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"...New solutions pose new problems, and the efforts at resolving those problems in turn generate new solutions..."

1.- INTRODUCTION:

1.1.- GENERAL PRESENTATION:

1.1.1.- Overview.

The present work, a first fruit of my stay at the JHU Institute for Policy Studies, should be seen as part of a larger on-going research project being conducted in a neighborhood in Barcelona called "Eixamiple". This neighborhood, the site of Barcelona's traditional Central Business District (CDB), is witnessing several changes. Because data and analysis of this central area of the city (Eixample) is lacking, my primary research project consists of analyzing dynamics of this neighborhood. In this paper, however, I want to study the internationally renowned CBD urban renewal in Baltimore in order to identify the main ideas that can be transplanted to Barcelona's urban renewal plan for the CBD.

The paper is based on the perception of the principal actors involved in the planning/decision-making process of the internationally renowned urban renewal.

The first section consists of a general discussion of Baltimore's Charles Center project (Appendix 1) within a context of counterurbanization trends, followed by an examination of the links between the implemented urban renewal and the rest of the city neighborhoods.

Although in many respects the United States and European contexts are different, a two context reference can still be made. The similarities between Barcelona and Baltimore (port cities, industrial base, tourism and service orientation and so on), make such study valid.

Barcelona is facing an urban renewal process of its CBD that is affecting the city as a whole. The examination of the urban renewal process in Baltimore could provide some valuable lessons for Barcelona.
My overall motivation to do this paper is to learn about methodology and to see other realities related to similar processes while learning from a more international view, in order to have a broader vision with respect to local issues.

1.1.2.- Methodology.

I have conducted the Baltimore case study based upon documentation provided by the City Planning Department, the Baltimore Development Corporation, the US Bureau of the Census, The Journal of Urban Affairs, various articles on Baltimore Downtown and The Baltimore Book. Particularly important have been the help of Dr. Vicente Navarro and all the Institute for Policy Studies staff - especially Dr. Michael Bell and Mr. Robert Seidel - and focused interviews with the subjectively selected principal actors who have played (either actively nor passively) the main roles in the urban renewal process of Downtown Baltimore.

Although I have changed the questionnaires depending on the person interviewed, the overall aim has been to gain information about these issues:

- The uniqueness of the Baltimore urban renewal;
- The strength of office use as a spill-over engine;
- Gentrification;
- Regionalism: (Asked if in the future a metropolitan notion of the city is avoidable);
- Subjects and instruments of urban plans in the 1990’s.

For the Barcelona case, I based my analysis on documentation collected at the Barcelona city hall, the National Statistics Institute (NSI/ in Castillian INE), the help of Dr. Vicente Navarro and Dr. Amador Ferrer’s article "The Construction of Office Buildings in the Eixample (1988-1992)", which is a study of the office market in the CBD and the rest of the city of Barcelona.
The concrete statistical data examined is:


2.- CHARLES CENTER: FIRST PIECE OF BALTIMORE URBAN RENEWAL.

2.1.- INTRODUCTION: THE CITY'S CONTEXT.

In 1867, after the United States Civil War, Baltimore was the third largest city in the U.S. The combination of a dynamic harbor with a highly commercial active waterfront, and the existence of the construction of a railroad that connected the city with the rest of the country, favored a successful industrial take-off. This transportation network made Baltimore a commercial power until World War II, when the revolution in ship manufacturing made Baltimore's harbor much less competitive as it was not deep enough for the new ship traffic. In the face of this reality, there were two possible solutions:

- Make the harbor larger and deeper.
- Move the harbor two miles to a location where the larger ships can arrive without any problem. This was the policy solution that was adopted in 1945.

We therefore find the earlier inner harbor left as a place without an economic function, and consequently its factories, warehouses and vacant spaces, began to become slums. During the period from 1945 to 1967 nothing was done to counteract this decline. (Bonell, B. 1993). This particular Baltimorean "problem" was characteristic of United States "problem" of central cities' decline, and turned into a "solution" through the urban renewal plans for the 1969's and 1980's.

Metropolitan sprawl is the main characteristic of Baltimore (Figure 14-Map 1), as well as in other American cities, until the point that metropolitanism and urban growth can be associated.

In the U.S. between 1944 and 1961, the entire transportation budget ($156 million) was destined to be used for road construction. In 1960, over one third of all federal grants were destined for road programs (Babcock, 1984). This regressive policy context favored the trend of suburbanisation, which in the U.S. is based on private means of transport, and faces in some way the fact to give housing to an increasing demographic citizens flow. This process was linked
to the marketing of home-ownership, and the symbolical meaning of owning property along with suburbanization became possible for the middle and upper class.

This policy was regressive because it meant less money for a public transport system and no compensation for inner city families who were displaced by road programs not accompanied by adequate housing programs. In Western Europe a stronger public intervention in housing produced a more balanced process.

There are at least three interpretations of this phenomena:

(1) The suburb arises from the preferences within the private housing sector. Individual households with access to private transport aspire to spacious and modern houses in relatively green areas, with all the status that this implies. At the same time it is an escape from the 'problems' of the city (poverty, congestion, insecurity and so on), and a coming together with nature.

(2) A structuralist view regards suburbs as a means to stimulate consumption and a fresh demand for industrial goods in housing, electrodomestics and cars, in a situation of 'underconsumption' whereby industrial surpluses could not be absorbed. At the same time, David Harvey argues that the stimulation of home-ownership by suburbanization was a method of achieving social stability by giving a sense of property to a wider range of people. (Harvey, 1985).

(3) Suburbanization is seen as a socio-economic-political process which creates independent municipalities of the central city that permit a social and racial segregation in the territory granted by different juridistions.

While in the contexts of Britain, the United States and Australia the suburb has played a major role in urban growth, it has had much less significance in some West European countries, including Spain and Catalonia. As White (1984) shows, this arises primarily from different cultural contexts where access to urban facilities is rated more highly than access to rural settings. Because land prices are high at the centre, only the rich can afford to live there and it is the poor population who is relegated to the urban periphery.
There are suburbs in European cities but they cannot be classified as one type. Industrial suburbs did not rely on cheap transport but had industries which acted as nuclei for a mixture of residential developments. New working class suburbs in Europe are typically high-rise and large scale. To regard these as suburbs in a British or American sense is misleading: they are more urban and quite different in character.

Nonetheless middle and upper class suburbs have appeared in European cities but are limited in scale for several reasons:

- Continued preference for city center residence.
- City centre apartment as a preferred way of living, due to a more urban than rural/environmental attitude scheme.
- Significant numbers of second residences which allow an escape to rural areas during the weekends, providing the reencounter with nature.

Among the important concrete reasons that have allowed suburbanization in Baltimore (as well as in other US American cities) to become the key features of urban growth, I have identified:

- Great quantity of land susceptible to be developed, with the possibility of horizontal urban growth.
- A metropolitan culture in which individuals highly value the ability to own a house with some land. This comes from an Anglo-Saxon way of looking at the city. The US anti-urban culture has its roots in the English tradition. An accelerated industrial revolution, with degrading living conditions for the working class and for the city as a whole, creates the idea of the garden city, which finds its more favorable conditions for development in the United States, with the new possibilities given by the massive use of car after World War II. However, it is implemented without any anticipation of the changes that this city model could cause to the already existing central city.
It is in this resulting city model, where the city centre is stripped of its residential function and becomes specialized as a business district, that we should situate the object of our study.

It is worthwhile to go to the data to support what has already been said. More Americans live in suburbs now than in cities. Baltimore is in this sense a representative example of an American central city, with 1,645,458 people living outside of the central city. Overall 68 percent of the population is suburbanite (Table 2).^1

This is a process where American central cities have arrived in a very clear policy context:

- Introduction of the car and the resultant new scale of the city. The capacity of commuting.

- Huge investments in public and private transportation infrastructures such as highways, tunnels and bridges. Seeing it to be consumed mainly by private means of transportation.

- Role of the job market outside the city. As a second step which reinforces the counterurbanization phenomena, the businesses also go to the suburbs because:
  - They look for lower taxes, and some counties can offer better conditions than the city.
  - They look for better control of the environment, that definitely is better offered by the counties, than by the cities. For example, the capacity to create parking lots beside the business installations.
  - They look for the proximity of the labor force that is working in their business. Because the suburbanization is a middle and upper class phenomena, the middle class work force that normally works in this labor
segment, lives in the suburbs. It makes sense then, that a possible logic in the business location is to be close to its workforce.

Despite the decentralization of economic activity in metropolitan areas, a large number of business and bank headquarters and administrative offices have remained in downtown areas. This has produced a new skyscraper construction boom in the core of the city, resulting in a further specialization of those areas (See the "Urban Renewal" point).

- Role of the new technologies in this process. Because of modern communication technology it is no longer necessary for a firm to be clustered near other firms in a CBD. Given the wide use of phones, fax, telex, TV-conferences, electronic mail and other technologies, the location decisions of the firms acquire a great degree of freedom. The consequences of this fact for the future of cities in a growing world economy is an interesting issue to be analyzed.

- Urban Renewal" action. This is the most important step toward concentrating business, banks and offices in downtown districts. In an effort to revitalize central cities' economic development promoting the spill-over effects of promoting office space. It supposes a specialization of services within the central city, slum clearance, public housing programs for low income families, demolitions... and the overall effect of urban renewal action on cities. Although the aim is the revitalization of all the functions in the city, the results have been the loss of residential uses in central locations and the production of a new skyscraper construction boom in the core of the city to serve only the service sector. The result is a further specialization of those areas in the CBD. This phenomena reinforces residential suburbanization (although there is an effort for gentrification in some parts of the city and promotion of residency in the city line), which mixes two dimensions:

- **The class dimension:** on one hand, upper and middle classes settle in the suburbs, providing within their own jurisdictions the public infrastructure and goods they need (such as schools, collection of disposals and so on). They also act as "free-riders" consuming the public goods/services the
central city of Baltimore offers (such as opera, concerts, museums, attractions and so on).

On the other hand, the lower strata of the working class, with a great percentage living under the federal standard of poverty, lives in the central city (Table 4). At the same time a small percentage of gentryfiers, normally young professionals without children, also prefer to live in the city rather than in surrounding counties.

- The race dimension: the majority of the population living in Baltimore city is African American (435,619 inhabitants), while the majority of the population living in the suburbs is white (Table 5). This dimension is not applicable to the Catalan context, but it is beginning to become an issue with the migration flows both from the Eastern European countries and the flows coming from North-African countries.

Suburbanization therefore provokes both a continuous specialization in downtown activities and a reinforcement of residential suburban culture. Nevertheless, the history of US metropolitan development has been broadly studied, I only want to situate this phenomena with the aim of framing the city of Baltimore’s historical context, and so try to understand better the policy tools that the policy maker has in order to understand the processes of urban revitalization of the city, beginning with its CBDs.

