discussion on the effect of informality on (evaluations of) justice. Justice is evaluated through a Just City lens and its dimensions of equity, diversity and democracy.

For Fainstein, equity refers “ … to a distribution of both material and non-material benefits derived from public policy that does not favour those who are already better off at the beginning… It should be redistributive, not only economically but also, as appropriate, politically, socially, and spatially.” (Fainstein, 2010, p. 36). This paper makes a slight adaptation in this regard as it looks at equity not only based on benefits but equally on burdens. This distinction revealed to have an important role in the evaluation of justice in the case study. Crucial in this regard is the distinction between equity and equality. Where equality offers equal distribution, equity calls for appropriate and fair distribution, to the advantage of those most in need (Fainstein, 2010).

Diversity is defined as the recognition of all city users within the space of the city, regardless of their cultural, gender, socio-economic, religious differences (Fainstein, 2010). The third dimension, democracy refers to the people’s involvement in the decision making process (Fainstein, 2010), thus making an analytical distinction between process and outcome. Fainstein (2010) cites Corburn (2005) who states that institutional citizen participation
increases the information available to policy makers by providing local knowledge, it makes decision making more democratic and open but not necessarily more equitable. This is why the different dimensions of justice must always be considered in relation to each other. Within this work the concept of democracy can be captured by Lefebvre’s ‘right to the city’ concept (Fainstein, 2010). It goes beyond the participation in the decision making by including the participation in the ‘production of space’.

The Policy Framework

In regards to household water provision, and water supply in its broader context, the Ministry of Energy and Mines (MEM) through its directorate General for Water and Energy (DGEE), heads the policy formulation and the administrative functions of the central government (USAID, 2015). The Water and Electricity Authority (REGIDESO), is responsible for service provision. It is a public utility with autonomous legal and financial status that operates under the supervision and with the support of the MWEM (USAID, 2015). REGIDESO is responsible for the catchment, treatment, and distribution of water in urban areas (USAID, 2015). The main legal document leading the water provision sector is the national water law (PNEau). This document is in turn supported by documents such as the national water code (2012) and the national water strategy (2012) that provides an action plan as to the implementation of the water law. The PNEau was published in 2009 and represents the national vision as defined by the Burundian Government (Republic du Burundi, 2012, para. 2). It is a simple document made in such a way that is comprehensible for all interested actors (Republic du Burundi 2009, p.6).

When analysing the document through the dimensions of the Just City, we see that equity is presented as a specific guiding principle of the law while both democracy and diversity are not clearly portrayed within those principles. The guiding principal of equity in the law states “the different categories of the population have to be treated in an equitable way for access to drinking water. This equity has to be searched in the distribution of water resources, their economic use as well as the measures taken for the protection and management of the resource.” (Republic du Burundi 2009, p.47). In addition to this clear prioritisation and focus on the notion of equity, the dimension is equally affected in a positive sense by other principals in the law. This includes for example the principals of political will, subsidiarity and sustainability, which highlight the role of the authorities in achieving equity. In regards to diversity, and the recognition of people, the only statement that supports it is equally that of equity where they refer to “the different categories of the population”. This is a very broad and unspecific categorisation of people that fails to really highlight the importance of encouraging diversity in the governance of such a system. The dimension of democracy is not touched upon, however the document does present a principle of solidarity where citizens are expected to actively participate in the provision of water “in order to be able to guarantee access to the resource to the populations in the most disadvantaged zones” (Republic du Burundi 2009, p.47). On the one hand this principal provides more democracy, as people are considered to be active participants in the provision of water. This aims for more equity and diversity, as the disadvantaged zones are recognised and considered within the policy formulation. On the other hand however, the principal creates a structure that fosters inequity as the disadvantaged zones have to rely on ‘solidarity’ while the rest of the city benefits of ‘political will’ and ‘subsidiarity’.

The national law’s main goal is: “to guarantee in a sustainable way the provision of water to all users through a harmonious development of the national water resources” (Republic du Burundi 2009, p.48). The goal is formulated as a utopic best-case scenario, in which there
would be absolute equity and inclusion but makes no reference to the participation of citizens. Only one specific sub-objective supports diversity, “insure to the poor and other vulnerable categories, access to water and sanitation services”. Through the formulation of the goal, the water law prioritises equity above the other dimensions of the just city, followed by diversity through a focus on the poor but not emphasising the multiple forms of oppression that might be marginalizing people. Democracy is only discussed in regard to the participation of people in the management and solidarity in the system. The sub-goal number 6 presents the concept of “improving the conduct of the population in relation to good practices of water and sanitation management”. Again the importance of the involvement of the citizens is highlighted.

The other important document within the policy framework is the national water code of 2012. Between the publication of the water law in 2009 and the water code that is meant to accompany the water law, key changes can be identified. Women are now invited to participate in the decision-making, and new actors are invited to participate in the implementation. These additions illustrate changes in the dimensions of diversity, as gender is recognised as a potential layer of oppression. This is especially important because woman make most decisions about water on a household level. As well as in the dimension of democracy where “the water management has to be based on a participatory approach integrating users, planners and decision makers at all levels.” (Republic du Burundi 2012, p.5). Another change is the formulation of the principle of solidarity where now “the population is as the centre of all actions in relation to the management and use of the resource. Measures have to be taken in order to enable the poor and other vulnerable groups to access water and sanitation at an affordable price.” (Republic du Burundi 2012, p.3). This further stresses the role and importance of citizen participation in the system. Remarkable in this new formulation is that the code omits to state that the poor should have access to drinking water and sanitation services, but simply water and sanitation. They do not have right to the service but merely to the resource. This point is also pointed to in Article 84 of the code:

“No water collection or rejection, except for those specified in this code, can be practiced in the public hydraulic domain without authorisation, concession or delegation coming from the ministry having the responsibility of water in its attributes. Nonetheless, the collection and use of water from the public hydraulic domain for domestic purposes can be freely practiced.” (Republic du Burundi 2012, p.35). This final sentence makes a state of exception for water provision for domestic use. This creates a policy loophole in the policy framework as the collection and use of household water is no longer framed. This creates room for alternative strategies to service provision for household water.

Considering the differences between the national water law and the national water code it has to be said that what would be informal in relation to the one might not be informal in relation to the other. Take digging and collecting water from a borehole on one’s plot for household use. This is considered informal based on the national water law, but not so based on the national water code. This illustrates the level of complexity as both these policy documents are currently valid, which means a practice can be considered as formal and informal simultaneously. More apparent oxymorons will be presented in more detail in the following section. While the national water law does not consider the systems of oppression that exist, beyond that of poverty, the national water code does make an explicit point of also considering gender as a dimension of diversity. In relation to democracy the national water code also takes a leap forward as they explicitly call for the need to have participation at all levels, however nothing is said about what this participation should entail or how it should be
assured. In addition it solidifies the concept of solidarity and responsibility of the citizens to be involved in the provision of water, with a special eye shut in regards to household water provision and use. Overall these documents seem to preach justice, equal rights for all and extra support for those in need, but the structural distinction that has been formulated in relation to household water provision where the policy framework makes a state of exception, and the poor quarters where solidarity and active citizen engagement are expected to take a more prominent role brings up questions as to whether the policies structurally enforce inequality or if they are a tool to provide more equity. The policies enable both and so it depends on how the policies are implemented on the ground.

The following segment focuses on the day-to-day practices and materialisation of the existing policy framework into the urban fabric. As certain aspects are enforced and others legitimized, the analysis contributes to the local evaluation of justice in the case of water supply in Bujumbura.

**Analysing Informality through a Just City Lens**

As was repeatedly pointed to in the expert interviews informality is and can be found at various levels and in various processes of the system. Studying informality enables a better comprehension of the reality on the ground and contributes to rethinking the governance of the system; which can then help to bridging theory and practice in urban governance research. Urban governance theories mainly aim to better understand the complex realities of cities, or aim to improve these realities. The gap between theory and practice is not equal everywhere. It varies, not only between theories, but equally between the contexts in which they are being used. Postcolonial critics have pointed to this problem and have called for the need to construct theories “which reflect the experiences of a much wider range of cities” (Robinson, 2002, p. 532), the need to address the geographies of theories (see authors such as AbdouMaliq Simone, Ananya Roy, Garth Myers, Jennifer Robinson). Besides extending the theories to be of wider relevance, this work supports that governance theories can be strengthened through a better understanding of the role of informality in urban governance.

In order to improve the understanding of the complexities related to the provision of household water in Bujumbura the analysis will focus on three different levels: the household, the neighbourhood and the city level.

**The household level**

The household plays an important role in relation to water provision. Considering infrastructure as a 'divination tool' (see Trovalla and Trovalla, 2015) describes the situation well. Where inhabitants are constantly trying to discern the logics behind the unreliable water flow “the unpredictable infrastructure also becomes a system of signs through which residents try to understand issues beyond those immediately at hand” (Trovalla & Trovalla, 2015, p. 332). One interviewee asked: “You tell me, with your research why is it that we have had so many water cuts recently? Has the director of the REGIDESO moved out of the neighbourhood? When I moved into the neighbourhood I was told the area had close to no water cuts due to the fact that he lived here” (Interview 1, March, 2017). Illustrating how “What has emerged is a city in which the materiality of infrastructure in a very palpable way turns rumours, suspicions and hidden agendas into tangible evidence of changing power relations.” (Trovalla and Trovalla, 2015, p.337). In addition to trying to understand the hidden agendas of the failures citizens exercise a mode of anticipation where they continually try to guess when the next failure will happen or how long the cuts are going to last in order to
adjust the coping strategy to the fluid changing contextual —service provision vs. failure— signs they observe. One interviewee proudly accentuated that while many had to go and fetch water from a far-away water source in the mountains during a recent water cut, she had stocked sufficiently and was able to overcome the cut, as she, unlike others had managed to adequately anticipate and plan for such an event (Interview 2, February, 2017).

Beyond the household involvement in reading, interpreting, predicting and planning the infrastructure and how to deal with it, households are equally involved in another dimension of the service, the access. Some have it, some not. Those that have access can be further split in function of the ownership. As one interviewee stated “the tenants have to follow the law of the owner, that is just how it is” (Interview 3, March, 2017). In this case all 10 households on this specific plot in Buyenzi had to work around the rationing schedule introduced by the owner. Water from the tap could only be accessed every second day very early in the morning. If a household would have gotten through their stock of water they would need to arrange themselves with other households on the plot in order to bridge their needs until the following schedules tap opening (Interview 3, March, 2017). This cannot be considered merely an exception as this was equally the case for two other households in this condition (a tap on the plot shared between different households). Figure 1 shows how a steel cover and padlock are used in order to be able to control whether or not water comes out of the tap on the plot. For households with no direct access to water, three main strategies have been identified. These are: bringing water to the house, bringing household tasks to the water and collecting, storing and (re)using available water on the plot. When it comes to bringing water to the house all household members can participate and depending on ones physical strength different strategies can be applied. “Woman and children will carry the water on their heads (…) if it is a strong man that goes and gets the water then he can carry that by hand,” (Interview 4, February, 2017). Depending on the path between the plot and the water source different transportation modes can be identified.
Certain household chores, particularly laundry, are very water intensive and thus certain households prefer to bring the chore to the water. This decision depends on certain external conditions, as expressed from an interviewee from Kanyosha neighbourhood “During the rainy season we do not use the water from the Kanyosha River, but during the dry season it is more or less clean and we use it for laundry and kitchen utensils. We bring the dirty clothes and utensils to the river with a basin and then clean them there.” (Interview 5, March, 2017). However some have described such practices as rural habits, slightly backwards for the modern urban lifestyle they are now a part of. “We have abandoned such practices but there are some who still go to the river and only get water to drink from the public taps.” (Interview 2, February, 2017). This can be interpreted as the materialisation of people’s marginalization as they are unable to conform to the urban livelihood they are intertwined in. As described by one interviewee “It is a coercion of life, a contradictory reality. I have studied public health and know that bathing in the river is not good. But that is what we do. It is a paradox.” (Interview 6, February, 2017). This interviewee’s statement is quite interesting as it highlights the fact that certain decisions are made not merely based on context and knowledge but equally on habit/tradition – how things are done - as well as the lack of viable alternatives that are affordable, available and known.

The neighbourhood level

The Bujumbura authorities adhere to a policy of decentralisation. The zone – a quarter with 50-100.000 inhabitants - is gaining importance within the governance structure. Each zone is further divided into sub-zones, which in turn are sub-divided into cells. During our visit of both the Buyenzi and Kamenge zones, we were informed that each sub-zone has 5 public taps (Interview 7 & 8, February, 2017). Public taps play an important role in neighbourhood water provision. They provide people with water from the REGIDESO. Management of the taps evolved over the years. Initially the water was free, and the taps maintained by the authorities. When that system collapsed, management was handed over to the community. Today private entrepreneurs have taken over that responsibility. The owner of the tap registers at the REGIDESO as a client with the task of re-selling the water at the price of 50 FBu (2 eurocents) for two water cans of 20L. Based on the current research a positive conception of the governance structure exist as two interviewees stated, “When it was public, not under the responsibility of a private person, people would waste and not maintain the tap
well, so we had water cuts much more often." (Interview 5, March, 2017) Or “Since they changed the system the service has been very good, the prices have not changed and if the tap needs to be replaced this always happens very fast.” (Interview 4, February, 2017). All interviewed households as well as tap managers have confirmed that that set price of 50FBu/2. This with one remarkable exception in the Buterere zone where a tap is selling water for 20 FBu/water can.

Some households access water through other households, two interviewed households found themselves in this situation in which they had to pay 100 FBu/20L water can, which is four times the usual price.

Certain water meters are in state of long-term malfunction and they are billed on approximate calculations rather than specific water use. This offers opportunities through which to become a particular water sales point. Looking for a failure and turning it into an opportunity is popular at the neighbourhood level. Leaks are golden opportunities. Figure 3 shows a water leak used as a free water source. Young children use the water for household chores as well as to bath in and play in.

Solidarity is the very important security net at neighbourhood level. As one interviewee stated “when there is a water cut I get water from my friend who lives down the road. As they are on another water line they usually have water even when we don’t. And when she has a cut she sends a boy here to fetch some water.” (Interview 9, February, 2017) This testimony points to existing local knowledge of the water network as, ‘the line of the military hospital’, or ‘the line of the tank in Gihosha’. Such knowledge plays an important role in household’s coping strategies.

**The city level**

The REGIDESO works on a city level. As there is insufficient water in the system, the REGIDESO has developed rationing strategies. Areas of strategic importance are not...
subjected to water cuts. This includes universities, hospitals, pumping stations, the radio and the presidency (Interview 10, February, 2017). Households connected to these lines are considered “lucky”. Nevertheless, they might have to pay for their “luck” as plots in strategic areas tend to more expensive. Yet, despite this prioritisation it became clear during the field visit that these areas also suffer the consequences of lacking maintenance and repair structures. This was for example the case in Mutanga North, where despite being located on the line of the military hospital and thus being one of the “lucky ones” the line had had no water for 5 days in the two previous weeks (Interview 10, February, 2017).

Electricity shortage is yet another factor affecting failure of the water infrastructure. The distribution system relies heavily on electric pumps to service water reservoirs all over the hilly city. From there the water is distributed to the households through a gravity based system. If the reservoirs are not refilled in time, due to longstanding electricity cuts, households on that line can be deprived from water. As the infrastructure nodes of the REGIDESO are considered of strategic importance, these electricity cuts usually do not last too long. In this sense, the reservoirs do not serve only as a start of a gravity-based local distribution system but also as a storage facility that enables the area provided by that reservoir to have a buffer in case of failure. This strategy of stocking plays an important role in the coping strategies at different levels, household, neighbourhood as well as city.

![Figure 4. Water Stockade on a neighbourhood (left), household (right-top) and city level (right-bottom) Source: Author’s original](image)

Despite the REGIDESOs formal institutional set-up, it lacks the professional, resource and infrastructural capacities that it would need in order to be able to fulfil its role. Some of the following examples illustrate how the REGIDESO is working with what they call “des moyens de bord” the available ‘brim resources’ (Interview 10, February, 2017). In the first image we see how a bucket is used to collect water dripping from the pumping infrastructure but as the bucket is not being emptied by hand the water overflows and soaks into the cement. In the second image we see how a metal hook is attached to a plastic container in order to scoop
water to test for its quality. The third picture shows the dashboard of the control programme of the REGIDESO. It is supposed to show the current state of the valves and pumps at the pumping station by the lake, but the programme doesn’t work so the image is just random. Since the REGIDESO installed the program it hasn’t worked and it is not used.

![Image of water testing and dashboard]

**Figure 5.** “brim resources” of the REGIDESO. *Source: Author’s original*

### Rethinking the Governance of Household Water Provision

When studying governance structures academics should not focus solely on how the state, private and civil actors interact but also the relations within these groups as they exercise governance (Lindell, 2008). According to the national water law public institutions such as the REGIDESO have the right to sub-contract private companies to fulfil specific task in the service provision systems. Beyond that only institutionalised forms of public participation are considered within the legal and institutional framework. Yet, in service provision in Bujumbura 38% is informal according to a research done by the ISTEEBU in 2006 (Nkeshimana, 2011, p. 51). Many academics, such as Nkeshimana (2011) point to the informal sector as playing an important role in the provision of services to the urban poor in the argument that they need such services, as they cannot afford “modern goods and services” but what is really the effect of such informality on justice in the system?

