



Off-cycle Comparing model sustainable neighbourhoods in France and Canada

Meg Holden, Cedissia About, Claire Doussard, Hugo Rochard, Annika Airas,
Apolline Poiroux

► To cite this version:

Meg Holden, Cedissia About, Claire Doussard, Hugo Rochard, Annika Airas, et al.. Off-cycle Comparing model sustainable neighbourhoods in France and Canada. City, 2021, pp.1-27. 10.1080/13604813.2021.1988346 . hal-03422450

HAL Id: hal-03422450

<https://hal.science/hal-03422450v1>

Submitted on 19 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



City

Analysis of Urban Change, Theory, Action

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://rsa.tandfonline.com/loi/ccit20>

Off-cycle

Comparing model sustainable neighbourhoods in France and Canada

Meg Holden, Cédissia About, Claire Doussard, Hugo Rochard, Annika Airas & Apolline Poiroux

To cite this article: Meg Holden, Cédissia About, Claire Doussard, Hugo Rochard, Annika Airas & Apolline Poiroux (2021): Off-cycle, City, DOI: [10.1080/13604813.2021.1988346](https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2021.1988346)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2021.1988346>



Published online: 09 Nov 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Off-cycle

Comparing model sustainable neighbourhoods in France and Canada

Meg Holden, Cédissia About, Claire Doussard, Hugo Rochard, Annika Airas and Apolline Poiroux

Comparative case study research in two prototype model sustainable neighbourhoods, Fréquel Fontarabie in Paris (France) and Dockside Green in Victoria (Canada), sheds new light on questions of ecogentrification in urban redevelopment cycles. The two cases are chosen for their superficial similarities, as mutual but independent frontrunners of the international movement to build sustainable neighbourhoods. They are also chosen for contrast value; the notable difference is that Fréquel is state-led and state-certified, dominated by social housing, compared to Dockside which is private sector-led and third party certified, dominated by market housing. The two cases offer certain shared features, including urban design, infrastructure, and amenities associated with green, bourgeois, and participatory democratic values. Beneath the surface, we examine how the redevelopment models pursued cycles of creative destruction of waste and value differently from how this cycle functions under hegemonic neoliberalism. In both cases, new wastes are identified and new values

Keywords ecogentrification, waste formation, model sustainable neighbourhood, creative destruction, Paris, Victoria

URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2021.1988346>

© 2021 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

created, that reach beyond economic capital into social, political and ecological territory as well. Confronting the specific dynamics of waste and value formation in different urban contexts offers new means to advance understanding of neighbourhood redevelopment and transformation and how values of solidarity and nature can be advanced off-cycle from the persistent churn of new forms of capital.

Is there a common experience of ecological urbanism?

Can neighbourhood change transform actually existing cities into places that offer better opportunities for sustainable development, with a common understanding of ecological urbanism? With urban inequalities and uncertainties on the rise, the notion of the neighbourhood offers a sense of human scale authenticity where people can find unity amidst diversity, some opening for extra economic value within the larger political economy of injustice, and opportunity for agency and locally unique possibilities. The sense that important changes occur in neighbourhoods is highlighted, for example, by Harris (2019, 753), who argues for greater recognition within critical urban studies of ‘the ongoing interplay of political economy, ethics and aesthetics in the production of the neighbourhood’. Pagano (2015, 7) argues that neighbourhoods offer the possibility of common experiences that connect place and people:

At a minimum, there is a common experience of being in a place—whatever the conditions—that is shared and affects all living there in some way. However, more commonly, it is assumed that there is some synergy between the place and the people, and that what is in common is neither arbitrary nor a coincidence.

Any real prospect of social transformation in a neighbourhood depends on residents with enough in common that their notions of what is valuable and what is waste cohere in some way—enough that they can recognize the same amenities and nuisances. This is a key tension in critical urban studies positioned at the neighbourhood scale. Numerous authors have pointed out that it is a mistake to equate the concept of the neighbourhood with social homogeneity (Bramley et al. 2009). We recognize at least two sides to this mistake: the mistake of characterizing a neighbourhood according to a homogeneous social group, and glossing over difference; and the mistake of actually generating new homogeneity and eliminating difference as a result of change. Both of these mistakes can be exacerbated by urban planning and development projects.

Neighbourhood change that aims to set new standards of sustainability is a special case. Across national contexts, model sustainable neighbourhood planning strategies have been criticized for both assuming and exacerbating socioeconomic homogeneity (About-de-Chasteney et al. 2016; Holden et al. 2016). On the one hand is the critique that the neighbourhoods selected to benefit from ecological urbanism are already treated as homogeneously middle- and upper-class and that they serve the subsection of the population already motivated and

able to make lifestyle and behaviour choices that take full advantage of these investments. These neighbourhoods are criticized for sharing similar features, technologies and designs across different local and national contexts and thus for actively working to homogenize urban landscapes, livelihoods and lifestyles. The tendency of model sustainable neighbourhood planning to converge toward a single international planning model has been critiqued as a shortcoming and negation of the place-specific value and potential of particular contexts, cultures and social groups (Jonsson and Holgersen 2017; Sharifi and Murayama 2015; Rapoport 2014; Hult 2015; Blok 2012).

Many of these critiques are constructed within a frame of ecogentrification (Anguelovski, Connolly, and Brand 2018; Anguelovski et al. 2018; Dale and Newman 2009; Chang and Sheppard 2013; Caprotti 2014; Caprotti, Springer, and Harmer 2015; Rapoport 2016; Bouzarovski, Frankowski, and Herrero 2018). Jonsson and Holgersen (2017), for example, examined the model sustainable neighbourhood of Western Harbour, Malmö, Sweden more than 15 years after its completion and found it to offer a mix of features that are 'spectacular' in the sense of attracting global attention, 'realizable' within existing political-economic structures, and 'everyday' or scaled to present value for local daily life. They conclude that this neighbourhood has overstated and failed to meet its sustainability goals and that the lifestyle on offer represents a particular notion of everyday life driven by private wealth, international tourism and export of sustainability strategies.

Not only is ecogentrification unjust and exclusionary, the homogeneity-seeking qualities of these redevelopments also diminish their green credentials (Rice et al. 2019). For example, Flynn et al. (2015) investigated Tianjin Eco-city with a view to seeing the impact of the district's sustainability features on resident behaviours. Rather than find efficiencies, their research raised concerns that the middle-class lifestyle on offer in this new ecocity generated more material and energy consumption, not less. In separate research, Caprotti and Gong (2017) note that residents moving to Tianjin eco-city were attracted by the fact that it was relatively less crowded and offered more personal space, not so much by the draw of a 'sustainable lifestyle opportunity'. Anderson, Teisl, and Noblet (2016) question whether sustainability outcomes can be understood in a generic way, separate from culturally specific contexts; while Berkhout, Weiczorek, and Raven (2017) suggest locally specific features and forms should become a test of authenticity in sustainable developments. The field is full of agreement with the principle that contextual specificity is needed to locate and pursue authentic sustainability transition pathways (Gaede and Meadowcroft 2016; Hodson and Marvin 2010; Ehnert et al. 2017; Geels et al. 2016; Gelissen 2007).

Also agreed by critical urban sustainability scholars is the sense that authentic and emancipatory sustainable neighbourhood development must be something other than a pretext to more capital growth. As critical pragmatists within this group, we conducted case study research to investigate the possibility that authentic, extraeconomic features and processes can be found at the microscale within sustainable development projects that fit, grossly, within neoliberal logic. We ask whether such neighbourhood development projects may, even within an overall context of neoliberal capitalism, operate with a range of motivations for social, cultural, ecological and political change.

On the other side, we recognize that projects that appear to sit outside the logic of neoliberal capitalism, such as social housing developments, may be found to operate with motivations that are not really distinguishable from those driven more directly by market forces. By choosing to compare two case study sites of neighbourhood sustainable development that sit on either side of this equation, our detailed analysis here aims to reveal underlying logics of value and waste that could create crucial openings for lived experiences and practices of sustainable urbanization.

