

Lidewij Tummers, Heidrun Wankiewicz

Gender mainstreaming planning cultures: Why 'engendering planning' needs critical feminist theory

Zusammenfassung

Gender-Mainstreaming-Planung braucht kritische feministische Ansätze

Ziel des Beitrags ist eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der Umsetzung von Gender Mainstreaming in der Planungspraxis. Im Fokus stehen die Fragen, inwieweit Rollen und Machtverhältnisse durch Planungsprozesse und -interventionen verändert werden können und welchen Beitrag Planungsleitbilder wie die „Stadt der kurzen Wege“ in unterschiedlichen Kontexten leisten können. Neben der Auswertung von Gender-Mainstreaming-Planungshandbüchern und der Gegenüberstellung der Implementierung von GM in EU-Staaten nutzen die Autorinnen eine vergleichende Analyse von kontextspezifischen Interpretationen des Planungsleitbilds „Stadt der kurzen Wege“. Dieses Leitbild wurde in Planungsdokumenten systematisch aufgenommen und integriert mehrere Genderthemen. Die Fallbeispiele Linz und Salzburg zeigen, dass sich die „Stadt der kurzen Wege“, flankiert durch Verordnungen, als strategisches Instrument eignet, um Gender in der räumlichen Planung auf die Agenda zu setzen. Allerdings muss dieses Leitbild aktualisiert und auf stadtregionale und digitale Raum-Zeit-Wege-Muster und Verflechtungen ausgeweitet werden. Ohne kritische Hinterfragung der Planungsgrundlagen, Prozesse und Entscheidungen hinsichtlich Genderstereotypen und Ungleichgewichten führt gendered planning nicht zu Gleichstellung.

Schlüsselwörter

Europäische Planungskulturen, Gender-Mainstreaming-Praxis, Stadt der kurzen Wege, Alltagsgerechte Regionen

Summary

This contribution looks at strategies for gender mainstreaming (GM) in planning practice applying gender/diversity design criteria. It offers a critical discussion of the 'city of proximity' (CoP) as a guiding principle for gender-aware planning. Examples of guidelines and handbooks from different planning cultures show that the CoP is a widely adopted model, not only in gender mainstreaming, however it is seldom associated with its feminist origin. As planning professionals and researchers, we consider the role of urban and regional planning to change power relations and gendered norms. Taking two Austrian cities as examples, we illustrate the impact of GM on planning practice, revealing both the strength of the legislative framework and the limitations of Leitbilder that unintentionally reproduce gender stereotypes. The paper concludes with suggestions to move beyond the stage of pilot projects and handbooks, particularly in two fields: first, by looking at the attitudes and competences of professionals, and second, by dissociating the city of proximity from neighbourhoods while implementing gender criteria at a larger scale, e.g. in regional development plans.

Keywords

planning cultures, gender mainstreaming, city of proximity, everyday/care-adjusted regions

1 Introduction

With the 1999 Treaty of Amsterdam, Gender Mainstreaming (GM) became mandatory for EU member states in all policy fields. GM entered planning, urban and regional planning policies in the 1990s, in other words late compared to other fields. Gender is back on the planning agenda, and this thematic issue as well as other recent publications indicate that planning is also back on the feminist agenda. At the political level, awareness has grown that sustainability goals – from water supply to urban renewal – cannot be achieved without taking gender equality into account; a view expressed amongst others in the UN Habitat Sustainable Development Goals SDG 2030 and the consequent Urban Agenda adopted by the EU member states.¹

A body of knowledge from empirical studies and experiments concerning gender and planning with varying strategies in different planning cultures is available. Nonetheless, so far, it is unclear how the experiences and lessons from research and fieldwork enter and transform mainstream spatial planning. The common premise of ‘engendering’ (Roberts 2018) or ‘gender mainstreaming’ (Zibell/Damyanovic/Sturm 2019) strategies is the desire to change power relations and achieve gender equality through planning. However, GM is facing a dilemma which Roberts describes as the difference between *women-centered* and *gender-sensitive* approaches:

“[An] approach to gender-sensitive urban design differs from a woman-centered approach. Taking gender as a guiding concept avoids the essentialism implicit in seeing women and men as homogenous categories, where women are always oppressed and victimized.” (Roberts 2018: 122)

The reconciliation of waged work and family life is at the top of the gender mainstreaming agenda² and builds on a safe and accessible city with freedom to move for all genders, ages and ethnicities (Wankiewicz 2012, 2016). Reconciliation as a guiding model for planning helps to prioritize planning interventions which facilitate the everyday routines of caregivers, spatially expressed in the model of a ‘city of proximity’ (CoP). The CoP is seen as creating opportunities for all genders by facilitating a combination of (unwaged) care work and waged work. Since the 1960s, it has been widely recognised as an environment worth living in, and has re-appeared under different names. Its logic is that short distances between work, care and home facilitate access to the labour market, especially for women who still do most of the care work. By contrast, the CoP may enhance gender imbalances by stereotyping women as caregivers and housewives and neglecting wider access to workplaces, culture and education while ignoring other structural problems such as violence and harassment.

This contribution argues that if the aim is to make planning a vehicle for gender equality (recognising the manifold possible conceptualisations of gender equality), we need to address planning practices by asking: How can we establish ‘engendering’ or ‘gender mainstreaming’ spatial development? As planning professionals and re-

1 Retrieved 15 November 2019 from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/>; <https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/node/1829>; <https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/themen/new-urban-agenda-werkzeugkasten-fuer-moderne>.

2 Retrieved 15 November 2019 from <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/what-is-gender-mainstreaming>.

searchers, we ask ourselves to what extent urban and regional planning can be expected to contribute to these objectives:

- Can planning and design of cities create an environment that enhances both subjective (group-specific) and objective, generally valued qualities for dwelling?
- Can planning processes and planning interventions create an opportunity to change gendered roles and stereotypes in the use and appropriation of space in the context of rigid and traditional planning legislation?