Indicators of the urban sprawl in Baltimore as well as in other U.S. central cities can be found attending the population data since 1960 supposing the trends have not stopped, but have been reinforced. Although, according to a projections study of the planning department of the Baltimore city hall, the urban sprawl figures are lower.

So, in regards to the population of cities (Table 1. Figure 1), it is clear that as a trend in the US cities represented [Baltimore; Boston; Philadelphia and Washington D.C.] the population decreases significantly from one decade to the following one. Only in the case of Washington D.C. during the 60’s does the population increase in 59,471 inhabitants. This is possibly due to the administrative-bureaucratic character of the city which has the competitive advantage of being the centre of the federal government. But for the rest of cities, and
particularly for Baltimore, a loss of 202,310 inhabitants in thirty years is a great handicap in governing and planning for the city. Even with a lower tax base, the city has to provide the same bundle of public goods and services, which are used by a growing number of population belonging to other jurisdictions that could be called "free-riders". This enables at least an income polarization (Table 4), that concentrates growing problems in the city territory.

Table 1.- Population of Cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BALTIMORE</th>
<th>BOSTON</th>
<th>PHILADELPHIA</th>
<th>WASHINGTON</th>
<th>BARCELONA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>939,024</td>
<td>697,197</td>
<td>2,002,512</td>
<td>697,197</td>
<td>1,577,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>905,787</td>
<td>641,071</td>
<td>1,949,996</td>
<td>756,668</td>
<td>1,745,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>786,775</td>
<td>562,994</td>
<td>1,688,210</td>
<td>683,333</td>
<td>1,752,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>736,714</td>
<td>547,283</td>
<td>1,585,577</td>
<td>606,900</td>
<td>1,696,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Data concerning Barcelona is added to mark the different trends both city natures are facing dealing with the same outcomes: cities under stress. So, while US cities have experienced a decrease in their centre population since 1960, Barcelona city has experienced an increase until 1980, although it has had a loss of 55,832 inhabitants in the last ten years. The main reason is that agglomeration problems such as traffic, congestion of public goods and services and insecurity have had a dissuasive effect with respect to living in cities, encouraging suburbanization. So, the trends in Baltimore and the rest of American cities represented show a clear decrease in terms of population (going to the suburbs) which Barcelona is now beginning to experience (Figure 1).

Regarding the population outside of cities (Figure 2), the American suburban population is growing at a spectacular rate although the metropolitan population growth is relatively stable (Figure 3). This applied to the case of Barcelona's suburbs, when the two notable increases in the population during the 1960's and 1970's took place. The rate of growth, however, decreased during the 1980's. The latter confirms that Barcelona also has to deal with the suburbanization reality. In addition, a distinction between industrial suburbs and upper & middle class suburbs has to be made because of the rare existence of the former in the context of American cities.
Table 2.- Population of Outside the Cities (Suburbs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BALTIMORE</th>
<th>BOSTON</th>
<th>PHILADELPHIA</th>
<th>WASHINGTON</th>
<th>BARCELONA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>864,721</td>
<td>1,990,886</td>
<td>2,340,385</td>
<td>2,422,589</td>
<td>411,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,165,229</td>
<td>2,258,030</td>
<td>2,874,114</td>
<td>2,153,443</td>
<td>961,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,387,248</td>
<td>2,200,383</td>
<td>3,028,608</td>
<td>2,422,589</td>
<td>1,328,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,645,458</td>
<td>2,323,386</td>
<td>3,271,304</td>
<td>3,316,981</td>
<td>1,317,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census & Instituto Nacional de Estadistica.

In a context of the Metropolitan regions a relatively stable population’s growth rate for all cities’ hinterlands represented is observable. The exception is Barcelona’s metropolitan area during the late 1980’s which has a negative growth of 77,313 inhabitants (Table 3. Figure 3).

Table 3.- Population of Metropolitan Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BALTIMORE</th>
<th>BOSTON</th>
<th>PHILADELPHIA</th>
<th>WASHINGTON</th>
<th>BARCELONA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,803,745</td>
<td>2,688,083</td>
<td>4,342,897</td>
<td>2,122,767</td>
<td>2,006,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2,071,016</td>
<td>2,899,101</td>
<td>4,824,110</td>
<td>2,910,111</td>
<td>2,713,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2,174,023</td>
<td>2,763,357</td>
<td>4,716,818</td>
<td>3,060,922</td>
<td>3,096,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,382,172</td>
<td>2,870,669</td>
<td>4,856,881</td>
<td>3,923,881</td>
<td>3,019,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census & Instituto Nacional de Estadistica.

Facing the consequent decline behind these demographic trends, Baltimore city is decreasing its population. If we cross this data with the household income data (Table 4), we also see that the inner city has to deal with a concentration of a poorer population (than the suburban one) in a regressive context where the city in some way subsidizes the counties by providing services used mainly by suburban population (Table 4 & Figure 6).
Table 4.- Household Income of Baltimore City and Suburbs. 1989.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Harford</th>
<th>Baltimore</th>
<th>Carroll</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Anne Arundel</th>
<th>TOTAL Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-$10,000</td>
<td>64,363</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>20,410</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>39,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$20,000</td>
<td>53,162</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>33,300</td>
<td>4,405</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>14,113</td>
<td>62,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$25,000</td>
<td>24,656</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>20,487</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>2,869</td>
<td>9,342</td>
<td>39,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>109,365</td>
<td>23,599</td>
<td>101,381</td>
<td>16,152</td>
<td>20,817</td>
<td>51,859</td>
<td>213,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than $50,000</td>
<td>46,631</td>
<td>24,151</td>
<td>93,050</td>
<td>16,307</td>
<td>38,249</td>
<td>64,502</td>
<td>236,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Household includes all the persons who occupy a housing unit. A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters.

The racial dimension has to be added to this situation. While in the inner-city the proportion of black citizens is 59.2 percent, the proportion of white population is 38.2 percent. This contrasts with the racial composition of the suburbs, that on average show a composition of 85.3 percent white population related to a 10.8 percent black population. In a general averages context aggregating city and suburbs, the 70.2 percent of the population is white population versus a 25.9 percentage of black population (Table 5 & Figures 7 and 8). This racial dimension aggravates the problems derived from a social segregation in the spatial configuration of the city within the metropolitan area which mixes the racial issue.
Table 5.- Racial Composition of Baltimore City and Suburbs. 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Harford</th>
<th>Baltimore</th>
<th>Carroll</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Anne Arundel</th>
<th>TOTAL suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>280,936 (38.17)</td>
<td>159,937</td>
<td>580,979</td>
<td>119,170</td>
<td>152,381</td>
<td>358,900</td>
<td>1,392,617 (85.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>435,619 (59.19)</td>
<td>15,511</td>
<td>85,025</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>21,982</td>
<td>50,369</td>
<td>175,773 (10.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian (*)</td>
<td>2,373 (0.32)</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>4,223 (0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7,982 (1.08)</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>15,050</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>8,059</td>
<td>7,752</td>
<td>33,806 (2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>6,997 (0.96)</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>6,705</td>
<td>21,250 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,107 (0.23)</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>5,786 (0.35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: (*) Referred to American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut.
In brackets, percentage of population respect the city and the total suburban population.

Baltimore reached a peak in the 1960s aggravated by the industrial crisis of its modus of production and the economic reconversion that it had to face. These conditions helped precipitate the riots of the late 1960s and the feeling that something had to be done was in everybody’s mind.

The strategy to revitalize the city through an intervention in the CBD and the waterfront was wrapped in a ‘successful’ urban renewal process, internationally 34 times awarded, that also has important weak points. Between them the lack of speed flexibility to adapt to a dizzy reality, that runs quicker than any urban renewal plan.
2.2.- DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT: BALTIMORE'S CHARLES CENTER
(CBD URBAN RENEWAL)

In the city revitalization plan the CBD redevelopment is a focal point, due to the strength of office use as a spill-over factor in the development of urban policy. Baltimore’s CBD, as a symptom of the city’s deterioration, had already undergone by 1954 a considerable deterioration. Vacancies were appearing, particularly in stores and in loft space. Rents were falling. Firms were moving either out of the city or were going out of business. There was little new money being invested in either new or already existing buildings.

The retailers were the first ones to decide that they had to organize themselves in order to do something to halt the socio-economic trend that was threatening them. They created the Committee for Downtown (made up of 500 businessmen) and a more operative smaller organization, the Greater Baltimore Committee (100 chief executives of the major commercial and financial institutions in the Baltimore metropolitan region) to put up the money necessary to create an effective central business district plan and to activate the Planning Council of the Greater Baltimore Committee (a private planning agency) in order to present a feasible project to the public authorities. The GBC managed to organize and operate under two assumptions:

- What retailers did was not merely a reaction to a retailer’s problem. It was everybody’s problem, it was the problem of the banks, the parking lot operators, the public utilities, the hotels and restaurants and theatres and so forth. (J.Jefferson Miller, former president, The Committee for Downtown, Inc.). So, all these interests were represented in the GBC. Nevertheless, it is worthy to note that the working class is not represented in this pressure group at all.

- If different groups were trying to do something for downtown, while the municipal officials and the public could not tell which group they should support. The public relations of all the groups suffered as a result. What was needed was a single group for the City officials and the public to look at (J.Jefferson Miller).

The organisation responsible for the revitalization plan was created in 1956 under the name of The Planning Council of the Greater Baltimore Committee, Inc. (PCGBC). It was a private, non-profit professional planning organization with a permanent staff of planners who
work outside of government, but who have a great deal of knowledge about the Baltimore region community. According to David A. Wallace (Urban planner & former director, PCGBC) this structure was designed to avoid the limitations of the two most usual sources of planning expertise:

- The municipal planning department, which must operate in public-in a gold-fish bowl-and therefore may have to emasculate its plans to adjust to various conflicting local interests.

- The out-of-town consultant, who may draw up a bold, imaginative plan and then depart, leaving no way to adapt the plan to the realities confronted when the plan is implemented.

The council responsible for setting policy consisted of nine unpaid civic and business leaders, chosen to represent the broader interests of the business community. In addition, a staff of qualified full-time professionals was employed to carry out the work.

The global strategy for Baltimore was a GRADUAL REVITALIZATION of certain specific areas. The first step in this strategy was recluded at the CBD, beginning in the Charles Center location (see annex 1), and growing gradually to other parts of the city: Inner harbor (already implemented in 1993) and other Baltimore neighborhoods (to be implemented in 1993). The redevelopment of Baltimore’s downtown has to be understood as a whole from the CBD to the waterfront.