In this article, we compare two model sustainable neighbourhood redevelopment projects for signs of convergence and divergence, as a way to specify what this redevelopment process does to our understanding of what constitutes waste and value in the sustainable city. These two neighbourhood projects fall victim to traps and errors already recognized by critical urban studies research—but they also fail to conform to these existing explanations. The details of the sustainability innovations offered, the governance and development process, and the motivations for certification in each case reveal certain commonalities as well as differences in structure, orientation, and social and ecological outcomes. These differences draw our attention to potential paths for the characterization of new cycles of value and waste formation and elimination in urban redevelopment. Conceptually, we offer reasons to doubt both the potential for model sustainable neighbourhoods to roll out a single, international, neoliberal standard product of ecogentrification and their potential to act as a ‘yellow brick road’ toward an equitable and just offering of sustainable urban living.

The cases we compare, Dockside Green (DSG) in Victoria, Canada, and Fréquel-Fontarabie (Fréquel) in Paris, France, are convergent in a number of ways (see [Figure 1](#)). Beginning in 2004, Victoria announced the vision for the industrial site now known as Dockside Green to be planned and developed as a global model sustainable neighbourhood. Based on the LEED-ND certification system, which was in prototype at the time, the DSG plan was certified at the highest performance level (platinum), indeed with the most points any such project has received, in 2008 and again in 2018. At the same time as DSG was taking shape, half-way around the world, in Paris, a vision and process were launched for what would become another model sustainable neighbourhood. The neighbourhood redevelopment of Fréquel was launched in 2002 with primary emphases on renovating dilapidated buildings and reducing energy consumption. It similarly has received accolades; notably, it was a pilot recipient of the national Ecoquartier label. In fact, in both cases, these projects were among a very few informing the creation of their respective certification or label.

In urban design terms, the two neighbourhoods share what have come to be considered hallmarks of a model sustainable neighbourhood (see [Table 1](#)). Emblematically, at least, the aesthetics of these elements are commensurate with what Habermas described in 1962 as the ‘bourgeois public sphere,’ (Habermas 1991) right down to the central element of both of these neighbourhoods: a neighbourhood café opening onto a neighbourhood-scale public plaza (see [Figure 2](#)). Perhaps more interesting, because these projects developed within approximately the same timeframe, in different languages and legal and policy



Figure 1: Comparative plan view Dockside Green and Fréquel-Fontarabie (Credit: Claire Doussard).

frameworks for urban design and development, there is no real possibility that either project was influenced by the other. These are independent cases of attempts to define and model a new idea of a sustainable urban neighbourhood.



Figure 1: (Continued).

Both DSG and Fréquel represent urban redevelopment projects that sit on brownfield at the edge of their city, offering the possibility of bringing land characterized as waste following urban deindustrialization back into productive value generation. In DSG, a pre-existing industrial use as a ship-building site meant that extensive environmental remediation was required. The site was uninhabited at the time of redevelopment but sits on unceded Coast Salish land in the traditional territories of the Songhees (Lekwungen) First Nation, who were displaced to the Songhees Point reserve before the onset of industrial development. In the case of Fréquel, this site within the ancient village of Charonne in the outermost arrondissement of Paris also had a former industrial use as a photographic film development factory. Its pre-Hausmannian buildings were dilapidated but inhabited by working and subsistence class people, artists and artisans.

The location of both sites offered value in linkages with existing mobility alternatives to the private automobile. Fréquel is well serviced by Paris tramway, bus and métro as well as bicycle and car sharing services. DSG sits adjacent to a principal Victoria bicycle path, the Galloping Goose trail, and is serviced by bus, a private passenger ferry service across the inlet to downtown as well as two car share vehicles and some bicycles.

DSG sits on a formerly heavy industrial site in the working class neighbourhood of Vic West. Freight rail yards and shipbuilding activities predominated since the end of the 19th century; the Point Hope Shipyard is still active adjacent to Dockside Green today. At the turn of the 21st century, residential uses surrounding the DSG site included government cooperative housing built in the mid-20th century, along with modest homes and

Table 1: Comparative elements of model sustainable neighbourhoods Dockside Green and Fréquel Fontarabie.

Dockside Green (2004–2027 exp.)	Fréquel Fontarabie (2002–2009)
1.5 ha (constructed), western extremity of Victoria	1 ha, eastern extremity of Paris
30,193 m ² built, incl. 266 condos, 49 units affordable housing	9575 m ² built, incl. 109 social housing units (74 new, 35 renovated), 60 daycare spaces (100 m ²)
Private sector led: Windmill West, VanCity, Bosa	Public sector led: Ville de Paris, Société immobilière d'économie mixte de la Ville de Paris (SIEMP)
Extensive environmental remediation and industrial character preservation	Extensive environmental remediation, restoration of dilapidated buildings and industrial character preservation
Moderate density, mix of neighbourhood land uses (condos, townhomes, commercial, office)	Moderate density, mix of neighbourhood land uses (social housing, daycare, school, commercial)
Variety of green technologies: 53% reduction in energy consumption, 67% reduction in drinking water consumption	Variety of energy efficiency building technologies: passivhaus, double envelope wall, exterior insulation, recycling, composting facilities
Range of citizen advisory and engagement activities: online, workshop, public festival	Enriched public consultation: participatory series of design workshops
High quality public green space: greenways, naturalized waterways, native plantings	High quality public green space: central greenspace with footpath, some community gardens
LEED ND Pilot 'Platinum' in 2008, LEED-ND v4 (Plan) 'Platinum' in 2018	Ecoquartier label in 2013

apartments. Fréquel is immediately adjacent to the Quartier St. Blaise, known as one of the most densely populated neighbourhoods in Europe.¹ Sitting outside of the historic City of Paris that was modernized by the vision of Haussmann in the second half of the 19th century, the area had a reputation as marginal, impoverished, and lacking a culture of urbanity. The French government had undertaken redevelopment activities in the surrounding area since 1979 but had excluded the Fréquel 'island' because of the complexity of its tenure and cadastral arrangements. This earlier redevelopment effort had given rise to a local anti-displacement residents group, a successful lobby effort for a new library, gymnasium, rooftop community garden, and local political interest in preserving the historical structure and form of the neighbourhood as its 'tradition faubourgeoise'.² This included its built form, the structures themselves, the mixed live-work nature of many dwellings, and the wild greenspace courtyard. This earlier phase of redevelopment contributed value to the Fréquel project at the outset, clarifying the nature of the waste-value transition intended by this redevelopment.

The impetus for the redevelopment of DSG came from a Request for Proposals issued by the City of Victoria in search of a private developer willing



Figure 2: Café-led neighbourhood development, showing Caffè Fantastico at Dockside Green (above) and SuperCafé at Fréquel-Fontarabie (below) (Photos: Meg Holden).

to undertake extensive environmental remediation and follow this up with a new urban development that would be a model of environmental sustainability. Private development firm Windmill West, led by Joe van Belleghem, offered experience and confidence in environmental remediation; a very persuasive component of the company's value proposition for DSG.

The redevelopment of Fréquel occurred at a moment of a notable political shift in the reconstitution of the values of good urban redevelopment practice in Paris. Paris councillor Jean-François Blet, a member of the Green Party, is credited with this shift in the understanding of the objectives of the nearby urban redevelopment project called ZAC³ Réunion. After 2006, the Fréquel redevelopment project's chief visionary and supporter was green party councillor for the 20th arrondissement Fabienne Giboudeaux; Giboudeaux later took on leadership of SIEMP, the public housing agency that acted as the master developer of Fréquel.

The Fréquel project needed similar environmental remediation work as did Dockside Green, with the added complexity of work to 'de-densify,' restore and 're-knit' the existing components of the neighbourhood together. The neighbourhood had a historical and structural identity to maintain its value for the City and existing residents alike, including a hidden interior greenspace that was, at the time of redevelopment, fenced off and used as an adventure playground for children. Neighbours wanted to keep this greenspace and indeed find ways to make it more accessible as 'breathing space' for the area as a whole. The streetscape was lifeless; neighbours wanted more meeting places, local merchants and social service offices, including a new daycare facility and a Maternity and Infant Protection office.



Figure 2: (Continued).