We conclude that the CoP is a strategic instrument to put gender on the agenda, but does not achieve gender equality without further critical evaluation of planning decisions.

The paper is structured as follows: first we present the methods and concepts used to develop our contribution, explaining why we address *Leitbilder* (guiding principles) in planning. We then introduce the concept of the CoP as a *Leitbild* for design criteria of GM. Section four looks at how criteria for gender equality are applied in different Austrian cities and regions. We discuss the findings looking at how GM strategies interpret the role of planning and consequently apply gender/diversity criteria in design or planning decisions. We conclude with identifying some key issues that GM in planning needs to address, specifically two under-researched questions in feminist planning: the regional scale and the roles of professionals as agents of change.

2 Methods and framing

2.1 Planning cultures and systems

In this paper, we refer to European planning practice as GM has been introduced into national policies and practices with the regional legislations following the EU Treaty of Amsterdam. Planning is often regarded as predominantly steered by economics and may not always include design (Dühr/Colomb/Nadin 2010). In the 21st century, European spatial development is increasingly profit-oriented as well as moving away from social blueprints towards more collaborative forms of planning (Sturm/Lienhardt 2018). In order to include the wide range of substance and process as well as of different ranges of professionalism, we use “planning” as a comprehensive term to include practices, policies, and research on governance and design of the environment, including both urban and rural areas. Where necessary, we name specific activities (such as planning, governance, design, building) and *modus operandi* (executive, administrative, theoretical) as well as fields or disciplines, borrowing from what Damyanovic and Zibell identify as “planning sciences” (Damyanovic/Zibell 2013: 25), i.e. architecture and urban design, civil engineering, environmental planning, geography, landscape architecture and planning, spatial planning, town and country planning, traffic planning urban planning, disciplines that are usually separated from each other.

Furthermore, we distinguish between planning *system* and planning *culture*: planning system is the ‘hardware’ of planning (Tummers 2012), such as legislative and ad-

ministrative regulations and authorities that define and describe planning substance, responsibilities, tasks and expected planning documents at different scale levels. The notion “planning culture” also includes the ‘informal’ (soft) practices, methods, conventions and institutions that are more diffuse and based on ‘unwritten rules’ (planning conventions). What belongs to the domain or jurisdiction of planners for example is partly defined in planning and building Acts, but increasingly depends on communication³. The communication of ideas takes place in the definition of visions, or *Leitbilder*, for regional development. ‘Vision’ documents do not have a fixed, legal status but nonetheless constitute an important step in planning, as we will illustrate below.

2.2 Gender mainstreaming strategies

Gender mainstreaming is embedded in a professional planning conceptualization that aims to create fair, just, accessible and sustainable urban environments or, quoting one of the leading gender and urbanism scholars: “In contrast to viewing space as a commodity to be exploited, a gendered approach seeks to understand how spaces and places are produced and co-constructed through everyday use combined with their presence in the imagination” (Roberts 2018: 119). At the same time, the approaches to gender equality, particularly in planning and urban design, are very different: Austria and the Netherlands have responded quickly at the beginning of the 21st century, whereas France with its strong egalitarian history, renewed the law on gender equality only in 2014. The Netherlands did translate GM in policy programmes rather than in planning laws, whereas Germany and Spain anchored gender in building and urban renewal Acts. While Spain and Germany continue to have equal opportunity institutes, the Dutch governmental infrastructure for equal opportunity policies was abolished in the late 2000s with the disappearance of first the regional equal opportunity offices and later the division of the Ministry of Housing, Planning and Infrastructure. The 2014 French law obliges local authorities to implement gender mainstreaming policies in all sectors, which constitutes an important incentive for planning: most major cities now have a ‘women and the city’ programme and budget⁴ and there is currently an exponential growth of local initiatives. One example is the *Journées des Matrimoines* to make the traces of women (particularly in art and architecture) more visible.

3 Researchers have used the term “communicative turn in spatial planning” since the 1990s, see e.g. Proli (2019) and Healey (1996).

4 Retrieved 12 August 2017 from www.genre-et-ville.org/.

Table 1: Handbooks for Gender Planning

City	Publisher	Author(s)	Year	Title	Access
Paris	Ville de Paris		2017	Guide Référentielle Genre & espace public. Reference Guide for Gender in Public Space	http://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/86068
Prague	Heinrich Böll Stiftung, (Prag), WPS – Women Public Space	Lammelova, M. et al.	2017	How to design a Fair Shared City? (available in Russian)	www.wpsprague.com/
Vienna	Magistrat der Stadt Wien, Stadtentwicklung und Stadtplanung	Damyanovic, D.; Reinwald, F. & Weikmann, A.	2013	Handbuch „Gender Mainstreaming in der Stadtplanung und Stadtentwicklung“ (available in English & German)	www.wien.gv.at/wienatshop/Gast_STEV/Start.aspx?artikel=314623
Barcelona	Collectiu Punt6	Collectiu Punt6	2014	Women working, urban assessment guide from a gender perspective (available in several languages)	http://issuu.com/punt6/docs/mujerestrabajando
		Collectiu Punt6	2012	Habitat para la convivencia. Herramientas de análisis y evaluación urbana	
Berlin	City Planning Department	Women's Advisory Group Schröder Anke et al.	2011	Handbook Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Development (available in English & German)	www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/soziale_stadt/gender_mainstreaming/download/gender_englisch.pdf
Berlin	Berlin Senat / Senatsverwaltung Berlin	Dorsch, P.; Droste, C. & Krönert, S.	2011	Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Development. Berlin on the path towards becoming a metropolis worth living	www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/soziale_stadt/gender_mainstreaming/download/gender_broschuere_englisch.pdf
Hamburg	Behörde für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt		nY, appr 2010	Planungsempfehlungen der Fachfrauen/Planning Recommendations from female Experts (available in English & German)	www.hamburg.de/contentblob/135132/871a9ae979b4d031ed51784098e58177/data/fachfrauen-planungsempfehlungen.pdf
Freiburg	City of Freiburg – Stadtentwicklung Geschäftsstelle GM	Zibell, Barbara & Schröder, Anke	2006	Gender Kompass Planung	www.freiburg.de/pb/site/Freiburg/get/params_E-496509981/505427/LeitzieleAnlageG_10_169.pdf
Salzburg (Region)	Land Salzburg-Raumplanung	Zibell, Barbara	2006	Requirement oriented spatial planning. Gender practice and criteria in Spatial Planning	Materialien zur Raumplanung, Bd. 24
Rheinland Pfalz – (Region)	Rheinland Pfalz, Metropolregion		2008	Gender Kompass – So wird Planung eine runde Sache	https://gender-mainstreaming.rlp.de/fileadmin/gender-mainstreaming/dokumente/Gender-Kompass_2008_-_So_wird_Planung_eine_runde_Sache.pdf

