Laboratoire de Géographie et Aménagement du Territoire

www.geo.ipse.uni.lu

Constance Carr, Markus Hesse

Implications of Results (SUSTAINLUX)

Working Paper 6

Luxembourg, April 2013

UNIVERSITÉ DU LUXEMBOURG

Fonds National de la Recherche Luxembourg

Implications of Results

Constance Carr

in collaboration with

Markus Hesse and Christian Schulz
Geography and Spatial Planning Research
Centre, University of Luxembourg

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of the current and sixth working paper is to outline some implications of the SUSTAINLUX. The third Delphi round of research consultation is described. The implications for spatial planning and further research that were extracted from that round are explained. Last, the research purposes of SUS-TAINGOV, the extension to SUSTAINLUX, are introduced.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

Through its CORE Research Programme, the Government of Luxembourg's *Fonds National de la Recherche* (2010) stated that:

> "Luxembourg is facing a number of challenges with an important territorial dimension that have to be addressed by spatial planning and development. […] It is essential to find new ways of living (manufacturing, housing, mobility) that allow for a sustainable development and sustainable land use […]. The geographic challenge consists in promoting a controlled urban development,"

The researchers co-ordinating the SUSTAINLUX project aimed and examining and assessing these challenges. Given recent economic and demographic changes and strong pressures on land-use, SUSTAINLUX focuses on an evaluation of the existing planning policy instruments and governance patterns with respect to spatial development in the Grand Duchy in general, and of housing policy and transport in particular.

A series of Working Papers were written for SUSTAINLUX which can be understood as yardsticks to indicate the progress of the three-year project. The first working paper (Carr, Hesse, and Schulz 2010) introduced the conceptual groundwork, identified the central problems and contradictions, and outlined a research methodology. The second working paper (Carr 2011) evolved from the completion of the first stages of the research process, namely the document analysis and carrying out of exploratory conversational interviews. It aimed to answer some of the preliminary questions that were outlined in the original CORE proposal: How did Luxembourg get to where it is today? Who put sustainability at the top of the policy agenda in Luxembourg, why, and how? What was the political economic context of such a development and what were the implications? To what extent and how has the

concept of sustainability become part of spatial development and planning policies in Luxembourg? How consistent is the approach in the realm of housing and mobility policies? What kind of guiding principles and which discourse patterns can be identified? What are the different conceptual "forms", "modes" or "models" of governance this particular practice can be referred to? The research process was thus able to identify the links between the European and Luxembourg national levels of government and the role of sustainable development as a normative spatial planning policy, in achieving some of the policy agendas defined at those circuits.

The third working paper (Carr 2012), addressed the questions: How do the current administrative and legal structures respond to the requirements of the sustainability objective laid down in the *Programme Directeur d'Aménagement du Territoire*? What kind of barriers and obstacles can be observed in the field of housing, mobility, and spatial development, regarding the implementation of the related sector plans? On-going document analysis and further interviews, both with and eye to governance in Luxembourg revealed significant barriers in place that prevent policy implementation in Luxembourg. Conceptualizing the problem through debates on policy mobility, wider global circuits of sustainable development policy were identified, that Luxembourg taps into.

The objective of the fourth paper (Carr 2012) was to present the findings of the textual data generated from the interviews. The data that was collected from 30 recorded and transcribed interviews, as well as a wide array of relevant policy documents was categorized, structured and synthesised into discursive categories. The fourth working paper thus served as a data source for future and more conceptually oriented peer-reviewed papers.

The objective of the fifth working paper was to: a) report on the final workshop meetings with the interview participants

that took place in March 2013; b) explain in detail some of the scenarios that were considered during the feedback process.

This sixth and final working paper aims to outline the implications of the SUSTAINLX research. This paper thus concludes the SUSTAINLUX research with some reflections on what this research has achieved, and what the implications are for practitioners, here conceived in its widest sense (e.g. local decision-makers, planners, research funding agencies, and the general public people).

Upon conclusion of SUSTAINLUX, the set of working papers will be compiled into a single manuscript, augmented and edited where necessary, and published with Peter Lang's double blind peer-reviewed book series entitled „*Luxemburg-Studien / Études luxembourgeoises.*" The proposal was accepted in April 2013.

