



The governance of urban regeneration in Lisbon: Drivers of continuity and change

Rosa Branco^{a,*}, Patricia Canelas^b, Sónia Alves^{c,d}

^a CICS.NOVA - Centro Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas - NOVA FCSH, Colégio Almada Negreiros, Campus de Campolide, Lisboa, Portugal

^b Department for Continuing Education, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

^c Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Professor Aníbal de Bettencourt 9, 1600-189 Lisboa, Portugal

^d BUILD, Department of the Built Environment, Aalborg University, A.C. Meyers Vænge 15, 2450 Copenhagen, Denmark

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Urban governance
Urban regeneration
Local government
Institutional change
Lisbon

ABSTRACT

Urban regeneration is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, and a field of public policy with profound impacts on people and places. While the literature acknowledges global and local forces of change, there is a predominant focus on the global – specifically, on globalisation and Europeanisation – with less attention given to the intricate interplay between global and local forces. Drawing on the urban regeneration literature combined with insights from urban governance, this paper scrutinises four decades of urban regeneration in Lisbon through a systematic examination of policy documents and interviews with policymakers, planners and other civil servants. This examination of the governance of urban regeneration in Lisbon reveals, first, some of the key factors influencing change and continuity between the distinct urban governance policy phases. Second, our findings underscore the influence of local planners in the face of global forces. Situated at the “coalface” of decision-making and implementation, these individuals played an active role in shaping the direction and pace of change of urban regeneration policy. Thirdly, our findings also indicate the limitations of local planners in withstanding global forces of change. Through a comprehensive longitudinal analysis, we aim to contribute to the existing literature on urban regeneration governance by delving into the drivers, trajectories, and pace of change, as well as the dynamics surrounding resistance against change.

1. Introduction

Urban regeneration policies have been a significant motor of development in European cities over recent decades, adopted mainly due to cities declining social, environmental, and economic circumstances (e.g. Couch, Fraser, & Percy, 2003; Magalhães, 2015). As Hall (2014) emphasises ‘in the 1970s, as deindustrialization gripped the economies of the great cities, the energies of planners and other urban professionals were massively diverted into the task of urban regeneration’ (2014: 200). The definition of urban regeneration has always been singularly broad, encompassing physical, social and economic regeneration. Magalhães (2015: 919) defines urban regeneration as ‘any significant intervention improving rundown urban areas’, noting that ‘what sort of interventions and policies that term encompasses is not straightforward’. Others highlight urban regeneration as a dynamic and intricate social phenomenon shaped by the priorities dictated by local, national,

and supra-national agendas, as well as market dynamics (e.g. Igreja & Conceição, 2021; Musterd & Ostendorf, 2023; Henderson, Bowlby, & Raco, 2007).

Cities in Europe that have undergone extensive scrutiny of their urban regeneration policies include Barcelona, Madrid and Bilbao in Spain, Liverpool, Salford, and Belfast in the UK, Dublin in Ireland, and Copenhagen in Denmark (e.g. see Blanco, Bonet, & Walliser, 2011 for Madrid and Barcelona; Arbaci & Tapada-Berteli, 2012 for Barcelona; Cocks, 2013 for Liverpool; Henderson et al., 2007 for Salford; Colantonio & Dixon, 2011 for Dublin and Engberg & Larsen, 2010 for Copenhagen).

As Lisbon has risen to prominence as a tourist and investment destination in the past decade, there is growing interest in investigating the relationship between longstanding urban regeneration policies and the existing socio-economic and physical conditions on the ground. By better understanding these dynamics, other cities might benefit from

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: rmbranco@fchsh.unl.pt (R. Branco), patricia.canelas@conted.ox.ac.uk (P. Canelas), sonia.alves@ics.ulisboa.pt (S. Alves).

insights into how urban regeneration and policy adaptation can effectively balance growth with preserving local character and addressing community needs.

The existing literature on Lisbon has concentrated on specific processes, either within a spatial framework such as project-based regeneration projects, or by looking at global driving forces where tourism has been the focus of attention (Carvalho et al., 2019; Cocola-Gant & Gago, 2019; Fernandes & et al., 2024; Sequera & Nofre, 2020; Tulumello & Allegretti, 2021). A broader analysis of national and local urban regeneration policy has focused on how external forces shape contemporary agendas, by exploring the importance of European Union governance re-scaling (Chamusca, 2023; Igreja & Conceição, 2021) and the political-economic processes of neoliberalization (Estevens et al., 2023; Tulumello, 2016).