Non-local handbooks:					
Bundesrepublik Deutschland	Peter Lang	Zibell, B. & Schröder, A.	2007	Frauen mischen mit. Qualitätskriterien für die Stadt- und Bauleitplanung	Beiträge zur Planungs- und Architektursoziologie, Bd. 5, ISBN 9783631567418
Europe	University of Copenhagen, Coord. Gender Studies	TRANSGEN Research team	2007	Gender Mainstreaming European Transport research and policies	www.sociology.ku.dk/koordinationen/transgen
Europe	Helsinki University of Technology, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies	Horelli, L., Booth, C. & Gilroy, R.	2000	The EuroFEM Toolkit for Mobilizing Women into Local and Regional Development.	http://issuu.com/eva_alvarez/docs/12_eurofem_toolbox
Global	Metropolis Observatory (Bruxelles)	Falu, A.	2018	Espaces métropolitains égalitaires/Gender equal metropolitan spaces (available in several languages)	www.metropolis.org/fr/nouvelles/2018/07/03/3550

Source: Own search. Online sources retrieved 30 July 2019.

2.3 Selection of case studies

To find answers, we look at both the substance (object) of planning, the ‘non-sexist’ city (Hayden 1980), as well as the planning process, the ‘non-sexist community of practice’ (Jarvis 2014).

To understand processes of GM we have studied case studies in EU member states. In the context of the ARL International Working Group Gender in Spatial Development 2014–2018 (Zibell/Sturm/Damyanovic 2019), in which both authors participated, we established that the selected cases are representative of the type of GM spatial planning in the countries concerned.

In order to implement successful strategies, it is necessary to understand region-specific planning dynamics. To understand design criteria that aim to integrate the gender dimension into planning, we performed a comparative study of gender planning handbooks and manuals published in Europe in the past ten years (table 1). They were selected because they are in active use and regularly referred to in gender planning proposals. We looked at the criteria for key topics of spatial design, and at the target groups addressed. Key characteristics, that can be found in virtually all handbooks and manuals, are:

- Accessibility and usability of public space, including streets, squares, parks and sports/recreation areas;
- multiple and mixed use of these spaces;
- secure cities, particularly safe public space;
- inclusive participation strategies;
- diverse, and affordable housing offers.

To get a deeper understanding of planning processes, we discuss examples from Austria to show that ‘engendering planning’ is highly contextual: even within one country the institutions and regulations can vary.

With regards to substance, we discuss the central *Leitbild* underlying GM as “a gender-specific policy with the aim to create socially desirable spaces” (Horreli 2017: 1780), the *Stadt der kurzen Wege* or ‘city of proximity’ (CoP). Looking for a “framework for engendering urban planning in different contexts”, Horelli recalls: “The core concept for gendered content is the ‘infrastructure of everyday life’” (Horreli 2017: 1784). The spatial model often referred to as optimal for everyday infrastructure is the widely used planning vision of the ‘city of proximity’, a European model of an accessible city of short distances.

To understand the function of the CoP as a spatial model through the lens of gender equality we apply insights from planning theory. These findings need to be contextualised against the background of the planning system they emerge. Below we introduce the CoP model starting with a brief introduction on the function of a *Leitbild*, or vision of the city for planning in general.

3 Planning and the guiding principle of ‘the city of proximity’

3.1 Planning following a guiding principle

National planning authorities increasingly share the responsibilities for public affairs with multiple actors to address complex problems. To communicate goals and direct manifold professional actions, spatial planning and urban design need strategic orientation and a guiding principle (German = *Leitbild*). Often this is expressed in a so-called ‘vision document’ or ‘structure vision’ summarising the desired socio-spatial structure of a city, neighbourhood or region. Such visions contain societal norms that in a given culture and period are generally considered as important collective values, e.g. economic growth, diversity or sustainability. Reversely, societal norms and values can be reconstructed from spatial visions drawn in certain periods. Throughout history, *Leitbilder* have been a guiding principle at an early stage, e.g. expressing images of military order or royal hierarchy. Following the industrialization, visions have been inspired by bad conditions in urban environments, proposing new spatial models for improvement, starting from the ‘garden city’ which proposes suburban communities with a green and healthy living environment, combining urban and rural qualities.⁵

A highly influential vision was the ‘functional city’ created in the 1930s by a pre-war European think tank of architects and planners, CIAM⁶, and summarized in the

5 In 1898, a self-educated Englishman named Ebenezer Howard, who had been influenced by the writings of Edward Bellamy and Henry George, published *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*. Revised and re-issued in 1902 under a new title, *Garden Cities of To-Morrow*, Howard’s book became a seminal text in the emerging field of city planning.