At the time when the CDB was being implemented, a self-fulfilling prophecy had been in operation. Investors had decided that the downtown area was going downhill, so they were not making investments in downtown businesses. They instead directed their investment to the suburbs, and as a consequence the downtown area was declining rapidly. This was the reality that made the planners propose a gradual planning strategy for the CBD and downtown instead of a comprehensive plan (David A. Wallace). The Charles Center development was used as a showcase project in order to sell the developers, businessmen, public authorities and citizens on the whole project. Yet it was also small enough to be feasible (at that time) without Federal aid. In 1957, although the city had renewal powers, projects did not qualify for Federal subsidies if they did not involve housing either before or after redevelopment. This was not the case of the
Charles Center project (Annex 1). Baltimore city was going to supply the total public cost, converting it in a opportunity for public support of the project. According to Walter Sondheim, former chairman of the Baltimore Urban renewal and Housing Commision, it was a virtue carved out of necessity.

The Federal law was changed by the 1959 Housing Act, and it resulted that Charles Center became qualified for Federal subsides all, and the Baltimore downtown redevelopment known today could began, involving the federal government through funds.

Charles Center is a unified complex of new office building towers linked together by an elaborate system of pedestrian walkways, squares and retail shops. There is also a theater, a hotel and two high-rise apartment towers, creating a balance of commercial activity, open space and leisure-attractions. It had the following characteristics that in some way fostered this balanced kind of development:

- Charles Center has a strategic position, in the centre of downtown.

- The land had to be acquired by negotiation or condemnation from more than 200 separate owners. A kind of consensus toward the plan was needed to make the project work.

- Most of the Charles Center development was privately financed.

- With its old structures, Charles Center attempted to have a continuity with the CBD which it tries to revitalize and which relies on concentration of high densities. The philosophy was to focus on aglomeration forms and the life they inspire, against the wide open spaces’ characteristics of the mall-type projects.

Charles Center did not pretend to solve all the problems of the city or the CBD. According to Wallace, the long term goals of the project were:

- Creating a concentrated business district, through a project that would generate private renewal around it.
To make Baltimore competitive with its own suburbs, and with communities to the north and south.

This was thought to be set through a strategy for the renewal of the downtown district as a whole. The existence of this strategy (not formulated in terms of policy) has not been perceived by all the actors involved in the renewal process. But it is there, with the aim to create an environment opportunity for the city relying on the strength of office use as an economic development vitalizer. It was an effort to revitalize the downtown life, an effort for gentrification trying to recuperate the symbolic value of the city’s centre, and an effort to attract back to the city business and higher socio-economic status groups, in a moment of vertiginous metropolitan sprawl. The instrument was the master plan in which Charles Center was the key point.

I have conducted this study through focus interviews looking at how the effects of this effort have been perceived by the main actors involved, and how the renewal of the district has benefited the city as a whole. It is interesting to refer to the map of actors (either active or passive) involved in the process in order to understand what kind of interactions happened in the late 1950’s that made the city take this first step in its transformation (Figure 9). It is important to incorporate the general idea that the decision-making process consists of actors working within a set of rules to defend certain stakes or to get certain rewards by influencing the actions of the other actors involved in the same process.

The implementation process of the plan is really amazing for a foreigner mainly because the organizational capacity of the interest groups and the relative facility to arrive at agreements respect partnerships between the public and the private sector.

The major actors identified in the urban renewal decision-making process were:

- In the Public sector:
  - The mayor.
  - The city Council.
  - City managers.
  - Commissions.
  - Boards.
- City agencies. (i.e., Baltimore Development Corporation).
- City departments.
- Councils of government.
- State agencies & departments.
- Federal agencies & departments.
- State programs.
- Federal programs.

• In the Private sector:
  - Developers.
  - Banks.
  - Corporations.
  - Local business. (Retail, hotel and attractions’ promoters).
  - Economic consultants.
  - Engineering consultants.
  - Planning and urban design consultants.
  - Communication and marketing consultants.
  - Lawyers.
  - Architects & interior designers.

• In the Non Profit sector:
  - Neighborhood organizations.
  - Community organizations.
  - Environmental organizations.
  - Minority organizations.
  - Service organizations.
  - Leisure organizations.
  - Public interest groups.
  - Development corporations.
  - Preservation groups.
  - Foundations.
  - Universities.
From these categories, I have selected as main representatives to interview: (It exists an Appendix 2, for more details about the interviews).

A) From the Public Sector:

A.2) The Urban Planning Department of the Baltimore City Hall. Albert Barry, deputy director-department of planning & Ray Bird, division manager-strategic planning.

B) From the Private Sector:

B.2) The Architects and urbanists perspective. David A. Wallace, urban planner & former director PCGBC.

C) From the Non Profit Sector:

C.1) The Community groups perspective. Bob Giloth, president of South East Community Organization.
C.2) Academics’ views of the process. (Through bibliographical review).
   C.2.1.- Critical vision: Marc Levine (Wisconsin Urban Institute) & David Harvey (The Johns Hopkins University).
   C.2.2.- Positive response. Berkowitz, Bernard.

Every leading character interprets the process in a very different way. The non profit sector vision is the most critical, because the actors involved are the ones who have received less direct benefits from the process.

There is an agreement about the overall success of downtown district urban revitalization, but whether the rest of the city has benefited in the same terms is not so clear. This is the next section’s topic.
2.3.- CONNECTION WITH THE REST OF BALTIMORE NEIGHBORHOODS.

All those interviewed agreed that the city benefited by the CBD-Inner Harbor redevelopment because it boosted tourism and improved the tax-base of the area by increasing business activity. However, there is also a consensus that the city center has not necessarily been the principal beneficiary of the whole process. Even in the planning department it has been noted that people working downtown but living in the suburbs as the ones who have gained the most from the process (R. Bird, 1993).

According to Marc Levine (1987, 1992), the main groups of beneficiaries from Baltimore urban redevelopment are:

1. Developers, Real Estate Speculators and Financiers.

They are the initiators of the whole project. On one hand this is a very positive process, because it organizes in one team very different interests and thus making possible an "effective" public-private partnership. One the other hand, it has a negative effect as well. These private groups seek exclusively to maximize their profits, while the public sector enters the game without having a clear policy framework which would ensure that these profits are earned within a project that benefits the common interest.

2. Suburban professionals.

The vast majority of quality jobs created by downtown redevelopment were filled not by city residents, but by suburban commuters.
Table 6.- Employment in Baltimore’s Central Business District, 1980 By place of Residence and Annual Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF RESIDENCE [IN PERCENT]</th>
<th>ANNUAL INCOME</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All CBD workers</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$10,000</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$20,000</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$25,000</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 and more</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


During the development period, the proportion of city workers in the CBD was of 46.2 percent while the percentage of CBD workers who were living in the suburbs was of the 53.8 percent. However, it is necessary to point out that it is in the segments of jobs which are higher paid, where the suburbanite population appropriates the CBD jobs created by the redevelopment. So, in the higher income segments, the proportion from workers of the suburbs is three times the proportion of the city workers (Table 6). It is clear then that to the extent downtown redevelopment created jobs, the benefits "leaked" rather substantially to the suburbs (Levine, 1992).


In the renewal plan is contemplated the attraction back to the city of middle and upper class population in a called gentrification process. However, in Baltimore redevelopment the gentrification encompasses only one population group: young professionals working in MetroCenter who are attracted to in-city living, close to work. But it does not encompass a broader gentry strategy reaching broader population groups. This is a very slow process, also addressed to a minority of the population. It is also important to bear in mind that downtown Baltimore did not have a tradition in housing. Where today’s redeveloped waterfront is, there were warehouses and industries 40 years ago, either vacant or functioning.
I think that another important variable in the gentrification policy is the school district system. This makes it very difficult for central cities such as Baltimore, with a considerable concentration of a poor population, to raise good public schools. As a result, the young population with children is encouraged to move to the suburbs in search of good quality public schools. The gentrification policy, without an education policy reform, is addressed only to young professionals with no children, or to older citizens.

4. Tourists.

They are the ones that a great part of the redevelopment is oriented to, because part of the strategy is to change the economic base of the local economy. However, this orientation produces an unbalanced form of development.

"The benefits that have been generated by downtown redevelopment have been unevenly distributed. City neighborhoods continue to deteriorate, city dwellers have been unable to secure quality employment, and city space has been increasingly restructured to meet the various interests of developers, tourists and upper income consumers. Along with secular trends in the American economy, such as the rise of services and the decline of manufacturing, Baltimore redevelopment has helped Baltimore become the archetype of a 1980/1990s "dual city", a city of haves and have nots" (Levine, 1987, 1992).

In the same line of thought David Harvey (1989) questions the urban redevelopment, because it has been precisely a private initiative, joined by the public sector, that has not counted with the city groups. For Harvey the whole operation has merely converted the downtown area into a mask to hide the true problems of Baltimore. Although it is true that a tourist center has been developed, he questions if this sectorial change has reversed industrial Baltimore’s crisis by giving the city a real economic alternative. "If people could live on images alone, Baltimore’s populace would have been rich indeed" (Harvey, 1989). But to have the city situated on the map and visited as much as Disneyworld does not mean that its structural problems have been addressed.

This contrasts with the aim of the planner, David Wallace, who understands planning as a broad concept, which includes the contemplation of the physical part in a socio-economic
basis, as a way of solving structural problems. According to Wallace, successful planning and design must evolve from a clear understanding of the natural, cultural, social, economic, and the often complicated regulatory context of the project (Wallace, Roberts & Todd, 1992). This philosophy was applied to Baltimore redevelopment, which was thought to reach the whole city. But because it was a private plan, and so much an unequal process, some benefits were granted leaving for the rest of the city not much capacity to control, on a democratic basis, the process (B. Giloth, 1993).

A discussion about whether the rest of Baltimore’s neighborhoods were "forgotten" in the redevelopment process that began in Charles Center is needed. The democratization of the process, and the role of the public sector has to be examined. The responses I had from the public officials about these issues were defensive:

- Although the downtown plan was the star of the urban renewal, it did not keep 100% of the city resources. The Baltimore Development Corporation had to report periodically to the Housing and Community Development Department, and this mechanism equilibrated the share of public money. Although a perception could exist that all the public money was going to the downtown project, downtown had to compete with the rest of projects in the city (B. Bonell, 1993).

- A trade off between money going to downtown and money going to the rest of Baltimore neighborhoods did not exist. The reason is that the money for downtown urban renewal was federal money specifically destined to this project. There was no local money going to downtown. The proof is that now that there is no federal money, few projects are going on in the downtown area (R. Bird, 1993).