The working paper series, however, also stand parallel to a rigorous publishing strategy that seeks to ratify our results in international discourse through the scholarly peer review process. "Discourse Yes, Implementation Maybe: an Immobility and Paralysis of Sustainable Development Policy" is forthcoming in European Planning Studies (IF 0.976). Together with Julia Affolderbach (FNR, NEBOR), a second manuscript is in review with the Journal of the Regional Studies Association (IF 1.784). Further publications in progress include: 1) together with Markus Hesse, an article headed for the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research (IF 1.339), which has also been accepted for presentation at the Spaces and Flows conference 2013 and at the Transport Research Day of BIVEC-GIBET in May 2013, in Luxembourg; 2) together with Christian Schulz, an entry to International Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning (IF 0.615); 3) a chapter accepted for contribution to "Adventures in Urban Sustainable Development: Theoretical interventions and notes from the field" (MIT Press); and 4) together with Affolderbach, a special issue of the Local Environment: Interna-

tional Journal of Justice and Sustainability will be guest edited. The contributing articles are currently under peer review.

Lastly, while this paper concludes the SUSTAINLUX research, it should be mentioned here that a research extension entitled SUSTAIN_GOV was granted under the 2012 CORE program, and is scheduled to begin April 1, 2013. Redirecting the research focus to integrative sustainable planning and participatory processes in the *Glattal Stadt* of Zurich North, SUSTAIN_GOV will add an international and comparative dimension to the SUSTAINLUX project. The procedures in SUSTAIN_GOV also foresee further involvement of local Luxembourgish actors, towards the deepening of our understanding of domestic sustainable spatial development and governance processes.

INTRODUCTION

Over a period of three years, SUSTAINLUX research aimed to examine processes in the small state of Luxembourg that had come under strong growth pressure over the past 15 years. This unfolded as the highly successful transition from an industrial-based economy to one that rests on financial services and a high degree of internationalization. This development trajectory, however, had driven a variety of fragmenting processes as micro-local ori-

ented systems were pressed to accommodate new demands and needs. Housing prices rose, in a real estate market high in demand and low in supply. Increased commuter traffic put demands on existing transport infrastructure. SUSTAINLUX aimed to better understand the governance processes and discourses that that contextualize these processes.

The SUSTAINLUX research is of international significance. Recent work has shown that processes in Luxembourg are relevant to the international urban studies literature concerning policy mobility (Carr forthcoming), scale and multi-level governance (Affolderbach and Carr in review; Hesse and Krueger, in progress), policy and governance analyses (Carr and Schulz, in progress), and fragmentation versus integration (Hesse and Carr, in progress). Processes in Luxembourg are thus interesting for scholars who are exchanging in wider debates in urban studies, because it can be inventoried among the geography of spaces that constitute the variety of urban worlds.

The SUSTAINLUX research is also of obvious local significance, and is thus interesting for local practitioners, planners, and research funding agencies. The SUSTAINLUX research examined not just processes, problems and specific difficulties in need of a quick fix. Rather, the SUSTAINLUX research examined the framework conditions that gave rise to the problems, as well as the discourses, and orbits of debate that inform participating actors. Analysing the discourses that contextualize and are derived from recent transformation processes is vital to understanding the possibilities and limitations of practical solutions. Understanding how problems are framed and understood by actors operating across a given field can help practitioners and planners understand the consequences of their own ideas and agendas. In this way, the SUSTAINLUX research differs from previous research on Luxembourg urban and regional development.

In this paper, the interpretations that were confirmed throughout the Delphi research processes are summarized, showing that transformation processes are currently widely debated in Luxembourg, and that there is a consensus across Luxembourg concerning social spatial and political economic problematics. The data, however, also shows a variety of mismatches and conflicts of interest that inhibit a consensus or unified solution. Certainly, these observations have implications for spatial planning praxes, and there is a corresponding and outstanding mandate for further research. However, there are also conceptual implications, which perhaps even demand new ways of thinking urban spaces.

The aim of this sixth working paper is to provide a settled result and set of conclusions of the 3-year SUSTAINLUX research process. A first set of results were summarized in Working Paper 5. These were the set of affirmations received after the second Delphi round. This paper presents the results of a third Delphi round, and sketch a road map of implications and possible consequences of the SUSTAINLUX research. This paper thus strives to function as a guide for practitioners, here conceived in its widest sense. The paper is structured as follows. First, the methodology that informs this paper, specifically, is explained. Second, some broad conclusions are drawn. Third, some of the implications are discussed. Fourth, some thoughts on and ideas for further study are expounded.