6 Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne.

so-called Charter of Athens, published after the war (Sert 1944; Le Corbusier 1962). The Charter identifies four main functions of a city: dwelling, waged work, leisure and mobility, which lead to spatially separated areas or infrastructures for housing (including domestic services), industry, recreation and transport. The functional city model has been criticised for a lack of human scale (Smithson 1991) and the abandonment of historical urban fabric and city centres (Jacobs 1963). However, this is not so much inherent to the vision as depending on its implementation. Karsten has shown that Dutch cities had much more usable sidewalks, streets, squares where children could play and meet in the 1960s and 70s than the cities of today (Karsten 2005). Since then, the availability and usability of public space like sidewalks and squares has changed dramatically due to an increase of cars and larger scale retail, healthcare, etc. Feminist critique on the functional city postulates, amongst others, that it is based on a division of labour within the household, confining especially housewives to the neighbourhood by separating industrial from residential zones and concentrating the daily infrastructure within the residential zones (Tummers/Zibell 2012). Later, further suburbanisation of dwelling and the lack of public transport hindered women to enter the labour market (Roberts 2018). From the sustainable planning perspective, similar criticism was aimed at the increased need for transport, especially car-dependence for commuters. Since the 1970s, alternative visions have been drawn, evaluating from functional separation to functional mix, countering urban sprawl with the ‘compact city’ (Dühr/Colomb/Nadin 2010). Contemporary versions are: the ‘walkable city’⁷ addressing the negative impact of cars or the ‘sharing city’⁸ looking for alternative economic models. An example of a *Leitbild* drawing attention to the position of female urban dwellers is the ‘women-friendly city’, which followed the ‘child-friendly city’.⁹ The CoP vision builds on this line of thinking.

Leitbilder often allow multiple interpretations: the ‘smart city’ for example is used both as a technical vision to introduce digital technology (e.g. security cameras, traffic regulation, energy grids) in urban infrastructure¹⁰ and a human approach that enables tailor-made solutions for diverse urban groups, e.g. the Smart City Framework Vienna 2014 (Stadt Wien 2014). An example of spatial models that contain different sets of value is the ‘Garden city 21’ (*Gartenstadt 21*) for which a research team coordinated by the German Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development updated Howard’s model in 2017. The original emphasis on healthy living conditions was replaced by a participatory, social and environmental sustainability discourse with an emphasis on sharing and collaborative forms of planning (Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung 2017).

In the same line, the ‘sustainable city’, which introduced a new paradigm in the 1990s, has lost its strength as a guiding principle throughout multiple interpretations, including evidence of ‘greenwashing’. In other words, *Leitbild* can become an empty

7 Retrieved 5 December 2019 from www.arup.com/perspectives/cities-alive-towards-a-walking-world.

8 Retrieved 5 December 2019 from www.sharingcities.eu/; www.sharing-city.de/index.htm.

9 Retrieved 5 December 2019 from United Nations 2004: www.womenfriendlycities.com/ and UNICEF 1996: <https://childfriendlycities.org>.

10 Retrieved 5 December 2019 from https://ec.europa.eu/info/eu-regional-and-urban-development/topics/cities-and-urban-development/city-initiatives/smart-cities_en.

container for justifying virtually any planning decision. Konter (1997) calls it an ambiguous term that can easily be misused. Whereas zoning plans have legal status, the status or form of a guiding principle in planning can differ considerably, depending on the planning culture.

3.2 *Leitbild* 'city of proximity'

The 'city of proximity' (in the German speaking realm mostly called 'city of short distances'¹¹) has been formulated as a guiding principle in the 1970s in Germany by the feminist planners/architects Kerstin Dörhöfer and Ulla Terlinden (Dörhöfer/Terlinden 1998). A CoP supports caregivers (mostly women) by providing infrastructures for everyday life, such as healthcare services, shops, playgrounds, childcare facilities, schools, etc., within the neighbourhood and makes them accessible for all age groups and abilities. Contrary to the separation propagated by the functional city, the CoP concept is based on mixture. Zibell (2013) explains how the CoP vision is based on the European model of cities, centred around pedestrian areas with mixed use quarters that include residential buildings as well as workplaces, shops, public and private services, markets, meeting places and all kinds of social infrastructure.

"The 'city of short distances' allows for the efficient combination of paid work, family chores, caregiving, shopping and service use. A varied mix of residential buildings, workplaces, shopping and leisure facilities creates a dense network of supply options in the neighbourhood. Children, older persons and persons with special needs are thus enabled to move independently through the neighbourhood and handle all everyday tasks on their own. This facilitates care work and reduces the trips imposed on caregivers. Daily trips are shortened, motorized individual traffic is curtailed, and supply tasks such as shopping can be handled in less time." (Damyanovic/Reinwald/Weikmann 2013: 25)

The CoP has first entered the mainstream in transport and mobility planning (e.g. Magistrat der Stadt Wien 2005, 2014). Empirical studies on traffic and mobility planning made visible different uses of space, based on a division of labour between women and men: people performing unwaged care work (cooking, caring for children, shopping, cleaning and other domestic tasks) visit the infrastructures of everyday life more often. This time-space pattern is best known as 'trip chaining' and typical of women who combine a part-time job with unpaid care work. The trip chaining concept is widely recognised and amongst the less contested gender tools in Europe, and these daily routines are regularly confirmed by mobility surveys and research (e.g. Mobilität in Deutschland¹²).

4 Case study Austria

4.1 Legal framing and planning system

Austria has a planning system with a strong role of federal state level in legislation and of local level in implementation, but a relatively weak regional level. In contrast to Ger-

11 Translation from German *Leitbild Stadt der kurzen Wege*.

12 Last update retrieved 20 January 2020 from <https://www.bmvi.de/SharedDocs/DE/Artikel/G/mobilitaet-in-deutschland.html>.

many, France and the Netherlands, Austria does not have a single planning legislation at state level, but nine different spatial planning and building laws, one for each federal state. There is no binding national planning strategy, regional planning as well as federal state planning levels are weak. Coordination between (mostly small) communities¹³ is highly variable, both in city regions and in rural areas.

Between 2002 and 2004, GM has become mandatory for national, federal and local public authorities in all policy fields including spatial planning.¹⁴ In 2009, gendered assessment of the impact of budget decisions in public authorities from state to municipality level has been anchored at constitutional level.¹⁵ In planning and urban design this concerns investments such as infrastructure, child care facilities, bus services, bicycle and pedestrian roads or the amount and distribution of housing subsidies. In the capital Vienna, which is at the same time a federal state with legislative power (including planning and building Acts) and a city, the first two GM officers have a background in planning, and thus planning has become an early focus of the GM strategy. A Co-ordination Office for Planning and Construction Geared to the Requirements of Daily Life and the Specific Needs of Women was created within the planning department. Its pilot projects and experiments in urban green areas, public space, obstacle-free city of proximity (pilot district Mariahilf), pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and mobility have become often cited examples (Stadt Wien 2009).