This paper expands the existing literature by presenting a longitudinal analysis of urban regeneration in Lisbon, incorporating insights from urban governance. This approach enables detailed exploration of the impact of local stakeholders on shaping the direction and speed of transformation in response to global influences. Consistent with other studies, we take a diachronic approach to urban regeneration (e.g. Booth, 2005; Lowndes, 2005). Echoing Lowndes' viewpoint, we contend that 'we should look for long-term causes and long-term outcomes ... [and] measure evolutionary processes over decades... and not try to spot changes across a few years' (2005: 298). To address the complexity of long-term analysis, we contextualise the continuities and discontinuities in urban regeneration in Lisbon by drawing from the literature on models of urban governance, particularly from the work of Pierre (1999, 2011) and Pierre and Peters (2020). This method reveals three phases in Lisbon's urban regeneration process. It also enables us to pinpoint both global and local forces to explain the (dis)continuity between the different phases while exploring the role of planners in adhering to and resisting external forces.

While acknowledging the significance of global forces influencing policy (dis)continuities, we aim to emphasise the role of local planners as key mediators of both the direction and pace of change. Our findings reveal that at various junctures, there was both adherence and significant resistance to change in Lisbon's local governance. We consider that such resistance contributed to attrition in the implementation of urban regeneration policy. However, the capacity to resist macro forces varied depending on how well the strategy, instruments, and structures aligned. We also note how, although the central government has been transferring authority to local governments over time, local government have increasingly struggled to resist the widespread impact of global influences. In striving for a more nuanced perspective on urban regeneration, we aim to elucidate how global forces are either mitigated or resisted by local circumstances and participants.

The article is structured as follows. The next section delves into the theoretical framework guiding our exploration of four decades of urban regeneration in Lisbon, where we integrate urban regeneration with urban governance literature. The subsequent section outlines the qualitative methods used in this research, which involves a broader project focused on Lisbon and its historic city centre. This is followed by the introduction of the threefold phasing structure as a heuristic device employed to investigate key factors influencing policy (dis)continuities and variations in the pace of change.

2. Urban governance continuity and change

An urban governance perspective offers a standpoint from which to explore changing governing practices. As Pierre and Stoker (2000: 33) reason, 'the value of the governance perspective rests in its capacity to provide a framework for understanding changing processes of governing'. Different from government, governance refers to all processes of governing, 'whether taken by a government, market or network, whether over a family, tribe, formal or informal organisation, or territory, and whether through laws, norms, power or language' (Bevir,

2009: 1). The idea of common goals is central, as governance can be defined also as 'the interactive processes through which society and the economy are steered towards collectively negotiated objectives' (Ansell & Torfing, 2016: 4). An urban governance framework opens up the 'black box' of governing by acknowledging and exploring '...the many different dimensions of governance, such as which structures or agents define collective goals, mobilize resources, provide information about societal changes and so on' (Pierre, 2011: 19). The urban governance perspective thus provides the theoretical tools and categories to distinguish and explore the actual ways that urban matters are governed and how decisions are made in diverse geographical and socio-political contexts (Lukas, 2019). It also underscores the role of institutions in shaping power dynamics, defining institutions as a framework of norms, recurring behavioural patterns, regulations, practices, and systems encompassing meaning and belief (Pierre & Peters, 2020).

Contrary to earlier notions of governing as monolithic, currently, there are several well-identified models of urban governance (Bevir, 2009). Models of urban governance can be defined as 'clusters of policy objectives, cultural values, norms, practices and patterns of recurrent political behaviour' (Pierre, 1999: 389). Pierre (1999) suggests that to understand urban governance, it is essential to identify and examine the relationships between relevant 'participants, objectives, instruments, and outcomes' (1999: 372). Based on these relationships, Pierre formulates four governance models – managerial, corporatist, welfare, and pro-growth governance.

In a nutshell, managerial approaches posit that market mechanisms are superior in efficiency compared to the institutions and processes typically associated with the public sector (Pierre & Peters, 2020). Moreover, managerial governance emphasises output performance and market-based criteria as the main criteria for evaluation (Pierre, 1999). Corporatist governance revolves around promoting the interests of organizations. Welfare governance involves governing under the strong hand of the state in economically weak contexts, where the main influx of capital comes from the central government, creating a particularly weak environment for cities. Pierre (2011) notes that under welfare governance, change can sometimes happen surprisingly quickly, even if it is resisted. Lastly, pro-growth governance is typically driven less by the government, and more by concerted public-private actions, prioritising economic growth with the belief that 'such growth is in everyone's interest and therefore above and beyond political debate' (Pierre, 2011: 27). Pierre's governance models have significantly influenced discussions and analyses within the realm of urban governance and policy implementation. They offer a heuristic framework that allows for both longitudinal and comparative analysis while accommodating empirical and micro-politics nuances. However, how continuity and change both within and between these different models happen is less well understood, particularly at the local level of government.