- As a direct way to connect profits in downtown redevelopment with the city, although there were not imposed "linkages" on developers, the city has negotiated profit-sharing arrangements with the main projects. This means that all firms that receive financing assistance from the city must utilize the city’s Manpower Program as a first source of new hires and training. The philosophy is that the creation of jobs for city citizens represents a much greater benefit than would the linkages (B. Berkowitz, 1987).
The community representatives point of view (according to B. Giloth, from South East Community Organization), is that downtown planning is used by particular interests to create an economic core in the city. It is promoted by political interests, but it does not mean that it is what the city needs. A concept of social justice has not been met, and downtown consumes resources and energies that the city needs to solve other problems around the whole. The majority of jobs have gone to the suburbs, and a centric development "island" has been created. There have not been clear links with neighborhood development. The City Council represents the communities depending on who is elected, and how engaged they are with community issues. During Mayor Schaefer’s mandate, his figure was so strong that the City Council did not represent any other posture than the support for the downtown urban redevelopment effort. Harvey (1989) also stresses the importance to the process of a populist, strong-willed and authoritarian Mayor Schaefer. Today there are more voices opposing the overdevelopment of downtown.

In Giloth’s words, although an effective public-private partnership has made possible the materialization of the urban renewal plan, a more active role from the public sector setting the rules of the game and making it possible to extend the process’ benefits to all the parts of the city has been lacking. Nevertheless there are a lot of positive things to learn from the Baltimore experience and I will discuss them in the last section.
3.- REFERENCE TO BARCELONA'S C.B.D. URBAN RENEWAL.

3.1.- INTRODUCTION TO BARCELONA.
[Note: this section is avoidable if one already knows Barcelona or wants to get directly to the CBD urban renewal].

First of all, an introduction of Barcelona's context is needed both on a regional and a city scale in order to visualize the frame into which I will fit my analysis.

3.1.1. - In a regional scale:

Barcelona is the capital of Catalonia, which is one of the seventeen autonomous communities in Spain with its own government (Generalitat de Catalunya) and own institutions. The formal relationship between the central state of Spain and the autonomous communities are specified in articles 148 and 149 of the Spanish constitution respectively. There is also a Constitutional Court to deal with the cases of either lack of or overlap of public action between the two government levels.

Catalonia in an area of 31,930 square kilometers and with 5,978,638 inhabitants has its own culture and language, the "Catalan" (Table 7). It constitutes one of the four historical autonomous communities of Spain, which means it has had, since the beginning of the organization of the state, more responsibilities than the rest of the communities which are gradually reaching the same status.

Catalonia is economically a very vital area, which traditionally has attracted migration of the rest of Spain, giving it 15 percent of Spain's population (Llarch & Saez, 1987). In this regional context, Barcelona is the capital of Catalonia and is the second city in Spain after Madrid (bureaucratic and administrative capital of the state). It is also a potential capital of the western Mediterranean region, thanks to its geographical position, energy, commercial dynamism, and cultural vitality.

Barcelona, with its 1,696,795 inhabitants (Table 1), accounts for 4.25 percent of the population of the whole state (39,857,587 inhabitants), and the per capita income is 43.6 percent higher than the average for Spain (Perramon, 1987). Traditional industrial sectors have survived
in the city such as textile and metalwork, made up mainly of very small enterprises, the location of which will depend on the future development pattern of the city and territorial growth. Although the metal refining sector, wholesale and retail trade are important employers in the city (Perramon, 1987), it must be kept in mind that Barcelona is the center of the Catalan economy as well as a potential center of the neighboring Mediterranean area, and its economy cannot be analyzed without taking this fact into account. This has made the city continuously specialize in a growing services sector (both commercial and non commercial) in the last twenty years. In fact in the last research on world cities, Barcelona is incorporated by John Friedmann in his cities’ ranked list as a regional world city\textsuperscript{10}.

In this sense, it has to be understood that it is the reality of Barcelona which has created Catalonia, and not the other way around. It is also important to stress the natural competitive affinity with other northern cities in Europe. Once Spain joined the European Common Market (E.C.C.), Barcelona was destined to be "the link that will attach the Iberian peninsula to the urban European axis that goes from London to Milan" in the words of Barcelona’s Mayor, Pasqual Maragall, who sees the city inserted in an European context where the cities have to play a primary role. This is true although the Generalitat (like other governments in the European Economic Community) taxes the city to subsidize the country, and the Catalan parliamentary system gives more weight to territorial representation over population. As a result, the laws are more representative of rural interests at the city’s expense, and are generally keyed to more conservative views than the majority of people actually hold.

In some sense it is necessary to keep in mind that due to the role of new technologies, the consolidation of the service sector and globalization of the economy, at least in Europe, central cities are called to have an active role. In this sense the Europe of regions will give way to the Europe of cities (Oriol Nel.lo, 1988), in which it will be possible to speak of an articulated system, and certainly a stratified one as well, according to criteria such as the size of the population, the strategic position at a given commercial level, and so on in the various cities, through which the economic flows in general will be made more flexible. (Clemente del Río, 1987).

The following table gives a better idea about surfaces and population of the areas in which we settle our comparative analysis:
Table 7.- Regional Demographic Data: Maryland and Catalonia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAND (Km2)</th>
<th>REGIONAL POPULATION</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>METROP. POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1990) MARYLAND</td>
<td>25,316</td>
<td>4,781,468</td>
<td>188.8</td>
<td>4,093,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1990) CATALONIA</td>
<td>31,930</td>
<td>5,978,638</td>
<td>187.2</td>
<td>2,961,019 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census & Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

Note: (*) population of the metropolitan area corresponds to the 1991 Padró d’Habitants (Spanish Census).

Similarities between both geographical areas can be seen in terms of demographic indicators. 4,781,468 and 5,978,638 inhabitants respectively for Maryland and Catalonia, living in a surface area of 25,316 square Kmts and 31,930 square Kmts. respectively define a very close density of 188.8 inhabitants per Km2 and 187.2 inhabitants per Km2 for each region (Table 7). This is an important determinant in setting the policy-making arena in which urban renewal processes will operate.

Although in demographic terms the units are quite similar, the different socio-economic organization makes the two regions radically diverse. In Catalonia the territory is organized into local municipalities which constitute their own jurisdictions. Today’s Barcelona city was formed in the early XX-th century by the incorporation of jurisdictions contiguous to the city centre as the only way the city could grow. The urban growth pattern of the city has been centrifugal urban sprawl or wave motion (Figures 16; Map 3 & 17; Map 4). But Barcelona’s need to grow has continued. The natural constraints have made a territorial growth impossible, but Barcelona has organised through a 1976 metropolitan master plan in a metropolitan city network.

One can not understand the processes going on in the city without an overview and deep understanding of the metropolitan context11 where one finds the real dimension of the city.
The demographic data has been organized along the existing metropolitan institutions (Table 8).

Table 8.- Barcelona’s Metropolitan Area Institutions and Barcelona City (1987).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Km2</th>
<th>Inhabitants</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.E.M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>331.50</td>
<td>2,864,719</td>
<td>8,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.M.E.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>585.36</td>
<td>3,083,353</td>
<td>5,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.M.A.M.B.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>407.18</td>
<td>3,002,032</td>
<td>7,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.B.(*)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>476.13</td>
<td>3,031,720</td>
<td>6,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARCELONA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.31</td>
<td>1,701,812</td>
<td>17,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

Notes: (1) T.E.M. (Transports Metropolitan Entity); E.M.E. (Environment Metropolitan Entity); M.M.A.M.B. (Mancomunitat Municipis Area Metropolitana Barcelona) and C.M.B./B.M.C. (Barcelona Metropolitan Corporation);

(*) CMB (=BMC) was abolished in 1987.

(2) Density: inhabitants/square Kmter.

The data of the metropolitan Barcelona can be compared either with the data of the B.C.M. or with the actual M.M.A.M.B. data, because the demographic indicators are referring to the same metropolitan reality and differ only in the adjudicated responsibilities.

The B.C.M., with its 27 municipalities and 476.13 square Kilometers (Table 8), looks a very small place in terms of surface compared to other metropolitan areas or even with their respective municipal areas. The extension is in many cases the extension of a single city, both in European and in American contexts. For instance Madrid city has 607 Km2, and the same happens if we compare with American cities of less population such as Chicago (590.7 Km2) and others which own a larger municipal territory (Table 1) (Figure 10). Comparing with our study focus, Baltimore metropolitan area with its 6,758 Km2 is clearly a more extensive area than the 476.13 Km2 of Barcelona metropolitan area (Table 3). This has an effect on the density of these
cities and on the problems and challenges this causes to the local government to keep on providing the public goods it must and governing the city.

3.1.2. - In a City scale.

Barcelona city is a small "closed" city of only 99.31 Km2 encircled by 32 metropolitan towns within the same urbanized territory. It is characterized by high densities in population and a high degree of economic activity that makes the existence of a metropolitan institution necessary. The whole area constitutes a solid network with a truly unitary nature.

Although small, Barcelona still keeps 1,696,795 inhabitants of the 2,961,019 (56.1 percent) total metropolitan population within the city limits. The Metropolitan Area has 2,961,019 inhabitants, 52 percent of Catalonia’s population (Tables 1, 3). The price is a density of 16,590 inhabitants per square Km, and it is necessary to have the metropolitan scale in mind at the time of conceptualizing the city and policy planning.

Regarding Figure 5, it is observed that the Metropolitan Area begins to lose population during the 1970s. In the period between 1970-1985 it loses 77,313 inhabitants (A. Ferrer, 1987). Barcelona city begins to lose population after 1980. It may be that the city is beginning to follow the trends already existing in anglo-saxon cities. Although the processes are different, it is necessary to point out that the outcome is the same one: a growth pattern of urban sprawl. The tendency in Barcelona may or may not continue in the same terms depending on the changes during the economic cycle and the corrective public policies that will be planned and implemented.

However, in 1990 the situation within Baltimore and Barcelona respecting their metropolitan areas is still radically diverse. Regarding Figure 1 it is observed how comparatively there are less citizens living in Baltimore city than in Barcelona city line with its consequences for the city at the time to provide services & public goods to their respective hinterlands.
Table 9.- Barcelona, Madrid and Baltimore: City and Metropolitan Area. Space, Population and Density. 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Km²</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARCELONA</td>
<td>99.31</td>
<td>1,696,795</td>
<td>16,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.B. (*)</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>3,019,435</td>
<td>5,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADRID</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>3,058,182</td>
<td>5,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.M.</td>
<td>8,027</td>
<td>4,786,488</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>736,714</td>
<td>3,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAs</td>
<td>6,758</td>
<td>2,382,172</td>
<td>3,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: (1) In 1948 the surface of the municipality of Madrid was 70 Km² and had 1,600,000 inhabitants. Between 1948 and 1954 Madrid annexed twelve municipalities and had a surface of 606 Km².

(*) Data corresponding to the MMAMB and Spanish Census.

In this picture we have to take into account the city’s urban renewal planning, which has constituted the reinvention of the city itself. No European capital in recent years has made such an effort at urban renewal as Barcelona has; in part because of the opportunity window given by the 1992 Olympic games.