The Fréquel project was completed in 2009, featuring a showcase of different green building technologies, including Paris's first multi-unit residential passivhaus.⁴ The residential component consists entirely of social housing apartments, 74 of which are new and 35 are renovated. As of 2009, DSG was only partially constructed, and about 75% of the project remains to be developed at this time.⁵ In addition to green building technologies, DSG boasts on-site

grey and blackwater treatment and a neighbourhood energy utility. Currently, 266 market condominium housing units have been built, along with 49 social housing units.

Following a brief overview of our research approach, we organize the presentation of key results of these two redevelopment projects in terms of their dynamics of waste and value generation. First, we present divergent results of common efforts to create new, green urban value on sites considered to be wastelands. Second, we present the new values associated with the amenities and processes of development, somewhat differently for the public compared to private sector developers for the site. Third, we present the reconstitution of value and waste in certification, and the equally complicated relationship of each to ongoing evaluation of its key indicators of sustainability.

The three themes organize the comparison of elements rendered valuable and those rendered as waste, in both sites. Ecological and neoliberal models of urbanization operate via a common basic understanding that urban redevelopment depends upon the identification, containment and elimination of waste in order to generate new value, in cyclical fashion. We build upon Lindsay Dillon's (2014) thinking about waste formation processes in urban redevelopment, involving the classification of not just industrial processes but also people, culture, politics and ecology. Understanding the processes of forming and categorizing groups of people, organizations, practices and spaces as waste and understanding how processes of urban value-creation and justification depend upon past values being laid to waste is important to opening up new strategies for justice-based arguments and actions and closing off older strategies.

Comparative case study research approach

Following other recent research into the 'lived' aspects of model sustainable city-building, as opposed to considering only their 'blueprints' (Lin and Kao 2019; Jonsson and Holgersen 2017; Caprotti and Gong 2017; Woodcraft 2012; Souami 2009), this research undertakes to present a synthesis of the values and wastes of two unique model sustainable neighbourhoods, for their respective residents and cities. Our ideological approach here is fully based neither in the critique of neoliberal urbanism nor in the utopian visionary approach common in the planning literature, but resists either choice (Harris 2019) and straddles both worlds, from 'critique' to 'co-production' (Perry and Atherton 2017). We opt, along with Helbrecht and Weber-Newth (2018, 117) to 'open new theoretical pathways and thus make space for cross-national learning that goes beyond the boundaries of what exists now—stretching toward the possible'.

Our intent in offering a pairwise comparison of two instances of model sustainable neighbourhood developments is to use the sense of both similarities and differences between these two cases in order to consider the extent of convergence and divergence of what constitutes waste and value in ecological urbanism across national contexts. We do not propose that the cases we have chosen are representative of practice in each country. Instead, both cases were generated as pioneer model sustainable neighbourhoods, spurred forward by

local to international interests and pressures, but independently of one another. Though not exactly a maximum-difference comparative pair, the context of each site is different enough to ensure that no lessons were shared between the two sites. Paris, a primary world city of over 2.2 million inhabitants, carries a great deal more political, historical, demographic, cultural, and economic significance when compared with Victoria, a provincial capital city of under a million population. But the Paris site sits outside of Hausmann's modernized Paris, more marginal and less classically urbane. The French context for urban planning and development, also, differs from the dominant anglophone model.

This team-based research was conducted in both Paris and Vancouver with members of the team travelling to take part in both on-site research teams. The Vancouver-based research team operationalized existing research data, including interviews, site observations, policy and media documents, collected as part of the Ecurbanism Worldwide project, supplemented by joint French-Canadian research teamwork in summer 2017 and fall 2018. The Paris-based research team operationalized existing research data, supplemented by joint French-Canadian research teamwork in spring 2018, notably via research interviews with stakeholders with different positions of expertise on the site (see [Table 2](#)), site observations, and review of policy and news media documents. Analysis proceeded with attention to significant points of divergence and convergence between the two cases, following superficial comparison shown in [Table 1](#) and [Figure 1](#).

As an important note to this research design, we do not contend that these case studies represent the general state of practice of building model ecourban neighbourhoods in Canada and France. The Dockside Green case has not been replicated at all; indeed, it remains an unfinished project, with the incomplete portion now owned by a mainstream developer without any track record for sustainable development approaches. In urban France, the political situation that gave rise to Fréquel Fontarabie has been superseded by plans and investments for the Grand Paris projects, beginning in 2007—including a new regional governance system, transportation, housing development and other infrastructure (Enright [2016](#)). This massive-scale investment also represents a definitive shift away from advancing ‘smaller scale, vernacular design, and community-centred use’ (Anguelovski, Connolly, and Brand [2018](#)) in sustainable development projects toward wholesale gentrification of many of the Paris metro region's racialized, impoverished, marginalized faubourgs in a redevelopment process often led by private investment partnership.

Table 2: Interviews conducted in two case study sites.

	Fréquel Fontarabie	Dockside Green
Private developers	0	4
Politicians and planners	4	3
Architects and consultants	3	4
Local workers	3	1
Residents	10	13
Local researchers	2	1

Common efforts to generate new green value on waste land

Opportunities to transform urban neighbourhoods into models of sustainable design often arise on waste sites seen as derelict or as having marginal economic value. At one level, this creates an opportunity space for redevelopment where little or no value needs to be disturbed, in the drive for 'highest and best' land use in cities with escalating property values. Notably, the DSG site was sold for \$1 to the City of Victoria by the provincial government. The land was considered worthless because of the soil contamination; the city contracted with a private sector company, Windmill West, willing to pay the cost of remediating the soil in order to derive a site ready for the creation of new economic value. Even when this contract was struck, the notion of this property as a waste persisted; in 2014, the City sold a portion of the site to a non-profit developer for \$1 to ensure the construction of 49 affordable rental housing units. Here, not just the toxic soil but also the lack of perceived value in affordable housing made the land giveaway the best idea the City had to meet its obligation for this development on site.

Most of the building stock pre-existing in the Fréquel site was seen as uninhabitable, or close to it, requiring the state to step in, clean up and render it valuable once again. Pre-development, the neighbourhood was described in this way:

The sector presented with a primary characteristic of a mediocre, decrepit, low-rise built form, full of narrow dead end streets. The lots were occupied by artisanal activities and homes deprived of all comforts. (Giboudeaux 2014, n.p.)

As the ecourban aspects of these redevelopments generated unprecedented excitement for the value creation where the value of other forms of redevelopment would have been harder to justify to the local publics, understanding the value created begs the question of whether the green value was worth the loss of what preceded it. DSG in particular generated local to international news coverage referring to it as setting a 'new standard,' generating a 'world record' for green building, and assertions that it was 'the world's greenest neighborhood' (Benfield 2011).

DSG was led by a transformative green vision, with \$6 million in contaminated soil remediation invested by the City of Victoria, and by an ambitious green developer, Windmill West. The Master Development Agreement included plans for a 53% reduction in energy consumption, a 67% reduction in potable water consumption, passive design principles, an onsite blackwater treatment facility, a focus on alternative transportation, and an aesthetic throughout of green, urban and wild:

Like a natural watershed, runoff will be contained, dissipated and channeled through a hierarchy of waterways that will employ biological processes to clean and filter water as it moves down slope. Treated water from the sewage treatment facility and runoff from roofs, streets and hard landscaped areas flow into the central north/south water channel to be detained and cleansed within the Site's ecosystem. (City of Victoria 2005, Schedule G)

Work on the water features winding throughout the site, as well as the pedestrian paths and improvements have generated a rich biodiversity, full of birds, fish, beaver, otters. Green rooftops, native shrubs and trees, complete the aesthetic.

The plan for a wild and green public space in the case of Fréquel extended beyond buildings to include the understanding of gardens, as well, not just as demonstrations of expertise and heritage but as sites for public use. Politically, as mentioned, a new kind of thinking was gaining ground, related to the types of structures and spaces worthy of preservation in the name of 'architecture faubourienne à caractère patrimonial (suburban heritage architecture)'. As a result of this revaluing of working class, industrial and living landscapes and structures not as waste but as part of Parisian *patrimoine*, the case was successfully made to keep all but one building (considered unsalvageable from a public health perspective). This in turn presented the opportunity to consider how to preserve the spirit of wildness pre-existing in the centre of the site, which was a wild space fenced off as a local children's terrain park called Petits Pierrots. The redesign envisioned an opening up of the public square, but not opening it entirely, according to the coordinating architect: 'we didn't want this space to become a Parisian Square in the sense of being very open to the city as a whole. We wanted to keep this space somewhat intimate and introverted'.