GM is implemented differently in each federal state, but generally weak in planning. We look at two cases: one from the Greater Salzburg regional spatial strategy (2005–2009) and one from the local development plan of city of Linz (2013) provide insights about the implementation of GM in planning.

13 Austria has 2096 communities with 4000 inhabitants on average, many below 400 inhabitants (retrieved 5 April 2018 from <https://gemeindebund.at/struktur-der-gemeinden>).

14 Rechtsgrundlagen für Gender Mainstreaming der Interministeriellen Arbeitsgruppe Gender Mainstreaming, retrieved 22 January 2020 from www.imag-gmb.at/gender-mainstreaming/rechtskondigen-zu-gm.html.

15 This gender budgeting prescription became Austrian constitutional law in 2009 Art. 3(3) B-VG and Art. 51 (8) B-VG) for ministries, federal states and local communities.

Figure 1: Map of Austria indicating Salzburg, Linz and Vienna city and region





Figure 2: Sachprogramm Standortentwicklung im Salzburger Zentralraum (Land Salzburg 2009)



4.1.1 Salzburg 2005–2009, revisited 2019

Following the federal legislation on GM, the spatial planning department of Land Salzburg government decided to revise the spatial strategy for the Greater Salzburg region through a gender lens and to use it as a pilot project for developing gender competence in planning.

The implementation took place within the Interreg GenderAlp! project¹⁶ which selected a set of guiding principles:

- *Leitbild* ‘Living and working in a region of short distances’ (= CoP) which includes care work and reconciliation of job and family;
- *Leitbild* ‘Polycentric settlement model’ which includes a minimum system of infrastructures of everyday life that are accessible with regional coordinated mobility offers;
- *Leitbild* ‘Requirement-oriented location of workplaces’ which includes new forms of co-working, mixed use areas and provision of services in manufacturing areas (Land Salzburg 2009: 9ff.).

The spatial strategy came into binding force in January 2009 (Land Salzburg 2009), but the knowledge and methods gained with the pilot project have not been integrated into the official guideline Spatial Planning Salzburg. While the EU regulation on the mandatory assessment of the Environmental Impact of Spatial Strategies and Plans (SEIA/SUP)¹⁷ has been systematically adapted and transferred into Salzburg only one page in the Spatial Planning Guideline Salzburg elaborates on GM (Land Salzburg 2011). This constitutes one of the reasons why it did not come into effect in Salzburg planning practice. In 2018 and 2019, this planning document was used as a model for the spatial strategy of the whole country (as one leading planner confirmed during an interview 2019). The methodology for the GM regulation has not been given and so has been left to the engagement of single female experts within administration.

4.1.2 Linz local spatial development strategy 2013, revisited 2019

Linz, the capital of Upper Austria, is a city with 250,000 inhabitants and a long industrial tradition in steel production. It was cultural capital of the EU in 2009. In 2008, the Upper Austria region has introduced ‘an impact-oriented public administration’ (= *wirkungsorientierte Verwaltung*) which includes to assess the impact of policy decisions and budget lines on women and men, girls and boys in all their diversity.¹⁸ Based on a federal law and on a detailed implementation guideline, each policy field in federal state administration has to apply this assessment.¹⁹

16 *GenderAlp! Spatial Development for Women and Men*. See www.genderalp.at, retrieved 29 March 2019.

17 Eight pages with detailed tables and guidelines for the implementation of the EU regulation on the mandatory environmental mainstreaming strategy and links to the spatial analysis.

18 This gender budgeting prescription became Austrian constitutional law in 2009 Art. 3(3) B-VG and Art. 51 (8) B-VG for ministries, federal states and local communities.

19 The guideline is based on the methods and experiences of Austrians first federal state gender budget analysis from Upper Austria within the GenderAlp! project (Buchinger et al. 2006).

A closer look at spatial planning documents shows a great awareness on gender and diversity issues (Stadt Linz 2013), including a strong group-specific differentiation and adequate infrastructures of everyday life:

- Equal opportunities for all – life situation and group-specific spatial patterns as a starting point for mobility planning: notably safe routes to schools for children, adults (avoided spaces of fear), people with disabilities (mobility training) as well as preventing accidents as key tasks of the city;
- sustainable settlement strategies for mixed use areas with work places, residential areas and services;
- high-quality public spaces and local social centres;
- enhancing reconciliation of job and care work by providing child care as well as facilities for senior citizens in the neighbourhood;
- upgrading and redesigning streets and squares for enhancing usability for activities beyond parking and transportation;
- multiple use of open spaces for different groups of society including migrants;
- free access to digital public space (free web-space and Wi-Fi for all citizens).

Although “gender” is not mentioned explicitly, the local development concept of Linz (Stadt Linz 2013)²⁰ is striving to implement the CoP vision. Nonetheless, in spite of the clear legislative requirements, GM and gender approaches to planning have not entered the Austrian planning culture, except in Vienna, where “success [of gender planning] is also in the improvement of social intelligence in the processes of city planning” (Horelli 2017: 1785). Nowadays, terminology is shifting from “gender-sensitive” planning to “social sustainability” (e.g. Wohnfonds Wien 2017), “user-oriented” planning, addressing “demographic transition” and “the challenge of diversity” of people living in a city, neighbourhood or region. And if this is alleviating everyday care responsibilities, is its impact then role-confirming or liberating?