The Olympics have not only located Barcelona on the international map but have also transformed the renewal process of the city. The need for this transformation became evident during the last twenty years. An economic impulse to revive the city was necessary and this came through the investment made in Barcelona because of the Olympics. This was so necessary for the city that if the games had not existed, the Barcelonans would have to had to invent them, according to Narcís Serra, former mayor of Barcelona.

This renovation has not been limited only to the infrastructure and urban utilities such as the city beltways, the olympic harbor, the macro sporting installations of the olympic base or the benefit to the city of the olympic village reclaiming an industrial neighborhood in decline.
It has also been a renewal of the collective aspiration for the city, as in the 1960's Baltimore Charles Center & the 1980's Inner Harbor renewed the collective aspiration for Baltimore city.

In today's Barcelona I would distinguish three different areas which show its demographic and economic evolution:

A.- The Downtown or Core City. This area is composed of two districts of very diverse characteristics. One is "Ciutat Vella" (Old City) and the other is the district of the "Eixample", or Central Business District, which is the focus of our analysis.

The district of Old City is in the centre of Barcelona. It is where the Roman empire first settled creating Barcino, where other cultures had settled. After the Romans, the goths, the visigoths and others settled there, arriving in history to a city "closed" by a wall in the XIX-th century during the Borbons reign and the implementation of the Cerdà plan and the creation of the New Barcelona. This New Barcelona later emerged as the second district of Barcelona (also called the "Eixample", Enlargement or rather CBD) (Figure 18; Map 5).

This former enlargement of the city became a central part of it, using a lot of charming appeal in order to attract business activity, and by appropriating the symbolic value of being a city centre. It was the site elected by enterprise headquarters and service activity in general to settle their activities, transforming the neighborhood from a place for residential use to the settlement of the basic infrastructure of the service sector: the office park. This situation has led the city hall urban department to think about an urban renewal process in order to equilibrate the uses in the city.

These two neighborhoods constitute the centre of Barcelona, but their social structure is completely diverse. While Old City has passed through a degradation process for many years which has made it appear as a slum with many urban and social problems, the "Eixample" district has followed the opposite trend. It has appropriated the symbolic value of being the city centre not only for office, business headquarters and commercial spaces' location, but also for high rise residence location. This has led to a bourgeoisiation process of the area through the market land price mechanism, which keeps other social groups from settling in the neighborhood.
B. - The rest of the districts inside the city line. These form the Central City, Sants-Monjuich; Les Corts; Sarrià-Sant Gervasi; Gràcia; Horta-Guinardó; Nou Barris; Sant Andreu and Sant Martí. They are peripheral to the city core and are the municipalities that surrounded Barcelona and in the early XX-th century were annexed by the city.

C.- Outer cities. These areas constitute their own municipalities around Barcelona, but are also an urban system with the city. We can associate them to the 24 municipality components of the M.M.A.M.B.: Castelldefels, Gavà, Viladecans, Prat de Llobregat, Sant Boi de Llobregat, Cornellà, Hospitalet de Llobregat, Esplugues de Llobregat, Sant Joan Despí, Sant Just Desvern, Sant Feliu de Llobregat, Molins de Rei, El Papiol, Sant Vicens dels Horts, Pallejà, Sant Andreu de la Barca, Sant Adrià del Besòs, Santa Coloma de Gramenet, Badalona, Montgat, Montcada i Reixac, Cerdanyola del Vallès and Ripollet.

These municipalities are still growing, although at a slower rate since 1975 (CEP, 1987). In the 1970s Barcelona had practically reached the saturation point of its municipal district and radically cut down its growth process; part of this shifted toward the neighboring municipalities that continued their rapid growth. Places such as Tarrassa, Sabadell and Mataró among others became population attraction poles, existing always an interrelational network within all the component units of the metropolitan area.
3.2.- TERTIARIZATION IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT AND THE URBAN RENEWAL PROCESS. NEW DOWNTOWNS: A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY.

Barcelona’s Central Business District has moved from the old city to Diagonal Avenue, through Passeig de Gràcia. (Figure 18; Map 5). Nevertheless, the core of the CBD is still the "Eixample". To support the idea that the "Eixample" is assisting an accelerated concentration of tertiary activities we have to regard the work of A. Ferrer on the office market space in Barcelona.

In 1986 the distribution of the public and private office space was highly concentrated in the "Eixample". The total surface of office space in square meters (tertiary, industrial business offices and Public Administrations) was 2,941,020 m² with a total of 17,677 offices (Table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TOTAL BARCELONA CITY</th>
<th>EIXAMPLE (CBD)</th>
<th>EIXAMPLE/TOTAL BARCELONA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Sector</td>
<td>2,032,262</td>
<td>879,970</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Sector</td>
<td>439,458</td>
<td>294,437 *</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>469,299</td>
<td>177,676</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,941,020</td>
<td>1,352,083</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: * corresponds to an aggregate figure of three districts.

The numbers do not include the changes in use made in rehabilitated buildings without major works which are still not quantified. A broad and systematic study of them is needed (A. Ferrer, 1988).
This spontaneous market concentration of business activity in one neighborhood without public control has had the effect of increasing the land price in the area, provoking a social restructuring. Because it is more expensive to live in this area (which also has the appeal of being the city centre), only the richest population strata can afford to live there. As a result the neighborhood suffers an aging and a bourgeoisie process through expelling inhabitants to the next districts within the city line and to the metropolitan area’s cities. It creates another social redistribution of these other population areas, which constitutes a change of arena for the local policy maker when producing public policies.

From the city hall, there is the will to have a balanced and redistributive city, and the belief that city planning is a legitimate tool to use to frame urban policies and implement them in order to increase the city’s quality of life. The Olympic project has been in terms of urbanism for Barcelona a means of priming the pump rather than end in itself, because it has become an instrument to coordinate the action of the three government levels (local, regional and central), and a way to raise the money necessary for the projected investments. However, the Olympics has constituted an opportunity to begin a partial development of the new downtowns plan. For Barcelona’s sense of neighborhood and the fabric of its past have recently begun to change.

The will (as Mayor Maragall put it in a speech to the Harvard Graduate School of Design in 1986) is that Barcelona should decentralize, even within the centre of the city itself. "This means giving up zoning and looking for a city in which all activities can coexist" (Maragall, 1986). This does not mean that the city hall will put factories back in the Old city, but that the centre should not be exclusively showcased at the expense of the periphery. It also means that run-down and shapeless areas all over the town should be brought back with what the mayor termed a set of urban spaces, parks and squares--of high urban design quality throughout the city (Maragall, 1986). The neighborhood converted in the CBD should not be completely specialized in the service sector but rather should be submitted to some planning initiative which would contemplate this "balanced" sense of the city in order to increase the quality of life of Barcelona as a whole and expand the "centrality" characteristics to all of Barcelona’s neighborhoods. So, the creation of New Downtowns\textsuperscript{14} [Arees Nova Centalitat (ANC)] fits into this analysis, as a way to generalize all over the city a common urban renewal plan, the spill-over effects of a diversified new downtown development.
As mentioned earlier, Barcelona is saturated in terms of new urban development. Nonetheless it still has many spaces that through urban renewal operations may contribute to developing new central areas that may tend to a more balanced use of the city.

These new downtowns are strategically situated areas, which can be developed in an effort to be able to "plan" the city, taking into account not only the partial area with which one is working, but the whole city system. It is what we could name a COMPREHENSIVE planning strategy. It aims to counterbalance polarization and give to Barcelona the urban quality level that the city deserves (Maragall, 1991). Such an ambitious project needs very careful treatment to preserve and increase residential uses in the traditional city center. This area is facing an urban regeneration and rebalancing operation that will have to be based on a continuous public-private partnership and have the support of Barcelona’s citizens.

In urban planning of new downtowns, there are different market impact relationships among specific downtown uses. The theory is that certain uses are more important than others in driving the market for development with interdependences existing between them. In terms of development, there are priorities indicating which uses are most important for establishing market conditions that underpin other uses. In this sense dependent and independent uses exist.

Independent investments/developments/uses can be defined as those not directly linked to market support generated downtown. These may be:

- Private developments, the market support for which comes from:
  - Outside downtown.
  - Outside the city.
  - Outside the region.
  - Outside the country.

- Public investments that depend more on capital and budget planning than on market supported decisions.

On the other hand, dependent developments/investments/uses derive a significant portion of their market support from functions that exist in their general vicinity.
Here one could construct an imaginary matrix reflecting the market impact relationships among specific downtown uses such as:

- Institutional use.
- Attractions use.
- Office use.
- Retail use.
- Hotel use.
- Residential use.

Then one could see which interdependencies occur among them in terms of primary and secondary impacts. After considering the possible combinations, it becomes clear that office uses are extremely important as independent generators of the development of other uses, without a need for the existence of other uses simultaneously in order for there to be a direct economic impact.

For instance, the first attraction needed for a developer to create/regenerate a downtown is office space development. In a mixed use environment, this encourages the creation of an attractive residential park, which constitutes the market base, which encourages the retail development, and the whole brings the attractions, hotel and institutional uses. From this concept arises the importance of the conception of the new downtowns with their spill over effects for the whole town. This is also the bottom line that has inspired Baltimore downtown urban renewal, having it worked not in the same direction because of the contextual differences and the different social structures within Europe and America's central cities.

In the first implementation (1989) of the ANC (ND), the office market in the "Eixample" was not realized, but the trend began to change according to the data for 1990-1992 (Table 11)(Figures 11 & 12).
Table 11.- Comparison of Barcelona City-CBD in Sq.meters of Office Space 1987 vs 1992: The Impact of the ANC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL BARCELONA CITY</th>
<th>EIXAMPLE (CBD)</th>
<th>EIXAMPLE/TOTAL BARCELONA CITY (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987 (January)</td>
<td>2,941,020</td>
<td>1,352,083</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3,546,708</td>
<td>1,501,963</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The ANC began to have its effect on the office market during the triennium 1990-1992. The concentration of office space in the Eixample (classical CBD) declines, dropping from 46.2 percent of the city’s total office park in 1987 to a 42.3 percent in 1992. (Table 11). Why this delayed effect? The main reason is that although the ANC’s are planned in 1986, they are partly implemented four years later.

According to A. Ferrer the ANC plan is favoured by:

- A period of great economic growth with a strong dynamic in the service sector that looks for alternative settlements.

- Attraction to the city (Barcelona) and the region (Catalonia) of capital flows, reinforcing cause 1.

- The possibility in terms of resources to implement the plans of a rethought Barcelona, with the perspective, since 1987, of the celebration of the Olympic games in the city.