METHODS

The contents of this report were generated as a result of the third and final Delphi round of the SUSTAINLUX research. Delphi methodology was explained in Working Paper 1.

To recap, the SUSTAINLUX research unfolded as a three-step Delphi process. The first round of expert consultation was the round of expert interviews that were undertaken in 2011 and 2012. Over 30 individuals were interviewed, and asked to speak about their experiences in the field of integrated sustainable development planning in Luxembourg. A variety of actors were chosen, whereby the sum total of their views represented a broad range of perspectives in the field. The recorded interviews were transcribed and coded. This textual data was then coded, analysed, and presented back to the interviewees in the second Delphi round (the Stakeholder Meeting). This round took place in March of 2013, and the results were discussed in Working Paper 5.

The third Delphi round occurred in April 2013. This meeting gathered a cross-section of experts at the Institute of Geog-

Box 1: List of Participants

Prof. Dr. Christian Schulz
- Governance, economic geography

Prof. Dr. Markus Hesse
- Urban geography

Prof. Dr. Geoffrey Carruso
- GIS, modelling

Dr. Constance Carr
- SUSTAINLUX manager

Dr. Estelle Evrard
- ESPON Contact Point

Dr. Malte Helfer
- GR Atlas

Annik Leick (Ph.D. candidate)
- Mega-projects in Luxembourg

Franklin Bahfon (Ph.D. candidate)
- Nature Reserves, governance

Mirjam Schindler (Ph.D. candidate)
- GIS, modelling

Isabelle Pigeron-Piroth (Research Asst.)
- Demographics and statistics

raphy and Spatial Planning at the University of Luxembourg. An attendance list is provided in Box 1. At this meeting, the project coordinators presented the methodology and results. The experts were then asked to reflect on the implications that the SUSTAINLUX research may have for spatial planning praxis and further study. The discussion that followed informed much of this paper.

RESULTS

A Consensus on the Challenges, but Disagreement on the Solutions

The participants of the third Delphi round were presented the results of the previous rounds which can be summarized as follows.

The First Delphi Round

During the first Delphi round, interviewees were asked: to discuss their general background and challenges with respect to their current position; to reflect on issues of land-use development; to comment on the balance of stakeholders in urban development processes; to give their assessment of policy initiatives; to talk about what sustainable development means to them and clarify the relevance (if any) to their work; and, to identify some of the main challenges that Luxembourg faces in the coming years. These conversations generated an immense database of textual data that could be analysed in a variety of ways. Five categories of immediate local relevance were elucidated (See Working Paper 4):

1. How is Sustainable Development Understood in Luxembourg;
2. The Specificity of Small State Government Structures;
3. Luxembourg Property Markets and Power;
4. Integrated Spatial Planning; and,
5. Perceived Challenges for Luxembourg

These were topics that interviewees repeatedly raised during the conversations.

The Second Delphi Round

The participants of the second Delphi round were presented the above named categories (See Working Paper 5 for details), and then asked to consider priorities for future Luxembourg development. To aid the discussion, scenarios were proposed (See Working Paper 5) to underscore the challenge and urgency that decision-makers and stakeholders face. In response, the following development priorities were gathered:

1. Fiscal Reorganization
2. Governance/Government
3. Public Awareness
4. Luxembourg and the Region
5. "Luxembourgish Mentality"
6. Planning Practice
7. Luxembourg's Niche in International Flows
8. A Vision for Luxembourg

These were conceived of as arenas in need of improvement or immediate corrective attention. (See Working Paper 5 for a detailed explanation.)

The scope of the challenges confirmed in the SUSTAINLUX research was striking. The research was able to identify not only incremental glitches in a malfunctioning system, but system-wide framework contradictions were also confirmed. Also striking was the degree of agreement that was reached in the second Delphi round. While the interviewees were chosen to represent a wide cross-section of actors in the field of spatial planning, and while their interviews represented a diverse array of opinions and perspectives, the second Delphi round revealed a surprisingly level of consensus. While there was, indeed, disagreement concerning solutions, there was agreement on the problems.