In relation to equity on a city level, the fact that there is an existing correlation between the so-called “lucky ones” and the higher end housing market it seems that the advantage here is to those better off households who can already afford to live in such plots. Of course this can then also be compensated in part as the hospitals that are being provided should be to the benefit of all. However, many urban poor do not have the means to visit hospitals and thus they are not even benefitting indirectly. On a neighbourhood level the absence of a public tap can create large inequalities as households then have to either buy water from other households for up to four times the regulated price or are forced to walk sometimes up to two hours to find an alternative water source (such as a river or natural water source). This strong contrast to the neighbourhood’s were public taps are available illustrate how important this form of infrastructure is in relation to justice on a neighbourhood level. At household level children are very valuable as they can fetch water and by doing so leave some time to the parents to focus on other things (for example income generating activities). In contrast to our analysis of the formal framework, where equity was a clear priority the reality on the ground shows that on the city level the system is to the disadvantage of the poor, who cannot afford to live on “lucky” plots that have better service provision, because they often share a tap and are thus unable to benefit of the pro-poor tariff structure, and because they cannot afford to invest into buffers such as large storage tanks or electric pumps. On the neighbourhood level
it is to the disadvantage of those who do not have access to a tap, as they depend on water vendors who re-sell the water for up to four times the formal price. On the household level it is to the disadvantage of people living alone and households who only have very young or no children at all. This brings new insights into questions of equity in the provision of household water in Bujumbura. Solidarity is key to the access to water as is told by the interviewee and her friend. The strength of social networks has an influence on equity.

When looking at diversity on the different levels we can see that on a city level the REGIDESO offers differentiated options for household water access. On the one side there is access to the centralised infrastructure to the plot or through public pipes. Most neighbourhoods have both options. Households who live along the lake, river or natural water springs have the option of accessing water that way. Rainwater is also collected across the city. In parallel to this diversity of strategies, the diversity of people and the recognition of various systems of oppression is not activity represented in the legislation, neither formally nor informally. The research has not come across any strategy that facilitates access for any types of marginalized group, with the exception of public taps for the financially less well off. In this regard the system can still be improved, by describing vulnerable groups and their various levels of oppression. Considering the legal loophole, analysing what is beyond the formal is not possible as the formal state of exception makes the informal formal.

Who pays, decides? When looking into the dimension of democracy it is important to bring the funding of the system into question. External funding is very important to the sector as it brings in up to more than three quarters of the available funds (IMF, 2012). The government is aware of the dependance the sector has to such external investments and thus puts in place fitted political strategies in order realise adequate mobilisation of such external funds. However, such structures of financing have been criticised by academic such as Moyo (2009) who argues that such support comes with conditions that have brought forward different governance structures that have repeatedly proven to be inadequate to fulfil the promises they have made. In Bujumbura’s water system has been funded for three quarters by the German development bank through the PROSECEAU project (Programme Sectoriel Eau et Assainissement 2007-2020) that has been involved in steering changes in the sector from the formulation of policy to the institutional structuring of the sector. As illustrated in the analysis of the formal framework the degree of importance of citizen participation depends on the document under analysis, however in general beside the general statement that all actors should be involved at different levels, little practical tools on how to plan such participation or how to evaluate it is given. The multi-scalar analysis exposes a gap between the city level and the other levels. The neighbourhood and household levels seem to be intertwined. As one household stated “even after working hours (...) if we are eight or ten who need water then we can call the guy and he comes to open the tap,” (Interview 5, March, 2017). This illustrates how the households can also be involved in the decision making of the private entrepreneur running the public tap. Both on a neighbourhood and household level there is also the notion of ‘Law of the owner’, where the owner of the tap comes up with rules, access hours, in relation to the use of the tap. Here these individuals seem bestowed with power through which they have a say to the households right to the service. They decide, how and when water can be accessed as well as the degree of participation that is allowed. In some cases it seemed like these rules were non-negotiable, while others were much more adaptive to situational and household needs. While the households are often very involved in their own access to water the discussion on the other two levels highlights the need to consider democracy more intensely within the formal framework.
Conclusion

Water systems are considered an issue of justice, where the poor face more problems than the better off (Hofmann, Allen, & Davila, 2006). This reveals the importance of approaching water access from a just city approach. However, to realise the intertwining of justice-norms and how in some cases they might reinforce one another while in others they might clash (Fincher & Iveson, 2011). By taking the three dimensions of the Just City (Fainstein, 2010) as analytical bases for evaluating justice in water access, it is evident that the interrelation between these dimensions is highly differentiated when one simply analyses the policy framework in contrast to when informality is considered.

The Just City concept provides tools that planners can apply in their analysis of equity, diversity and democracy (Fainstein, 2010). However, based on the analysis of the legal framework one of the limitations of this approach was highlighted, the fact that what is legal and what is illegal can be difficult to distinguish. The case of the conflicting guidelines presented by the national water law on the one hand and the national water strategy on the other illustrates this problem. This accentuates the complexity of issues related to the formality-informality debates and supports the need to invest in lenses that enable an analysis of processes in the system regardless of whether they are considered formal or informal. The high percentage of informal income opportunities in the sector equally points to the importance of considering what is both within and beyond the legal framework. The multi-scalar analysis has pointed to the varied insights that can be collected at the different scales and thus confirms that such an analysis is beneficial. If justice were only analysed on a city scale, the findings related to the existence of plot politics and the ‘law of the landlord’ would not have been made. Yet, these have an important effect on the everyday lives of the households as people in positions of power claim certain rights that they formally do not have the rights to.

Broadening the understanding of the different dimensions of justice equally brings different insights. The idea of looking at equity of burdens in addition to equity of gains is important as it enables to broaden the reflection, consider the interrelations of the system under analysis with other urban systems and understand the effects of these burdens. The example of households collecting water from polluted rivers shows that there can be stakeholders who do not have any benefits of the system. They would thus be left out of the discussion if the only question in regards to equity was ‘who benefits, and to what degree’.

The broadening of the concept of diversity to encompass the diversity of people and systems equally enables the inclusion of a wider array of realities. The analysis of the formal framework accentuates that the diversity of people has been gaining importance within the developing framework, however it still needs to find a more prominent role for example through explicit mention of differentiations. Many of the informal systems described within the paper have accentuated the existence of a large array of socio-technical arrangements that can fit and adapt to the specific realities of households. Yet, these are not formally recognised within the legal and institutional framework but still a legal loophole is provided to allow for such variations. This openness for diversity of systems can now be included in the discussion on justice, which would have been overlooked within the original understanding. The same goes for the concept of democracy. It points to the main lacunas of the policy framework, the fact that nothing is said as to how participation is to be done or evaluated. But a broader understanding of participation and the analysis of the different forms of participation identified at the different scales show that the largest part of participation is
outside the formal framework. Yet, it has to be considered in discussions of justice as it affects the everyday realities of the households.

Based on these findings, context specific action oriented recommendations are now presented.

In relation to equity:
- As priority infrastructures are identified that require constant water provision on the centralised network, the same should be done for smaller health centres that aren't connected to the infrastructure, by investments into boreholes and tanks. Small health centres should equally benefit of some sort of prioritisation through investment into reservoirs so they can continue to provide their services even in times of rationing.
- Considering demographics is already a big problem in the country, there should be structures that facilitate access to water for those that do not have the capacity to fetch water themselves. Introducing the business of pushcart vendors for examples could be useful, as water can then be delivered directly to the households. Alternatively technological innovations that enable an easy transport of the water can be introduced.
- In order to balance out the importance of personal social networks, each cell should have a type of neighbourhood reservoir, which would provide safe and accessible water to all households in the neighbourhood in times of infrastructure failure. This way, also those who do not have a good friend living down the street will have an alternative source during water cuts.

In relation to diversity:
- Rainwater harvesting must be encouraged on a policy level for uses such as laundry, cleaning the house and watering plants. It is currently being done by some but not by others despite its availability.
- There is a necessity to explicitly require the involvement of people of all origins, religions, and political parties in addition to the gender dimension that is already included.
- The policy loophole that exists in relation to household water provision makes that all strategies are recognised and legally accepted. This encourages diversity in a very prominent way.
- Beyond the formal recognition of woman as important actors in the decision making processes, specific measures should be taken to ensure this contribution happens.

In relation to democracy:
- There is a need to set specific participatory requirements within the formal framework, so that it can be evaluated accordingly.
- Certain limitations must be put on the power of the tap owners through a policy formulation that gives certain specific rights to the users. (For example: Tap owners must allow a minimum of daily access to the tap.)

This list of recommendations can be seen as soft reforms. They aim to provide a potential way through which the current system can be made just a little bit more just within the socio-political and current context of the case study under analysis.
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Introduction: New Challenges for Housing in Europe and Serbia

One of the most important features of social welfare in 20th century Europe was high quality and relatively affordable housing (Tomka, 2013). However, the evident rise of socio-spatial inequalities in Europe has been intertwined with negative tendencies in housing sector (Buck et al, 2005). It is an unfavourable consequence of the neoliberal economic model (Jones and Watkins, 2009), which has caused the middle class to shrink. The problem of shortages of affordable housing is so evident throughout Europe that it is becoming the focus of everyday media. For instance, there has been a series of recent articles about gentrification, residential segregation and housing shortages in the main European cities. It is even common to find mass-media articles which cover housing problems in major cities, such as London (Hancox, 2016) or Berlin (Braun, 2015; Kamradt, 2015), or in affluent university towns and tourist destinations, such as Oxford (Osborne, 2014; Foster, 2015).

This topic is also frequently discussed in the institutional sphere. The latest research from major European institutions concerning the necessity of social housing reveals that almost 120 million or approximately 20% of the European population is threatened by poverty and social exclusion through housing problems (Kern, 2013). This is double the rate of the 1990s, when the European Commission estimated that 58 million EU citizens were in such a position (Hadjimichailis & Sadler, 1995).

Socioeconomic inequalities in housing have had different manifestations in space. Gentrification and housing shortage in globally attractive places are just one side of the coin. Quite opposite problems are taking ground in the other places with economic decline, where the existence of neglected and depressed housing estates and neighbourhoods or empty housing units in shrinking cities and communities are becoming a new normality (Pittini et al, 2015). Both problems are more evident in post-socialist Europe, where 82% of cities are shrinking (Mykhnenko & Turok, 2008, Haase et al, 2016). The main challenge in this region is how to manage and reuse insufficiently occupied living space and accompanying infrastructure and services (Wiechmann, 2009).

If housing is becoming an immense issue for all of Europe, it is surely more problematic in the least developed European countries such as Serbia. Housing in contemporary Serbia is very distinctive even comparing with neighbour post-socialist countries. It is a product of the mixed influence of the unique socialist model of social self-government, rapid and partly uncontrolled socialist urbanisation, post-war immigration and then harsh post-socialist transition (Petovar, 2003; Hirt & Petrović, 2010).

Modern housing in Serbia appeared in major cities after the First World War, fuelled by the first waves of industrialisation and urbanisation (Antonić, 2016). This process continued after the Second World War, despite the profound change in economic and political systems. During socialist period, gap between two prevalent housing types crystallised. They are mutually extremes in housing typology: multi-story multi-family buildings and single-family detached houses. These two types left little space for intermediate types such as terraced houses and other medium-density forms of housing, which are relatively rare in Serbia, comprising just five percent of single-family stock in the country (Jovanović Popović et al, 2013).

Currently, the total area of housing stock in Serbia is approximately 290 billion m². It is divided between single-family and multi-family types by the ratio of 60%/40% (by cumulative
Serbian residential buildings are relatively new as over 70% were built after the Second World War (Jovanović Popović et al., 2013). This is particularly the case in urban settlements. The residential buildings built during the post-socialist period (after 1992), are becoming significant in total share - more than 30% of national housing stock by surface. This, newest housing is prevalent in the suburbs, usually in the form of illegal residential development.

A significant problem for housing sector in Serbia is that there is still no coherent housing policy or strategy at the national level (Antonić, 2015). The outcomes of such a state of affairs can be noticed across Serbia: underused and substandard housing in rural areas; devastated multi-family residential buildings in towns and small cities, noticeable pressure on housing in the major cities and illegal housing settlements in their suburbs. This complex spatial polarisation is without doubt a significant problem not only for housing, but also for general spatial development due to the size of housing sector. Ultimately, solutions are required for the future.

The question remains as to what kind of public institution or body should be responsible for any future solution, policy or strategic approach in the housing sector in Serbia (Antonić, 2015). In contrast to other socialist states, the former Yugoslavia had the specificity of strong decentralisation (Hirt & Stanilov, 2014). This led to the development of very powerful local Funds for Solidarity Housing Construction, better known as the Housing Funds. They were presented at national/state and local/municipal level, and they had an important role in urban planning. These Funds had the most notable role in the case of Serbia (Tsenkova, 2005). However, the Housing Funds disappeared with the disintegration of the old socialist system. Their ‘descendants’ are recently established local housing agencies, which are formed as public enterprises with the competence in housing policy, maintenance and management, with special duties in social and non-profit housing (Parliament of Serbia, 2009). They are developed to combat the transitional conditions, such as still unregulated property issues in housing, old housing stock and fragile housing market (Stanković, 2008). Although local housing agencies were proclaimed to be the important element of the development of the housing sector from its early beginnings (Mojović, 2008), these agencies are still rare, organised independently by local authorities and without stronger financial base. Thus, it is perhaps understandable that they have been less prominent than the previous Housing Funds and are still seeking out a more significant role in the Serbian housing sector.

Hence, the aim of this research is to analyse the possible role and basic organisation of future institutions suitable for the provision of housing governance and planning in Serbia and their hierarchy. To achieve this aim, the context of housing and housing governance in socialist and post-socialist Serbia is examined to identify what are key tasks for future housing development. This set of tasks lead to the creation of the new model of housing-related agencies. It is compared with the structure and role of current housing agencies to point their differentiation. This model includes the hierarchy and competence of new agencies.

Methodology

The methodology for this study is based on a comparison between post-socialist and socialist models of the housing sector and housing governance in the territory of Serbia. Sources from relevant scholars provide a basis for considering important and unique characteristics of these distinct models. Hence, this study is designed as a review paper for the very unique history of modern housing in Serbia. The positive and negative characteristics identified in
both models are used to create a new proposal: a model for the organisation and hierarchical structure of housing governance in Serbia and an outline of scope of responsibilities (‘competences’) that are formed in relation to analysed challenges in current housing development. Aside major aim, this organisation model needs to provide connections between housing governance with urban planning.

Basic Characteristics of Housing in Serbia during Socialist Yugoslavia

Serbia was one of the federal republics in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which was a socialist country during the ‘Iron Curtain’ period in Europe (1945-1991). In general terms, this part of Europe was less developed before the Second World War (Bodnar, 2001; Hamilton, 2005; Vujović and Petrović, 2005), which fuelled rapid urbanisation in parallel with ideologically supported mass industrialisation and the formation of an urban working class, or proletariat, after the war (Pickvance, 2002).

Socialist Yugoslavia was characterised by typical features of socialist ideology and systems combined with unique localised arrangements. This was transferred to housing, which was very important to the socialist agenda in Yugoslavia, as well as in the other socialist countries. Considered as a fundamental requirement for achieving socialist equality, housing was a focal point in all socialist societies (Pickvance, 1996; Petrović, 2004). The main features of housing models in socialist states were “limited property rights, extensive central planning and politically determined allocation of subsidies” (Hegedüs et al, 1996, p. 101). In the case of Yugoslavia, publicly owned housing with tenant rights in multi-family dwellings formed a template for the entire country (Milić, 2006).

Nevertheless, Yugoslavia was a unique country for the ‘socialist world’. Unlike other socialist countries with clear political and economic centralisation, it was decentralised after the reforms of the 1960s, when substantial aspects of government control became delegated to individual republics (Hirt & Stanilov, 2014). This was a key consequence of the introduction of social self-government, which enabled more links with the market economy and a consumer-oriented development model and, thereby, higher living standards (Petrović, 2004).

Still, this system was essentially based on the postulates of a socialist state and economy, which prevented full decentralisation and limited independence of cities and municipalities from republic authorities (Petovar, 2003). Therefore, the former Yugoslavia had similar problems to other socialist countries in its housing sector, specifically, lack of available housing, pseudo social equality and intensive problems with illegality and informality (Petrović, 2004).

It is important to note that this distinct socialist model ‘opened doors’ to the West early and so general cooperation was more evident. For instance, academic circles were well informed about developments in the West. During this period, research concerned with ‘expanded housing’ or ‘housing programming’, dedicated to high quality services, open public spaces and infrastructure, and the development of rural housing was generally common and innovative (Bjelikov, 1978; Bjelikov, 1983).

However, there were also some unique problems. Inherited under-development of urban areas was remarkable: less than 20% of the population in Serbia lived in urban areas after World War II (census in 1948). State structures promoted growth of industrialisation and urbanisation, an approach that has been termed ‘urbocentric politics’ (Petovar, 2003). As a result, mass migration from the underdeveloped rural countryside to towns and cities...
occurred in the first decades after the war. The response was a mass construction of multi-storey collective housing, where quantity was more prevalent than quality. The Serbian housing expert in housing, Professor Bjelikov (1983) illustratively described the then new mass-housing estates as “monuments for the institution of housing savings” (pp. 2-3). Nevertheless, mass-construction projects were very productive - from 4,700 ‘social’ flats built in Serbia in 1955 to more than 23,500 flats built in 1975 (Plavšić, 1996).

Although the mass-construction projects of multi-family open blocks were common in many socialist cities (Czepczynski, 2008), they were less monotonous or standardised and were more innovative in Serbian and Yugoslav cities. New Belgrade, where most of the urban blocks were specially conceptualised and designed, provides a good illustration (Blagojević, 2007). This specific approach meant that many of the negative consequences with which other post-socialist cities have recently struggled, were largely avoided (Tosics, 2005). In the case of medium-sized cities in Serbia and other Yugoslav republics, both multi-family and single-family housing projects were implemented and often intentionally mixed in urban spaces (Ralević et al, 2014). Ultimately, the prevalence of this type of publicly owned housing was lower in Serbia than in other socialist countries (Petrović, 2004).

Nevertheless, in common with other socialist countries (Hegedüs et al, 1996) even rapid acceleration of this very efficient type of housing was not sufficient to accommodate all the newcomers to Serbian towns and cities. Private initiatives were inevitable in this situation, resulting in both legal and illegal residential settlements with single-family houses as the dominant form of construction in situ (Bjelikov, 1978; Petrović, 2004). Legal settlements were usually well connected to urban spaces. In contrast, illegal residential settlements were formed around most of the ‘outer belt’ of cities in Serbia (Petrović, 2004).