5 Discussion

5.1 The ‘city of proximity’: guiding principle for transformative planning?

Planning decisions have a long-term impact and can only be evaluated some years after the implementation and use of newly designed spaces. Meanwhile, the CoP concept is facing the dynamics in retail towards big shopping centres and supermarkets in the suburbs and workplaces far away from residential areas. The pitfall of the CoP *Leitbild* is that ‘proximity’ is interchanged with small-scale planning. Already in 2006, Larsson highlighted a deficit of gender planning beyond local and neighbourhood scale (Larsson 2006). Gender issues in planning are often considered relevant only to local public spaces and neighbourhoods and are hardly considered in big urban or regional

²⁰ Urban development/Future Linz see www.linz.at/stadtentwicklung/futurelinz.php, retrieved 15 July 2019.

projects. This fails to acknowledge, as Listerborn observed, that female lives are globalized, notably those of migrant women with social networks and families in other countries within or beyond Europe (Listerborn 2007).

A pilot study in four Nordic city regions in Sweden, Finland, Norway and Denmark highlights considerable knowledge gaps and evidence of the needs and the time-space patterns of people “living across municipal borders” (Langlais et al. 2017: 17). They propose a set of self-reflective questions to be asked to policy makers and planners during the planning process, around one key question: “Are we planning our cities based on our own assumptions about how people live, or are we planning our cities based on empirical knowledge about the lives of different groups of people?” (Langlais et al. 2017: 17, 23).

Another example is the Paris Handbook of Equal Urban Space²¹ which proposes questions for planners to reflect on, such as: How do M/F move in the city on a daily basis? Do M/F benefit from the same amenities and urban resources? It offers background information and questions stereotypes around five main themes: circulating, dwelling, visibility, security, and participation. It focuses on a change in attitudes, rather than specifying the planning procedures or documents for implementation.

This is not only relevant at local level or during concrete planning processes, but affects planning cultures as a whole. As Jarvis puts it:

“Ultimately, in order to transform the sexist city into a more progressive place, it is necessary to unsettle the attitudes, assumptions and practices underpinning the professional training of architects, designers, planners and local government officials.” (Jarvis 2014: 19)

Based on these experiences, we conclude that, despite legal frameworks in place and besides the different political priorities, the planning culture, that is the way local stakeholders interact in planning processes, can be decisive for the success of gender planning strategies.

5.2 How to establish engendered planning?

From a GM perspective, striving for a transformation in power relations and gendered roles, the question of CoP as a transformative strategy has two aspects: 1) can it improve urban conditions for women and 2) does it enhance the position of women in planning processes?

GM strategies in general signal a lack of segregated statistics, as we derived from recommendations for the collection of empirical data. In addition, there is a lack of monitoring and evaluation criteria, that would allow to establish in how far the implementation of CoP principles has the desired effect. Horelli differentiates between gender as variable (expressed in quantitative indicators) and gender as construction or action. During implementation, planners and engineers need quantified or verifiable indicators: establishing, for example, what distance still classifies as ‘proximity’. However, how do variables and constructs interact? Whether a 400 metre walk to a bus stop is acceptable also depends on the conditions of the roads. And how helpful is a functional ‘mix’ when

21 French: *GUIDE RÉFÉRENTIEL. Genre & espace public*, retrieved 2 September 2019 from www.paris.fr/actualites/la-ville-de-paris-devoile-le-premier-guide-referentiel-sur-le-genre-l-espace-public-4138.

chic restaurants alternate with high-end boutiques? Power is often in numbers, both of people of certain class, race age or gender involved in decision-making and of resources such as investments or acres of land made available for different user groups.

Furthermore, a key problem signalled by (rare) commissioned policy evaluators (Larson 2006; Burgess 2008) is that theoretical concepts for 'gender as a construction' are not operable in planning practice. Gender and power are concepts with a (range of) definition(s) in research, but how to translate them into planning actions, such as drawing regional development visions, designing spatial structures for sport facilities or industrial areas, consulting or mobilising inhabitants to improve public space?

'Engendering' then easily becomes tokenism and can hardly escape from the 'women as victims' discourse (Fainstein/Servon 2005; Tummers/Denèfle/Wankiewicz 2019).

Equal representation in planning decisions was one of the first demands of the feminist movement (Ottes et al. 1995), but there was also the awareness that power exercised by female bodies and brains is not necessarily feminist or emancipatory. Rather, there is the need for a 'non-sexist community of practice' (Jarvis 2014). The impact of financial figures is addressed through the instrument of gender budgeting, but otherwise there is little awareness of how regional planning allocates resources, such as the quantities of (urbanised) space allocated to female or male user groups or the amount of time allocated to female or male speakers at a consultancy meeting. Scarce empirical research available reveals considerable gendered differences (Raibaud 2015; Listerborn 2007).

In the long run, developing a planning perspective for the 'city of proximity' is beneficial for maintaining a lively 'everyday fabric' combined with preserving local identity: the European city model made accessible for all. However, while the CoP is a useful guiding principle both for GM and sustainable planning, it is also vulnerable to crucial methodological problems:

- Extending the 'proximity' concept from a physical and restricted local level to regional scale level and beyond by including digital networks and communication;
- conceptualizing the creation of cities and public space both as everyday practice and planning profession;
- constructing a clear and evidence-based picture of user profiles and time-space patterns deconstructing stereotypes of female/male gender roles;
- anchoring women as co-creators, stakeholders and actors, beyond the status of special needs group and victims.

6 Conclusion: gendering planning cultures

This paper raised questions about the role of urban and regional planning in changing oppressive gender roles and stereotypes and enhancing equal access in the planning and appropriation of space. Our research investigated in how far gendered planning approaches allow to reshape the built environment and the mobility networks of a city and how this concept has penetrated 'mainstream' planning, thus effectively gendering planning decisions. We found that the idea of the CoP as a desirable urban model is

widely followed, but not often associated with its gender equality roots. Climate change adaptation strategies and visions are building on CoP principles, sometimes under the wording ‘walkable, low carbon or zero emission’ city. This demonstrates how establishing care tasks as priorities is very relevant for the planning debate, however in the phase of implementation leaves too much room for ‘gender washing’.