Discord during the second Delphi round was heard upon discussion of the solutions. A couple of participants were convinced that the *Programme Directeur* (Ministère de l'Intérieur 2003) and respective Sector Plans were the solution. They were further quite concerned that substantial

disagreement will arise once the Sector Plans are in force. Others argued that Luxembourg lacked a collectively defined vision. Such a vision would ease development processes and the realization of respective projects. Still others, however, considered the idea that Luxembourg's advantage was precisely that there was no vision.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SPATIAL PLANNING

After hearing a summary of the results, the participants of the third Delphi round deliberated on several implications for spatial planning practice, concerned visioning as a practice of representing space, the dilemma of territory and demos, and the contradiction of integration and fragmentation.

Conflicting Representations

Much of the discussion in the second round of Delphi discussions circled around whether or not. While it is a legitimate question, there are still deeper unanswered question: Who will decide this? Who may participate in the generation of the vision or plan? Put another way: Whose plan will it be, and by extension, whose vision and associated agenda will it be? There are some fundamental dilemmas concerning visioning.

These are not new problems or observations. The role of space, human perceptions and conceptions of it, and the politics of representation therein, have long been the subject of philosophical and empirical inquiry in the social sciences. In the 1970s, Lefebvre (1991), for one, categorized three kinds of space: conceived, perceived and lived. His goals was to envision social relationships in space that transcended the Cartesian split that largely that dominated social sciences until them. Maps, according to Lefebvre (ibid.), belonged to the realm of conceived space: Maps were particularized representations of particular spaces, and of course, socially produced products. In this vein, Carte-

sian geographers have come under particular scrutiny, and sociologists like Lefebvre were not the only critical voices:

> "Maps are notorious instruments of power/knowledge, which can effectively solidify existing relations of power," (Pratt 2004: 165).

Others have noted the prevailing desire of those in power to reproduce and dominate perceptions of space. Some have concluded that such practitioners have gone:

> "…`map-crazy', which at times seems no more than a form of 'gun crazy' once removed," (Katz 2001, 215).

The general observation is that representations (visions) of space are tools of power. It follows that what is left off the map is equally as interesting as that which is put on the map: Namely, counter-topographies can expose a "non-innocent" (ibid) representation of global unbounded imperial capitalism. Katz, in particular, demonstrated that unbounded global capitalism does not solely annihilate space by time, or generate "time-space compression" (Harvey 1991), but it also and simultaneously generates its opposite, which are moments of "time-space expansion". These geographies are only visible from the perspective of the capitalism's under belly (Katz 2001: 1224).

Visioning and planning processes are thus dangerously capable of creating authoritative rational spaces. No one vision can exist within a vacuum and is necessarily tied to a variety of alternative visions. While it may seem inadmissible to contemplate anti-planning, it would be a lesson for practitioners to at least remember that visions and plans cannot be disconnected from the social political context in which they were produced.

Demos, Decision-making and Territory

A second dilemma is a political geographic one, concerning the *demos* that govern a given territory:

> "There is a crucial link between democratic self-governance and territorial representation. Precisely because democracies enact laws that are supposed to bind those who legitimately authorize them, the scope of democratic legitimacy cannot extend beyond the demos which has circumscribed itself as a people upon a given territory. Democratic laws require closure precisely because democratic representation must be accountable to a specific people. Imperial legislation, by contrast, was issued from a center and was binding as far as the power of that center to control its periphery extended. Empires have frontiers; democracies have boundaries," (Benhabib 2004: 219).

Benhabib (ibid.) was addressing this problem with respect to immigration and migration between and across Westphalian states: How can the human rights of refugees be fairly addressed while simultaneously respecting the sovereignty and right of a given demos to regulate its own membership. The problem, however, is transferrable to collectively defined visioning and/or planning processes, which also demand defined, gated, membered communities that governs a bounded territory.

Visioning would seem a particularly hazardous practice, under spatial conditions that are temporally and materially fluid. Luxembourg would be one such case as spatial arrangements are: 1) dependent on changing cross-border jurisdictions and governing conditions; 2) regulated by conflicting levels of government, which further represent barely half of the resident population. Matching a Westphalian demos and territory seems particularly difficult to satisfy in this small state. Political scientists like Benhabib conceptualize other forms of

polis, such as territorially unbounded demos. These could, for example, be memberships defined by stakeholders on a given problematic. Perhaps new concepts of *demos* that transcend boundaries thrown up by the Westphalian ordering of territory are worthy of reconsideration in Luxembourg.