Also:

- Community support for a comprehensive plan to increase the quality of life in the different neighborhoods of the city, thanks to the spill over effects of the new downtowns.
However, the pressure of the service sector over the Eixample has not decreased. One can even say the contrary, although in relative terms the proportion of settled offices over the total is smaller. So, the increase of office space produced in Barcelona neighborhoods outside the CBD, has not dramatically affected the Eixample neighborhood, which continues its transformation in this 'service direction', instead of experiencing a radical change in obtaining an equilibrium between service and residential uses. This puts the question of the public targets for the CBD/Eixample vicinity on the political agenda. As A. Ferrer says "Maybe the moment has arrived to face the invasion of office & service sector use of the 'Eixample' over the planned residential uses, in a straight way, beginning from a dissuasion or control policy directed to impede the use changes in the CBD".

This phenomena has to be quantified for the implications that it has for the city and the metropolitan area. But right now the policy tools available to control the process are scarce. Basically they are limited to the city district ordenança (1986) about the activity use changes.

The idea of a mixed city center (at the same time residential, commercial and tertiary) implies promoting and protecting the weakest uses (mainly the residential ones) and limiting the strongest ones (office and complementaries). The options for the use of the center are descriptive of the more global urban policies, and in this sense they are indispensable for any city. This is particularly true in the Barcelona case where the urbanistic potential of Cerda’s "Eixample", and its flexibility and adaptability to the requirements of different periods is great. In these terms, it must be decided which city model is wanted for the immediate future.

A constraint of the different analysis of the Eixample/CBD vicinity is the dispersion and partiality of the available information, both the uses transformation and the new office building. A systematic study of the current situation which examines the last years evolution and which would propose a reflection for the future perspectives is needed.
3.3.- CONNECTION WITH THE REST OF BARCELONA'S NEIGHBORHOODS.

Barcelona's urban renewal plan is a COMPREHENSIVE plan which wants to affect the city as a whole. It was born by the public initiative and planned by the city hall urban department. Although the neighborhood participation is important, it is not determinant in the process (Figure 13). There is not a firm claim for it by organized interest groups. This eliminates the dominance of certain groups in setting the rules of the game, but rests legitimacy to the process. A strong will by the socialist hall government exists to equalize in social terms throughout the city.

There is a strong understanding by the public sector about the role in urban planning and policy-making that it has to assume.

The plan has a clear connection with Barcelona's neighborhoods precisely because it is a "neighborhoods' plan", conceived by the local political authority. Maybe the biggest drawback is the relative lack of intervention of interest groups affected by the process. This is because Spanish society lacks the tradition of organizing in active interest groups able to have a role in the decision-making process. As well as the articulation of groups' social activity through the existing political parties in a plural and relatively broad political system. In other times and regimes, such under Franco's dictadure, and because it was not possible to be organized politically in a legal way, the neighborhood groups were very strong and organized, being the core of the political oposition to the regime (Alabart, 1987). However, since the democracy has been settled, and the political activity driven from the political system, the neighborhood groups play a quite passive role in the citizen organized life. Just the very powerful interest groups get organized in a less transparent way as they do in the U.S. This phenomena affects to the conception of new downtowns, constituting a shortage that has to be point out.

Another weak point of the ND's process has been the lack of spectacularity that other renewals, such as Baltimore's have had. The reason is that the plan, although has been accelerated by the Olympic investments, is still being implemented. Several years have to pass to make the scope of the renewal and its effects evident.
However, the plan’s main purpose, the historical CBD service weight’s clearance through a continuous and territorially equilibrated growth, has not been totally successful. The "Eixample" still keeps a great service activity concentration. But again, some time has to pass to make an accurate assessment of the whole urban renewal process.
4.- REFERENCE ELEMENTS.

4.1.- LESSONS THAT CAN BE SUCCESSFULLY TRANSPORTED FROM BALTIMORE’S EXPERIENCE TO THAT OF BARCELONA.

4.1.1.- City spirit.

In the words of David A. Wallace, Baltimore’s urban renewal planner, "The experience still does not explain fully the magic of the Inner Harbor and Charles Center today. What makes the place marvelously unique among cities is that it looks inward on itself, is intimate in scale, is enclosed, framed, and yet opens provocatively to the Outer Harbor and to the world. Lacking the skill to capture the soul of a city in words, I can only challenge each viewer to be aware that, in the Inner Harbor, Baltimore has rediscovered a crucial reason for its being and a way to enjoy it" (D. Wallace, 1987).

Unquestionably, Baltimore’s urban redevelopment has meant a "change" in the attitude of Baltimoreans towards the city, although serious socio-economic problems have not been addressed. It is true that the city has made an enormous effort at improving its image by means of its downtown urban renewal. Baltimore has appeared indisputably again on the map, as a city to visit between Washington D.C. and New York, and I assess this as very positive. This has opened a new venue for tourists and the possibility of combatting industrial decline through this new activity sector. This, eases the deindustrialization problem without meaning that it solves the problem. There is not a sectorial substitution between industry and tourism. The structural problem remains there, but at least the possibility given by the tourist boom as a means of reacting to the industrial economic crisis should be beneficial for the city.

Barcelona, which sectorially relies more in tourism than Baltimore, has followed Baltimore’s policy of changing citizens’ attitude towards the city, using the opportunity environment constituted by the 1992 Olympic Games. In the "magic year" for Spain, 1992, where other events were happening (Universal Exhibition in Sevilla and Madrid, Culture Capital), Barcelona has taken the opportunity to become situated on the international map. Several campaigns, attempting to revive a "city spirit", have been launched. "Barcelona, posa’t guapa" (Barcelona, get nice), and "Barcelona, més que mai" (Barcelona more than ever) are two of the most recent campaign slogans used to create and maintain a city spirit. A whole marketing
campaign to stress the advantages of "living the city", has been really succesful, retrieving a
collective will and civic culture for the city that has increased the perception of Barcelona’s
quality of life by its citizens.

I consider this citizen support for public policy in general and urban renewal in particular
to be very important both for the legitimacy of the policy process and the success of the
initiative. In the case of Baltimore’s renewal, the perception of the Charles Center plan was as
important as the plan itself. The city feeling towards the plan was one of the key points of the
urban renewal according to the business community, and then adopted by the public city
planning department. This marketing action, which is a necessary first step in urban renewal
actions, has to be accompanied by a set of urban and social policies addressed to increase not
only the perception of quality of life, but the quality of life itself. A policy centered only on
image is not enough, because it neglects to face the city's structural problems, becoming more
a "mask" (as Harvey points out) or a "make up" than a policy itself.

However, the public sector’s consciousness of the importance of a city spirit, which
worked in Baltimore’s renewal, is crucial to the success of urban renewal projects, but this spirit
does not have to be the ultimate aim of the renewal actions. I understand urban renewal to be
a means of solving urban structural problems rather than as an end in itself.

Although in the Baltimore downtown renewal there have been few links with the
neighborhoods, it has strongly relied in the existence of this "urban spirit" encouraged by the
business community. I think this is positive as long as it is accompanied by a strong "public
regulation" which makes possible an equal-democratic participation of all the different social
groups in the process.

Barcelona is working in this direction in its new downtowns plan implementation. I think
it is, as in Baltimore redevelopment, one of the clues of the physical urban renewal success and
an asses for the city if it really represents a true citizen participation.
It is a way to increase legitimation of the urban renewal cities’ transformation through the use
of the community participation, always that the process grants the participation in equal terms
of all community groups.
One aspect in Baltimore’s downtown urban renewal that I assess as being very positive is the organizational capacity demonstrated by the business community group launching the downtown urban renewal process. In a moment of Baltimore’s inner city deterioration, with vacancies appearing in its CBD, rents falling, firms moving either out of the city or out of business and population moving to the suburbs, the business community decides to organize and raise the necessary money to employ a planning council in order to present a feasible project to the public authorities for the city, focusing in the CBD. This organizational capacity materialized in the Greater Baltimore Committee (100 chief executives of the major commercial and financial institutions in the Baltimore metropolitan region) and the Committee for Downtown (a made up of 500 businessmen). This organizational capacity of the GBC is extremely important because the business community, as part of the global community, is able to be the engine of a needed change, involving the public sector. The point is that there are two clear different interests: the public interest and the private one. The private interest (although specially in the Baltimore case is strongly interested in the good for the city) has as its main purpose the profit maximization while the public interest should be the good for the whole community. As a result the urban renewal process has to be subjected to a firm public sector control, that in the Baltimore urban renewal case is at least weak or questionable.

The public sector in Baltimore redevelopment has played an active role, but being dragged by the private sector. It has not settled a clear game’s rules, to insure an equal benefit throughout the city of the urban renewal benefits. The interests of the neighborhoods and the working class have to be granted in the process. It is the public sector who has to state the rules of the game, bearing in mind all the various society actors. If not, an exploitation relation is established that transforms the city into an unequal place for different groups.

However, the materialization of the business community’s organizational capacity in a strong public-private partnership has been the base of the successful Baltimore renewal plan’s implementation. This constitutes a new orientation in public policy, as Osborne & Gaebler pose out\(^\text{15}\). In a context where public organizations are constraint by budget cuts, they contemplate the possibility of reaching their goals relying in public-private partnerships. Baltimore downtown urban renewal is one example of how operational public-private (business community)
partnerships have successfully functioned. In fact, it has been the public-private partnership created around Baltimore downtown redevelopment the main factor of its success. It is precisely the success of this strategy (in terms of the short run physical materialization of the plan) that makes cities around the US and the world look at Baltimore's experience and learn from it. Although in terms of physical results the experience has been enourmously satisfactory, the excessive policy dominance by the private sector over the public sector, makes the process criticizable. Public-private partnerships are a necessary condition, but not a sufficient condition. The weaker community groups interests have to be noticed in the game, or at least be represented in the public interest performance. It has to be very clear which are the rules and assumptions under all the actors will play, and which will be the rewards and externalities they will receive from urban renewal actions.

Barcelona has a field to learn how the public-private partnership has been implemented in the Baltimore case, but the democratic oversaw of this process has to be assured/granted.

4.1.3.- Philosophy of urban planning as a unit within a social policy framework.

In this section I would like to underline the vision that the planner, David A. Wallace has of the process, and of planning in general. He understands planning as a broad concept, which includes contemplation of its physical materialization in a socio-economic basis, as a way of solving structural problems. For Wallace, successful design and planning must evolve from a clear understanding of the natural, cultural, social, economic, and the often complicated regulatory context of the project (Wallace, Roberts & Todd, 1992). And, according to him, this was the philosophy applied to Baltimore's redevelopment which was thought to reach the whole city.

But, because it was a private plan, and so much an unequal process, business community benefits (surmounting the risk period) were granted. As an outcome, the gradual development strategy conceived by the planner, became a focused strategy. So, the links of downtown redevelopment with other neighborhoods have been scant because other interests have been more important. Nevertheless I think it is important to underline the existence of this philosophy underlying the project.
It is important in Barcelona’s urban renewal implementation, to keep in mind the aims that surrounded the new downtowns project in its planning phase. These, focused (as in Baltimore renewal) on a global understanding of the natural, cultural, social and economic environments where the renewal is going to be. It is important not to loose the sensibility needed for finding the correct context in the urban frame in order to transform the city. Planning is shaping the city in a different way with a coordination of forces, trying to correct negative externalities and promote the positive ones.