A major pitfall for the implementation of gendered planning is the predominant focus on ‘vulnerable groups’ implicitly reconstructing male norms. The CoP as a *Leitbild* for gender mainstreaming is inherently ambiguous and can become role-confirming in stereotyping women as caregivers and confining its relevancy to the neighbourhood scale. *Leitbilder* in 2019 must not underestimate city-wide and regional mobility and activity patterns of their inhabitants nor the outreach of digital and social networks. Looking at daily and weekly commuter relations shows that people living in city regions cross administrative boundaries several times a day. This is the case in urban and metropolitan areas, but also in peri-urban and rural areas. For GM to be effective, the CoP model has to upscale everyday life and daily routines of from local to regional scale. Regional scale level is generally perceived as too abstract for everyday infrastructure, but this underestimates the regional dimensions of everyday life patterns and the interdependency of communities and countryside.

The Austrian cases show the importance of a *systematic* adaptation and integration of gendered models, concepts and methods, in other words of mainstreaming those into the planning system and into the planning culture. Otherwise, engendering planning is limited to single pilot projects and linked to the engagement of single planning experts. GM needs to promote a planning culture as non-sexist community of practice, supporting the transformative competence of professionals. Facilitating new roles for professionals, as agents of change to make synergies between GM and EU sustainability goals, means enhancing the understanding of gender and intersectionality amongst urbanist professionals in planning departments and private firms. In order to overcome stereotypes of men being the implicit norm and women being the special needs group, gender and intersectionality scholars need to produce operational categories for planning regulations and parameters for design, hard enough to secure implementation but without producing a homogeneous/monotonous city. To address these issues, we set our hopes on gender studies and critical feminist theory, as so far planning theory has largely failed to integrate the gender dimension, excepting some attempts to define spatial justice.

References

- Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung (Ed.). (2017). *Gartenstadt21. Ein neues Leitbild für die Stadtentwicklung in verdichteten Ballungsräumen – Vision oder Utopie?* (Bd. 2: Gartenstadt21 grün-urban-vernetzt. Ein Modell der nachhaltigen und integrierten Stadtentwicklung). Bonn: BBSR.
- Buchinger, Birgit; Gschwandter, Ulrike; Mayrhuber, Christine; Neumayr, Michaela & Schratzenstaller, Margit (2006). *Gender-Budget-Analyse für Oberösterreich*. Endbericht unter Mitarbeit von Hedwig Lutz. WIFO Studies Nr. 27 105. Linz, Wien, Salzburg: Land Oberösterreich.

- Burgess, Gemma (2008). Planning and the Gender Equality Duty – why does gender matter? *People, Place and Policy Online*, 2(3), 112–121. <https://doi.org/10.3351/ppp.0002.0003.0001>
- Damyanovic, Doris & Zibell, Barbara (2013). Is there still gender on the agenda for spatial planning theories? Attempt to an integrative approach to generate gender-sensitive planning theories. *disP - The Planning Review*, 49(4), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2013.892784>
- Damyanovic, Doris; Reinwald, Florian & Weikmann, Angie (2013). *Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Planning and Development. Manual*. Werkstattbericht Nr. 130 A. Vienna: MA-18 – Urban Development and Planning.
- Dörhofer, Kerstin & Terlinden, Ulla (1998). *Verortungen: Geschlechterverhältnisse und Raumstrukturen*. Basel, Boston, Berlin: Birkhäuser.
- Dühr, Stefanie; Colomb, Claire & Nadin, Vincent (2010). *European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation*. London: Routledge.
- Fainstein, Susan & Servon, Lisa (2005). *Gender and planning, a reader*. New Brunswick, New Jersey, London: Rutgers University Press.
- Hayden, Dolores (1980). What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 5(3), 170–187.
- Healey, Patsy (1996). The communicative turn in planning theory and its implications for spatial strategy formation. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 23(2), 217–234. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b230217>
- Horelli, Liisa (2017). Engendering urban planning in different contexts – successes, constraints and consequences. *European Planning Studies*, 25(10), 1779–1796. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2017.1339781>
- Interministerielle Arbeitsgruppe Gender Mainstreaming (Ed.). (2019). *Rechtliche Grundlagen Bund und Länder Online*. Date of access: 24 April 2019 at <http://www.imag-gmb.at/cms/imag/subcoverpage.htm?channel=CH0619>.
- Jacobs, Jane (1963). *The death and life of great american cities. The failure of town planning, peregrine architecture, environment and planning*. New York: Random House.
- Jarvis, Helen (2014). Transforming the Sexist City: Non-Sexist Communities of Practice. *Journal of Gender and Feminist Studies*, 3(17), 7–27.
- Karsten, Lia (2005). It All Used to Be Better? Different Generations on Continuity and Change in Urban children's Daily Use of Space. *Children's Geographies*, 3(3), 275–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733280500352912>
- Konter, Erich (1997). Leitbild wozu? Versuch einer Klarstellung. In Arbeitskreis Stadterneuerung an deutschsprachigen Hochschulen (Hrsg.), *Jahrbuch Stadterneuerung* (pp. 53–60). Berlin.
- Land Oberösterreich (2008). *Gender Budget Analyse. GBA-Leitfaden für die Landesverwaltung Oberösterreich* (Gender Budgeting Analysis. Guideline for Upper Austrian administration). Linz. Date of access: 22 January 2020 at <https://www.land-oberoesterreich.gv.at/70788.htm>.
- Land Salzburg (Ed.). (2009). *Sachprogramm Standortentwicklung für Wohnen und Arbeiten im Salzburger Zentralraum. Verordnung der Salzburger Landesregierung vom 26. Jänner 2009*. Salzburg: Land Salzburg.
- Land Salzburg (Ed.). (2011). *Handbuch Raumplanung*. Salzburg: Land Salzburg.
- Langlais, Richard; Dymén, Christian; Tepecik Dişkj, Aslı; Perjom, Liisa & Larsson, Veronique (2017). *Addressing social sustainability through everyday life: Experience from a pilot study in four Nordic city-regions*. Stockholm: Nordregio Working paper No 1. Date of access: 21 January 2020 at <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1082795/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Larsson, Anita (2006). From equal opportunities to gender awareness in strategic spatial planning. *Town Planning Review*, 77(5), 507–530.
- Le Corbusier (1962). *An die Studenten. Die 'Charte d'Athènes'*. Reinbek: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag (Translation of 1957 Editions Minuit version by Hugo Steinfeld).