The public space in both projects was designed with native vegetation, and both projects include a meandering footpath with benches and an intimate feel. Radically new landscaping was trialled in both neighbourhoods; in Fréquel, the decision was made to open the public square to the street via two footpath access points, without the gate and night-time closure that are habitual for public parks in Paris. In DSG, a watercourse streams alongside the main neighbourhood footpath in front of the podium townhomes to the public plaza, returning the filtered and clean wastewater from the on-site ecological blackwater treatment system as a landscaping element.

The project teams' ability to implement new visions of value in wilder green features was limited by the levers of bureaucratic control that they encountered, which continue to count these as waste or liability. In Paris, the public nature of access to the space was ensured by removing it from a park designation entirely, and designating it instead as a 'pathway,' falling under the responsibilities of the roads and mobilities department of the city. This guaranteed that, like all streets and pathways in the city, it could be kept open 24-7; and that residences could have windows looking onto the plaza, which would have been prohibited by land-use by-law were the area designated as park. These victories for the project vision however caused other downstream problems. Because the public plaza was considered a pathway, little flexibility existed to include opportunities in its design for lingering. Landscaping that would make it possible for residents to picnic or bring a lawn chair out to spend leisure time in the space, or to permit those with ground level windows to place a flower pot outside their window, was prohibited by planning rules. The coordinating architect noted how their vision was actively rejected by the planning authority: 'To ensure that absolutely no one would get anywhere near the windowsills that gave onto the plaza, they planted holly, for its thorns.' Individual building architects, for their part, tended to think of the space more as a park, and limited the size of

the windows overlooking the plaza, and equipped them with large shutters to offer residents privacy over and above the possibility of a sense of common and shared greenspace.

Also, because the terrain park had been a place for children, the commitment was made to ensure continuity of access to the park by children at the elementary school at one end of the square, which also benefited from a schoolyard redesign to include fruit trees and a food garden, as well as a new daycare building. The project team hit another bureaucratic planning hurdle in trying to ensure continuity between the public plaza and the school and daycare. Their recommendation that the standard 3 m fence be reduced to 2 m with a hedge was ignored, resulting in a hidden schoolyard, separated from the interior neighbourhood courtyard that was supposed to provide children the opportunity to interact with nature. The gate to the courtyard is kept locked at all times; not even teachers can bring their bicycles inside the yard. All must enter via the main entrance on the busy exterior street corner. This was a disappointment to the project team, as they expressed:

Because the whole idea was that, clearly, we did all we could to move beyond that way of thinking about the separation between the schoolyard and the public greenspace, so that the school could come and take advantage of the garden, it's calm, there are no cars, no dangers. And now the school doesn't even have the ability to enter the garden through the schoolyard. That is a technocratic aberration.

At the other end of the square, the vision was for a café with patio seating to further ensure a variety of uses and users in the new public space. Although it went against the Parisian cultural model of cafés in very public places, a new kind of family-oriented café opened in Fréquel, called SuperCafé, featuring inside and outside play spaces for children alongside the patio tables. It has proven popular for some parents with young children. Longtime residents of the surrounding area continued to place greater value on the longer-established, more traditional Parisian Café Solidaire, accessible from the exterior street side of the development.

In Victoria, as part of the package of amenities promised and delivered in the original Master Development Agreement made by the developers of DSG, Caffè Fantastico, a neighbourhood café with on-site coffee roasting, as well as grain milling and baking, has a patio spilling into a public neighbourhood plaza, with connections to the local bicycle path rather than the street. The café also features a community bulletin board inside. This is a very popular neighbourhood gathering place for residents, cyclists, and weekend visitors as well.

While the overall aesthetic appeal of the greenspace offered in both DSG and Fréquel is strong, both sites are also subject to critique from residents and visitors that these neighbourhoods have sacrificed more of their former wild value than they offer in their new overvalued form. Despite experiencing the native landscaping and reading about the rooftop gardens and climate-friendly plantings on informational placards, a visitor to DSG expressed: 'The space seemed to be a little too predisposed and planned, as I didn't feel like it was a natural area to enjoy. I felt as if I was there temporarily, just using the space for a short time.'

For those who had benefitted from access to the Fréquel terrain park pre-redevelopment, they could only see the change as rendering the space ‘less wild’—lacking the pond where children could play with minnows, chickens pecking around, heaps of earth laid bare for dirt bikes. Coupled with this outcome, the introduction of specific plans, rules and responsibilities for the different components of Fréquel landscaping—from species selection and rules of use in the public space, to the responsibility for care of the vines and fruit trees, to the community gardens dedicated for use by particular buildings, to the play equipment owned by the café, rendered the space less valuable than it had been, less amenable to creative uses by residents. Ultimately, the calculus of value, waste and liability within the formal bureaucratic structures of government interfered with the best-laid designs, as lamented by the lead architect:

We just suggested that the public space could be this: a very simply designed space that everyone could treat as their own, where children could play, where there were no gates, a very simple little public garden. It would have taken almost no effort, it would have cost almost nothing. Well, look at it now and every action has been taken to prevent people from treating this space as their own.

The divisive nature and countervailing impacts of different political and bureaucratic rules and responsibilities impeded a shared understanding of natural value with residents and designers. This is reflected more strongly in the case of Fréquel, according to project leaders: ‘This is the reason why in sum, the project overall is a success, but only half-way—it could have been much better.’

Both Fréquel and DSG projects integrated old and new understandings of wildness into their design through landscaping with native species and unmanicured gardens, wayfinding for non-automobile transportation, water features, and signage. Both project teams argued their need for more resources to increase the value of this offering of a rich and green public amenity space, because of its context. However, the value of these green features was limited by the different understanding of value and liability or waste within the urban bureaucracy, where rewilding was viewed as most valuable in sum when nature is filtered, ecology is sanitized, and local residents are held apart from the responsibility of tending to local ecologies (Boland 2007; Curran and Hamilton 2017).

Common efforts to generate value from wasted public amenities and public engagement

A key critique of ecourban development is that when the private sector leads, public value is privatized and the residual public interests are recast as waste. The two projects converge and diverge on this general point. DSG is private sector-led; the project took shape around a sense of visionary private leadership for sustainability. Fréquel is entirely state-led and includes only public housing and public amenities. In DSG, private sector leadership is credited with the green vision for the site and its delivery; the private developer, Windmill West,

is considered to have heroically provided so much value in public amenities, up front, that it drove itself into bankruptcy. Contrary to this narrative, the DSG project benefitted from generous public subsidy that meant the land was available at no cost, government subsidies for the soil remediation and for the required affordable housing provision, and the City's decision not to collect the fees prescribed when the terms of the MDA were violated. In Fréquel, state leadership is considered instrumental for the sustainability initiatives that were advanced; the commitment of the state to improve living conditions in the neighbourhood was also what ensured that the budget for the work was available, including public amenities.

Using neoliberal development logic, private sector developers are expected to be more motivated than the state to innovate with new technologies that are appealing to homebuyers, because the developer is able to capture more value from both profit and reputational boost of being the first to offer something new to the market. In a neighbourhood master planning context, leading edge private developers may also be willing to reinvest more of their profits from home sales into high quality public amenities up front, because these amenities increase the overall value of their investment, from the draw and sense of vibrancy and success of the neighbourhood. In Dockside, the developer agreed to an ambitious slate of public environmental amenities to be provided as part of their bid for the right to develop, and was so confident in this bid that they agreed to a penalty of \$1 million dollars (about a dollar per buildable square foot) if any aspect of the MDA, including LEED Platinum certification and amenities, were not delivered on time. When the housing market slowed down in 2008, the logic failed, and the developer had to stop developing more condos for sale. By this time, 75% of the cost of the promised amenities had already been incurred, forcing Windmill West into bankruptcy. The remaining developer partner, the non-profit Vancity Credit Union, reflected:

Unlike any development that I have ever been associated with, the delivery of sustainability pieces, wastewater treatment plant, district energy system, parks, any of these amenities associated with the development had dates attached to them so October 14 2014 you will deliver this... Well development doesn't work that way, development is market driven and so to have set dates for delivery of a district energy system... doesn't set the development up to succeed.

