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Why talk about shrinkage?

*Turok, Mykhnenko (2006), p. 12*
Explanations for shrinkage

- Stage- and life-cycle theories of urban development (Berry 1977, van den Berg 1982)
- Territorial division of labour (Massey 1984, Lipietz 1977, Scott 1988)
- Demographic change, 2nd demogr. Transition (van de kaa 1987)
Shrinkage as a challenge for municipal governments

**Expenses:**
- Additional expenses for the adaption of urban infrastructures
- Irreducible operational costs
- Rising expenditures per capita, as a consequence of demogr. change and unemployment
- Intensified marketing and incentives to investors

**Revenues:**
- Declining economy and population $\rightarrow$ declining local tax base
- (Yet, important variations in the allocation of funds across different countries)
Shrinkage, urban governance, and the „growth imperative“

- City limits (Peterson 1981)
- Growth Machine (Logan and Molotch 1987)
- Entrepreneurial cities (Harvey 1989)
- Austerity urbanism (Peck 2012)
- ...
Shrinkage as a new chance?

“Planners and decision-makers have to overcome their aversion, usually induced by the growth-oriented wider culture in which they operate, to the very idea of shrinkage. (...) planners are in a unique position to reframe decline as an opportunity: a chance to re-envision cities and to explore non-traditional approaches to their growth at a time when cities desperately need them. (...) Probably the key obstacle here is the notion (...) that a healthy city always grows and that only unhealthy ones shrink.”

(Hollander et al. 2009: 223-24, 232)
Experiences from Leipzig
Deindustrialisation
Falling birth rates
Suburbanisation
Housing vacancies

Table 3.4.1: Development in Leipzig’s housing stock 1997-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>277.812</td>
<td>310.329</td>
<td>317.439</td>
<td>316.763</td>
<td>316.358</td>
<td>316.358</td>
<td>316.027</td>
<td>314.223</td>
<td>314.223</td>
<td>+36.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New constructions</td>
<td>13.891</td>
<td>9.086</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2.124</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>1.948</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>+32.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Leipzig</td>
<td>9.845</td>
<td>5.236</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>+19.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the region</td>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>3.850</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>+12.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1.687</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>11.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancies</td>
<td>57.000</td>
<td>68.000</td>
<td>68.000</td>
<td>64.000</td>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>57.000</td>
<td>53.000</td>
<td>48.000</td>
<td>43.000</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per cent</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses: demolitions

Federal Programme
Stadtumbau Ost

about 2.5 billion €, 260 cities
from 2001-2010

Subsidies for “backwards-building” of oversupply and upgrading

Plans are set up collaboratively by local administrations and housing companies

By now 350,000 flats have been demolished
Demolition of >7,500 appartments since 2001
2009

samedi 1 juin 2013
Ownership structure in 2002
„Integrative Development Plan“ 2001
Perpetual demolitions 2002-2009
Restructuring Leipzig‘s East
More green by the means of demolitions
“The derelict pre-war structures along the street have been torn down to a large part. As a result, the backyards of the blocks behind are now opening up towards the 'forest', instead of unattractive vacant lots. This lead to immense improvements in the living and housing quality for the remaining houses.“ (Head of Leipzig’s City Planning Department, 2004)
Responses: Guardian houses
Conclusions

- Shrinkage is no taboo at all, problems are not o much in the filed of knowledge and perception, but with power and resources
- Broad variety of responses, not only „entrepreneurial“
- Responses depend on state capacities, interplay of different levels of statehood is crucial
- …but also dependent on private cooperation → variety of forms, from „growth coalitions“, via „grant coalitions“ to „no cooperation“
- Fragmented solutions, problems to implement comprehensive apporaches („Mikado“-planning)