4.2.- PERILS OF THE PROCESS.

4.2.1.- Strength of the most powerful groups.

Other sections have already dealt with this point. I think this is the most powerful criticism that the whole process can receive: the supremacy of the business class over others groups in the renewal process, due to the different adscribed power. Baltimore redevelopment plan was very well thought, but forgot that a planning program must coordinate functions and democratically assure control of decisions that affect the different communities living and using the same urban structures. However, it is consequence of being a private plan not oversaw by a strong public sector. Between the reasons, it is a plan thought from the private sector, which the public initiative supports in a moment of despair for the city, viewing it as a necessary and sufficient condition, while it is not.

In order to learn from it, in the Barcelona’s experience, it is necessary to ensure an equal participation of all the community groups, in a democratic basis. Ensuring it by a strong public sector which sets a fair planning rules.

4.2.2.- Increasingly strength of metropolitanization trends. Social differentiation in different juridisions.

The fact that the urban renewal redevelopment is not thought from a metropolitan perspective is one of the perils Barcelona should avoid. However, Barcelona is immersed in the same contextual situation defined by the absence of a metropolitan executive institution.
Urban planning will not to have same role in the 1990’s that it had in the 1950’s & 1960’s. Today's urban planning is working more on the micro scale than on the macro one. It is more concerned on operating in an urban scale basis rather than in a metropolitan scale. In that way the changes in the transformation of the city are more visible at the short run, but the structural problems are more difficult to define and solve. The downtown urban renewal plans are a good example. However, the metropolitan scale can be introduced in this thinking-frame, constituting it a more articulated way to think urban planning. To consider the central city as an analysis unit is not enough, since many problems of the central city are outcomes of the organizational structure arround it and have their origins outside the city limits itself. In this context some kind of revival of the regional planning, at least on an advisory basis, may be expected.

For authors such as Marc Levine and David Rusk, some kind of regionalism entity has to be the center of urban development in the future. The only way to solve cities’ problems is to create another tax-base, existing a redistribution of resources within the metropolitan area (M. Levine, 1992).

It is also needed sensibility for finding the correct context in the urban frame in order to transform the city. Planning is shaping the city in a different way with a coordination of forces, trying to correct negative externalities and promote the positive ones. The implication of local government structure on urban planning are enormous, because it reduces the scope of urban planning lacking a broad sense of the city’s scope.

A planning program must coordinate functions and democratically assure control of decisions that affect the different communities living and using the same urban structures. Cities and suburbs (or merely different municipalities in the Barcelona’s case) have to be considered together to get a correct understanding of urban dynamics. The function of urban planning is not only to catalogue land uses but it is a policy tool which allows joint the short term with the long term, the small with the large scale, and the social with the economic policies under the "urban" policy label.

According to R. Bird, the planner has to look at problems. In a first phase, stop the problems and see if they can represent another opportunity. In a second phase, being aware of the problems and the trends that they are creating, to look for solutions and opportunities (R.
Bird, 1993). Then see how "new solutions pose new problems, and the efforts at resolving those problems in turn generate new solutions" (E.Olin Wright, 1985). Planning becomes an imprescindible tool when resources are scarce. Then it is a way to save money setting carefully the priorities and redistributing wealth throughout the different population strata.

In the case of Barcelona, the city's heritage is so heavy that it may substantially bias the effects that equal or similar processes are producing in the American and Baltimore case. It is important for Barcelona to learn from processes that have happened in Baltimore, as representative of American central city. The experience of residential, retailer and business counterurbanization, has to be regarded and studied. The implications of social segregation in different jurisdictions has to be viewed in order to plan in an European context. In my understanding a through image of the future of the city, which includes a social idea of the city, remains a necessity to enable, design and asses every urban policy program.
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POPULATION TRENDS IN SELECTED CITIES

Thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
Source: US Bureau of the Census & INE
Outside of Cities Population (Suburbs)

![Graph showing population growth in thousands from 1960 to 1990 for Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington DC, and Barcelona.]

**Figure 2**

*Source: US Bureau of the Census & I.N.E.*
POPULATION TRENDS OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Figure 3
Source: US Bureau of the Census & INE
Population Trends
Baltimore in detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Bureau of the Census.
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Source: A. Ferrer Barcelona City Hall
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Figure 42
Source: A. Ferrer. Barcelona City Hall.
FIGURE 13. ROLES MAP IN BARCELONA’S NEW DOWNTOWNS URBAN RENEWAL.
MAP 1. FIGURE 14. SUBURBS AND INDEPENDENT CITY.
Source: US Bureau of the Census.
MAP 2. FIGURE 15. BARCELONA CITY, METROPOLITAN AREA AND CATALONIA (PROVINCE ORGANIZATION).
Source: Mancomunitat Municipal Area Metropolitana Barcelona (MMAMB).
MAP 3. FIGURE 16. BARCELONA's GROWTH JOINING NEXT MUNICIPALITIES.
Source: Ajuntament de Barcelona.
MAP 4. FIGURE 17. BARCELONA's URBAN EVOLUTION.
MAP 5. FIGURE 18. "EIXAMPLE". BARCELONA'S TRADITIONAL CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT.
Source: Ajuntament de Barcelona.
Next I enclose some information about the Charles Center Plan. This section has been elaborated through information facilitated by CBDC and the Charles Center Urban Renewal Plan (revised as of December, 1962).

The public presentation of the Charles Center Plan consisted not only of an official city hall’s ceremony, but a full-color brochure and a scale model designed to be seen by thousands of people. The media were briefed and supplied with photos of the model and project area, and a speakers committee was organized to present the Charles Center story to any group interested. These active promotion campaign, as important as the plan itself, was maintained till after the 1958 bond issue approval.

The timetable of the Charles Center Plan was the following:


January 24, 1958. Downtown is declared an Urban Renewal Area by the ordinance #1210 of the Baltimore City Council. This is a procedural step required by local law. It does not authorize any urban renewal activity until a project has been delineated and a plan adopted.

March 27, 1958. The Charles Center Plan is presented to the Mayor and the city, and the Mayor refers it to the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency (BURHA).

June 14, 1958. A bond issue is authorized by a special session of the Maryland General Assembly.

July 30, 1958. The BURHA’s report recommends the execution of Charles Center.

November 4, 1958. The bond issue is approved by the Baltimore city’s voters.

March 25, 1959. The Urban Renewal Plan for Charles Center is adopted by the ordinance #1863 of the Baltimore City Council.

June 1, 1959. The Charles Center Management Office is created as an authonomous organization, in order to speed the project’s implementation. This organization will change names depending of which projects is encharged of. Actually is called the City of Baltimore Development Corporation.

And the new development required by the urban renewal plan, as it figures in the Charles Center Urban Renewal Plan (after amendments 1962), was the following:

+ Office Building Facilities - 2,000,000 square feet of net rentable area.
+ Facilities for Retailing and Commerce - 430,000 sq. ft. net rentable area.
+ Residence Facilities - 300/400 units.
+ Theatre Facilities - 1,500 seats.
+ Hotel Facilities - 700 hotel rooms.
+ Tenant Parking Facilities - 1,500 parking lots.
+ Commercial Public Parking Facilities - 2,500 parking lots.

I enclose in this append, general information about the plan, and some maps were is easy to locate what already has been said in a space basis. Finally I add the part corresponding to the CBD in the 1989 city’s plan, The Renaissance Continues.
Charles Center Project, Baltimore, Maryland

SUMMARY AND FACT SHEET

Introduction

Charles Center, Baltimore's full-scale urban renewal project in the very heart of the Central Business District, was completed in 1986. The 33-acre project occupies a strategic sector of downtown. Boundaries are Saratoga Street on the north, Charles Street on the east, Lombard Street on the south, and Hopkins Place and Liberty Street on the west.

The cost of developing Charles Center is estimated at $235,000,000. Public expenditures of about $35,000,000 created a setting which has attracted large scale development by private enterprise.

Facilities

Charles Center provides new office buildings, apartments, a hotel, a legitimate theatre, commercial and specialty retail space, transit depots, public parks, walkways and underground parking garages.

The total size of the facilities is as follows:

- 2,000,000 sq. ft. of net rentable area in office buildings;
- 652 apartment units;
- 430,000 sq. ft. of net rentable area in facilities for retailing, retail services, and related commercial activities;
- 1,500 tenant parking spaces;
- 2,500 public parking spaces;
- 700 hotel rooms;
- 1,600-seat legitimate theatre.

Five older structures in the Charles Center area have been retained, and extensively renovated. They are the Lord Baltimore Hotel, the Baltimore Gas and Electric Building, the Fidelity Building, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Building, and the Eglin parking garage.
Related Projects

Charles Center lies at the hub of a network of major projects. Facing the southern portion across Hopkins Place is the Baltimore Arena, a 13,000 seat entertainment complex with an 850 car garage.

Two blocks west of the Baltimore Arena lie four University of Maryland urban renewal projects, which are creating a downtown campus for the University's professional schools.

Directly north along Charles Street, the "Fifth Avenue" of Baltimore, lies the Mount Vernon area, where the cultural center of old Baltimore is being rehabilitated and restored.

West and north of Charles Center lies the heart of the pre war downtown shopping district. Since 1979, the City has been transforming this 225 acre area, known as Market Center, by stabilizing and upgrading the existing retail elements and by attracting people through improved access and parking, new housing and office development, and other amenities. Major accomplishments include the refurbishing and expansion of the historic Lexington Market; the opening of the Lexington Market Metro Station; and the start of construction of the downtown section of the Light Rail System on Howard Street.

South and east of Charles Center lie the Inner Harbor projects, where the City is building a major new downtown residential and commercial area with office buildings, apartments, and a new waterfront park and marina with cultural, education and recreational facilities. (A separate fact sheet is available on the Inner Harbor program.)

Development of the Project

The Charles Center concept was presented to the City of Baltimore in the form of a proposal by the Committee for Downtown and the Greater Baltimore Committee in March, 1958. Later that year the City agreed to undertake the project in the context of the urban renewal program.

A special session of the state legislature authorized an urban renewal bond issue, which was approved by the voters as a referendum. An Urban Renewal Plan was prepared and approved by the City Planning Commission, the Board of Estimates, and ultimately the City Council, which took final action in March, 1959.

The first building – One Charles Center – was completed in 1962.

The last structure – the Park Charles residential and office complex was completed in 1986.
Charles Center – Development Completed or Underway

Area 1-2 -- Two Charles Center -- Charles A. Mullan and Thomas Mullan, Jr., trading as Charles Tower Partnership, are the developers of a residential and shopping complex, which includes 400 apartment units in two award-winning towers, a public underground parking garage for 600 cars, and commercial and retail space.