The City declined to collect the million-dollar penalty from the bankrupt developer, instead working to ensure a project 'reset' via additional public consultation, and revisions to the master plan. All of this activity introduced a vision of 'cultural and creative vitality' to the completion of DSG. As such, not all of the outstanding amenities were delivered—a large central plaza, sustainability centre, and alternative transportation strategy have yet to be completed—but some new ones were added, including affordable housing. This latter was accomplished through the donation of a small site to non-profit Catalyst Community Developments Society for the development of 49 units of affordable housing,⁶ in the form of family townhouses and studios.

In Fréquel, by contrast, the state-led redevelopment process meant that one of the City's social housing providers, SIEMP, played the role of master

developer. SIEMP's specific mission in public housing provision is to achieve reabsorption of dilapidated housing into the Paris urban fabric; it also had a reputation for Green politics, having been led by Jean-François Blet from 2001 to 2002 and by Fabienne Giboudeaux from 2006 to 2008. The public developer hired a coordinating architect, Eva Samuel, who in turn contracted two other firms, a novel choice at the time: Terre Eco, for advice on green technologies, and Aire Public, for advice on public consultation. An extended period of work investigating green technologies and possibilities and consulting the local public ensued through 2005. Project proponents reflect on the personal relationships they formed with the local public, which resulted in greater efforts to preserve the existing structures and neighbourhood fabric, whereas the default operational mode was demolition. One building was determined unsalvageable structurally, and an unspecified number of households were displaced as a result. The project team insisted upon a set of public investments necessary for this 100% social housing neighbourhood, including a mix of the three categories of qualifying income levels, a school and a daycare, building upon recent additions of a gymnasium and rooftop garden. The garden was programmed as a workforce development project for the unemployed and those facing barriers to employment, with a dual life as a more recognizable community garden model for neighbourhood residents on the weekends. The project team was tasked with imagining what a sustainability model could do on top of these social value necessities.

The pursuit of a model sustainable neighbourhood held political value in both cases. For both, the opportunity was to create a 'first' and 'first in class'—and to spark the imaginations and pride of residents, in so doing. But in the French context, the vision for Fréquel was developed in a context of high-level government attention to sustainable development, with an important role reserved for urban policy.⁷ Canada has never devoted such high-level policy attention to sustainable development; nor, for that matter, to urban development. As a result, whereas Fréquel can be considered a model project in the launch of the national écoquartier movement which has now grown to include over 500 signatories nationwide, DSG is still almost unique in Canada.⁸

In the case of the neighbourhood sustainable sewage and greywater treatment system constructed in an experimental mode for Dockside, in particular, the mayor did not consider this a replicable part of the model, because of its cost as an experiment. Whereas the Mayor adopted neoliberal thinking about the value-waste equation in sustainability innovations, the developer sought a new calculus of waste and value, based on understanding the need for patience in investment in new technologies that may require time to come to scale in order to 'pay off'.

Nor is this perception of innovations needing to 'pay off' the whole story. DSG developers also expressed a sense that the value of what they delivered is limited by copycat developers in the area adjacent to DSG that mimics the same value, but without the same accountability. The new high density development in the immediate vicinity represents competition for the same limited pool of households that are open to higher density, higher amenity, green living. Copycat sustainable urbanism in the vicinity vaunts demonstrative green features, such

as a waterfall, that do not actually represent environmental or energy efficiency gains, although they do represent green luxury. DSG developers expressed:

If I'm selling 100,000 square feet of residential development with a LEED platinum obligation attached to it and a developer can go across the street...and not have any environmental obligations... They are going to buy across the street.

Importantly, the different leadership for each project meant a different target market for each. Dockside Green was developed primarily for those who could afford to move in order to embody the new green urban image. Fréquel, as a 100% social housing project in a working class area on the outskirts of Paris, was expressly built for people already on the city's wait list for social housing, without the luxury of choice of where they will live.

This is not the end of the story of impact, however. During the development process for Fréquel, residents from the surrounding vicinity attended some of the public meetings and through conversations with the project team, solicited advice about sustainability-oriented renovations to their own residences and buildings. This is the key value that the project team saw in the work they were doing:

For me, an écoquartier is a model for the people who are in the surrounding areas. That is, there has to be enough of a draw for the people in the surrounding areas to come visit. In this way, Fréquel is a success... there is an urban design that is risky in different ways... toward a city that permits mixing, that permits things that are not fixed in particular technocratic categories. And I think this happens around a variety of public spaces with different qualities.

Both projects demonstrated unusual levels of public consultation. In Fréquel, beginning in 2002, a public panel was constituted. Composition of this panel was complicated by the fact that, because the new residents would be selected according to a priority-based formula by the SIEMP, resident identities were not knowable at the time. Once the project team was able to provide assurances that the entire site was not facing demolition, the tone of the consultation was generally constructive and positive. It proceeded with a primary focus on how the redevelopment could maximize space and openness, generating new value from 'breathing space'. The reasoning was that to do the latter would be to invite mistrust from a group of people who, as a low-income population, already feel over-regulated and suspect that every effort led by the state is an effort to impose more rules and surveillance on their lives. The project team described:

If we were to go into a consultation in a neighbourhood in the 20th arrondissement and say—we're going to make an eco-neighbourhood, people would not understand. They would lose trust, saying, great, you're going to sprinkle solar panels all over, it's going to be ugly—and it isn't necessarily those kinds of things that create an ecological lifestyle on a daily basis anyway. We needed to bring really practical things.

In Dockside, the private developer took risks in engaging more actively with the public than required, and also to the extent that the engaged public did

not primarily consist of the future neighbourhood residents. The assumption behind the elevated level of public participation attempted was that a more engaged public would support doing things somewhat differently in this project in order to advance new agreed values. Concomitantly, the assumption was that the public involved in the consultations would be motivated to care about the sustainability values built into the project, perhaps to encourage more citizen activities on site.

'Beta' at Dockside was a 2016 initiative to create a 'maker' culture and activate the new neighbourhood. This initiative saw the launch of Topsoil, an intensive container farming operation now with a four-year track record of market gardening on 20,000 sq ft of undeveloped land at DSG. Topsoil provides produce to restaurants throughout the growing season, with a net positive carbon footprint, as well as other services, including educational tours and festive outdoor dinners on-site. Other initiatives included CARGO, a 'makers market' with local as well as sustainability themes, and Thinklandia, a social disruption festival (Devlin 2016). However, Dockside Beta is now dormant, and the new development activity at DSG currently is commercial, with a new LEED Gold cidery and brewhouse built in 2019, maintaining the interest in 'local craft and entrepreneurship'.

The different leadership models exemplified in these two projects, then, represent the chicken-and-egg challenge of ecourbanism—which values come first? For private sector-led developments, the provision of public amenities cannot outpace private profits, if the developer is to remain solvent. For public sector-led developments, the state's public agenda comes first, with all the political wrenches that can be thrown into this mix. Both projects put a high priority on public consultation, but faced the challenge engaging the residents of a neighbourhood that has yet to be built in experimenting with urban sustainability aspirations.

Common effort to generate value from the waste of certification and evaluation

A large part of the appeal of both projects within their respective contexts was the value of being 'first'—the first neighbourhood to make certain claims in certain specified ways, toward sustainability. Certification was a component of this, but for both projects, certification came as recognition for work already done, not as motivator for the work itself. Instead, the technical experimentation and the never-been-done nature of initiatives in both projects motivated the project teams.

The technological, social and political challenge of making advanced green building and infrastructure technologies fit within the understanding of what was valuable and allowable within existing policy, regulatory, space, and budget frameworks was felt in both projects. The excitement of the challenge to be 'the first' to accomplish the important technological goals—the first north-facing passivhaus in France, the first blackwater digesting wastewater utility in Canada—was highly motivating for the project teams, though costly. Built at a time when the larger Victoria region lacked a secondary sewage treatment

facility, the ecological treatment facility at DSG was both necessary for the green credentials of the project and considered to lack pay-off value; to be a waste, at least initially.