Fragmentation through Integration

While the planning profession varies from state to state, a particular trend for so called "integrated planning" has emerged in recent years, to address changing needs that require transcending and joining-up otherwise distinct administrative and conceptual boundaries and purposefully making the most of benefits that can be extracted from such synergies. Normatively, integrated policy can address – at least in theory – the need:

> "to overcome artificial organizational boundaries; to tolerate a significant degree of uncertainty and probability in the policy-making process; to interact closely with stakeholders and citizens; and, significantly, to engage in flexible, creative and systemic thinking which is "holistic" rather than linear or partial in character," (Givoni et al. 2013, 2).

The effectiveness of integrated approaches has been debated in recent years with scholars such as Givoni et.al (2013) representing the more optimistic side of the discussion, and others such as Stead and Meijers (2009), Allmendinger and Haughton (2009) and Hesse and Carr (2013)[1] somewhat more cautious:

> "Advocates of spatial planning share a naivety about the nature of contested spaces and thee role of spatial planning. The assumption is that

---

[1] Excerpts from the paper presented by Hesse and Carr (2013) at the BIVEC-GIBET conference are reiterated here.

spatial planning, if undertaken in an open, transparent, and collaborative way will lead to consensus and, ultimately, better development. But experience shows that intractable tensions may be eased through at the level of producing strategic documents, only for problems to surface at the level of implementation. […] The realpolitik of planning allows the system to be hijacked and abused, not least, by those intent on preserving the status-quo," (Allmendinger and Haughton 2009: 2548).

Integrated planning is worth mentioning here, because the recent set of sustainable development plans, explicitly promote integration. The features of integrative policies defined by Stead and Meijers (2009) can be observed - comprehensiveness, aggregated topically, encompassing. Integrated policies address issues that "transcend the boundaries of established policy fields, and that do not correspond to the institutional responsibilities of individual departments," (Stead and Meijers, 2009: 321). This is clearly seen as the Sector Plans were created by representatives from a cross-section of national ministries. But it is not only the actors that are cross-governmental. The topics themselves are cross-disciplinary. Some have called this type of policy "holistic" (ibid.) as they try to attempt to address topics of a broader scope than those bound within the frameworks of isolated functional systems.

Yet, one of the overall SUSTAINLUX findings was that the steps and measures undertaken by the government towards achieving a sustainable spatial development are effectively flawed. Indeed, that have, at least thus far, failed to resolve the critical situation that Luxembourg finds itself in. The concept of integration is part of the problem. As planning is about endorsing a particular vision of space, and integrated plans endorse integrated visions, the above dilemmas apply. There are at least three further problems.

First, the policy of decentralized concentration, which is viewed as being integrative from the state level creates severe spatial imbalances at local levels; as long as office floor space continues to increase (and this indeed represents the current unique selling point of Luxembourg as an ideal business setting and location), decentralized concentration deepens the functional and thus spatial mismatch, instead of resolving the current problems.

Second, the set of integrated policies are also limited in terms of their objective because attention is only given to one end of value chain (destination wise), whereas the other ends (the origins of the commuter flows) are located rather remotely and are quite dispersed. It appears difficult to co-ordinate these flows by traditional transit systems.

This is first evident in the documents. All the maps show only Luxembourg (Innenministerium et al. 2004; Ministère de l'Intérieur 2003). Indeed there are conceptions of the Grand Region, (where Luxembourg is placed at the centre). Transport plans and densities are located solely within the nations boundaries. At a meeting of ESPON in November 2011, one panellist suggested subsidizing neighbouring municipalities across the border in Belgium or France. This was met with widespread scepticism in the audience. The reaction reflects the unwillingness or inability, which may be grounded on practical rather than political reasons, to transcend national borders.