**Figure 1.** Two different types of publicly developed housing in socialist Yugoslavia: multi-family housing in New Belgrade, Serbia (left), and terraced houses in Nova Gorica, Slovenia (right). Source: Author’s original

### Basic Characteristics of Housing in Post-Socialist Serbia

The post-socialist transformation of societies in Central and Eastern Europe is generally characterised by a process of sudden and comprehensive change (Pickvance, 2002; Petrović, 2005). In a similar way, housing also witnessed intensive and usually negative changes, with the focus now on housing privatisation, residential property restitution, and decentralisation of housing policy (Stanilov, 2007). Similar consequences are also observable in housing planning. In general, the system of urban planning in post-socialist spaces has been “weak, passive, reactive, and subordinated to private interests” (Hirt & Stanilov, 2014, p. 41).
Nevertheless, the transitions in all sectors have had very diverse trajectories throughout the region (Chavance, 2008). The transitional period in Serbia as well as in the other republics of the former Yugoslavia has been harsher and much more turbulent than for the majority of post-socialist countries (Tsenkova, 2005). Post-socialist transformation in Serbia in the 1990s was characterised by the Yugoslav wars, international embargo, the huge impact of refugees and internally displaced persons, and transitional socioeconomic crisis. These obstacles prevented real socio-economic transformation during the first decade of the post-socialist period. Petrović (2004) described it as a ‘blocked transformation’ of society in the 1990s. The opening up of the country to Europe after 2000 has brought evident progress, but far less than has been expected (Petrović, 2009).

Many elements of the first post-socialist legislative framework of housing, adopted between 1992 and 1995, were used till 2016 although they were designed as temporary measures (Mojović et al., 2009). This legislation had certainly been inadequate for the challenges of such a long and turbulent period. For example, the former Law on Housing (1992-2016), had 15 amendments. Petovar (2003) had concluded over a decade ago that this law was obsolete because of the speed of transitional changes. The relatively new Law on social housing and its accompanying strategy have had almost negligible implementation in situ notwithstanding their legal and institutional qualities (Ristić, 2010). A sequence of ambitious laws and other legal acts relating to the legalisation of illegal structures has not achieved full implementation. Therefore, it may be perceived that a clear housing policy has not existed in Serbia since the post-socialist transformation.

The problems in legislation have been acutely reflected in practice. Four main subtopics in Serbian housing are identified as crucial for the further development of this field (UN Habitat, 2006):

1. Development of affordable/social housing;
2. Regulation and upgrading of informal settlements;
3. Inclusion of Roma population through housing; and

The challenges for housing in urban areas

The first shock for housing in Serbia was the rapid and widespread privatisation of previously publicly owned housing stock after the adoption of the Law on Housing in 1992. Generally, this phenomenon was widespread across transitional countries in the early 1990s, due to strong support by neoliberal international institutions, most notably the World Bank (Pichler-Milanović, 1999). Their recommendation was adopted intensively in some of the Baltic, Balkan, and Caucasian countries (Hirt & Stanilov, 2009). Serbia has become one of the extremes: the percentage of publicly owned housing shrank to 2.1% of the entire housing stock in 2005 (Tsenkova, 2008), which sharply reduced housing affordability. The related issue of residential property restitution, which was not covered by the law, has not yet been resolved. In addition, the provision of social housing measures has been very weak, leading to a drastically restricted availability of housing in major cities (Hirt & Stanilov, 2014).

An additional pressure on the housing sector came from the refugee population during the Yugoslav wars in the 1990s, which led to the acceleration of illegal residential construction. Over the last two decades, there have been two significant developments: growth of illegal construction in the inner urban areas and illegal multi-family construction for the private market. However, the most severe cases have been the Roma settlements which share many characteristics with the kinds of informal settlements present across the Third World (Vuksanović-Macura & Mojović, 2008). Hence, the problem with illegal/informal housing has become so immense that it cannot be ‘bypassed’ in the agenda for future Serbian development (Antonić & Mitrović, 2013).

A further significant issue in Serbia is the management and maintenance of multi-family buildings (‘condominiums’). This kind of building accounts for approximately 30% of total housing stock in Serbia (Petovar & Mojović, 2006). The process of housing privatisation has caused a range of problems regarding management and maintenance of joint-ownership spaces such as communication corridors, roofs and facades of condominiums. Appropriate legislative acts have not resolved these issues. Moreover, implementation of legislation has also been weak and incomplete. Therefore, the state of the existing housing stock depends almost solely on their individual owners (Mojović & Žerjav, 2011). In most cases, this has not been a sufficient solution to ensure the maintenance of buildings in good condition. However, this confused housing situation has produced some positive effects; specifically, it has prevented residential segregation, spatial fragmentation and gentrification, which has been a typical feature of those post-socialist countries with a better economic performance (Stanilov, 2007).

---

2 Bad construction and materials, the lack of basic amenities and infrastructure, etc.
The challenges for housing in rural areas

The issue of rural housing has also been an ‘acute’ problem across post-socialist space, but does not seem to have generated much attention at any level (institutional, academic, in practice, etc.) within Serbia. The problem can be extended to general social exclusion of rural areas and its population (Cvejić et al, 2010). The systematic neglect of rural areas during the socialist period (Petovar, 2003) has brought consequences for the entire country, including massive depopulation, noticeable shrinkage of basic economy (agriculture and forestry) and huge spatial, demographic and economic imbalances in the country. The last national population census in 2011 clearly demonstrates this problem: almost 20% of houses in Serbian villages are empty or only used seasonally (SOR, 2013). In addition, the rural population is generally poorer than the urban population (Mitrović, 2015). Furthermore, socially appropriate space of 30 m² per person in villages, presented by the last census from 2011 (SOR, 2013) is favourable only at first glance. Given the problems with services and infrastructure, rural people tend to actively occupy a much smaller space. The challenge of heating the home provides a good illustration as, in order to cut heating costs, many villagers live in just one or two rooms during the relatively long winter.

In terms of the current situation, there are few institutionally provided solutions or programmes for rural housing improvement. For example, there is only one programme detailed in the Law on Social Housing that is dedicated to the improvement of living conditions in villages and suburbia, a programme which provides support for construction materials and technical assistance (Vuksanović-Macura & Mojović, 2008). In addition, this housing programme is described as ‘alternative’, which indirectly illustrates its ‘status’ (Ralević et al., 2013). Conversely, it does have better implementation and acceptance among the population compared with other programmes, due to the relatively simple process involved and strong connections with local resources.3

Basic Characteristics of Housing Governance in Modern Serbia

Before describing the housing-related governance in Serbia, it is necessary to briefly explain the current administrative-territorial organisation. Firstly, the organisation of housing governance in Serbia has not changed significantly for decades (Milosavljević, 2005), which does simplify the process of comparison between socialist and post-socialist models. Secondly, only two levels of administration are active in practice; at national and local level. The level of local administrative units fully corresponds to local administrative units (LAU) in NUTS system. There is a distinction between cities and ‘classic’ municipalities mainly by difference of terminology (Parliament of Serbia, 2007) and they possess wide jurisdiction and significant power (Vasiljević, 2007). NUTS3 level (districts) and NUTS2 level (regions) are formed only for statistical purposes and do not have any administrative significance (Milosavljević, 2009). The exception is the northern Serbian province of Vojvodina which has had profound and long-lasting autonomy.

History of housing governance in Serbia during socialist Yugoslavia

The Yugoslav housing model was unique in socialist space due to its decentralisation. The housing policy was decentralised in the early 1950s. The next step was the transfer of housing provision governance from state organs to specific housing institutions in 1965

---

3 For example: the possibility of realisation through phases, still preserved self-build construction skills in rural and suburban housing, in combination with resources from the local environment (wood).
This decision meant that state-owned construction companies obtained the right to freely form prices for new housing. However, all state-owned companies and institutions had an obligation to contribute 4% of their net income to housing investments. Additionally, Yugoslav banks offered credit with very affordable interest rates of three percent annually and without a mortgage (Petrović, 2004). In accordance with this, a housing ‘market’ with state-controlled supply and demand was created.

A new programme Funds for Solidarity Housing Construction (‘Housing Fund’) was established in 1974. It was formed at municipal level to enable better control over the distribution of new housing units (Petrović, 2004). Formally, Housing Funds were organised as cooperatives for housing construction (Milić, 2006). Informally, their establishment was linked with the problem of (inadequate) control and (in)efficiency of the state housing provision sector, which indirectly had triggered the dominance of state structures in socialist Yugoslavia (Mandić, 1990). The impact of the funds was usually evident in new residential buildings in urban centres, in accordance with ‘urbocentric’ politics (Petovar, 2003).

However, other important stakeholders were active in housing construction in the former Yugoslavia. Some very powerful state entities had a huge influence on housing construction through their construction companies. Perhaps, the best example is the Yugoslav People’s Army, which built a lot of high quality, spacious flats across the country, although most notably these flats were in the best locations in the capitals of the Yugoslav republics (Petovar, 2003). Individual private initiative was also an important factor in housing construction. As an illustration, the share of state-owned housing units was the highest in Belgrade (53% of the total number in 1991). It was followed by republic capitals with approximately 40-45% of share (Plavšić, 1996). With the exception of the main cities, private investors were prevalent in this sector. Their role grew particularly during the last decade of socialist Yugoslavia, concurrent with the fading of the state and the start of the crisis of Housing Funds (Petrović, 2004).

### Table 1: The model of housing governance in socialist Serbia/Yugoslavia in the last phase of socialism (1972-1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING GOVERNANCE</th>
<th>HOUSING MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family housing: the most important state organisation (for example, Yugoslav People’s Army)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family housing (legal): Support from banking sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republic Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing standards and norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family housing (legal): Support from banking sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing standards and norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family housing: Funds for Solidarity Housing Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family housing (both legal and illegal): Private initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family housing maintenance and management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic secretariats for housing affairs <em>(minor role)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for solidarity housing construction (‘Housing funds’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City housing companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In socialist Yugoslavia, the management and maintenance of existing housing stock was led and controlled separately. It is important to reiterate that the overall share of relatively new flats was high due to very active housing construction and the relatively small number of flats inherited from the presocialist period (Jovanović Popović et al, 2013). Thus, housing
maintenance was not a major issue. Nevertheless, it was under the jurisdiction of city housing companies. The word ‘city’ in the description of these companies was very indicative, that is, although these companies were organised at municipal level, they often used the term ‘city’ because almost all flats were located in the city or the town, which was the seat of the related municipality. Tenants paid a relatively small amount out of their incomes on a monthly basis towards maintenance of the collective building.

**History of housing governance in post-socialist Serbia**

The problem of housing governance in post-socialist Serbia relates to both the construction of new housing and to the maintenance and use of existing housing stock. Similar patterns have occurred in the other post-socialist countries (Tsenkova, 2008; Hirt & Stanilov, 2014).

The distinctiveness of the situation in the housing sector in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1992-2003) was the ‘cohabitation’ of old/socialist and new/post-socialist elements of housing during ‘blocked transition’ in the 1990s (Petrović, 2004). For instance, the Housing Funds survived the first part of the transition, still existing until 2000 (Rogan, 2014). However, this ‘dual’ period is usually considered as the most problematic in the recent history of Serbian housing, due to the evident withdrawal of the state from the housing sector and the resultant widespread practice of illegal residential construction and reconstruction (Petovar, 2003; Tsenkova, 2008; Mojović et al, 2009). In fact, the inattention of the state to the conspicuous activities taking place in illegal housing can be explained as its tacit consent to illegal practice in this sector to preserve elemental social stability in these turbulent times (Antonić and Mitrović, 2013).

Since 2000, there have been reforms to and an overall improvement in the housing sector. The strengthening of governance was followed by improvements in other segments of housing. UN Habitat played a particularly important role, initiating a special programme for the refugees in Serbia in 2002, which was implemented during the period 2005-2008 (Ramirez et al, 2008). This program was a ‘driving force’ in improvements and led to the introduction of pilot projects in all aspects of housing (institutional, legislative, social, financial, professional, practical, etc.). Nevertheless, the housing sector still has many problems and confusions.

In the case of housing construction in Serbia, private investors have taken the initiative from approaches of the early 1990s. Housing construction has been a very attractive business for these investors, proving to be one of the most profitable activities in the Serbian economy since the introduction of capitalism (Mojović & Žerjav, 2011). Aspiring to increase profits, almost all private investors tend to maximise building capacities. Within the context of obsolete housing legislation and weak state and public bodies, many illegal and semi-legal activities have occurred in relation to the capacities of building plots and quality of new housing stock.

Older housing stock in Serbia has not been in focus of policy-making initiatives, which consequently has led to the de-motivation of private investors and dwellers. Despite being mostly under private ownership, it is usually in a poor state (Petovar & Mojović, 2006). The relevant official public bodies have had insufficient resources for refurbishment and modernisation. Incredibly, private initiative has also been a dominant factor here in perhaps the most questionable of ways; the most common method of refurbishing and modernising socialist blocks of flats has involved the addition of storeys with new flats for the private market on top of host buildings (Vranic et al, 2015).
Current state of housing governance in Serbia

The governance of housing in contemporary Serbia is mainly organised at state and local/municipal level. At the state level, there are several bodies responsible for different aspects/segments of housing. There is a small section in the Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure for housing legislation. Its main responsibility is the creation and coordination of legislative and strategic acts in the housing sector. Additionally, the National Mortgage Insurance Corporation was founded in 2004. The work of this financial institution has been evaluated positively by experts (Mojović et al, 2009).

The most controversial professional opinions have been connected to the National Housing Agency, which was established by the Law on Social Housing in 2009. The law defined that the agency is responsible for the organisation, financial and professional management, implementation, control and monitoring of social housing programmes (Parliament of Serbia, 2009). Therefore, even though it is a national institution, it is not concerned with the dominant ‘market mediated’ housing sector. This is certainly a failing in the governmental and institutional approach. In the opinion of some housing experts, the agency has not been able to cope with its basic responsibilities (Mojović, 2015). There is an ongoing debate amongst professionals about the usefulness of this kind of agency.

Local level housing governance usually depends on the size of the local administrative unit. Major cities and municipalities have local housing agencies which are formed as independent institutions. They can be established freely by local authorities. Local housing agencies are relatively new organisations, although they have some roots in the older Housing Funds. The first agency was established in the City of Kragujevac (Stanković, 2008). Their responsibilities include the creation, implementation, and monitoring of local housing policy, with special interest in non-profit/social housing programmes (Mojović et al, 2009). Smaller cities and municipalities have no separate institutions for housing governance. They are usually incorporated in relevant official secretariats or agencies for land development. In the case of the smallest Serbian municipalities, the entire housing governance is often situated in one office, which illustrates the limitations of local level housing governance, although it has a broad scope of responsibility.

There are around 15-16 local housing agencies accounting for less than 10% of all the local administrative units in Serbia.
Forming a Model for Housing Governance in Serbia

Considering the aforementioned data, several tasks for the proposed model of the hierarchy and the scope (‘competences’) of housing governance in Serbia may be identified:

1. State/national level should be better interconnected and more powerful in relation to other national bodies and organisations. Ministries are particularly decisive for these purposes;
2. Upper levels (state and perhaps regional) should have a more creative and proactive role;
3. Intermediate levels (regional or district) should provide a necessary link between the local and national level. It is especially important to support the smallest and usually more rural municipalities which tend to have limited capacities and more housing problems in their rural parts;
4. Minimum standards for the organisation of housing governance in smaller municipalities are necessary;
5. All levels should be more concerned with housing management and the correlated renewal/refurbishment of existing housing instead of primarily the construction of new housing. Moreover, they should refocus from in situ construction to the creation of a good environment for it. The role and competence of the old Housing Funds in socialist Serbia can be taken into consideration to enable these qualitative transitions.

Figure 5: Comparison of the current and proposed model for the organisational hierarchy of housing governance in Serbia, with competences explained at all levels.
The proposed model is also important for urban and spatial planning in Serbia, because it offers a similar organisational hierarchy to planning documents. In this way, substantive cooperation, integration and comparison can be easily introduced. Moreover, the focus on a proactive and more analytical approach to the organisation of housing governance can be particularly valuable for improved mutual development.

Conclusion

This research has discussed the unique experience of housing governance in socialist and post-socialist Serbia, with special focus on the most significant organisations involved: socialist Housing Funds and post-socialist housing agencies.

Despite the disadvantages identified, the distinctive socialist model of housing in the former Yugoslavia with the use Housing Funds enabled mass construction of relatively high-quality flats and neighbourhoods. This model has had a huge impact on the current state of housing in Serbia and should be considered in any future organisation of housing governance. The relationship between public control and the market should be examined in particular.

In addition, the main disadvantages of the previous model, such as active illegal residential construction and weak housing management and maintenance, have continued through the period of post-socialist transformation. It seems that international best practice can be useful for both procedures and solutions. The positively-viewed activities of UN Habitat in Serbia, with new housing programmes and pilot projects and the building of institutional frameworks, can offer a promising template for addressing these problems. It is also possible that the expected integration of Serbia into the European Union system will enable similar kinds of efficient ‘external support’ in the housing sector.

The problems caused by transitional challenges in housing are evident. The relative regency of housing governance bodies at both national and local level and their interrelations affects their competency in that they are without ‘strong roots’. Therefore, it is important to react promptly with new creative and proactive approaches.

The findings of this study indicate that a comprehensive and coherent housing policy and strategy are a priority. However, both elements should only be seen as elements of a wider framework. Subordinate legislative acts are also required, especially those related to standardisation and improvement in spatial, urban, and architectural respects. Furthermore, governing bodies should also produce some ‘soft’ actions and documents, such as best practice and guidance documents, to make the entire system of housing governance both efficient and better understood among Serbian citizens.

Finally, improvements in housing governance cannot be treated independently, that is, in isolation from other sectors of spatial development such as urban and spatial planning. Connections between housing and urban and spatial planning can be established through subordinate acts that will scrutinise urban aspect of housing at both macro and micro levels, that is, at the level of settlements and their networks as well as at the level of neighbourhoods and urban blocks. Such attempts have not been evident in recent Serbian practice.