After explaining that he had designed building walls overly thick, placed the staircase in an unusual location, and sourced windows at a much higher cost and quality than what was common at the time, one of the architects at Fréquel admitted that: 'my building was within two centimetres of not working'. The novelty of what they were attempting to accomplish in both sites demanded incremental research, demonstrations and proofs that would typically be considered outside the scope of a programme of work (preparing a carbon budget, providing input to a user's guide). This all rendered the work valuable, despite its cost and unprecedented ambition.

Beyond the specific challenges in design and construction was the motivating challenge of introducing a new conversation about urbanism, addressing a condition that the project team referred to as 'a deficit of urban culture'. And, whereas both projects were pleased enough for the bragging rights associated with the certification that each received, both project teams met this certification with a healthy dose of skepticism about the value of this certification to the debate over urban culture. As the Fréquel coordinating architect put it, this was the larger pedagogical task of generating value:

Beyond the boundaries of écoquartiers, because in a way I don't care about écoquartiers ... I think the role of urbanists is to be the intermediary between political intentions, economic actors, and a given spatial, historical landscape.

Connected to this, both projects have suffered from a lack of follow-through on evaluative work. Each set out with the knowledge that to truly demonstrate pioneering work, performance evaluation was needed. This has been much more easily said than done.

This experience of mismatch was also felt at DSG, where residents of the Madrona affordable housing project were allocated one bicycle per unit, but the majority of bicycles have had to be removed and stored off-site, because residents needed more and different bicycles for their households, or already had them, and had nowhere to store them, as no bicycle storage room was built.

Challenges exist here on multiple fronts. On one front are disagreements about the most appropriate measures and indicators for evaluation, what the most appropriate reference frame for value ought to be, and how to standardize complex measurements of factors like cost or greenhouse gas emissions. On the other front are more social and political choices about how much evaluation should be informed by expectations of behaviour change compared to expectations of technical systems performance, whose behaviours should be evaluated as part of this, and what conclusions might be drawn from these behaviours. These are the truly thorny questions of evaluation when it comes to what is waste and what has value in one's neighbourhood.

Within the French context, the existence of a national écoquartier office means that many actors, nationwide, are now asking questions about appropriate and meaningful evaluative process of écoquartiers. In North America, while

LEED v.4 has introduced post-occupancy evaluation, this is an optional activity, making the prospect of credible, third party evaluation even less likely in the case of DSG. Within the City of Victoria, the Mayor admits that DSG is not treated as a model for replication:

We will watch, I guess but we are not singling Dockside out from any other neighbourhood in terms of learning about sustainable neighbourhoods... The buildings are more sustainable than some of the other buildings in the city, although we are having other developers build to the same standard... So I think we will monitor it as a neighbourhood among neighbourhoods.

Discussion of the waste and the value in ecological urbanization

To summarize the elements of value and waste in these two early-adopter model sustainable neighbourhood projects, both generated new property values from land that had been rendered derelict and wasted, reinforcing some of the understandings of who and what has value in an urban neighbourhood and who and what is a waste. At the same time, both offered inspiration from the opportunity to generate new green and bourgeois value from some elements once considered waste. Two decades on, both projects have definitively increased immediate and surrounding land values. The usual critique of gentrification levelled at this windfall of value from wasteland is that the increased value is not equitably shared and excludes some from being able to benefit from the value created. Particular to the case of value creation via ecourbanism, the sustainability vision behind both redevelopments generated a fertile imaginary of value within typically development-averse contexts.

Markedly, high-quality public amenities, and public engagement activities, once considered wasteful, were rendered valuable on more than economic terms. In other aspects, the two projects differed in their new characterization of waste and value—with social housing being considered to have a much more obvious value in the case of Fréquel, whereas in DSG, it could only be valued as a small component of the overall development project. Both projects were valued for boasting green certification, although these efforts elsewhere are considered a waste.

During our observations and interviews, we encountered a great deal of appreciation of the value recognized in developing and living in each neighbourhood. The particular public amenities, including their greenspace, socializing space, and daycare space (in the French case), were valued, as was the green identity of both neighbourhoods, offering the opportunity to live differently from the mainstream. Those who lived and spent time in these neighbourhoods felt lucky to be there, whether they were 'ecogentrifiers' opting in or social housing dwellers placed there from a city-wide wait list.

The value of ecological urbanization emanates from the generation of new green value on waste land. The logic of converting waste into value is core both to hegemonic urban redevelopment models and to the ecological urbanization model on display here, but this superficially similar logic begs further questions

about what constitutes value and waste in specific contexts, and how waste is converted into value or eliminated.

The Schumpeterian (1942) logic of creative destruction is dominant in urban redevelopment: redevelopment opportunities exist where the built structures and organization of wealth creation in place have run their course and ceased to generate new wealth. What was built to generate new wealth, through use and wear, and changing social context, is rendered as waste over time. The identification and remediation of wasted landscapes is key to the next round of wealth creation.

The logic of ecological urbanization is different only by degree. The objective is to close and tighten the loop between production and consumption, seeking to reuse and recycle more of the waste generated by past cycles of development and, ultimately, generate new understandings of waste and value that offer progress with less long-term harm. Proponents of ecological urbanization argue for closed-loop production and consumption using the ecological metaphor that, in nature, all waste is food (Hajer 2021).

The shift to an ecological urbanization model for redevelopment can accelerate capitalist appropriation of landscapes and resources into the new cycle of wealth creation: lemonade from lemons, so to speak. The fact that the removal of waste from the landscape can set the stage for new value creation justifies the cost of remediating that waste. More problematically, this promise of value additionally justifies the continued loss and erasure of that which the industrial model already characterized as waste, such as households and livelihoods displaced, for example, and the Indigenous identity and trusteeship of lands. Alternately, a transformative view of the potential of ecological urbanization understands a transformation in the characterization and calculation of value and waste, such that what once was waste is now recognized for its value to sustainable urban living. The new forms of value identified and generated by the ecological urbanization operating in these two cases include other quantities previously formulated as waste: public green space, certain other creative amenities, entertainment and opportunity spaces for urban culture formation, the democratic engagement of residents in development planning, and the value of demonstrating urban change toward sustainability, itself. The fact that these are now treated as features of value in new ecological urban neighbourhoods, means that the terms and conditions for taking part in urban redevelopment are also changing. Activities that were once best kept private, so as not to call public attention to their wastefulness, are now subject to scrutiny, regulation, and evaluation in order to track and take credit for their value, and defend the argument for the new value created by the new model. This change in the waste and value formation demands change in professional development and planning organizations and the politics of justice-seeking in urban neighbourhoods undergoing change. Recognizing this, sustainable neighbourhood planning and development efforts constitute a 'key extraeconomic' discourse that is 'mobilized in concert with economic factors,' but is not entirely subsumed within those economic factors as dominantly conceived. As such, sustainable neighbourhood development efforts 'have the potential to foster, redirect, or inhibit ongoing capital accumulation' (Harris 2019, 770).

The two cases examined here demonstrate some of both paths to ecological urbanization and are not entirely convergent in their outcomes. Clearly, the

resident mix is different, with the residents of Fréquel accidental occupants by virtue of having their number come up on the citywide wait list for social housing, while the residents of DSG made intentional decisions to buy or rent there. Private sector leadership of the Dockside Green case was behind the failure to complete the delivery of the planned suite of public amenities on time, but the public sector-led effort in Fréquel was not entirely successful in delivering its intended public amenities, either. In the case of Fréquel, the public amenity provision plan had adequate cash flow from the public purse, but the success of this plan was nonetheless held back by conflicting urban governance rules and political interference. Private sector leadership of Dockside Green is to blame for the lack of leverage being created by this project to generate more and better sustainable neighbourhoods in Victoria and in Canada.

A justice-oriented ecological urbanization would seek not only to reformulate the waste of the industrial and neoliberal development models as food for a new, non-exploitative, closed-loop production-consumption cycle. It would also seek to recognize and reclassify certain kinds of waste as injustices. The challenge of this political project is summarized well by Dillon, although she wrote it with a somewhat different political project in mind: ‘what justice might mean in such circumstances where the toxic by-products of twentieth century industrialization must ultimately be confronted and lived with by humans and other creatures at some time and place. Here, the concept of waste formations attempts to bring emerging theoretical approaches on waste together with ideas of environmental justice in a way that recognizes these new socio-ecological problems of the twenty-first century’ (2014, 1218).