Third, instead of addressing problems of uncoordinated and conflicting authorities at various spatial scales, the strategies presume a clean system-wide durable "Russian Doll" architecture of how state and municipalities interact and collaborate. Hooghe and Marks (2003; 2004) are often credited with the Russian Doll metaphor of European governance: General-purpose jurisdictions (Type I) describe governance arrangements that include a specified number of governments from the local to the international, whereby the smaller ju-

risdictions are contained within wider ones. While their work has been widely questioned (Keil and Mahon 2009; Affolderbach and Carr in review; Jessop, 2005), the central concept is reflected in Luxembourg's spatial planning policies. Reminiscent again of Allmendinger and Haughton (2009), the assumption is that policy can be asserted in an orderly and predictable manner if only the correct actors are gathered at the right time and place.

Spatial planning policies were largely informed by European strategies and initiatives. As a member state, Luxembourg was to carry forward with its corresponding commitments. In line with these responsibilities, local politicians formulated the spatial arrangement of Luxembourg territories. Further, national ministries were networked in order to bring their expertise to the table. The final step was to give the Sector Plans legal backing so that they can be instituted with ease. It is clear that Luxembourg governing officials understand their political structure as a collection of discrete jurisdictional units neatly ordered under a national level. These jurisdictions are further general purpose (not task specific) and are organized across two levels of municipal and federal government.

As already noted elsewhere (Carr forthcoming; Affolderbach and Carr in review), the lethargy is likely a sign of domestic structural mismatches. "The political structure that characterizes Luxembourg land-use planning today is one that was founded on notions of municipal autonomy, relatively horizontal modes of negotiation, and individual private property rights where land-owners and local politicians are the gatekeepers to land-use," (Carr, forthcoming). The nation is divided into 106 Municipalities, each of which define land-use and zoning, and the majority of which are sparsely populated such that many know Municipal land-use decision-makers personally. Further, many local politicians fulfil second function as Chamber Deputies in Parliament. The small state government architecture thus reveals a variety of con-

flicts of interest, and the distribution of power and decision-making is hotly contested, particularly between the state and the municipalities.

Further impeding a clean system-wide architecture in which spatial planning can be implemented, are respective relations between gatekeepers to land-use and the private sector. High land prices and low land taxes have endorsed speculation. Moreover, the sometimes not very transparent means of land-use designation, created in part as a result of horizontal closely knit governance networks, have led some to wonder if projects that are likely to be realized are those that promise to be lucrative. The result is further fragmentation by way of integration.

CHANGING FRAMEWORKS

In the face of such observations, planning practitioners carry a heavy onus of responsibility and legitimation: Finding a collective vision, securing a *demos* that can legitimately claim authority, and addressing the fragmentary processes that proceed, or result from, integration attempts. These are some of the implications of the SUSTAINLUX results that practitioners of spatial planning might reflect on, if it is to avoid repeating other poor examples such as spatial planning in England that succeeds only in underscoring:

> "the fault line between the Treasury push for control of the planning agenda and the inability of successive planning ministries to create a planning system which commands respect across other government departments," (Allmendinger and Haughton 2009: 2548).

The participants of the third Delphi round, however, also observed that it isn't only planning practice itself that is in question, but also oncoming framework changes in Luxembourg faces and the practical planning challenges it faces as a result.

Luxembourg officials would not be the first to carry forward with integrated planning. It has been observed elsewhere that integrated sustainable development policies were created by governments who supposed that:

> "growth would underpin the achievement of broader social and environmental goals in relatively uncontroversial ways. [..That] in a period of sustained growth, the government wished to push through a major programme of infrastructure and housing investment, involving the government, the privatised utilities, and private companies, [and] to achieve this, land-use regulatory functions needed to be brought into line, allowing quicker decision-making on development but without losing the legitimacy of local planning with its links to the democratic process," (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009: 2546).

Growth has been the underlying assumption of all planning documents and strategies in Luxembourg. This was not unfounded, as Luxembourg had indeed experienced record high growth rates, in terms of immigration and economic productivity (European Commission 2011; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 2007). Furthermore, there are studies that show that Luxembourg requires further growth to alone to sustain the current pension system (Allegrezza 2010). If pressure continues, three are current problems that need urgent attention.

Still, the original tenets of the sustainable development as stated in the Brundtland Report and in Rio many years ago (United Nations 1987; United Nations 1992), underscored that development needed to protect planetary resources, and further, ensure that future generations inherit a planet equal or better to the one we currently have. As we enter a timeframe where global depletion of resources has only accelerated rather and

slowed, as the European States struggle financially, and as Luxembourg's ability to retain its secure position in international flows weakens, perhaps it is high time to revisit scenarios without growth. Some have called it post-growth (see Schulz (2012) for an overview of the current state of the art in economic geography with regards to research on post-growth). What could developmental strategies look like under these conditions, for example? What will sustainability look like? Who or what shall be sustained?