---

5 Spatial plans exist at national, regional and local/municipal level. Urban plans exist at urban/settlement level. With the exception of regional plans, all listed plans figure significantly in current territorial development in Serbia.
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Introduction

The economic crisis in Europe and the austerity politics implemented thereafter had severe effects on urban societies. While the hegemonic discourse on austerity policies is held on a level of abstract terms, dealing with budget deficits, state restructuring, and default risk, such policies affect people very materially, through foreclosures, cuts in welfare and pensions etc. (Benach, 2015). As a reaction to these material effects of crisis regimes and austerity politics civic protests have localized spatially, in Europe’s cities, in their public spaces. Public spaces have become the place where citizens have loudly expressed their discontent with the political and economic system and demanded democratic governance and accountability, their right to the city (Walliser, 2013). This paper aims to address the implications of crisis regimes on the urban level. It investigates the governance of public spaces in the years following activists’ protests in the street, and reflects on the effects of the crisis and austerity politics on urban development and its contestations through the re-appropriation of public spaces by citizens. While the academic discourse has focused on public spaces as sites of protests, this research shows that urban societies have reacted in various ways to participate in an urban development challenging neoliberal and austerity policies. With the crisis deepening, we witness the emergence of squares, empty lots and green spaces as places of a creative process of making public space, commonly. New forms of urban activists have interfered in the production of the city, in the “making, producing, participating, moving, sharing, spreading, enhancing, inventing and rekindling” (Tonkiss, 2013, p.233) of public space.

The main aim of this research is to reflect about the relation between the economic and political crisis in Europe, its manifestation in the governance and development of the city and the appearance of counter discourses and practices dealing with urban public space. Comparing a capital of Southern Europe, Madrid, with the city of Berlin in Germany is based on both cities’ strive to become a global city and related neoliberal urban development projects affecting public spaces in similar ways. In both cities we have seen activist and active citizenship challenging urban governance characterized by austerity measures. In Madrid new urban activists have taken participatory action from the grass-roots, in a context where formal participation mechanisms don’t have a high priority. In Berlin, public authorities have been formally integrating various methods of citizen participation, top-down, in urban governance processes of public space. Nevertheless, many projects’ legitimacy is questioned and Berlin’s citizens produce their right to the city outside the channels they have been invited to. The following questions guided the research:

1. What effects do austerity and the global city model have on the hegemonic production of public spaces, both in their governance as well as in spatial terms?
2. In this context, how do citizens transform the production of public space bottom-up and which values, discourses, and participation practices do they apply?

In a first step, this paper outlines concepts, which have been used to describe the recent trajectories of urban development. It then sketches how urban development in a context of austerity has materialized in the cities of Madrid and Berlin. The paper is based on field work conducted in 2015. For the analysis of citizen initiatives’ practices and discourses in the two cities secondary data from newspapers, initiatives’ statutes, or pamphlets served as important sources. Furthermore this research is based on empirical data acquired through semi-structured interviews with citizen initiatives and participatory observance. Mapping the development process and the discourses and participatory practices applied throughout this
process we can apply and extend the categories on government attitudes towards citizen initiatives by Tonkiss (2013) as well as the forms of invited and irruptive citizen participation described by Bonet I Martí (2012).

Urban Development in the City of Crisis

Austerity, the Global City model and governance

Albeit the consequences might manifest in very different forms, both capital cities, Madrid and Berlin, experience a phase of austerity while simultaneously trying to establish themselves as global cities. In the wake of the financial and economic crisis since 2007, the concept of austerity has been used incessantly in public debate, especially to justify the further re-structuring of the welfare state. The discursive production of scarcity and austerity plays a significant role in the continuation of the politics of neoliberalization guided by the belief in the free market, suspending social conscience (Klein and Rumpfhuber, 2014). The restriction of workers’ rights, ever lower wages, and the restructuring of health care, social security and education systems are some of the consequences of this new phase of politics. These adjustments have been implemented with the argument that the welfare state was a wasteful and unsustainable system. The fact that the rising indebtedness of certain countries cannot be explained with welfare spending, which was adapted to economic growth, is not debated. Neither is debated how investment and lending and risky derivate trading and speculation brought about the crisis (Klein and Rumpfhuber, 2014). But how do scarcity and austerity manifest in cities? Peck (2012) describes austerity as the downscaling of saving measures and spending restraints to the lower spatial and political level, that is the municipal level. This downscaling of the effects of the crisis also takes place on the social level. As these political levels and social classes of society only have disproportionate means to cover for that new responsibility, “cities are therefore, where austerity bites” (Ibid. p. 629). In face of unquestioned spending on the military and the incremental tax reduction for the highest incomes, Marcuse (2011) exposes the politics of public austerity as a ‘scam’ (p. 1). This interpretation underlines that austerity has been used as a discursive means to accelerate neoliberal policies and planning.

The transformation of processes of handling public interest from government to governance, a more horizontal understanding of decision-making processes, that often incorporates an amalgam of stakeholders and citizen participation schemes, has generally been associated with more democratic planning and development. Keil (2006) recaps governance as a form of control that “contains more communicative and cooperative elements, is structured less hierarchically and is characterized by the informal activities increasingly becoming more important for actors and the exchange between governmental and non-governmental actors, public and non-public institutions in the setting-up, negotiation and implementation of public policy” (p. 337). The shift to intensive participatory practices introduced by urban development authorities as well as the emergence of grass-roots citizen initiatives is generally associated with a more democratic governance outcome. Jouve (2005) describes the shift from government to governance though being characterized by “the dilution of authority and accountability, and an increase in the number of actors of different statuses with the capacity to aggregate their local interests and to defend them collectively against other levels of government, particularly in a context characterised by globalisation” (p. 280). Swyngedouw (2011) criticises governance for in-transparent and unfair decision making processes and a lack of accountability, in short for its ‘democratic deficit’. The character of dominant urban governance is described as a techno-managerial process of decision-making with the aim of consensus where any form of open conflict is not intended. An inherent
political debate and its public space have more and more ceased to exist and “politics is reduced to institutionalized social management, whereby all problems are dealt with through administrative-organizational technical means and questioning things as such disappears” (Nancy in Swyngedouw, 2011, p. 373). According to the authors, the integration and formalization of citizen participation has de facto not led to a more democratic capacity of these governance frameworks but, on the contrary, is enforcing the old hierarchies of the political system (Jouve, 2005). With the institutionalisation of citizen participation citizens and activists get trapped in the rules of the game of the hegemonic political system and can only participate as long as in line. Furthermore, the place of expertise and technocracy excludes questioning values and power structures in these consultations, ‘as the “genetic code” of these participatory institutions and procedures prevents all expressions of conflict’ (Ibid., p. 292).

**Hegemonic austerity urbanism in Madrid and Berlin**

Urban development in Madrid is embodied by an immediate past full of excesses (Fernandez-Güell, 2015). The crisis was also affected by the burst of the real estate bubble and extensive public investment in facilities and infrastructure, partly and unsuccessfully for the Olympics qualification, leading to millions in government debt. Since the 1980s politicians of all factions pushed the idea of developing a competitive metropolitan region and making Madrid a global city (Díaz Orueta, 2007). The strategic plan developed for this goal aimed at transforming Madrid into a hub for global advanced services and finances, with a high-capacity airport; it aimed at putting Madrid back in the centre of Spain with a high-speed railway system; and lastly it aimed at establishing Spain’s capital as a hub for science and technology, culture and tourism (Fernandez-Güell, 2015). For some years the global city strategy seemed successful with high rankings and rising economic activity in the capital. In this optimistic economic climate with many investing in construction, Spain’s real estate sector formed an enormous part of the country’s gross national product and the huge amount of newly built housing led to an explosion of real estate prices and rent. When the housing bubble burst, the collapse of the real estate sector in 2007, with its profits and employment, dragged down Spain’s economy and financial sector as a whole (Klein and Rumpfhuber, 2014) leading to skyrocketing unemployment rates, declining incomes, and fiscal debts rising from 1,033 Million Euros in 2001 to 7,074 Million Euros in 2013 (Fernandez-Güell, 2015).

How have these development paths been translated into actual urban spaces? The mural at one of the case studies of this research, ‘Esta es una plaza’ (EEUP) in Madrid, can be interpreted as a global critique of urban development in the city. The artist manipulated Madrid’s coat of the arms in which a bear leans against a strawberry tree. In the new version of the arms two construction workers cut the tree and carry building materials to the site. The work of art is a perfect illustration of the recent renovation of two squares in Madrid’s city centre, following a rationale of control and commercialisation. Plaza de la Luna in the neighbourhood Universidad has been a recent target of an urban renewal strategy and a process of commercial gentrification. A newly founded commercial association realized its vision for the renovation of the plaza in collaboration with the authorities with a “connecting space in the central zone, constituting an authentic scenery for urban living, a free zone, undetermined and manifold in its use”, as described by the renowned architects (Urquiaga, 2014, p. 7). At first, the local population supported the renovation of the square as they also wanted to get rid of the homeless and street sex workers who had ‘stigmatized’ the area and the square. It seems as though the locals who feared to be unheard in the renovation of the square at the same time themselves practiced exclusion of those lower in the social hierarchy, legitimized by the stigma and immorality of homelessness and sex work. Due to
the temporary occupation of the square for festivals, upscale markets or sports events, the square is no longer accessible for everyone equally but excludes all those who are no target of these events. Children playing in the streets and sex workers are excluded from the square likewise. ‘Anti-Plaza’ (EEUP 2) or ‘Plaza Alquilada’ (Urquiaga, 2014) refers to Callao, one of the most central squares of Madrid. It is located at the crossing of the city’s main shopping streets Gran Vía and Preciados Street and used to be a highly frequented traffic node. The main objective of the renovation in 2009 was to make it a pedestrian zone, eliminating heavy car and bus traffic. In the end, instead of planting 48 new trees as was promised, the authorities turned Callao into a huge concrete surface, where not a single bench is provided and shade can only be found under the few café terraces on the edge of the square. Instead of providing for the least functions of a public space in a Southern European country, it is designed as a privately rentable parcel which is profitable for the municipality. The Madrid examples show the transformation of public space into an object of and for consumption, while it should be a place for locals (ibid.). The increased CCTV surveillance that has been implemented in addition to the physical renovation of these squares furthermore fosters “circulation and commercial appropriation and prevents people from appropriating open spaces by implementing municipal ordinances that hamper everyday use” (Sequera & Janoschka 2015, p. 386), and act to produce citizen obedience, rather than to control crime (ibid.).

In Berlin, austerity has been a regional condition for the past twenty years. Despite the important strategic location and its role as the capital of one of the world’s strongest economies, the city itself has been suffering from a constant economic crisis. As a consequence of the reunification, East Berlin’s industrial base was either closed down or privatized and the whole government apparatus of the GDR dissolved, as well as subsidies to West Berlin industries cut. Today, Berlin still is “not only the German city with the highest unemployment but (…) also on a European scale the only capital whose GDP lies below the national average” (Bernt, Grell & Holm, 2013, p. 16). Apart from the effects of the reunification Berlin’s debt grew when a public bank which speculated with public finances went bankrupt. Saving this bank created an ‘extreme budgetary emergency’ of around 60 billion Euros in 2013. Privatisations of both the public housing stock, as well as of public services and infrastructure, such as gas, electricity and water followed (ibid.). The public investments in the reinvention of Berlin as global metropolis, as well as the recent cost explosion of the region’s new airport BER stand for the paradigm of the global city model in Berlin’s urban development. Following this argumentation, Berlin didn’t have to wait for the global economic and financial crisis to implement austerity urban development.

Potsdamer Platz is one of the city’s most emblematic examples of the privatisation of public property and its transformation into a commercialised space implemented in the 1990s. The square used to be at the centre of Berlin’s cultural scene, but World War II and its location on the new border turned it into a no-man’s-land without any buildings left. Already one year after the Fall of the Wall, the former borderland in the very centre of reunited Berlin was sold to the global giants Daimler, Sony and A&T to be developed into a new business city quarter. The sell-out of public land to private investors allowed the city to implement a prestigious project despite financial constraints. ‘Sony Center’ was built between 1996 and 2000, characterized by its idiomatic main square called ‘Forum’ which is surrounded by high-rise buildings made of glass and steel and covered by a tent-like roof. The property, including its squares and streets, is owned by a private company and is subject to the rules of conduct developed by a property management firm, forbidding e.g. begging, sitting on stairs or consuming alcohol other than in the centre’s restaurants. Thus, the space is only accessible for consuming visitors while unwanted groups are excluded (Glasze, 2001). Still today, Sony
Center is very popular among tourists, who look at this city of the 21st century, as it was imagined in the 1990s, with awe. Functionally, 50.000sqm of office space are empty and looking for new users (Jürgens, 2014). Apart from the constant economic crisis, the conflict of re-uniting the formerly two cities shaped by contrary ideologies also affected the ways in which socialist heritage was handled. The destruction of the GDR Palace of the Republic and the reconstruction of the Prussian Stadtschloss devalued the socialist past of the city (Bernt, Grell & Holm, 2013) and many of the “voids of Berlin” have become either places of a symbolic urbanism of the capital of a reunited Germany, or sites of privatisation (Huysssen, 1997, p7). A prominent new project in the city centre of Berlin is the reconstruction of the 18th - 19th century city castle, which was destroyed in WWII and completely demolished by the GDR government as a symbol of Prussian monarchy and the German ‘Machtpolitik’. In its place a composite of a people’s palace and a state palace was constructed, the ‘Palace of the Republic’, featuring the seat of legislature but also spaces for culture and recreation (Flier & Marcuse, 2010, p. 272). After the reunification the national parliament decided about the demolition of the GDR palace and reconstruction of the baroque city castle, trying to “replace, especially in the city’s historic centre, the image of the most recent past with the image of a past that is long gone, to replace the image of the GDR’s Palace of the Republic with the image of a Hohenzollern castle from the era of Prussia and the German empire” (Ibid., p. 273). The transformations of two central spaces of Berlin introduced here illustrate the “image ecstasies” (Huysssen, 1997, p.68) in the government’s pursuit of a global city and the invention of a German capital with buildings of a selective national symbolism.

Figure 1. Protest poster in the city centre of Berlin. We are the crisis: Crisis-migrants, the precarious and useless at the demonstration ‘Make. Europe. different’. (©2015, Elina Kränzle)
The Re-appropriation of Public Spaces

The democratic capacity of urban governance processes is debatable. Despite the implementation of intensive participatory processes in urban development, projects fail to attain sufficient support from the public and are criticized for their lack of legitimacy. Is citizen participation planned top-down still a sufficient instrument to guarantee adequate decision-making, or is citizen engagement being exploited as symbolic politics to justify and legitimize projects that already have been decided upon, as Zimmermann claims (2012)? As theoretical framework for the analysis of citizens’ re-appropriations of public spaces serve Bonet I Martí’s (2012) concept of invited and irruptive participation, as well as changing government attitudes towards bottom-up action in the context of austerity described by Tonkiss (2013). Through these concepts we can unravel governance processes of public space analytically and understand shifts and outcomes of urban governance shaped by participation.

Invited and irruptive participation and changing government attitudes

As Jouve (2005) and Swyngedouw (2011) underline, formal participation methods are no longer a guarantee for more democratic urban governance processes. According to Zimmermann (2014) this critique though cannot be associated with inherent problems of the instruments but is a result of a misconception of their application and the different expectations of actors. Participation appears in two main forms, either as a deliberative, consensus-oriented process (based on Habermas), or as a basic democratic majority decision. Deliberative participation aims at a consensus and a decision in accordance with ‘the common good’. As participation processes are designed to bring personal or group interests to the table though, it makes dissent a possible outcome, one that is usually not recognized as a positive outcome. In his study of participatory processes in Madrid and Barcelona Bonet I Martí (2012) reviews different participation approaches. Following the author, citizen participation is defined as ‘the incorporation of the population (as individual citizens or as associations) as actors in decision-making processes in the development of public policies in one or more of its phases (diagnosis, design, implementation and evaluation)’ (translated by author, ibid., p. 22). Participation can furthermore be divided into invited participation (participación por invitación) and irruptive participation (participación por irrupción). Invited participation covers all processes initiated by the political authorities, structured according to set norms and rules and generally built upon the notion of a general interest as opposed to individual interest. From a perspective of politics it is set up to complement representative democracy and is based on a deliberative democratic understanding. Irruptive participation on the other hand are those processes initiated by citizens, where existing channels of participation are challenged, or informal channels and means are used to influence urban development. Here, notions of common and individual interests are not considered counter positions but problematized as interrelated (Bonet I Marti, 2012, p. 23). In the research four typologies of participation occurred:

- **Institutionalisation** of a formerly irruptive participation process
- **Staging** of invited participation to show the accordance of formerly oppositional irruptive participation processes
- **Subversion** of a formal participation process by citizens disturbing the formal order and the aim of the process formulating their proper aims and ideas
- **Dis-Activation** of citizen opposition from the beginning by setting up a participation framework top-down to integrate citizens in line from the very start
These categories describe participation as a dynamic process and the relation of bottom-up initiatives and top-down planning as interdependent. Looking at the case studies from Madrid and Berlin through this concept allows us to trace complex governance processes of public space and the actions and reactions of different actors. The concept also allows us to trace the appearance of invited and irruptive citizen participation and to analyze how they are interrelated in the Madrid and Berlin case studies. Rather than evaluating those categories, the first part of this analysis is about the complexity of the governance process of public space and the actions and reactions of different actors. Do they fit into the categories found by Bonet I Martí (2012), or do we see other combinations and how can we explain those?

Against the backdrop of commercialised public space grass-roots initiatives have appeared in both cities. They are reclaiming and shaping public space, which has been neglected by the city, mostly in the form of urban gardening and the occupation of squares with non-commercial uses. Therefore cities are the places where the ‘there is no alternative’-politics of austerity is questioned and held against possible alternatives. Looking at citizen initiatives taking charge of creating their own modes of participation in urban development, how are these bottom-up processes received by the authorities? Tonkiss (2013) points out the ways in which urban planning deals with bottom-up interventions under an austerity regime characterised by ‘disinvestment, disuse and decline’ (p. 312):

- A **positive model** of policy and planning creates the legal and political conditions for informal interventions;
- A **permissive model** allows for self-organization and improvised spatial solutions to a certain extent, but does not facilitate them;
- An **abandoning model** leaves the urban entirely to the agency of citizens and organisations and cedes to provide any services;
- A **proscriptive model** is characterised by over-planning through the authorities, leaving little space for negotiation and alternatives (Tonkiss, 2013, pp. 313-314).