Conklin and Rossant of New York are the architects for the complex, which was completed in the summer of 1968. The design of the public plaza above the underground garage, called Charles Plaza, was executed by the local architectural firm of RTKL, Inc.

In the fall of 1985 a specialty marketplace developed by the Enterprise Development Company of Columbia and Stuever Brothers, Eccles and Rouse of Baltimore opened in Charles Plaza. Architect for the project was Cho, Wilks and Benn of Baltimore.

Area 3a -- Fidelity Building Annex -- The Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland completed a new annex on this lot in 1968, to accommodate the air conditioning equipment and servicing facilities for the Fidelity office building and provide retail store frontage along Charles Street and Charles Plaza. Jamison and Marcks of Baltimore were the architects.

Area 3B -- Park Charles -- III B Housing Associates Limited Partnership is the developer of a residential tower (252 units) together with approximately 95,000 square feet of office space and parking for 135 cars. Architects for the project, which opened in the spring of 1986, were Winsor/Faricy, Inc. of St. Paul Minnesota.

Area 4 -- Baltimore Gas & Electric Building addition -- the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company constructed a new 150,000 square foot building, which was completed in 1966, adjacent to their existing headquarters tower at Lexington and Liberty Streets. Architects were Richter, Cornbrooks, Matthai, Hopkins, Inc. of Baltimore.

Area 5 -- One Center Plaza -- Liberty Associates and the Manekin Corporation completed a 140,000 square foot office building with 10,000 square feet of retail space on this site. Architects for the twelve story tower, which opened in January 1984, were Richter, Cornbrooks, and Gribble of Baltimore.

Area 6 -- Fayver Park—Under Garage—Following a competition based on land price, Fayver Parking Company was the developer of an underground parking garage for 550 cars, completed in November, 1968. The architect was the H.K. Ferguson Company of Cleveland. Above the garage, the City constructed an oval-shaped public square known as Center Plaza. Architects for Center Plaza were RTKL, Inc. 6A and 6B are two small parcels of land, which have been developed by the City as integral parts of Center Plaza.
Area 7 -- One Charles Center -- Mies van der Rohe was the architect, and Metropolitan Structures, Inc. of Chicago, the developer of the first building in Charles Center. One Charles Center is a 24-story dark glass and duranodic aluminum tower containing 275,000 square feet of office space and 30,000 square feet of retail space. Two basement levels are devoted to servicing and 120 parking spaces. Since completion in October, 1962, it has been widely hailed by architectural critics as a masterpiece of design.

Area 8A -- Hamburger's Building -- Hamburger's apparel store, a long established firm located in the Charles Center area at the time the plan was adopted, celebrated the opening of its new building in October, 1963. Designed by the local firm of Tyler, Ketcham, and Myers, the three-story, buff-colored brick and glass building spans a portion of Fayette Street and joins the plaza of One Charles Center.

Area 8B -- Vermont Federal Building -- The office building known as the Vermont Federal Building was completed in September 1964. Edward Quigley Rogers, a local architect, designed the seven-story glass and stainless steel building which lies to the west of Hamburger's.

Area 9-10-11 -- Omni International Hotel -- In 1967, a 23-story tower containing 350 rooms and over 200 parking spaces was constructed on a lot opposite the Baltimore Arena, representing the first of two stages of hotel development. The second tower, containing 250 guest rooms, plus meeting and display rooms, was started in March, 1972. William A. Tabler of New York was the architect for Phase I of the Hotel. Idea Associates of Chicago designed the second tower, which was completed in 1974. An additional 220 rooms were completed in 1981.

Area 12 -- Mercantile Trust Building -- Following an architectural design competition, British-American Properties, Inc. was chosen to develop a major office building containing 350,000 square feet of office and retail space and underground parking for 375 cars. Architects for the structure were Peterson and Brickhauer, of Baltimore, and Emery Roth and Sons of New York. Principal tenant of the building is the Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust Company, for whom the building is named. The building was completed in 1970.

Area 13 -- George H. Fallon Federal Office Building -- A Federal Office Building, designed by three local architectural firms -- Nes, Campbell and Partners, Fenton and Lichtig, and the office of James R. Edmunds, Jr. -- was completed in the summer of 1967. The 17-story granite and aluminum tower contains 460,000 square feet of office space, as well as underground servicing and parking for 180 government vehicles.

Area 14 -- Down Under Parking Garage -- Following a design competition in which nine qualified developers submitted proposals, the Joseph Meyerhoff Corporation of Baltimore was chosen as the successful developer of a four-level, self service underground parking garage for 800 cars. Designed by the H.K. Ferguson Company of Cleveland, the facility was completed in the spring of 1966. A public square, called Hopkins Plaza, including a fountain and extensive groves of trees, was completed on the surface above the garage by the City in 1967. The architects of the square were RTKL, Inc.
Area 15 -- Morris A. Mechanic Theatre -- A local theatre owner, Morris A. Mechanic, selected this site for an 1,600 seat legitimate theatre, which is part of a building complex containing 40,000 square feet of retail and commercial space and underground parking for 210 cars. John M. Johansen of New Canaan, CT, was the architect for this striking concrete structure, which opened in January, 1967.

Area 16A -- Sun Life Building -- The Sun Life Insurance Company of America, completed a new home office building on this site in April, 1966. Architects for the 12-story granite and glass tower were Warren A. Peterson of Baltimore and Emery Roth and Sons of New York. The building contains 110,000 square feet of office space with underground parking for 50 cars.

Area 16B -- Charles Center South -- Following a design competition, RTKL, Inc., were selected as architects for a major office building containing approximately 310,000 net square feet of office space, and tenant parking for a minimum of 75 cars. Developers of the office building are 16B Associates, a group of Baltimore and Washington, D.C. investors. Construction was completed in September, 1975.
A map of Baltimore's Central Business District, showing the relationship of Charles Center to the primary functions of the center city, the proposed inner loop of expressways, and other in-town urban renewal projects.
A property map of the Charles Center area, indicating the former boundaries of properties which have been assembled. The heavy lines indicate either parcels which will remain, or new parcels which are to be sold for redevelopment.
Organization Chart for Execution of the Charles Center Project

Mayor and City Council
  Board of Estimates

Urban Renewal and Housing Commission
  (contract)

Urban Renewal and Housing Agency
  Region II (Phila.)

U. S. Government
  Housing and Home Finance Agency
  Urban Renewal Administration

Park Board
  Dept. of Recreation and Parks
    Park maintenance
    Dept. of Transit and Traffic
      Traffic planning and control
  Dept. of Planning
    Master plan
    Subdivision regulations
    Capital improvements budgeting

Transit and Traffic Commission
  Dept. of Transit and Traffic
  City Solicitor
  Dept. of Law
  Dept. of the Comptroller
  Director of Public Works
  Controller

Comptroller
  Land acquisition
  Audits

Influences
  Coordination of all agencies
  Land disposition
  Relocation
  Property management
  Supervision of project architects and consultants

Charles Center Management Office
  Highways
  Tunnels
  Water supply
  Lighting
  Conduits
  Surveys

Coordinating
  Coordination of street and utility work
  Construction of other public improvements
  Purchasing
  Accounting
Sample of the standards and controls imposed on development sites in Charles Center. This is an illustration from the Prospectus for the design competition for Development Area 7... now the site of One Charles Center.
Map showing areas made available for development in the Charles Center Project. For anticipated development of these areas, see site plan on Page 25. The uses planned for the numbered development areas are as follows:

**Area 1-2**: 300-400 high-rise apartment units, with underground garage and public park to be developed by the City.

**Area 3**: Future office building, with retail and commercial space and tenant parking.

**Area 3A**: Small commercial annex to be constructed by Fidelity Building.

**Area 4**: Site of 15-story office building under construction by the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company.

**Area 5**: Small future office building, with retail or commercial space and tenant parking.

**Area 6**: Underground parking garage, with public park to be developed by the City on the surface.

**Area 7**: Site of One Charles Center.

**Area 8A**: Site of Hamburgers building.

**Area 8B**: Vermont Federal Savings and Loan Building.

**Area 9-10-11**: Proposed Baltimore Hilton Hotel, with retailing and commercial space, tenant and commercial parking. Completion scheduled for 1966.

**Area 12**: Future office building, with retail and commercial space, tenant parking.

**Area 13**: Federal Office Building, scheduled for completion in 1966.

**Area 14**: Underground parking garage (construction started July 1964) with park developed by the City on the surface.

**Area 15**: Legitimate theatre of 1,500 seats, with retail and commercial space and commercial parking. Completion scheduled for 1965.

**Area 16A**: Sun Life Building, scheduled for completion in mid-1965.

**Area 16B**: Future office building, with tenant parking, optional retail or commercial space.
MISSION: The Business District should serve as the primary core of office and retail activity. Density and compactness should be welcome in this district largely through the construction of new infill buildings within and adjacent to the existing Financial area and more extensive development along the Howard Street Corridor.

The economic mission of the Business District should be to retain and increase a broad range of business activity and to add conveniently located retail and support services necessary to the business community located here.

As the key employment center, sidewalks, pocket parks, plazas and open spaces should be enhanced and built to serve as settings for a wide variety of people-pleasing activities and service including retail carts, out-door cafes and entertainment oriented to the people who work in the surrounding buildings.

WORK PLAN: Public Environment:
1. Redesign and program Charles Center’s open spaces with active uses.
2. Create better physical linkages between the University Center district and Market Center to Charles Street and the eastern parts of the Business Center district.
3. Redesign existing open spaces and special pedestrian streets for more active uses relating to the surrounding daytime community.
5. Promote private development of small street level pocket parks and plazas.
6. Plan and develop a new major active public open space within the Financial area.
Development:
1. Encourage concentrated office development and consolidated retail expansion through infill development.
2. Create development opportunities along the Howard Street corridor that consolidate retail, and create a corridor of government offices. Consider the relocation of the Fayette Street Greyhound-Trailways intercity bus terminal.
3. Relocate the Baltimore Arena and plan for the redevelopment of the site to include the extension of Redwood Street in the tradition of the 400 block.
4. Eliminate “the Block” adult entertainment area without dispersing its activities to other inappropriate areas. Redevelop East Baltimore Street for office and retail uses.
5. Identify and set aside key sites for “big bang” development.

Guidelines and Zoning:
1. Change existing Floor Area Ratio (FAR) bonuses permitting more development to create better public benefit and amenities.
2. Change existing zoning districts to reflect district mission such as decrease or increase of allowable FAR’s as appropriate.
3. Create urban design guidelines for specially designated pedestrian streets.
4. Create urban design regulations to encourage active uses at the street level of buildings on retail streets.
5. Create urban design regulations to prohibit structures above all street right-of-ways leading to water’s edge.