FURTHER STUDIES

The reality of changing frameworks is also a call for further studies. The SUSTAINLUX research shows that the most pressing issues are: 1. acknowledging peculiarity of local context, 2. taking another look at problem. Some applied research might also include a re-writing of the IVL. Perhaps the classical distinction between the commuter and resident could be revisited. Re-examining the problem also means re-examining the question itself. What is the epistemology of the problem? How do we know an urban space? "How can the city be narrated?"(Roy, 2002: 221).

The current structure of government is also clearly problematic. Reconnecting the demos with decision-makers could be addressed. Concerning this, the Fonds National de la Recherche, Luxembourg set aside funds

> "to explore the conceptual construction, organisation and practical use of space […] in order to foster sustainable territorial development in urban as well as rural areas […to evaluate] policy instruments [with reference to] new forms of governance and cooperation […] citizen participation [and] planning policies," (FNR 2012: 23)

Within this framework, an extension was granted to the SUSTAINLUX research, which will examine institutional frameworks that construct planning and urban trans-

formation processes and the possibility of more participation.

The research, entitled SUSTAIN_GOV, aims at investigating sustainable spatial development policies in the context of governance, both with respect to both Luxembourg and, by way of comparison, Switzerland, a country: often considered at the cutting edge of innovative approaches in spatial planning policies in Europe; similar to Lux in terms of economic success, a high degree of internationalisation, and patterns of urbanization; with a model of spatial planning grounded in the legal and political context of direct democracy, which can provide insights into modes of participation and horizontal consensus building in Luxembourg. Particular focus is placed on the so called Glattal-Stadt in the area of Zurich Nord.

SUSTAIN_GOV will build directly from the conceptual and empirical foundations of the SUSTAINLUX Project that has shown that the Grand Duchy's policy, planning practices, and institutions of governance remain underdeveloped. Despite the intense urbanization pressure, strains on land resources and infrastructure, and the political dilemmas these issues raise, policy, planning, and governance practices in the Grand Duchy have thus far failed to meet stated best-practice standards and requirements, particularly in the domain citizen involvement in public decision-making.

The research sits at the nexus of 4 streams of scholarly thought concerning sustainable development, rescaling and urban transformation, governance and planning, and urban comparison. SUSTAIN_GOV aims at a nuanced scientific understanding of participation, governance, and integrated sustainable spatial development, and is informed by contemporary literature in urban and regional studies. The proposed research strives for a four-fold impact:

1) The research team will examine ways to overcome hindrances in policy implementation processes that are a product of governance structures;

2) The results will provide a critical assessment on the strengths and weaknesses of current public participation structures in Luxembourg, and thus reveal new approaches to creating, implementing, and governing sustainable spatial development;

3) A comparative analysis that will reveal the advantages and disadvantages of the Swiss political model as well as a reflection on models of participation and horizontal consensus building that Luxembourg aims to achieve.

Dr. Constance Carr
constance.carr@uni.lu

REFERENCES

Affolderbach, Julia, and Constance Carr. submitted for review. "Blending Scales of Governance: Land Use Policies and Practices in a Small State." *Regional Studies* Special Issue forthcoming

Allegrezza, S. 2010. "Entwicklungen Und Trends Auf Dem Arbeitsmarkt Luxemburg". at the Symposium "Sind die Renten sicher? Zur Nachhaltigkeit der Finanzierung der sozialen Sicherheitssysteme in Luxemburg", Association Luxembourgeoise de la gérontologie-gériatrie.

Allen, John, and Allen Cochrane. 2007. "Beyond the Territorial Fix: Regional Assemblages, Politics and Power." *Regional Studies* 41 (9): 1161–1175.

Allmendinger, P., and G. Haughton. 2009. "Critical Reflections on Spatial Planning." *Environment and Planning A* 41: 2544–2549.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2004. *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens.* Cambridge University Press.

Carr, Constance. forthcoming. "Discourse Yes, Implementation Maybe: An Immobility and Paralysis of Sustainable De-

velopment Policy." *European Planning Studies*

European Commission. 2011. *Demography Report 2010*. Luxembourg: Eurostat.