The discussion of different aspects of participation provides an important framework to analyse the development processes of the case studies. Who initiated the participatory process and how was it transformed from either the authorities or the citizens in the course of the process? What were the authorities’ attitudes towards citizen initiatives’ participation in the governance of public space? Does the framework described by the authors suffice or do we see other ways in which invited and irruptive participation occur and how government attitudes towards citizen initiatives evolve?

**Madrid – creating new common space in face of prohibitive authorities**

The first case study, Esta es una plaza! (EEUP) is located in the neighbourhood of Lavapiés, characterized by its dense building structure, a general lack of green spaces, and a diverse population with a high percentage of foreigners (Madrid Estadistica, 2014). Public investments in central squares of the area have been identified as a state-led gentrification of the area (Díaz-Oruet, 2007; Sequera & Janoschka, 2015). The history of EEUP begins with the intervention of the cultural actor La Casa Encendida located just a few blocks away, which organized a workshop on the production of public space. They received an official permit to install temporary constructions for two weeks in a lot, which had been empty for more than 30 years. During the workshop, participants had the idea to extend the use of the space as a new public park. But after the two week permit ended, the authorities destroyed the workshop’s creations and closed off the plot once again. This dismissal was perceived as a violation of the neighbours’ right to the site, as it has been reserved to benefit the area’s
social infrastructural needs, a promise that has not been realized in the past 30 years. In a process of irruptive participation the activists protested in front of the closed off land and with growing neighbourhood support they were granted a temporary permit to stay. Since then a neighbourhood association was founded to manage and maintain the space. Every year the association has to apply for a new permit to stay.

The second case study, Espacio Vecinal Arganzuela (EVA), is a citizen initiative still in its beginnings. The neighbourhood association is made up of more than 30 collectives and initiatives, who started a bottom-up planning process for the re-use of the Legazpi market halls with a building programme that would satisfy the local population’s need for common spaces for its clubs and organisations. The area of Arganzuela is a former working class district, where the closure of old industries was an opportunity for the city to use the huge empty spaces for a strategy of urban renewal, highlighted by the implementation of two emblematic projects to improve the image of Madrid: Madrid Rio and Matadero Madrid. As a reaction to the violent eviction of the social centre La Traba, EVA formed as an irruptive participation process. Facing a lack of communal spaces in general, but also a lack of public services for the growing population of Arganzuela, EVA drafted a plan for the re-use of the market, building on the professional knowledge of the many architects and urban planners involved in the project. At first the municipality showed a sympathetic attitude towards EVA’s plans. Only after the association had drafted a detailed plan of a self-managed space for the area, the financial department rejected the project and a viability study of the conversion of the Legazpi buildings into a gourmet market was revealed. The intervention of the financial department shows of the city authorities’ inner hierarchies, where urban planning has to conform to an idea of maximising profits in the management of urban development, while the city’s responsibility to cater for public services is of lesser importance. While EVA tried to collaborate with the authorities, representing a very ‘tame’, by the rules organization, the authorities had no interest in working with them. The process represents a case where irruptive participation attempts to get formalized but is faced with a prohibitive governance network excluding them from their planning process and rejecting their proposal.

While the government didn’t implement an invited participation process in Lavapiés and Arganzuela, citizens organized a participation process bottom-up, in both cases fighting for access to a publicly owned space and implementing their project idea. In the case of EEUP, a workshop organized by an independent cultural organization firstly brought up the idea to make use of the empty lot. Thus, the intervention of an intermediate organization activated the neighbourhood. Moments of government aggression towards citizen initiatives, the destruction of workshop constructions at EEUP and the eviction of La Traba in the case of EVA, have triggered civic engagement. EEUP, which started already eight years ago, was able to get their irruptive participation process formalized, if temporary. The initiative EVA has successfully fought against the city’s development plans for Legazpi market, but still has not gained permanent access to develop the space on its own. Both groups were faced with a prohibitive government. After mobilizing more supporters the lot in Lavapiés was legally transferred to EEUP, suggesting a more permissive attitude of the authorities. In the case of the market space in Arganzuela, the government pursued their own interests for its development to financially profit from the space. Their prohibitive attitude towards EVA has not changed throughout the past year, only the change in government gives hope for a more successful project development in the future. These findings lead to the addition of a fifth category of government’s attitudes developed by Tonkiss (2013): A prohibitive attitude, inhibiting citizen initiatives and criminalizing or illegalizing bottom-up initiatives or squatting. In the absence of invited participation possibilities, both EEUP and EVA understood their way of producing public spaces as democratic, as they held assemblies open for everyone to join,
where they applied basic democratic, deliberative decision-making processes aimed at consensus. With little formal participation mechanisms Madrid citizens created their participation platforms bottom-up to then ask the authorities to be accepted, formalized, ‘legalized’ with their ideas. Therefore, despite pursuing ideas and values which counter hegemonic urban development, both cases from Madrid tried to influence the governance process by establishing deliberative democratic participation channels bottom-up and asking for legal recognition by the authorities. The representation of mostly middle-class, academic, European citizens in the neighbourhood initiatives, lacking members of different ethnic backgrounds and generations can be considered a handicap in these participation processes developed bottom-up. EEUP and EVA might be criticized for collaborating with the neoliberal government, but did so in order to get on with their venture. As Tonkiss (2013) points out, “co-optation, in settings such as these, is not simply a danger spotted by sharp-eyed and disabused social critics; it is a condition of the work these practitioners do if they want to make space” (p. 323). The case of EVA though showed that co-optation not always leads to success in face of a prohibitive government attitude towards irruptive participation.

**Figure 2.** Impressions of EEUP: Families spending time at the untamed garden. (©2015, Elina Kränzle)

**Berlin – Defending public land by bypassing the formal participation process**

The site of Tempelhofer Feld (THF) has become a well-known public space and since the end of its function as an airport has seen many artists, architects, and planners as well as investors and politicians imagine its future in the brightest colours. The surprising success of the citizen initiative 100% THF in keeping the former airfield free from any development made it an interesting case study. Located at about 6km from the city centre, THF covers 4,000,000 square meters, the largest inner urban ‘green’ space in the world (Roskamm, 2014). After the end of THF as a functioning airport, the huge area was still fenced in and closed off. In 2009 leftist activists called the public to ‘squat Tempelhof’, to occupy the airfield. The protesters found themselves facing national police forces, which were lined up to defend the empty space. Shortly after this event, THF was opened to the public as a park in 2010. In 2011 the Tempelhof Projekt GmbH was founded by the state of Berlin to manage and develop the airport building and create ideas for a new city quarter on the site. With
respect to the many bottom-up projects on empty lots in Berlin, the planning authorities aimed at integrating citizen initiatives in the development of the site from the very beginning. A second participatory process was implemented by the authorities but criticised by participants as influenced strongly by the planning professionals mediating the process. Meanwhile the initiative 100%THF was founded with the aim to organize a referendum in Berlin to let the citizens vote about the future of the airfield. In opposition to the city’s master plan for the airfield, which provided for the development of a new, vibrant city quarter, they proposed to keep THF empty and to suspend all permanent development. The initiative mobilized 64.3% of Berlin’s population to vote for the law they suggested, which would forbid any development on the former airfield but keep it 100% public (John, 2014).

In Berlin, invited and irruptive participation processes emerged simultaneously, opposing each other throughout the governance process. Because of the relevance of THF as the biggest empty space in the city, many actors had an interest in developing the former airfield, leading to a complex governance process receiving a lot of media attention. A moment of unrest, the announcement to squat the field, was repelled but led to the opening of the space to the public. Invited participation by the planning authorities featuring ‘pioneer projects’ seemed to be an innovative participation framework to integrate alternative ideas. Later on though, citizen participation was criticized for being guided by the interests of the planning authorities. The government’s formerly positively received attitude towards bottom-up initiatives turned into a prescriptive typology. Berlin has adopted an ‘activating state paradigm’, ‘poking citizens’ to get involved in urban development, somewhere between a positive, a permissive and a prescriptive attitude towards citizen initiatives. The irruptive participation process started by the initiative 100% THF both campaigned for an alternative to the master plan for the space as well as it practiced a different way of citizen participation: A radical, basic democratic decision on the future of the space by all citizens of Berlin in face of the deliberative, consensus-oriented participa-
tion process which the government had invited to. Existent participation channels were declined and a new channel was opened, countering the government’s model of deliberative participation. This channel was not aimed at collaboration, but used the formal means of a referendum to disarm the master plan and to integrate the population of the whole city in the decision-making on the future of the space. With these findings we can add a fifth typology to Bonet I Martí’s (2012) participation processes: The bypassing of an invited participation process by citizens organizing new formal channels of influencing the governance of a project.

Figure 3. The vast empty airfield Tempelhofer Feld looking west. (©2015, Elina Kränzle)
Figure 4. Newspaper for 100% THF’s campaign, designed in the style of a popular newspaper (BILD). Topics discussed include a discussion of the masterplan and who will benefit from it (only few), the housing scam, the costs of the development as opposed to the ‘city for all’ which is represented by the empty, undeveloped field (©2015, Elina Kränzle)

Conclusion

The analysis of hegemonic urban development in Madrid and Berlin has shown the severe effects of an austerity urbanism on central public spaces. With the argument of budgetary constraints and in pursuit of the global city model both cities have turned public space, a public good, into a commodity and into a means of broadcasting a specific image to the global economy. In Madrid, commercialisation and control were the guiding principles in the paradigmatic renovation of two central public spaces. The sell-out of publicly owned land right after the Fall of the Wall and its development into a space meant to represent the new global future of re-united Germany as well as the reconstruction of the Prussian city castle exemplify the ‘image ecstasies’ of hegemonic urban development in Berlin.

In the face of an urban development catering to the global rather than to the local, the cases have shown that citizens are taking initiative to produce public spaces, which represent alternative interests and values. While in Tempelhof, the aspiration lied in preserving the void, the huge emptiness of the former airfield, the bottom-up production of public spaces in Madrid can be understood as “anti-utopian projects, given their commitments to making actual places in the void spaces of grand designs” (Tonkiss, 2013, p. 321). The bottom-up initiatives have shown how engaged citizens counter the hegemonic “there is no alternative - discourse and unmask the common sense that naturalises all kind of decisions as unavoidable and undermines all possibilities of resistance” (Benach, 2015, p.74).

Bonet I Martí’s (2012) analysis of invited and irruptive participation models as well as Tonkiss’ (2013) outline of different government’s attitudes to grass-roots initiatives have structured the comparative analysis of citizens’ re-appropriation of public spaces in the “cities
of crisis”, Madrid and Berlin. The case studies suggest that we should expand both frameworks to reflect the experiences made in Madrid and Berlin. The development of Tempelhofer Feld in Berlin adds a fifth typology to Bonet I Martí’s framework:

**Bypassing** an invited participation process by citizens organizing new formal channels of influencing the governance of a project

The Madrid cases of EEUP and EVA have displayed the challenges of a municipal government trying to restrict grass-roots action, adding a fifth model to Tonkiss’ outline of authorities’ attitudes towards bottom-up initiatives:

**A prohibitive model** inhibits citizen initiatives and criminalizes or illegalizes bottom-up initiatives or squatting

The sustainable influence of these bottom-up practices on the hegemonic logic of urban development remains to be seen. In Madrid, the success of the Municipalistas in the municipal elections in 2015 gives hope for a more permissive or even positive attitude of the new government towards citizen initiatives. After the rejection of years of planning in the referendum on THF, Berlin’s government started yet another invited participation process from the very beginning of the planning of the central public space of Berlin Mitte. If the city government has learned from the critique citizens raised about the participation process of THF being proscriptive cannot be assessed yet. Still, urban public spaces, which have been created or preserved by the resistance of engaged citizens, represent materializations of the citizens’ right to the city. While their actions take place on a local level their aspiration is founded on values of self-organization, cooperation, and equality and thus the city is not just where capitalism takes place but also where imaginations of a different society are lived.
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Introduction

Following the revolution of the 25th of January 2011, several initiatives were introduced in the hope of making a change for the development of a better Egypt. On the urban and social level, a number of initiatives targeted the claim of the public space, public policy, urban and social upgrade projects, research and community work, etc. Working with almost the same aim and hope, these initiatives varied in scale, agenda and structures. Some of these initiatives were introduced by young initiators, NGOs and non-profit organizations, and on more international spectrum the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH and UN-Habitat.

“Informal development has been, and continues to be, the dominant mode of urbanization in many developing countries, including Egypt. It occurs especially on the urban fringes, on privately-owned agricultural land, rather than in desert areas, which would be considered squatting on state-owned land. Despite 30 years of attempts by the government to limit unplanned growth and urban expansion on agricultural land around Cairo, as it has in most Egyptian cities and villages, informal settlements around Cairo sheltered more than 7 million inhabitants in 1998. As of 2006, they are estimated to contain more than 65% of the population of the metropolis.” (SéJourné, 2009, p. 17). The informal settlements led to several societal problems. Therefore, several parallel practices to the work of governmental institutions were initiated. They aimed to improve Cairo’s urban environment which is deteriorating. Several practices were introduced by young initiators with multi-disciplinary research background involved in urban and social fields.

Some initiatives have helped communities to prepare plans for their neighborhoods’ development using participatory approaches such as Madd Platform, 10 Tooba, Takween and DK Shehayeb Consults. Other initiatives started to raise awareness of the historic built environment which is facing destruction such as Megawra and Save Alex (10 Tooba, 2015). Other initiatives were introduced by non-profit organizations or NGOs hoping to improve the quality of life of the less fortunate people. Most of these initiatives depended on charity, funding and the work of volunteers. For example, ma'an project which translate as ‘together’, aims to construct residential units to accommodate the informal settlement residents’ with a budget of 400 million Egyptian Pound (around 40 million U.S. dollars). Around 106 million was collected to complete the first phase of 5300 units out 60,000 units which should be achieved by the end of 2018 (ma’an, 2013). Some charitable organizations and NGOs such as Benebny Hayah (which translates as building a life) have rebuilt or repaired housing and extended services such as water and wastewater in many deprived communities (Benebny Hayah, 2013).

On another level, some projects were introduced by international organization such as the UN-Habitat or GIZ. The UN-Habitat is working on three programmatic areas: (1) urban and regional polices and governance, (2) urban development and environmental climate change, and (3) informal settlements, housing, and urban regeneration. These programs are being processed through a series of ongoing projects. One of its achievements was the "strategic development of greater Cairo" report developed with the ministry of housing and several other governmental bodies. (UN-Habitat, 2012) The GIZ has also agreed with the Egyptian government to work on three research fields: (1) renewable energies and energy efficiency, (2) participatory development, and (3) employment promotion for sustainable economic development. Their plans are executed through several ongoing projects all around Egypt (GIZ, 2012).
The above mentioned initiatives are sample of different projects which increased the concern to urban and community development issues. This concern drove the UN-Habitat to organize, along with the Ministry of Housing and Urban Communities, and the Ministry of Urban Renewal and Informal Settlements (MURIS) (currently cancelled), the First Egypt Urban Forum (EUF) in Cairo in June 2015. This event brought together several Egyptian institutions, decision makers, civil society representatives, scholars and experts, and private sector companies to build a policy dialogue platform to shape Egypt's future urban agenda and contribute to the World Urban Agenda at the Habitat III Global Conference in 2016. Although the event offered a good platform for networking opportunities, such events tend to be more ceremonial than effective.

These initiatives and events are providing networking opportunities which in turn creates possibilities for researchers in the urban and social fields to transform their initiatives to more realistic urban social innovations. However, a main question is still unanswered: how to execute these urban social innovations and transform them to reality especially in terms of dealing with the public authorities? In order to answer this question, this paper analyzes four executed urban social innovations in deprived areas in Egypt. The Mozza (which means the beautiful girl) series of street art work, the main highway road access to El Me’temdeya area developed by the community, Maspero area urban upgrade project by Maad and Al Athar Lina (which translates as the monuments are ours) project by Megawra.

These projects are considered urban social innovations as they aim to dissolve boundaries and overcome barriers between the public authorities, the community and the researchers/initiators to execute novel solution to the society problems. The Stanford Social Innovation Review defines social innovation as: ‘A novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals ... the publication’s unique approach to social innovation: "dissolving boundaries and brokering a dialogue between the public, private, and non-profit sectors"’. (Phills Jr., Deiglmeier, & Miller, 2008, pp. 36-37). Based on this definition, this paper analyzes the different approaches of the four initiatives to deal with the public authorities in order to dissolve the boundaries between the public authorities, the community and the researcher/initiator to create urban solution to societal problems.

This paper perceives these boundaries as a wall. This wall needs to be infiltrated in order to open access and dissolve the boundaries between the different sectors together. For this purpose, the term “Urban Trojan” is metaphorically used in reference to the Trojan horse or the computer Trojan. The computer Trojan deceives the system in a hidden and undetectable way, wait for the system to execute them, and make it vulnerable to future entry by creating back doors (J. Garcia, Reilly, & Shorter, 2003), (PC Magazine, n.d.). The term “Trojan” can sound a negative and destructive act. The metaphor is used in this paper to represent the effectiveness of the urban social innovation to be welcomed by the different sectors and to infiltrate their systems without being rejected. It also represents the ability to open the way for other urban social innovation, thus infiltrating the walls between the different sectors and dissolve their boundaries.

**Methodology**

In order to achieve this paper's research question, the study examines previously executed parallel practices and analyzes the process adopted by the initiator to deal with the public authorities. The main criterion which influenced the case studies' selection process is the
diversity in the scale of the entity/initiator(s) which is responsible for the urban social innovation. The selected case studies needed to cover a wide spectrum of diverse structural entities from: individual initiator, community base, group of researchers and NGOs initiatives. International organization initiatives, such as GIZ and UN-Habitat, were not included in the study as they represent a different structure. These organizations have their own means to deal with the public authorities which is most of the time related to a wider international agenda.