Urban governance scholars have argued that change in governance is place-time contingent and shaped by influential agents. For example, Lukas (2019) suggests that 'who decides and who rules is an empirical question and in research leads to the consideration of different actors, their relationships, and forms of interaction as well as the political and economic institutions and contexts structuring the different processes and arrangements of urban governance'. Pierre and Peters (2020: 21) posit that 'the actual role which the State plays in governance is often the outcome of the tug-of-war between the role the State wants to play and the role the external environment allows it to play'. Integral to this process is the role performed by the private sector.

Bevir and Rhodes (2010) make the point that political life is marked by actors' intentionality, and that social scientists should explain these cultural practices by reference to the meanings embedded in them. They conclude that continuity and change are products of the traditions that people inherit and the modifications they make to these traditions in response to new dilemmas. Other authors exploring institutional change suggest that change stems from actors' responses to the perceived inadequacy of existing structures. For example, Hansson (2019) claims

Table 1
Phases of the governance of urban regeneration in Lisbon and their key characteristics.

	Phase 1: 1985–2001	Phase 2: 2002–2007	Phase 3: 2008–2020
	Welfare governance	Managerial governance	Pro-growth governance
Participants	Central-local state relationships With a focus on residents	European-central-local state relationships With a focus on owners	Local state-private relationships With a focus on investors
Objectives	Democratic consolidation	European convergence	Economic growth
Instruments	Local area technical teams with broad powers (GTLs) Area-based plans	Municipal agencies Priority areas	Municipal agencies and project-based structures City-wide masterplan
Outcomes	Halted inner-city decay on a limited scale Protection of residents	Public space improvements International promotion	Physical rehabilitation Housing affordability crisis

that when existing institutions are unable to address important functions, agents may try to alter existing institutions in order to improve processes and/or outputs. However, as [Keogh and D'Arcy \(1999\)](#) argue, 'institutional change will only contribute to collective or social efficiency where the interests of those with bargaining power to create the new rules coincide with the interests of the wider society' (1999: 2409). This brings power back to the centre stage.

The political leaning of local government has been identified as a key factor behind (dis)continuities. Some have noted that left-leaning local governments are inclined towards 'social municipalism' and their right-leaning counterparts towards 'market-logics' (e.g. [Henderson et al., 2007](#)). However, [Booth \(2005\)](#), in his analysis of urban regeneration policy in the UK, warns that changes in policy direction should not simply be attributed to changes in ruling political parties. He notes how 'though there have been distinct differences in the approaches adopted by the Conservatives and the Labour party, there have also been significant shifts during the periods of power both parties have enjoyed in the past 25 years' (2005: 259).

Meanwhile, [Lowndes \(2005: 292\)](#) focuses on 'the coexistence, and interaction, of forces for continuity and change' by researching local government policies and practices. Drawing on [Giddens \(1984\)](#), Lowndes argues that agency can change structure as they are mutually constitutive, and that "structure is not external to individuals, it is 'instantiated' in their practice" (2005: 298). She suggests that we should 'bring the actor back in' (2005: 299), focusing on "institutional entrepreneurs" – a term she uses to refer to both politicians as well as managers who 'seek to adapt "the rules of the game" in order to meet the demands of uncertain and changing environments' (2005: 292).

When it comes to the speed of change, [Hansson \(2019\)](#) stresses the importance of distinguishing what she calls fast-moving institutions, such as political and legal institutions, and slow-moving institutions, such as culture. Similarly, analysts of institutional change argue that 'it is not so useful to draw a sharp line of institutional stability versus change' ([Thelen, 2000: 106](#)). Thelen argues that periods of institutional stability are frequently characterized by gradual change. This emphasis on gradual transformation during stable periods calls into question the more established view that institutional change is brought on by shocks ([Van der Heijden, 2010](#)).

3. Urban regeneration policy: a brief overview of the literature

This section aims to identify the core ideas and epistemological approaches that have been developed in research on urban regeneration, a topic inseparable from political debates about and practices related to urban problems, their causes and their solutions ([Healey, 2020](#)).