- Listerborn, Carina (2007). Who speaks? And who listens? The relationship between planners and women's participation in local planning in a multi-cultural urban environment. *GeoJournal*, 70(1), 61–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-007-9114-8>
- Magistrat der Stadt Wien (Ed.). (2005). *STEP 2005. Stadtentwicklungsplan Wien*. Wien.
- Magistrat der Stadt Wien (Ed.). (2014). *STEP 2025. Stadtentwicklungsplan Wien*. Wien. Date of access: 20 January 2020 at <https://www.wien.gv.at/stadtentwicklung/studien/pdf/b008379a.pdf>.
- Ottes, Liesbeth; Poventud, Erika; van Schendelen, Marijke & Segond von Banchet, Gerke (Eds.). (1995). *Gender and the Built Environment. Emancipation in planning, housing and mobility in Europe*. Assen: van Gorkum.
- Proli, Stefania (2019). Communicative Turn in Spatial Planning and Strategy. In Walter Leal Filho, Anabela Marisa Azul, Luciana Brandli, Pinar Gökcin Özüyar & Tony Wall (Eds.), *Sustainable Cities and Communities* (pp. 1–10). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71061-7_65-1
- Raibaud, Yves (2015). La participation des citoyens au projet urbain: une affaire d'hommes! *Participations*, 12(2), 57–81. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3917/parti.012.0057>
- Roberts, Marion (2018). Engendering Urban Design: An Unfinished Story. In Alexandra Staub (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Modernity, Space and Gender* (pp. 119–130). New York: Routledge.
- Sert, Josep Lluis (1944). *Can Our Cities Survive? An ABC of Urban Problems, their Analyses, their Solutions*. Cambridge/MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smithson, Alison (Ed.). (1991). *Team 10 Meetings: 1953-1984*. Delft, New York: MIT press.
- Stadt Linz (2013). *OEK-Örtliches Entwicklungskonzept: Verkehr, Siedlungsentwicklung, Freiraum*. Linz: Magistrat der Stadt Linz.
- Stadt Wien (2009). *10 + 1 Jahre Alltags- und Frauengerechtes Planen und Bauen*. Leitstelle Alltags- und Frauengerechtes Planen und Bauen (Ed.). Wien: Magistrat der Stadt Wien.
- Sturm, Ulrike & Lienhard, Melanie (Ed.). (2018). *Kooperation Bau und Raum. Neue interdisziplinäre Wege in Forschung und Praxis*. Zürich: vdf.
- Tummers, Lidewij (2012). How to research spatial planning from a feminist perspective? In Ruth May & Barbara Zibell (Eds.), *GenderKompetenz in Architektur, Landschaft, Planung – Ideen, Impulse, Initiativen* (pp. 104–112). Schriftenreihe des Forums für GenderKompetenz in Architektur Landschaft Planung, gender_archland, WEITER_DENKEN 3. Hannover: Fakultät für Architektur und Landschaft der Leibniz Universität.
- Tummers, Lidewij; Denèfle, Sylvette & Wankiewicz, Heidrun (2019). Gender Mainstreaming and Spatial Development: Contradictions and Challenges. In Barbara Zibell, Dagmar Damaynovic & Ulrike Sturm (Eds.), *Gendered approaches to spatial development in Europe: perspectives, similarities and differences* (pp 78–98). London: Routledge.
- Tummers, Lidewij & Zibell, Barbara (2012). What can planners do create the 'Connected City'? A Gendered Reading of the Charters of Athens. *Built Environment*, 38(4), 524–539.
- Wankiewicz, Heidrun (2016). *Gender Planning – Gender Mainstreaming in der räumlichen Planung*. Dissertation in Geographie. Salzburg: Universität Salzburg.
- Wankiewicz, Heidrun (2012). City Region of Short Distance for ALL? Planning the "Everyday" for a Diversity and Mixity of Users in Functional Areas. In Manfred Schrenk, Vasily V. Popovic, Peter Zeile & Pietro Elisei (Eds.), *Re-Mixing the City. Towards Sustainability and Resilience? Proceedings of 17th international conference on Urban Planning and Spatial Development in the Information Society* (pp. 109–119). Schwechat-Rannersdorf: CORP – Competence Center of Urban and Regional Planning.
- Wohnfonds Wien (2017). *Kriterien für Bauträgerwettbewerbe Wien*. Magistrat der Stadt Wien: Wien.

- Zibell, Barbara; Damyanovic, Doris & Sturm, Ulrike (Eds.). (2019). *Gender Approaches to Spatial Development. Perspectives, Similarities, Differences*. London: Routledge.
- Zibell, Barbara (2013). The Model of the European City in the Light of Gender Planning and Sustainable Development. In Inés Sánchez de Madariaga & Marion Roberts (Eds.), *Fair Shared Cities. The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe* (pp. 75–90). Farnham: Ashgate.

Authors' details

Lidewij Tummers, Dr. ir. (Dipl.-Ing.), director of design and engineering firm Tussen Ruimte. Research focus: sustainable housing, specifically self-managed housing and energy transition, gendered perspectives in spatial development, criteria for inclusive urban design.

Contact: NL 3037 XJ / 13A

Email: l.c.tummers@tudelft.nl; LT@corrina.eu

Heidrun Wankiewicz, Dr. (*1959), director of the research and consulting studio planwind.at. Research focus: gender fair and inclusive urban and regional development, gender mainstreaming in spatial planning and development, gender and governance in cities and regions.

Contact: Bergheimer Straße 42/3, 5020 Salzburg, Austria

Email: office@planwind.at; hw@corrina.eu