Conclusion: Converging dynamics of waste and value in ecological urbanism

What, in sum, can be considered the key value and biggest waste in both of these sustainable neighbourhood projects? Just as research participants in Paris reflected on the omnipresence of the state—‘In France, nothing happens without the state being involved,’ the sense in Victoria was that the lack of government leadership was the key wasted element in Dockside—particularly, Victoria’s unwillingness to collect promised fees from the developer when the contract was breached. That is, an ominous sense of panopticon governmentality in one country may have the same effect as an ominous sense of neoliberal state retrenchment, in another.

Of course, the increase in land values achieved in both cases is a well-known double-edged sword in studies of ecogentrification (Anguelovski, Connolly, and Brand 2018; Anguelovski et al. 2018). This is a critique that Dockside Green has faced, with only a small proportion of subsidized housing units, as a neighbourhood predominantly built to improve quality of life for the upper middle class. Perhaps more surprisingly, it is a critique that has also been levied at Fréquel, not because of the cost of housing, but because of the urban design which has made the area more discoverable to non-locals, and more enviable, and thus less a place where residents could feel beyond the state’s watchful gaze. And, equally, because of the landscape design which is less wild, less dangerous,

less amenable to resident appropriation and adaptation to their own particular preferences (Valegeas 2016).

Both Dockside and Fréquel represent unfinished business for their respective cities when it comes to establishing expectations and channels for public amenity, public engagement, evaluation and learning, institutionalizing lessons, and sharing ideas of value and waste generated in their processes. Instead, what these cases show is the force of resistance to look honestly at the results of pioneering urban redevelopment work, in search of ways to channel the excitement of being first to model a new approach into a new normal, higher standard of urbanism. Both sites have had limited capacity to break through bureaucratic and private sector intransigence to change their imbricated notions of value versus waste or liability. Status quo has a powerful bounce-back effect in urban redevelopment work.

From one perspective, the invisible hand of urban planning in these two cases can be seen as each wagging a finger at the wasted opportunity of the other: at DSG for its limited capacity to execute its comprehensive development plan due to unfavourable market conditions and its private financing model, resulting in a lack of confidence from government or the private sector in the feasibility of sustainable neighbourhood plans; and at Fréquel for its own limits exacted as bureaucratic intransigence, leading to instances of structured, regulated aberration of what might have been a flexible, holistic, and even justice-serving model of sustainable neighbourhood development without the bureaucratic rules created under other circumstances and pretexts.

At a deeper, ideological level, the differences in local values and experiences of ecourbanism have implications for a model sustainable neighbourhood's understanding and potential contribution to the evolution of the city, its governance, and implications for social change. Uncovering these implications may uniquely depend upon cross-cultural, up-close case study research such as presented here. This surprising result that harkens to the findings of Lin and Kao (2019) related to the different ways in which ecocity projects are being mobilized and leveraged in different circumstances, invites more intensive examination. In the cases examined closely here, we can summarize the distinctive value being upheld as motivator of sustainability transition in two different words that frame each project.

In the case of Fréquel, the word that best captures the locally unique expression of value is: solidarity. This French redevelopment project, conducted on the ground of an old city with a sense of a common social heritage, not always beautiful but still shared, was wrapped up in the unstated sense that the element to be sustained was the social contract. In the case of Dockside, the word that best captures what the project was uniquely concerned with sustaining is: nature. In a context in which the case for urban living is still unproven, and in which few if any residents would feel entitled to any sense of common social heritage, the Dockside project sought instead to elevate the value of ecology, more popularly conceived of as shared in the Canadian values system.

Some of what has transpired in Fréquel is considered politically impossible in the Canadian context: an écoquartier consisting entirely of social housing; led, managed, and championed by the state; with amenities like a daycare and

elementary school provisioned up-front. These achievements provide a greater urban justice quotient, or at least on a faster timeline, than is the case at Dockside.

Dockside, for its part, demonstrates what in the French context would be impossible levels of resident behaviour change in terms of energy, waste, and recycling behaviours, changes in mobility choice, within its environmentally motivated population (Mairie de Paris 2016; Dockside Green 2014). Some residents were attracted to Dockside Green because it provided them a possibility, rare in Canadian cities, to live their green values.

The specific strategies and mobilizations of sustainable city redevelopment, mobilized in overlapping and complex ways by private and public sector actors along with residents, should be continuously confronted for their place-specific assumptions in order to make sustainable city-building efforts more grounded, authentic, and built upon foundations of transparent and informed debate.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the participation of residents and planning and building professionals who contributed to the data collected and presented here. The authors acknowledge the constructive feedback of the anonymous reviewers as well as the City Editorial collective.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This research was supported by a France Canada Research Fund award, by a MITACS Globalink award, and by SSHRC Insight Project 435-2014-0465.

Notes

- 1 75,000 habitants per km² for an area of 0.17 km². For comparison, for the 20th arrondissement as a whole is already highly dense at approximately 33,000 persons per km². The population in 2016 was 195,604 over 5.98 km² <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/3681328?geo=COM-75120>.
- 2 'Faubourg' is a French term that designates a pericentral urban neighborhood. Since the 18th century, these have been home to low income populations; since the end of the 19th century, they have been progressively integrated into the city.
- 3 Zone d'Aménagement Concertée in French, a specific urban planning and design procedure that involves multiple stakeholders.
- 4 Passivhaus is a concept and movement in house design in which thermal comfort is achieved through passive (insulation, heat

- recovery, passive solar, and internal heat sources) rather than mechanical measures.
- 5 The development planned for the entire 6 ha site is 1.2 mill sq ft built area; 11 buildings, 2500 residents total.
- 6 These affordable housing units are offered for rent at the BC government's Housing Income Limits, set annually at a rate to represent no more than 30% of household income for households earning \$25,000–\$60,000 per year.
- 7 In France, a high point for national policy attention to the environment was 2007, when the Grenelle de l'Environnement accord was adopted, and an initial reference framework for what would become the écoquartier was crafted, mandating attention to écoquartier development for all municipalities with a population greater than 50,000, within their housing plan (PLH).
- 8 While the adoption of the Ecoquartier program across France has been strong, its results are unequal and contested (Fenker and Zetlaoui-Léger 2017). In Canada, uptake of LEED-ND has been moderate, with 22 other projects at various stages of LEED-ND certification, only four of them at the Platinum level (Canada GBC 2021).

References

- About-de-Chastenet, C., D. Belziti, B. Bessis, F. Fauchaux, T. Le Sceller, F. X. Monaco, and P. Pech. 2016. "The French Econeighbourhood Evaluation Model: Contributions to Sustainable City Making and to the Evolution of Urban Practices." *Journal of Environmental Management* 176: 69–78.
- Anderson, M. W., M. F. Teisl, and C. L. Noblet. 2016. "Whose Values Count: Is a Theory of Social Choice for Sustainability Science Possible?" *Sustainability Science* 11 (3): 373–383.