For this reason, the research investigated these four-selected urban social innovations: The Mozza series of street art work, the main highway road access to El Me’temdeya area developed by the community, Maspero area urban upgrade project and Al Athar Lina project by Megawra. All these projects are considered urban social innovation as they tried to solve a problem that is facing the society on different urban scale. These urban social innovations varied in its entities starting from an entity of an individual initiator, The Mozza to the collective organization of El Me’temdeya community. Another form of entity as Madd platform, which is a borderless entity that includes independent urban designers and researchers, and finally Megawra which works under a formal umbrella as a registered NGO. The case studies were mapped through different methods: (1) the analysis of the publications that the entities produced, (2) interviewing members from each entity, and (3) actively participating with some of these entities while developing some of the case studies. The analysis focuses only on two issues. First, it focuses on the effectiveness of the urban social innovation to dissolve the boundaries between the initiator, the community and the public authorities. Second, it analyzes its sustainability in terms of allowing for such initiatives to be reproduced and to open the door for more initiatives to take place.

The variable aspect between these four initiatives was their working model process to get their work executed and the way they dealt with the public authorities. Their approaches in dealing with the public authorities varied from neglecting, depending and trying to integrate them. In order to put this analysis in a more theoretical framework, this paper adopts in its analysis the approaches presented by Jesse Marsh to bring initiatives depending on open and participatory approaches to policy makers. These approaches, explained later, are metaphorically titled as: work in the shadow, depend on a hero and infiltrating through cracks.

**Theoretical Framework**

In October 2015, the city of Palermo hosted its first Urban Thinkers Campus, titled as “City as a Service”, organized by PUSH and the World Urban Campaign. This forum aimed to investigate different ideas and solutions, offering an integrated approach and giving voice to the various stakeholders: civil society, public administrations, companies, experts and researchers to meet in order to identify and overcome obstacles towards a smart development (UN-Habitat, 2015). During this event Jesse Marsh presented a book that he edited and mostly wrote called “Citizen-Driven Innovation: A Guidebook for City Mayors and Public Administrators”.

Although the book is mainly guided to city mayors and public authorities but it provides also several good practices to realize urban innovations. The processes of these practices and

---

6 He worked with learning technologies, teleworking and e-commerce and then in policy work on the link between the information society and sustainable development, cultural diversity and democratic participation. (UN-Habitat, 2015)
the way they dealt with public participation are of a great importance to any research who intends to work on participatory practices. "The report explores the concept of smart cities through a lens that promotes citizens as the driving force of urban innovation." (The World Bank and the European Network of Living Labs, 2015, p. 8). Beside the content of the book, when Jesse Marsh presented the book in the form, he presented different approaches for young researchers and experts to deal with the public authorities when executing their innovations which depend on participatory methods. He mainly presented three approaches which this paper metaphorically titles as: work in the shadow, depend on a hero and infiltrating through cracks (Marsh, 2015).

In the first approach, titled as working in the shadow, initiators try to work without any cooperation or relation with the public authorities. They try to execute their urban social innovations with the community only as if the public authorities don’t exist. According to Marsh (2015), this approach will make the work done and the initiator will enjoy it but still its results won’t be effective enough or sustainable. He said “I am going to ignore you and I am going to do my social innovation in the backyard and pretend that you don’t even exist and it is going to be nice and fun but there is some sort of a limit to the kind of impact that you are going to get.” (Marsh, 2015). The second approach is when the initiator or the research finds a hero in the public administration that he/she can deal with. This hero takes care to get him/her the signed documents to do what the initiator thinks he/she wants. According to Marsh (2015), this approach is also not going to work as this hero will leave someday and the initiator will lose the support than he/she depended on to push the public administration in a certain direction. In this case, the process of executing the social innovation is not sustainable.

These two approaches, according to Marsh (2015), aren’t enough as they don’t target the main problem that faces the initiators which is the lack of innovation in the public administration. He believes that the only possible way is that public authorities should open up to these citizens driven innovations. For sure, they won’t do this by their own and here comes the role of the initiator to penetrate through the body of the public authorities’ system through cracks aiming to bring the public authorities to the community of initiators from researchers and citizens. This won’t happen overnight but it needs several explorations and experiments in order to be able to contaminate the system one day. Throughout these three approaches, this paper investigates four urban social innovations in Egypt and analyzes the way they dealt with the public administration. The analysis of the approaches focuses on the urban social innovation’s ability to break the wall between the different sectors and dissolve the boundaries between the initiators, the community and the public authorities in order to solve the existing societal problems.

Working in Shadow Approach

The working in shadow approach refers to the approach explained by Marsh (2015) is when the initiator(s) of the urban social innovation seeks to execute the project without including the public authorities. In the case of Egypt, this becomes more critical as the initiators tried to work without being detected by the public authorities. It is not only about not including them but it is about not being spotted by the system and to stop the initiator’s work. This might happen as field work and survey is recently forbidden by law in Egypt except after getting required approvals (Mada Masr, 2016). Such approvals in case of individual initiatives and recently for NGOs are very complicated to get. This paper investigates this approach in two main initiatives where the project was executed in absence of the public authorities. The first is an intervention lead by an artist, the Mozza, series of street artwork as a mean of
upgrading deprived areas as seen in Figure 1. The second project is an intervention lead by the community to build access to main highway road in El Me temdeya area.

![Figure 1. The two interventions by the Mozza in Old Cairo. Source: Adapted from Google Earth V7.1.5.1557. (July 5, 2015). Cairo, Khalifa. 30° 01' 44.04"N, 31° 15' 29.53"E, Eye alt 2298 feet. DigitalGlobe 2012. http://www.earth.google.com [April 26, 2012].](image)

**The Mozza project**

After the revolution, street art became a major mean of reflecting demands, political and social problems, and a parallel media. Several groups of young artists adopted perfectionist notions and started painting the buildings in poor areas. The movement was investing too much effort and money and it had limited impact. In addition to the negative impacts that appeared in offending the residents as they perceived that they needed to be cleaned and re-painted. The process started to take another form, when other planners and artists started to use participatory process in their interventions. Their process can be described under the umbrella of working in shadows as the public authorities were not part of the process as no permits were taken because Graffiti work is recently considered illegal by law.

The Mozza is a pseudonym used by a female street artist active in Cairo who prefers to stay anonymous. She communicates with local residents in deprived areas and reflects their own traditions and local culture on their buildings’ walls. She has several street artworks in different deprived areas which contributed in the vitality of the public space, and initiated debates within the local community. The presented two art works in this paper, represent the idea of working in shadow as the public authorities were not involved in such initiative.

The first artwork, see Figure 2, is painting on a wall next to a café in Historic Cairo. The artwork represents a group of women sitting in a traditional café. It is well known that traditional cafés in Egypt are male dominant spaces. This artwork reflects a gender societal issue regarding the relationship between women and the public space. This piece is a context specific, as several women visit this spot for religious ceremony, and sit on the sidewalks, in front of the café. Based on the artist, the café’s owner used to kick-off women who in front of his place. The artist convinced him that she can implement an artwork to
promote more customers to his café. The artwork was put on the wall after the café owner approved the design. The artwork enhanced the exposure of the café and attracted more customers. Consequently, the café owner accepted women to sit in the café. In certain events, such as music concerts, the café is chosen for such purposes as the bands can have a nice background. This turns with benefits to the café owner while vitalizing the space as shown in Figure 3.

The other urban social innovation, in Figure 4, by the Mozza is reshaping a whole public Space in Darb el Hosr in Old Cairo. The project was in collaboration with Megawra\(^7\), to turn an urban pocket used as a garbage pit into a pleasant space and a football field for the young residents in the area. The work idea was to revive an old artwork "The Noah's Arc" done by a local resident in the area. It brings back an oblivion story that was about to vanish, in the local community's memory. It returns their story and sustaining it on a huge wall. The residents in the area perceived an added value to the work as it helps in reclaiming the residents their own legends and stories, in addition that it builds a sense of ownership towards the area.

\(^7\) Megawra is an architecture hub and platform which is operated by the Egyptian NGO, Built Environment Collective. Megawra. About Megawra. Retrieved January 22, 2016, from Megawra: http://megawra.com/about/
The model of the work process to develop such urban social innovation can be concluded as follows. In the first case the artist (initiator) communicated with a key person directly, the owner of the café. Then she worked with the community to gain their trust and to develop the artwork. The artist then executed her work self-financed (Mozza, 2016). In the second case, the artist was approached by an already existing body Megawra which has already gained the trust of the community and had its key persons through its different projects in the area. The artist then started to execute its intervention which was mostly also self-financed. In the two interventions, both the community and the artist enjoyed the work and the public authorities didn’t take any part in the process.

Such a model is inspiring, necessary and impacts the community directly. It allows the initiator to infiltrate the community and dissolves the boundaries. It can also have a snow ball effect allowing future innovations to emerge from such a small intervention. However, its impact is limited by scale, key person(s) and financial circumstances. The amount of impact is relatively small in relation to the amount and scale of problems that the community is facing in such deprived areas.

**The main highway road access to El Me’temdeya area**

The second example that its work process can be described as work in shadow is the main highway road access to El Me’temdeya area. This project is an intervention lead by the community without any collaboration from neither public authorities nor planners. The 2011 revolution opened up the idea of the power of the people. The condition of a fragile state, at that time, provided spaces for the communities to take over and intervene the built environment. Planners and urban designers tried to map informal practices and perceive them as collective decisions by masses to appropriate their built environment. **El Me’temdeya** road is a strong example for this kind of social innovation that solved an urban expansion accessibility problem.

**El Me’temdeya** neighborhood is an informal settlement on the periphery of Cairo. It appeared in the 1970’s as an extension of a rural settlement on agriculture land. Cairo ring-road built in the 1990’s aimed to limit the city expansion, however, this didn’t occur and the urban expansion increased. The ring-road separated **El Me’temdeya** from Ard el Lewa neighborhood which is a bigger informal settlement that has better services and transportation to central Cairo. The residents had to walk for 2 km, crossing below the ring road through an unsafe tunnel, to reach means of transportation that can take them for daily trips, as work, visiting families and shopping.

The local popular committees and community organizations in the area, decided to take matters into hands and fix this problem. The community started to collect money to build an exit and access from the ring road to the area to give access for informal transportation, see Figure 5 and Figure 6. In just six weeks, the community was able to collect the needed money to build the road and they started the work immediately, see Figure 7. After six more weeks, the exit and access were fully built and paved. The community also collected the broken street lighting poles from the ring road, fixed it and reinstalled it on the new road as shown in Figure 8. The community was so proud of such an intervention that solves a major problem that faced the area. Therefore, they invited the governor for the opening of the road, where the governorate blessed the community project by legalizing the road by placing official road signage. They also placed a police station in the tunnel under the ring-road to create a safer area. At that time, the local authorities were keen to win the local community to their side and not to provoke them.
Such approach cannot be applicable under a powerful state and efficient laws and policies. The project is a unique autonomous case. It is, however, an urban social innovation as it provides a solution that directly benefited the local community. In addition, it was planned, funded and built by them. In order to sustain their project, they were pretty aware that the government must be involved to legalize their solution. That was, however, after they finished the implementation of the project. Such work model can’t be appropriated by urban planners.
to conduct their urban social innovations as its process is illegal. This intervention is a strong case of a working in shadow approach which shows the barrier between the community and the public authorities. It also shows the importance of the role of researchers/initiators to overcome this barrier in order to create a more sustainable environment to implement urban social innovation.

**Depending on a Hero Approach**

This approach, as described by Marsh (2015), is when the initiator finds a mayor or a key person in the public authorities who he/she can deal with. This hero is an effective person who can push the public authorities towards a certain direction and gets the necessary signature. The Maspero area urban upgrade project is a case which in part of its process depended on such a hero. The project that started as working in shadow approach, then it reached a hero in the state. Dr. Laila Iskandar, Minister of Urban Renewal and Informal Settlements (MURIS)\(^8\), backed up the project. The project, however, stopped when the Egyptian Prime Minister Ibrahim Mehleb resigned and later on the whole ministry was cancelled.

**Maspero area urban upgrade project**

The parallel practices and the groups that are adopting new approaches in dealing with the built environment, generally have problems of mistrust and miscommunication with the government. However, sometimes there are certain officials who have an understanding to the urban social innovation processes. This open the door for switching from working in shadow process, to working under the umbrella of an official authority that can back up the process, through a key person in the authority.

*Maspero Parallel Participatory Project (MPPP)* by Madd Platform is a case in which a hero was very important for the project’s process. The project started in 2013 as a working in shadow approach for 15 months. The project was a participatory upgrade for *Maspero* neighbourhood (See Figure 9).

---

\(^8\) The Ministry of Urban Renewal and Informal Settlements (MURIS) was actually a new ministry that was established in June 2014 and was aborted after a mere 14 months and its work in informal areas moved to the portfolio of the Ministry of Housing.
The problem in developing the area goes back to the 1970’s when the state was planning to relocate the residents of Maspero and use their neighborhood for investments and turning the area to a Central Business District. The project attempted to upgrade the area by dealing with the local residents as a main given in the development equation (Tooba, 2015).

Madd Platform team worked closely with the local community to produce a participatory research and a participatory re-planning for their area as seen in Figure 10 and Figure 11. The team was totally depending on the community as a source of power, in negotiating with the authorities. Madd worked with the community to produce an urban upgrade plan. The area is inhabited by 3500 families of low-income groups, living in bad conditioned buildings that are standing on land owned by investors from the Gulf. The project’s social innovation was to solve the problem of the local community who were living under the hazards of relocation. They worked together with the community on redistribution of land ownerships among stakeholders to keep the potential for investments in the area while creating enough plots to build appropriate houses for Maspero’s residents, see Figure 12 (Madd, 2011). The project’s process was unique, as the designers team lived in the area for more than a year.

By mid-2014, the Urban Renewal and Informal Settlements ministry was created. Dr. Laila Iskandar, the minister, gave hope for practitioners and experts in the urban planning fields, as she has a huge experience in participatory approaches and bottom up development. She
worked previously with deprived communities in economic upgrading for their areas. Iskandar was a great potential to push MPPP and to include it to the state priorities. Iskandar asked Madd’s team to present the process in the ministry as shown in Figure 13. Later on, she pushed the project’s process more to reach the prime ministry and up to the president. The parallel process became a formal process, by working with the government in validating the project outcome and research.

Figure 13. Official meetings with authorities and public conferences with local residents in Maspero area. (Source: Madd Platform, 2015)

In early 2015, the project has been officially declared as a project on the list of development projects in Egypt, using the whole principles and approaches that Madd Platform implemented. The project was stopped later on when the Prime Minister resigned and the whole ministry was even cancelled. In such a scale, a neighborhood scale, continuing working in shadow was not realistic, as the amount of resources needed exceeds the independent group’s capabilities. Iskandar provided such resources in addition to establishing networks with government officials and investors. Depending as well on a hero like Iskandar wasn’t the optimum strategy to reach a sustainable process. Madd Platform team is trying now to shift its approach towards trying to ensure the continuity of the project and the process. They are trying to take their case to the media and to involve the local public authorities and local politicians hopping to execute their project.

Infiltrating through Cracks Approach

As presented by Jesse Marsh (2015), this approach needs to get the public authorities and the mayor (in the Egyptian case the governor) together to the table with the local community and the researchers and initiators as one community. They need to open up for the urban social innovation. Such process should not take the form of a conference as this is not the way the local community work. Our role as researchers and initiators in this approach is to find cracks in the barriers between the different sectors to bring them together. This approach hopes to contaminate the system one day in order to tackle the public authorities’ innovation. For sure, such process will not happen overnight but it needs several explorations and experiments in order to be able to contaminate the system one day.

Al Athar Lina project can represent one of the experiments that hopes to open cracks in the system, as a relationship was built between planners, community and authorities, and made them all working closely to upgrade El Khalifa neighborhood in old Cairo. This Approach needs a deep understanding of the system and the way decision-making process is taken, to
start working in harmony with the public authorities without compromising the process or the principles.

**Al Athar Lina**

*Megawra*: The Built Environment Collective reached a good harmony with the authorities through *Al Athar Lina* Project. The project was upgrading *El Khalifa* neighborhood in Old Cairo, by empowering the community to reclaim the benefits of living next to monuments. “Athar Lina is a participatory conservation initiative that aims to establish modalities of citizen participation in heritage conservation based on an understanding of the monument as a resource not a burden.” (Megawra, n.d.) From day one, Megawra team included the ministry of Antiquities and Cairo governorate as two main stakeholders to work closely with the official employees as well as the local community (Tooba, 2015).

*Al Athar Lina* project by Megawra is an ongoing series of projects that is being developed on after the other as shown in Figure 14. The first project involved a series of participatory workshops, seminars, and exhibitions between representative stakeholders and resulted in a set of concept papers prepared collectively that recommended interventions in and around the monuments of the street as in Figure 15. The first project’s recommendations lead to two new projects, the establishment of a school for Art and Heritage in a primary governmental school in the street and the conservation of *Shajar al-Durr’s* mausoleum in Figure 16 (Megawra, n.d.). These series of projects are trying, day after day, to involve more stakeholders from local public authorities, NGOs and international funding bodies.

![Figure 14](http://www.earth.google.com)
On another hand, this project is metaphorically contaminating the local community by raising their awareness of the importance of the historic assets and monuments of their neighborhood. The project is working through a very slow participatory process, but also very efficient and sustainable one. Working with the ministry of Antiquities, ease the process of dealing with monuments in the area, and opened more opportunities to extend the work. Having all stakeholders on board from day one and building a slow process without giving huge promises were the main keys for success for this project. This process assures sustainability, as it fixes minor and major neighborhood problems, step by step. It also upgrades the local community slowly, without having to face sudden changes in the neighborhood. What shows that this project has a different approach then the depending on a hero one is that throughout the years of the project development several ministers and governors were changed without affecting the project continuation.