Faludi, Andreas. 2012. "Multi-level (territorial) Governance: Three Criticisms." *Planning Theory & Practice* 13 (2): 197–211.

Fonds National de la Recherche Luxembourg. 2010. "CORE Multi-annual Thematic Research Programme". Fonds National de la Recherche Luxembourg. http://www.fnr.lu/en/Grants-Activities/Research-Programmes/CORE-Programme.

Givoni, Moshe, James MacMilllan, David Banister, and Eran Feitelson. 2013. "From Policy Measures to Policy Packages." *Transport Reviews* 33 (1): 1–20.

Harvey, David. 1991. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Hesse, Markus, and Constance Carr. 2013. "Integration Vs. Fragmentaion: Spatial Governance for Land and Mobility (extended Abstract)." In *Proceedings of the BIVEC-GIBET Transport Research Days 2013*, edited by Markus Hesse, Geoffrey Caruso, Philippe Gerber, and Francesco Viti, 379–381. Luxembourg: BIVEC-GIBET.

Hooghe, Lisbet, and Gary Marks. 2003. "Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance." *American Political Science Review* 97 (2): 233–243.

Innenministerium, Transportministerium, Ministerium für Öffentliche Bauten, and Umweltministerium. 2004. "An Integrated Transport and Spatial Development Concept for Luxembourg (IVL)". L.A.U.B. Gesellschaft für Landschaftsanalyse und Umweltbewertung mbH. http://www.ivl.public.lu/documents/de/IVL_Bericht_Januar_2004_-_integral1.pdf.

Jessop, Bob. 2005. "The Political Economy of Scale and European Governance." *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 96 (2): 225–230. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2005.00453.x.

Jonas, Andrew E G. 2006. "Pro Scale: Further Reflections on the 'scale Debate' in Human Geography." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31 (3): 399–406. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2006.00210.x.

Jordan, A. 2001. "The European Union: An Evolving System of Multi-level Governance ... or Government?" *Policy & Politics* 29 (2): 193–208.

Jordan, Andrew. 2008. "The Governance of Sustainable Development: Taking Stock and Looking Forwards." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 26 (1): 17 – 33. doi:10.1068/cav6.

Katz, Cindi. 2001. "On the Grounds of Globalization: A Topography for Feminists Political Engagement." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26 (4): 1213–1234.

Keil, Roger, and Rianne Mahon. 2009. *Leviathan Undone?: Towards a Political Economy of Scale*. UBC Press.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Marks, Gary, and Liesbet Hooghe. 2004. "Contrasting Visions of Multi-level Governance." In *Multi-level Governance*, edited by Ian Bache and Matthew Flinders, 15–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ministère de l'Intérieur. 2003. "Programme Directeur D'Amenagement du Territoire". Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. http://www.miat.public.lu/publications/amenagement_territoire/index.html.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2007. *OECD Territorial Reviews: Luxembourg*. Paris: OECD Publishing. http://oberon.sourceoecd.org/vl=8122560/cl=41/nw=1/rpsv/cw/vhosts/oecdthemes/99980177/v2007n17/contp1-1.htm.

Pratt, Geraldine. 2004. *Working Feminism*. Temple University Press.

Roy, Ananya. 2002. *City Requiem, Calcutta: Gender And The Politics Of Poverty*. Univ Of Minnesota Press.

Schulz, Christian. 2012. "Post-Wachstums-Ökonomien - (k)ein Thema

Für Die Wirtschaftsgeographie?" *Zeitschrift Für Wirtschaftsgeographie* 56 (4): 264–273.

Stead, Dominic, and Evert Meijers. 2009. "Spatial Planning and Policy Integration: Concepts, Facilitators, and Inhibitors." *Planning Theory and Practice* 10 (3): 317–322.

Stubbs, Paul. 2005. "Stretching Concepts Too Far? Multi-level Governance, Policy Transfer and the Politics of Scale in South East Europe." *Southeast European Politics* VI (2): 66–87.

United Nations. 1987. "Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future." http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/resources/res_publcorepubli.shtml?utm_source=OldRedirect&utm_medium=redirect&utm_content=dsd&utm_campaign=OldRedirect.

———. 1992. "Earth Summit Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio". United Nations. http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/index.shtml.