- Anguelovski, I., J. Connolly, and A. L. Brand. 2018. "From Landscapes of Utopia to the Margins of the Green Urban Life." *City* 22 (3): 417–436.
- Anguelovski, I., J. Connolly, L. Masip, and H. Pearsall. 2018. "Assessing Green Gentrification in Historically Disenfranchised Neighborhoods: A Longitudinal and Spatial Analysis of Barcelona." *Urban Geography* 39: 458–491.
- Benfield, K. 2011. "Is This the World's Greenest Neighbourhood?" *The Atlantic*, August 25.
- Berkhout, F., A. Weczorek, and R. Raven. 2017. "Avoiding Environmental Convergence: A Possible Role for Sustainability Experiments in Latecomer Countries." *International Journal of Institutions and Economics* 3 (2): 367–385.
- Blok, A. 2012. "Greening Cosmopolitan Urbanism? On the Transnational Mobility of Low-Carbon Formats in Northern European and East Asian Cities." *Environment and Planning A* 44: 2327–2343.
- Boland, A. 2007. "The Trickle-Down Effect: Ideology and the Development of Premium Water Networks in China's Cities." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 31 (1): 21–40.
- Bouzarovski, S., J. Frankowski, and S. T. Herrero. 2018. "Low-Carbon Gentrification: When Climate Change Encounters Residential Displacement." *IJURR*. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12634.
- Bramley, G., N. Demspey, S. Power, C. Brown, and D. Watkins. 2009. "Social Sustainability and Urban form: Evidence from Five British Cities." *Environment and Planning A* 41: 2125–2142.
- Canada Green Building Council. 2021. *Projects Database*. Accessed June 25, 2021. https://leed.cagbc.org/LEED/projectprofile_EN.aspx
- Caprotti, F. 2014. "Eco-Urbanism and the City, or Denying the Right to the City?" *Antipode* 46: 1285–1303.
- Caprotti, F., and Z. Gong. 2017. "Social Sustainability and Residents' Experiences in a New Chinese Eco-City." *Habitat International* 61: 45–54.
- Caprotti, F., C. Springer, and N. Harmer. 2015. "Eco' for Whom? Envisioning Eco-urbanism in the Sino-Singapore Tianjin Eco-city, China." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39 (3): 495–517.
- Chang, I.-C., and E. Sheppard. 2013. "China's Eco-Cities as Variegated Urban Sustainability: Dongtan Eco-City and Chongming Eco-Island." *Journal of Urban Technology* 20 (1): 57–75.
- City of Victoria. 2005. "Master Development Agreement Between the Corporation of the City of Victoria and Dockside Green Ltd." Victoria, BC.
- Curran, W., and T. Hamilton. 2017. *Just Green Enough: Urban Development and Environmental Gentrification*. New York: Routledge.
- Dale, A., and L. Newman. 2009. "Sustainable Development for Some: Green Urban Development and Affordability." *Local Environment* 14 (7): 669–681.
- Devlin, M. 2016. "Ambitious Thinklandia Is Full of Big Ideas." *Times Colonist*, September 8. <https://www.timescolonist.com/entertainment/ambitious-thinklandia-is-full-of-big-ideas-1.2339050>.
- Dillon, L. 2014. "Race, Waste, and Space: Brownfield Redevelopment and Environmental Justice at the Hunters Point Shipyard." *Antipode* 46 (5): 1205–1221.
- Dockside Green. 2014. *Annual Sustainability Report*. Victoria: Vancity.
- Ehnert, F., F. Kern, S. Borgstrom, L. Gorissen, S. Maschmeyer, and M. Egermann. 2017. "Urban Sustainability Transitions in a Context of Multi-Level Governance: A Comparison of Four European States." *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 26: 101–116.
- Enright, T. 2016. *The Making of Grand Paris: Metropolitan Urbanism in the 21st Century*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Fenker, M., and J. Zetlaoui-Léger. 2017. "Les politiques nationales de développement urbain durable en France à l'épreuve des expérimentations locales—le cas des écoquartiers." *Politiques et Management public* 34 (1–2): 79–98.
- Flynn, A., L. Yu, P. Feindt, and C. Chen. 2015. "Eco-Cities, Governance and Sustainable Lifestyles: The Case of the Sino-Singapore Tianjin Eco-City." *Habitat International* 53: 78–86.
- Gaede, J., and J. Meadowcroft. 2016. "A Question of Authenticity: Status Quo Bias and the International Energy Agency's World Energy Outlook." *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 18 (5): 608–627.
- Geels, F. W., F. Kern, G. Fuchs, N. Hinderer, G. Kungl, J. Mylan, M. Neukirch, and S. Wassermann. 2016. "The Enactment of Socio-Technical Transition Pathways: A Reformulated Typology and a Comparative Multi-Level Analysis of the German and UK Low-Carbon Electricity Transitions (1990–2014)." *Research Policy* 45 (4): 896–913.
- Gelissen, J. 2007. "Explaining Popular Support for Environmental Protection: A Multilevel Analysis of 50 Nations." *Environment and Behavior* 39 (3): 392–415.
- Giboudeaux, F. 2014. "Participation et paysage dans une politique d'écologie urbaine.

- Stratégie d'une élue parisienne." Université Paris-Est, Université Paris 8, Université Paris Nord. Mémoire Master Villes Durables.
- Habermas, J. 1991. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hajer, M. 2021. *Neighbourhoods for the Future: A Plea for a Social and Ecological Urbanism*. Amsterdam: Valiz.
- Harris, K. 2019. "Making Room for the Extraeconomic." *City* 23 (6): 751–773.
- Helbrecht, I., and F. Weber-Newth. 2018. "Recovering the Politics of Planning." *City* 22 (1): 116–129.
- Hodson, M., and S. Marvin. 2010. "Can Cities Shape Socio-Technical Transitions and How Would We Know if They Were?" *Research Policy* 39 (4): 477–485.
- Holden, M., C. Li, A. Molina, and D. Sturgeon. 2016. "Crafting New Urban Assemblages and Steering Neighbourhood Transition: Actors and Roles in Ecourban Neighbourhood Development." *Articulo Journal of Urban Research* 14: 1–24.
- Hult, A. 2015. "The Circulation of Swedish Urban Sustainability Practices: To China and Back." *Environment and Planning A* 47 (3): 537–553.
- Jonsson, E., and S. Holgersen. 2017. "Spectacular, Realizable and 'Everyday': Exploring the Particularities of Sustainable Planning in Malmo." *City* 21 (3–4): 253–270.
- Lin, G. C. S., and S.-Y. Kao. 2019. "Contesting Eco-Urbanism from Below: The Construction of Zero-Waste Neighbourhoods in Chinese Cities." *IJURR*. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12813.
- Mairie de Paris. 2016. *Fréquel Fontarabie, Paris 20^e: Rénovation exemplaire d'un quartier*. Paris.
- Pagano, M. 2015. *Return of the Neighborhood as an Urban Strategy*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Perry, A., and M. Atherton. 2017. "Beyond Critique: The Value of Co-Production in Realising Just Cities?" *Local Environment* 22: 36–51.
- Rapoport, E. 2014. "Globalising Sustainable Urbanism: The Role of International Masterplanners." *Area* 47 (2): 110–115.
- Rapoport, E. 2016. "The Boundaries of Experimentation in Sustainable Urbanism." In *The Experimental City*, edited by J. Evans, A. Karvonen, and R. Raven, 77–87. London: Routledge.
- Rice, J. L., D. A. Cohen, J. Long, and J. R. Jurevich. 2019. "Contradictions of the Climate-Friendly City: New Perspectives on Eco-Gentrification and Housing Justice." *IJURR*. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12740.
- Schumpeter, J. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Bros.
- Sharifi, A., and A. Murayama. 2015. "Viability of Using Global Standards for Neighbourhood Sustainability Assessment: Insights from a Comparative Case Study." *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 58 (1): 1–23.
- Souami, T. 2009. *Écoquartiers, secrets de fabrication. Analyse critique d'exemples européens*. Paris: Éditions les Carnets de l'info, Coll. Modes de ville.
- Valegeas, F. 2016. "Les quartiers durables français à l'épreuve de la mixité sociale : de la diversité de l'habitat aux normes d'habiter écologiques." *Lien social et Politiques* 77: 62–84.
- Woodcraft, S. 2012. "Social Sustainability and New Communities: Moving from Concept to Practice in the UK." *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 68: 29–42.

Meg Holden is a Professor of Urban Studies and Resources and Environmental Management at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada. Email: meg_holden@sfu.ca

Cédissia About is an Architect, urban planner, and researcher, Lab'Urba EA3482, Université Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée, France. Email: cedissia.about@gmail.com

Claire Doussard is an Assistant Professor, Ecole Spéciale d'Architecture, AHTTEP lab, UMR AUSser 3329, CNRS, France. Email: claire.doussard@gmail.com

Hugo Rochard is a PhD researcher, LADYSS, LabEx DynamiTe, Université de Paris, France. Email: hugo.rochard@gmail.com

Annika Airas is a Lecturer, Urban Studies, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver Canada. Email: aairas@sfu.ca

Apolline Poiroux is an urban engineer, Energy department, City of Paris, France. Email: apolline.poiroux@gmail.com