Discussion

The above mentioned urban social innovations with their different working models in their approach with dealing with the public authorities are considered Urban Trojan. The concept of the Urban Trojan works like a Trojan horse or a computer Trojan. Trojans deceive the system to allow them to infiltrate without being detected. Then, they start to spread while opening back doors for others to enter the system. The same scenario happens with the urban social innovation. The initiator of the urban social innovation wants to affect the different bodies from the urban system including the community and the local authorities in order to dissolve the boundaries between them. The initiator introduces the urban social innovation after being accepted by a body of the urban system that it starts to spread while making the system accept possible future urban social innovation. The impact of the Urban Trojan depends on the way they are designed and on their working process models in dealing with the different members in the system. The Urban Trojan can be found in the previous cases and approaches: working in shadow, depending on a hero and infiltrating through cracks.

In the case of the working in shadow, the urban Trojan is designed to contaminate or to deal with the local community mainly. In this case in order to introduce the urban Trojan a trust is
needed to be built with the local community through a key person or key NGO in the community. Then the impact of the Trojan mainly affects directly the local community in its small local context. The Trojan also in this case opens the way for other virus or urban social innovation to tackle the same body which is the local community of a certain area. It makes the community more resilient to open up for new innovation. This can be reflected in the artwork of the Mozza in the small café in Old Cairo which can offer a platform for more street artwork or other urban social inanities to take place in the area. The impact of such Trojan is, however, very limited in scale and the bodies of the system to be tackled. It is also very limited in comparison to the problems that the community is facing.

The case of depending on a hero is an approach of considerable risk that the Urban Trojan can be detected and eliminated. This approach, although, it tries to contaminate one of the most effective parts of the system which is the public authorities under the protection of high official or a hero, but it is very vulnerable. In this case the hero embraces the Trojan and tries to push it against the existing bodies of the system but with doing this it doesn't fulfil one of the main characteristics of the Urban Trojan which is to be undetected. The hero tries to make the system bent for the urban social innovation thus creating an anti-reaction towards it. Being embraced by the hero, also, limits the Trojan ability to spread through the system and it spots light on it. This also can be reflected in the Maspero when the minister tried to embrace the project and to present it to the high officials which after a while reacted by eliminating the whole ministry.

The last approach, infiltrating through cracks, provides a more appropriate setting to host the Urban Trojan. In this case the Urban Trojan is designed to contaminate and tackle the different bodies of the system, researchers (i.e. planners, architects and artists), community, funding organizations, and authorities. The Urban Trojan in this case works with slow pace to gain the trust of the different bodies. It tries to knock different doors through different experiments and explorations to find cracks to infiltrate through these bodies. In the same time, it tries to do this gently without provoking any of these bodies to react against it. Once a crack is infiltrated in any body of the system the Urban Trojan makes these bodies more resilient to accept other urban social innovations. It thus tries to dissolve the boundaries between the different sectors of the urban system and bring them to the same table. This differs from the working in shadow approach as it tries to make different bodies resilient to more urban social innovations not only one element. This happened in Al Athar Lina project when Megawra offered the opportunity for the Mozza to make its artwork in in Darb el Hosr in Old Cairo.

Conclusion

The 25th of January revolution provoked a change in how urban concerns are dealt with. Research centers, NGOs, public authorities started to think in different way towards urban issues. They are trying to create opportunities for citizens to reclaim their built environment through different initiatives. Such changes are creating opportunities for research and initiators interested in urban and social issues to work on urban social innovations through participatory process with the community. This change is also starting to create a change in the public authorities to accept such innovations. These urban social innovations act in this changing phase as Urban Trojan in the body of the system trying to open cracks in the walls between the different sectors in order to dissolve their boundaries. The approach in dealing with the public authorities in general and the other stake holders, community, NGOs, funding bodies impacts the effectiveness and sustainability of the Urban Trojan.
The different approaches discussed in this paper represent the answer to this paper research question which is how to deal with the public authorities in order to execute urban social innovation. The three presented approaches show different scenarios to pursue for the initiators/researchers who are interested to execute urban social innovations. Each approach has different impacts and limitations which need to be taken in consideration by the initiator prior to starting. The three discussed approaches presented by Jesse Marsh (2015) and reflected on four projects in Egypt reveal such an impact. They present the effectiveness of the urban Trojan to infiltrate the different sectors of the urban system represented in the public authorities and the community in order to dissolve the boundaries between them to create urban social innovations.

The working in shadow approach which does include the public authorities spotted in the Mozza project showed how the urban social innovation had a limited impact on the local community. The depending on a hero approach which appeared in the Maspero project expresses the unsustainability of the urban Trojan although it is embraced by a major key influential person in the public authorities. This approach makes the urban social innovation easily detectable and opposed by other bodies of the system. The opening cracks approach which matches with the appropriated steps to conduct Al Athar Lina project by Megawra is an ongoing exploration to contaminate the system through such repetitive urban social innovations. Finally, more opportunities to conduct urban social innovation are currently being provided. However, the adopted approach to conduct such innovations reflects on their effectiveness as Urban Trojan and limits their impact in dissolving the boundaries between the different sectors.
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Introduction

Berlin has a very strong history of self-organised and self-initiated projects that actively produce urban space without the aim of maximizing personal profit. Throughout this paper we will refer to such projects as “self-organised projects”. Berlin is an interesting case in this regard as several examples of citizen engagement exercises have impacted urban planning processes in the city.

The basis of this research is the hypothesis that crises often provoke self-organised responses providing individual solutions, which can influence local urban planning when they address societal questions with a broader relevance. Such processes can be observed in historic examples such as the squatting movement in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s in West-Berlin, which was a response to the lack of housing corresponding to an increasing demand for individualized ways of living. The squatter movement addressed the question of a renaissance of the urban centre that was beginning at that time and could therefore develop an important impact on the formal planning structures in Berlin. This impact can be observed in the participatory approaches to urban renewal implemented during the International Building Exhibition 1984/1987 in Berlin (IBA 84/87), which still continue to have an impact today.

Analysis

Self-organisation as reaction to crisis situations can provide innovative directions for long-term solutions because they can act and think outside of existing ways of doing or thinking, they can react fast, adapt rapidly and therefore provide a high degree of flexibility. All those attributes are core qualities in the discourse of sustainable urbanism today and most of contemporary integrated urban development plans try to use them on their way towards a lively urban future for all citizens. The present research focuses on the investigation of these processes and their various spatial forms in the current urban situation in Berlin via four examples that are representative of four basic types of organisational structures of self-organised projects:

- Protest movements against investor driven urban development projects
- Temporary users active in inner city areas as pillars of non-commercial urban space
- Spatial appropriations of existing buildings to provide affordable space in a long-term perspective
Spatial entrepreneurs creating experimental forms of productions of urban space.

In this paper, these four types are illustrated by four different examples, which exemplify these types of actors in Berlin’s urban development today. The examples have been selected as they are part of an ongoing investigation throughout a series of interviews from 2011 till today and therefore data from the last years is available. The four categories are not to be understood to be exclusive but they cover a broad field of possible action. They include a wide range of aspects such as political engagement, bottom-up opposition to formal planning, top-down projects, self-organised development of new housing projects following a set of ambitious social goals set up by the actors themselves, leading to the activation and appropriation of built up or vacant places. They all act on different time frames in order to realize projects that claim to create an added value for the overall urban society. All four examples are from the same period of time and therefore also share the same socio-cultural background of Berlin after the 2000’s.

The main aim of this paper is to define today’s urban crisis provoked by neoliberal urbanism, to analyse contemporary reactions to this crisis, and the impact they develop on urban planning in Berlin today. This cross view tries to link theory and practical examples in the field of contemporary urbanism in order to explore what roles they might have for each other. Further major issues in which the connection to the overall topic of the conference seems evident are the debate about shifting planning processes, the integration of participatory approaches in urban planning and urban transformation, the questioning of the role of the public sector in urban development and its relation to private actors and finally the investigation of the strength or even the relevance of bottom-up initiatives in a rapid changing urban environment.

Methodically the historic example of the IBA 84/87 serves as an introduction to the topic and the relationship between crisis and self-organisation in the Berlin case. It also introduces the recent four examples, all of which can be understood as reactions to the situation in Berlin after the early 2000’s. Their common contextual background is what links them together. The selected examples are representative of the four basic types mentioned above and data was available for them and a series of interviews has been conducted with actors directly involved in the projects since 2011. Besides the literature review and data analysis, these interviews are the most important method applied in the present research. Conclusions out of the four examples as well as to their reflexion in relation to the IBA experience will be shown at the end of the paper.

IBA 84/87 in Berlin

In the late 1970’s and early 1980’s Berlin was not just politically a quite contradictory place but also regarding its relations between housing provision, population development and lifestyle. There was massive production of subsidised housing in standardised mass-housing complexes in peripheral areas of the city in both parts – East and West Berlin. But at the same time there was also a housing shortage in the inner-city districts of West Berlin. This was mainly due to a high degree of vacancies linked to increasing speculation with real estate at the same time. Speculation with real estate was partly motivated by tax advantages for West-German citizens investing in Berlin in order to increase money flowing in the island city of the West in the former GDR (East-Germany). Furthermore, there was a large part of a political left oriented population in West Berlin that was developing alternative lifestyles, promoting a renaissance of the inner city urban districts and seeking increasing individualism which was increasingly expressed by alternative modes of living and practicing the city.
Influenced by all of these factors, the housing market in West Berlin at that time created a complex situation in which a growing amount of people could not find what they were looking for, a massive housing production that could not fill that gap and a lot of vacant buildings in the inner-city districts.

Within this context, the population faced a serious problem, and there was no political will in sight to find a solution for them. Thus, citizens started to help and organise themselves. Squatting of houses and occupying of space were at the core of these actions which commenced in order to realise their ideas of how to live in their city. Occupying buildings that have not been renovated since the Second World War was also a challenge for the actors of that movement, because it required certain know-how to repair these apartments and houses at least to the point that it was possible to inhabit them. This process fostered self-organisation by the people and thereby created a common knowledge and a growing ability to organise, repair and resist authorities that wanted to push the squatters out at first. The common interest and an agreement on the renouncement of economic interests between the members of the squatting movement created an atmosphere of solidarity as well as an increasing awareness for urban issues and a growing political influence. This movement of squatters was uncomfortable for the politics at that time, because it brought deeper societal problems and questions to the surface not only by its physical presence in urban space but also in the political dimension it took by creating a discourse around its goals and claims based on direct democracy and citizen participation.

During the same period, it was not just the question of appropriate housing for new lifestyles which became more and more important, but also the paradigms of classical modern urbanism started to be increasingly questioned by society in general and also by experts and practitioners within the planning disciplines. The idea of car-based transportation and suburbanization as well as the radical break with the classical urban form of a clear division between private and public space that was promoted by modern urban planning started to be strongly opposed. Authors such as Alexander Mitscherlich (Mitscherlich, 1965) in Germany or Jane Jacobs (Jacobs, 1961) internationally, were relevant voices for such critical positions towards modern urbanism since the 1960's. With the rise of post-modernism, the historic city centres with an urban life created by a heterogeneous mix of uses had a remarkable renaissance. In this general atmosphere started West Berlin's project for an “International Building Exhibition – IBA” in the late 1970's. It was decided that the IBA would have two directors and two main directions, one, “IBA NEU”, dealing with new constructions and the so called “critical reconstruction” with Josef Paul as director and the other, “IBA ALT”, dealing with rehabilitation and renovation of the existing building stocks and the so called “careful urban renewal” with Hardt-Waltherr Hämer as director. As main site of intervention for the second part of the IBA 84/87, which should be realized for the cities 750th anniversary in 1987, the district of Kreuzberg was chosen. Kreuzberg was also the place of many occupied houses at that time, so squatters and planners had to deal with each other, as it was also defined in the 12 principles for careful urban renewal that were written as guidelines for the urban transformation process which took place over the years in the framework of the IBA (Senatsverwaltung für Bau- und Wohnungswesen (ed.), 1991).

12 principles for careful urban renewal:

---

9 On the following website all occupied buildings in Berlin, including their brief histories as well as their evolutions over time are documented and well represented on the basis of an interactive map: http://berlin-besetzt.de

10 Several maps of the exact sites of intervention within the IBA and a more detailed history about it in general and its various projects can be found in the following study published by Berlins senate department for urban planning: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/staedtebau/baukultur/iba/download/IBA87_Endbericht_Karte.pdf

11 Senatsverwaltung für Bau- und Wohnungswesen (ed.), 1991, translated by the authors
1. The renewal must be planed and realized with preservation of substance with the actual residents, businessman and craftsman.
2. Planners should agree with residents, businessman and craftsman on the goals of the renewal measures. Technical and social planning should go hand in hand.
3. The particularities of Kreuzberg should be preserved and trust and confidence must be raised in the threatened neighbourhoods. Substance threatening damages on houses have to be immediately repaired.
4. Careful changes in floor plans should enable new forms of living.
5. The renewal of apartments and houses should happen in phases and be completed gradually.
6. The quality of the built environment should be improved by reducing demolitions, plantations in the courtyards and the design of facades.
7. Public facilities as well as streets, squares and green areas must be renewed and supplemented according to actual needs.
8. Right to participation as well as material rights of all concerned persons must be arranged during social planning.
9. Decisions on urban renewal must be found in an open process and if possible discussed on site. The representatives of concerned people have to be strengthened.
10. Urban renewal that generates trust must be based on a fixed financial support. It must be possible to spend the money fast and according to the specific situation.
11. New forms of organizing institutions have to be developed. Fiduciary tasks of renovation and construction tasks should be separated.
12. The urban renewal following those principles must be continued after the time of the IBA.

Following those principles, the process of urban renewal started to involve local residents, businessmen as well as craftsmen. In the case of squatted houses their inhabitants were considered as affected residents and treated as such, which made them active actors of this process. Within this process-oriented approach to urban renewal around 6,000 flats could be renovated until the completion of the IBA in 1987. Various examples of projects realized during that period of time, such as Admiralstraße, Wohnregal, among others were still inhabited by the inhabitants from the time of the IBA 20 years later which can be understood as a success of these projects (Deutsches Institut für Stadtbaukunst, 2012). The IBA was in the comfortable situation to have plenty of public money to invest in projects conducted under its direction, nevertheless new models of financing housing accessible to less fortunate inhabitants were developed. Especially the fact that people could pay their necessary personal share in the financing of a project not just by money but also through their time in form of work was an experiment tested by the IBA, the so called "Muskelhypotheken", which means credits for muscles. Besides the immediate financing of the project costs a strong focus was put on the long-term evolution of the projects and the legal structures that would ensure them. In the publication “25 Jahre Internationale Bauausstellung Berlin” (Bodenschatz, Harald; Lumpugnani, Vittorio Magnago; Sonne, Wolfgang; Deutsches Institut für Stadtbaukunst (Ed.), 2012) many authors such as Harald Bodenschatz or Cordelia Pollina show throughout several examples that the measures taken at that time can be seen as right and appropriate as many of the projects still follow their original goals today.
Today and possible futures

Today, Berlin is a vibrant city and as such a magnet for many people. Its image as a hub for creative industries and at the same time an affordable city with a high quality of life make it even more attractive for people from a globalized creative class to move there. From the early 2000’ on, Berlins population grew constantly\(^{12}\), but its housing production didn’t manage to follow this dynamic fast enough. This was mainly because it was still dealing with the question of what to do with a large percentage of vacancy in the housing-stock which has been a big issue in the late 1990’s and early 2000’s. As many of the people coming to Berlin are highly educated and working in the city or internationally, they enter the housing market as very dynamic actors that can afford rents or real-estate prices higher than large parts of the local population. This situation led to severe Gentrification processes in inner city areas over the past years and as a consequence to the expulsion of vulnerable populations from the city centre as well as an increase of rents and real-estate prices all over the city. The development of rents in Berlin is observed and statistically treated by the department of urban planning and yearly published in the Berliner Mietspiegel\(^{13}\). Besides a growing population and an associated shift in the relation between offer and demand on the local housing market, international investment in real-estate is increasing every year in Berlin. Especially after the economic crisis at the stock market in 2008 a boom of investment in real estate could be recognised, showing clearly how tightly globalized economics and urban development are linked and have a strong impact on the social conditions in our cities. The dominance of economics in this interdependency is pushed to an extreme by neoliberal policies that often seem to be an unquestioned ‘common sense’ leading to an increase of social differences and loss of diversity in our cities (Schwarz, 2009). It’s a strange phenomenon that in the beginning of the 21st century we live in a time where there is more wealth then ever in Europe and still there is a clear presence of an urban crisis nourished by increasing social inequalities (Piketty, 2014).

Looking at four projects in Berlin it is important to mention that they did not pass unseen by the city’s urban planners and first steps to find new ways to activate the potential of self-organised citizen engagement for the production of active urban places can be observed. The already enduring discussion about the procedures of selling city-owned real estate led to the creation of the “Runder Tisch zur Neuausrichtung der Berliner Liegenschaftspolitik”\(^{14}\) – a round table to re-define the direction of public real estate politics in Berlin, that brings together experts, politicians and activists to debate actual real estate questions as well as strategic developments. Further first attempts of new formats of selling procedures, as for example the so called “Konzeptverfahren” have been carried out in recent years. The “Konzeptverfahren” – the concept based procedures – is a tool of the public administrations to sell land not based on the principle of the best price offered but on a combination of the concept proposed by future buyers and the land price they offer. Further urban development goals can be demanded and agreed on in the contracts when the land is sold later on in the procedure. This procedure was tested on several pilot projects and could be used on a bigger scale over the next years, but by now it is not very clear if a systematic use of the procedure is planned by the local administrations or postulated by local politics. Recent

\(^{12}\) All statistical data over the last years concerning population development as well as housing units realised and building permits approved can be found at: https://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de

\(^{13}\) More information about the Mietspiegel as well as all the last editions can be found at the following website: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/wohnen/mietspiegel/

\(^{14}\) The meetings of the “Runder Tisch zur Neuausrichtung der Berliner Liegenschaftspolitik” are open to the public and protocols of the past meetings can be found on the website of one of the founding initiatives: http://stadt-neudenken.tumblr.com/Runder%20Tisch
cases have been for example the former “Blumengroßmarkt” where innovative projects by local architects such as FRIZZ:23 by deadline architects or the “Integratives Bauprojekt am ehemaligen Blumengrossmarkt” by ifau + Heide und von Beckerath architects are under construction at the moment, or the site in “Ritterstraße 50”, where the co-housing project with the same name by ifau + Jesko Fezer + Heide und von Beckerath architects has already been realized in 2011 and was successful, or soon to come for the “Schöneberger Linse” where such a procedure is running at the moment and should have been decided in 2017. In 2015 even a new funding scheme for “experimental housing” was announced and carried out with the result of nine awarded projects that were selected to receive funding of in total about 30 Mio € for their processes of implementation. The procedure was carried out as an open competition addressing teams of architects cooperating together with land owners asking them to submit proposals for experimental and innovative housing concepts for the sites they already owned. The projects should be able to enter construction phase in 2017 and provide innovations for the questions of housing and urban development in Berlin. All these attempts, ideas and experiments can be seen as first steps towards more inclusive strategies of an active co-production of the urban environment. These projects can be understood as prototypes of such new attempts to co-produce our cities and rethink the way we use them.

Protest movements against investor driven urban development projects | Example: 100% Tempelhofer Feld e.V.

The first example is the former airport of Tempelhof in Berlin, not only a huge field of vacant inner-city land after the closure of the airport in 2008, but also a symbol of freedom and the very particular history of West Berlin. Right from the end of its use as an airport the so-called “Tempelhofer Feld”, the field of Tempelhof, was claimed by Berlin’s citizens as a public space and therefore became a crucial space for urban development over the last years. After a very short time the public call to open the airfield as an urban green space accessible for everybody gained political influence. It rapidly became a major green space for the city, preserving its special and unique atmosphere of a converted airport. In parallel to the opening, the Senate of Berlin was working on urban development plans for the fringes of the airfield in order to build housing and a big park. The plans to develop the recently claimed space were not supported by the activists dealing with the Tempelhofer Feld or indeed the simultaneously active ‘Raumpioniere’ spatial pioneers. The Senate had launched a procedure that allowed people to get access to a plot of land on the airfield in order to set up a temporary project that was selected in a two-phase procedure to be realized for 3 years. In a very short time especially the community garden project “Allmende Kontor” was very successful and has today more than 1,000 people active creating a multicultural non-profit project providing a publicly accessible and lively place. An initiative of urban activists, urban planners and many others formed in order to keep the airfield an un-built open space for

15 The final decision in the procedure of Schöneberger Linse has been announced after this article was written.
16 More information about the funding scheme in general and the procedure carried out in 2015 can be found on the website of Berlin’s senate department for urban planning: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/aktuell/wettbewerbe/ausschreibungen/siwa/ and further information concerning the awarded projects can be downloaded at the following link: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/aktuell/pressebox/archiv_volltext.shtml?arch_1511/nachricht5845.html
17 West Berlin was isolated in the former GDR with East Berlin as its capital and had to be not only financially subsidised by the rest of West Germany, but also had to be provided with food and all goods for daily life and therefore survival through the so called air bridge for almost a year in 1948/1949, meaning that that almost constantly airplanes were landing at Tempelhof Airport making it a symbol for survival, resistance and freedom for the local population.
everybody. Under the slogan “100% Tempelhofer Feld” they started a campaign against the Senators plans for a classical master planned urban development on the airfield. What seemed a small group of leftist activists in the beginning, gained much more support in their campaign than anybody expected in the beginning. Due to this broad resonance among the population the initiative achieved support for a referendum in Berlin which would pose the question of whether there should be any construction on the airfield or not. To achieve a city-wide referendum was already a remarkable success for “100% Tempelhofer Feld”, but at that time the question had already reached everybody in Berlin and it was embedded in a broader discussion about who would decide about future urban developments, what role citizen participation would play in it and what means would stop Gentrification in the city in order to keep its vibrant mix of populations alive. The general public in Berlin is very sensitive to issues dealing with urban development and especially with urban renewal in existing neighbourhoods as it had to face severe changes and saw several paradigms of urban planning fail with their ambitions to shape the city according to their new ideas, such as the car-friendly city. A lot of these transformations lead to expulsions of original populations and since it became a political agenda to use urban upgrading as a tool to advance urban transformation or Gentrification – processes which are very well documented concerning Berlin by the social scientist Andrej Holm who is researching at Humboldt University Berlin. After some months of public debate the referendum was clearly won by 100% Tempelhofer Feld and the Senate of Berlin had to stop its plans for any urban development on the former airfield. The initiative viewed this result as a huge success not only for them but, also for all citizens and as a new symbol for the power that citizen engagement can develop when it claims an interest for everybody.

In the context of the lack of several thousand housing units, the Senators proposal to build new housing on the airfield might have been expected to be very well accepted by a local population. However, the way in which politics dealt with the city owned land over the last decade and the lack of trust in the real estate market stimulated people to fight the official proposal. The disappointment of the local population about the way their city government ruled over public space and the way they tried to provide adequate housing to the population were so strong that it could gather such a large majority of people in the city and by that became a symbol for the power of the inhabitants in the transformation of their city in Berlin.

Temporary users active in inner city areas as pillars of non-commercial urban space | Example: Prinzessinnengärten gGmbH

The second example is a bit further north in Berlin, the Prinzessinnengärten is a community garden project in the heart of Kreuzberg, close to the former Berlin Wall. What started 2009 with a short-term rental contract for a vacant plot of land as an experiment of the association “Nomadisch Grün e.V.”, nomadic green, founded by Robert Shaw and Marco Clausen soon became a success story, the so called Prinzessinnengärten. The project is based in an inner-city area with a high diversity concerning its population and commercial structures and the neighbourhood already started to encounter Gentrification when the project started. Right from the beginning, it was a goal of the project not to focus primarily on the production of food but to create an active non-commercial community space for the neighbourhood and the whole city that would of course be oriented towards questions of urban gardening, food production, sustainability and urban development. The Prinzessinnengärten soon became a

---

18 More information about the initiative can be found on their website: http://www.thf100.de/start.html
19 More information about Andrej Holms studies can be found at his blog on Gentrification issues in Berlin: https://gentrificationblog.wordpress.com.
20 More information about the project can be found on their website: http://prinzessinnengarten.net
meeting place for all kinds of people in the city and by its well working network also a self-declared active agent in the discourse about user-based and bottom-up urbanism in Berlin. Over the years the organizational structures of the projects also evolved and at a certain point the association was transformed into a non-profit making limited company in order to be able to manage the growing size of the Prinzessinnengärten. Besides all the events that take place at the garden, its initiators try to communicate the idea of the project and the issues linked at many different occasions in the field of urban development. These networking activities are essential, as the long-term potential of the project is not assured. The lease contract for the plot of land is re-negotiated every year, meaning it is a permanent threat to the existence of the project, thus making it very sensitive to changes in the area. As the neighbourhood around goes through a rapid urban transformation process linked to increasing land prices, the Prinzessinnengärten understand themselves more and more as active actors against Gentrification, keeping up their ambition to provide a publicly accessible and non-commercial urban space for everybody.

The upscaling of existing neighbourhoods such as Kreuzberg is a permanent threat to non-commercial activities and spaces in Berlin as many of them such as the Prinzessinnengärten only dispose of short term rental contracts, which make them very vulnerable actors. The public sphere they create around them is not only important for their daily activities but also a tool to justify their relevance for a neighbourhood to have a stronger position in order to be able to stay and maintain the space they provide for the neighbourhood.

**Spatial appropriations of existing buildings to provide affordable space in a long-term perspective | Example: ExRotaPrint gGmbH**

The third example is in the district of Wedding in the north of Berlin, a multi-ethnical working-class neighbourhood in the former West Berlin. The urban structure dates from various times of Berlins agitating urban history over the last 150 years. While in large parts of Wedding the so called “Flächensanierung”, the demolition and reconstruction of whole neighbourhoods in the 1960’, 1970’ and early 1980’ took place, in some other parts a big housing stock from the period before the First World War was conserved. At that moment, urban planners perceived the housing stock from the 19th century as a problem to solve and their solution was to tear down the old and not renovated buildings in order to be able to build up new neighbourhoods following the ideals of a modern city based on the idea to be as car-friendly as possible. In this area, the former printing company RotaPrint is located, which was established in 1904 and was, with more than 1.000 employees during its best times, one of the biggest companies in Wedding but went bankrupt in 1989. In 1991 the administrative buildings from the 1950’ were declared protected monuments. The district that had become the new owner was renting spaces in the former factory complex on a temporary basis to artists and other temporary users till the “Liegenschaftsfond Berlin”\(^{21}\), the cities real-estate managing company, became the new owner and got the order to sell the complex in 2001. This meant a potential threat of expulsion for all the renters at that time and led to a long process of self-organization and self-initiative organised by the artists Les Schliesser and Daniela Brahms both artists and renters in the building. After more than two years of negotiations they could set up the very particular and complex structure of the “ExRotaPrint”\(^{22}\), which is based on the fact that two foundations (Trias and Edith Marion) with social guidelines bought the land and gave the ExRotaPrint gGmbH, a non-profit making limited company, a 99 year lease for all the buildings on it, a so called “Erbbaurechtvertrag” in order for them to be able to manage,

\(^{21}\) The Liegenschaftsfond is the legal body managing the real estate owned by the city of Berlin, more information can be found on its website: http://www.liegenschaftsfonds.de

\(^{22}\) More information about the project can be found on their website: http://exrotaprint.de
renovate and use the buildings without aiming to maximize profit for anybody and having cut off the complex from further real-estate speculation. The Erbbaurecht is a long-term land lease based on the separation of the land ownership and all constructions built on it, which allows for example having an owner for a certain plot of land and at the same time having another owner of a building standing on the same plot of land. Within its own set of rules the ExRotaPrint has fixed to maintain a mix of a third each of social business, artists and handicrafts among its renters. Besides the rental spaces for studios, etc. there is a café open to the public and a series of spaces that can be rented on a daily basis for events. The process of renovation is still on-going, because it is realized in an incremental way so renters can stay for a maximum of time and the works are conducted little by little instead of having to evict everybody for a certain time during the works. The case of ExRotaPrint became an example for many other project spaces and activists, showing that endurance and straightforward propositions towards politics and potential other project partners can create astonishing results and create more value for a city, a neighbourhood and everybody involved.

The interesting fact about ExRotaPrint is that without the threat of losing their workspace the projects initiators would not have had the idea to start such a project, but the fact that they were threatened by that option through the increasing dynamic on the real estate market was somehow the kick-off for the project in the beginning. What is remarkable is that by doing so and by the learning process of running and realising the project they became more and more aware of the dynamics they were dealing with and therefore started to understand themselves increasingly as active producers of urban space and not only as actors for their personal interest. This shift of perspective can be seen in the structure of the project that allows itself to continue in the same mind-set as it was initiated, assured by its organisational framework and legal status.

Spatial entrepreneurs producing experimental forms of productions of urban space | Example: Spreefeld Berlin eG

The fourth example is situated in the centre of Berlin, close to the Prinzessinnengärten but to the other side of the former Berlin Wall on a former industrial site on the banks of the river Spree. The site, where today the "Spreefeld Wohn- und Baugenossenschaft", a cooperative housing project is located, was used by the GDR water police that had three boats in a garage here to control the water border zone before this use became obsolete in 1989 and it became one of Berlin’s uncountable inner city urban brownfields that were the paradise for all kinds of temporary users over the 1990’ and early 2000’ (Overmeyer, 2006). The place at the water and especially the boat house were used as a club for some time before a group of people around the architecture firm “die Zusammenarbeiter” started the Spreefeld project. In a long and participatory process with the future users, three mixed-use buildings were realized with commercial and communal space on the two first levels followed by up to six levels of housing and shared roof-terraces in 2014. The project structure was set up as a newly founded cooperative, the Spreefeld Berlin eG, that operates as a self-organised and self-initiated project developer and therefore is a key actor for the project. At the very beginning of the project a set of rules were established that built the foundation of the project and that could not be changed by the future inhabitants and users in order to assure an active role of the project within its neighbourhood. These rules mainly clarified the

23 More information in particular about the basic rules and principles of the “Spreefeld Wohn- und Baugenossenschaft” can be found on their website: http://spreefeld-berlin.de

24 More information about their projects can be found at http://www.zusammenarbeiter.de
The relation between public and private spaces outside and inside the buildings. The main rules were the following:

- The first two levels stay without housing
- All non-built free spaces stay publicly accessible
- In each of the three buildings there are so called option-spaces for use that had to be defined

Based on these rules the planning dealt with the future users and their various lifestyles that should find an adequate place to live in the future buildings. Due to that process, a huge variety of housing typologies was realized reaching from regular 30sqm flats to 800sqm cluster apartments that are shared by around 20 people. This mix of typologies also reflects the diversity of people in different life phases and with different needs for their living environment. Through its mix-used ground floor the project is an active agent in the neighbourhood that is also undergoing a rapid urban transformation at the moment. The members of the cooperative were able to establish links, relations and find a common ground with all their very diverse neighbours in the area reaching from the architects living and working in the next-door German Architecture Centre - DAZ to the anarchist squatter community called TeePeeLand on the other side. Having been widely published and nominated for the Mies van der Rohe Prize for Contemporary European Architecture in 2015 the project got international attention and it was also featured in several exhibitions dealing with the question of housing in Berlin, such as Urban Living (Ring, 2015), putting its social and urban goals in front and promoting its innovative project structure and development process that enables the creation of a project that complex and holistic in its ambitions.

The Spreefeld is a prototype for a community-oriented way to inhabit the city, for example the fact that the form of a cooperative was actively chosen as a legal and ownership structure is a strong indicator for an alternative approach to classical real estate development in inner city areas. The fact that the present diversity of floor plan layouts and through that the variety of different co-housing forms as it can be found at the Spreefeld cannot be found in any of the housing projects built by the city-owned housing corporation nor on the rather upscale real estate market of investor based projects shows clearly that the project has to be understood as a self-organised reaction to that deficit. The market and the existing housing stock could not provide the inhabitants what they were looking for but the fact that they were able to realise a project that would offer them the spatial framework to experience the form of community living in an inner-city context they were looking for, demonstrates the creative power and potential that lies embedded in processes of self-organisation.

Conclusions and outlook

After having looked at the example of the IBA 84/87 and new types of self-organised projects, it is important to mention the phenomenon of temporary use as a major element of Berlin’s recent urban history. In the 1990’ and early 2000’ they were forms of self-organised appropriations of the huge urban brownfields that were opened up by the fall of the Berlin Wall and that contributed in a remarkable way to the image of Berlin as a centre for creative spatial practice. After the city’s experience with the IBA the city’s department for urban

---

25 Overall plans including floor plans of various housing units, programmatic schemes of the project and an interview with the initiators and architects of the project can be found in the following article of the architectural magazine die Bauwelt: http://www.bauwelt.de/dl/805623/bw_2014_39_0014-0023_NEU.pdf

26 More information about this as interesting as unconventional project can be found at https://teepeeland.wordpress.com
development was already sensitive to the potential of user based bottom-up urbanism and conducted an urban research project called “Urban Pioneers” (Overmeyer, 2006) in order to try to better understand the role of temporary use projects for the city. This approach has to be seen as an important step by the formal administrations towards bottom-up actors in the city and an attempt to learn from them and take them serious as local actors. The fact that real procedures influenced by this process can be observed for example on the former airfield of Tempelhof with the already explained “Raumpioniere” in the early 2010’ shows that the actual learning process is quite slow but a real transfer and impact can be seen. Besides that, the process of learning by planning authorities is slow it also seems that it starts anew again for each period of different forms of self-organised and self-initiated projects. The IBA was quite a singular project for many of its ambitions but citizen participation and a sensitive approach to urban renewal remained important factors for further urban development after its completion. After the change of perspective on urban pioneers, formats were developed to activate the potential lying in this approach. The impact of the new self-organised and self-activated projects can just be seen in first steps and attempts but it can already be stated that through research and exhibition projects such as “Stadtschaum” (Sabatier, Schwarz, 2012), “Self Made City” (Ring, 2013), “Urban Living” (Ring, 2015) and “Raumunternehmen” (Overmeyer, 2014) the interest of planning authorities in these projects and approaches to co-produce urban space is already high. Further, it seems that there might be a shift in the way public land is dealt with. Procedures such as the already mentioned “Konzeptverfahren”, where the concepts of future projects are taken into consideration before selling land to future developers, show this new approach. At the moment, the application of these procedures is just about to start, so it is too early to make a clear statement if the first attempts in this direction are the signs of a real paradigm shift or just singular projects.

The slow speed of this learning process must be highlighted because when looking at the goals formulated during the time of the IBA regarding social aspects and the warning from an increasing social imbalance, it is evident that they still are almost the same as claimed by urban activists and actors of the above explained self-organised and self-initiated urban space projects. This makes it evident that these goals have not been reached by now, as demonstrated by the their continued relevance. This fact also links the IBA experience to the new cases, because the goals and ambitions formulated and claimed by them are very much corresponding to each other. The fact that the processes of bottom-up urbanism as an alternative to top-down urban development have been central to various urban research projects and publication in the field of academia over the last decades, shows how present the topic is on a theoretical level. However, as the examples from the ground discussed above have shown, the topic is still in a process of entering mainstream practice. It seems very important to us to foster discussion about these issues in an interlinked way between theory and practice, because theory can provide key arguments around the quest for a socially more just urban environment. It is not just an idea from utopian dreamers, but a key factor towards a sustainable urban future as all the factors dealing with ecology, economy, culture and sociality are interdependent and their problems cannot be solved separately. This knowledge seems to be well recognised in theory but still has a certain way to go to find its place in practice. As such, further work is needed to develop its own way of producing or better articulating how to co-produce urban space today for all its inhabitants equally.
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