The urban regeneration literature, which sits at the intersection of urban planning, urban studies and studies of governance, pays particular attention to the assumptions underlying urban regeneration initiatives – to how reality is framed, how problems and solutions are produced and by whom, with what level of decentralization, and in which political, cultural and socioeconomic context ([Rabbiosi, Coletti, & Salone, 2021](#)).

In epistemological terms, we see in the urban regeneration literature, both in Portugal and internationally, a diversity of research strands that

reflect the existence of different research and scholarly traditions (those of urban planning, architecture, urban geography, etc.). Particular attention has been directed towards levels of participation in policy decision ([Van Bortel & Mullins, 2009](#)), levels of horizontal and vertical coordination (or integration) in policy design and practice, and implementation gaps – especially their impacts on social groups and places ([Tulumello & Allegretti, 2021](#)).

The considerable extent of the literature about urban regeneration shows that this remains an important field of government intervention, and that stability and change in the conceptualisation of urban problems, the ordering of policy goals, and the choice of policy tools continue to attract big interest.

The debate about the topic has become more nuanced over time, with researchers noting that change may range from routine adjustments, through the production of new instruments, to shifts in policy goals ([Sager, 2011](#)). They also note that change can be driven by different and often complementary factors related to shifts in politics (i.e. changes in the actors, conflicts and dynamics between and within political institutions) and to shifts in solutions adopted (i.e. changes in policy ideas, technical solutions or operational capacities, and in the direct involvement of local community groups in planning, etc.) ([Kindgon, 1984](#); [Blanco et al., 2011](#)). Examples of the latter mentioned in the literature include changes in the field of urban planning (e.g. the shift from regulatory planning to the more laissez-faire approach of strategic planning) and the use of more place-, group-, or tenure-focused approaches ([Turok, 1992](#)).

Studies on urban regeneration have further elucidated the relationship between political systems and urban regeneration policies. For example, it has been emphasized that in more centralized political systems, where local governments typically have less influence, urban regeneration policies have tended to be more centralized ([Skifter-Andersen & Leather, 1999](#)), urging us to consider how these factors change across time in a given context. One example from The Netherlands in the 1990s is the use of tools to stimulate private investors and entrepreneurs in urban renewal, which became dominant after 2010 when liberal ideas became increasingly explicit, related to individuality, 'citizens own responsibility', and cuts in public services ([Musterd & Ostendorf, 2023](#)).

The tensions between centralism and devolution, on the one hand, and stability and continuity, on the other, have been emphasized by several authors. [Leary and McCarthy \(2013: 119\)](#), for example, note 'the seemingly irresistible urge for politicians to keep trying new regeneration experiments'.

What has become manifest and is reiterated by the literature, is the importance of taking a diachronic approach to urban regeneration. This facilitates a better understanding of the long-term causes and long-term outcomes of stability and change over time. This paper aims to contribute to such a perspective by analysing four decades of urban regeneration policies in Lisbon. What follows is a brief exploration of the literature that contextualises our case.

4. Local regeneration agency in Portugal

Portugal has been a centralist state despite its move towards greater decentralization in recent decades (Alves, 2017; Silva & Syrett, 2006; Teles, Romeiro, & Pires, 2021). Although municipalities have had autonomy in local matters since their inception in the Middle Ages, in practice, they only gained full political status under the 1976 democratic constitution that followed the 1974 revolution (Candido de Oliveira, 2021). By then, local authorities had limited means and competencies (for a more detailed account of Lisbon municipality's evolution before 1974, see Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 1996). Municipalities tried to respond to the demands of social movements after the 1974 revolution, namely in terms of the population's housing conditions, but adequate legislation and human and financial resources were scarce. Local authorities have developed a range of competencies in the following decades, growing the instruments and resources available to them (Candido de Oliveira, 2021). There is currently a two-tier local government system consisting of parish councils and municipalities; the regional level suggested in the 1976 Constitution has not been implemented. Consequently, local-level government has emerged as the primary actor at the subnational level (Silva & Syrett, 2006).

The problems of Portuguese cities' physical decay came to the forefront in the aftermath of the Portuguese 1974 revolution, which instituted the democratic regime. Vocal social movements drew attention to the fact that a vast number of Lisbon's homes were in disrepair, lacked basic infrastructure, and offered sub-standard living conditions incompatible with the democratic project (Drago, 2017). Many dwellings were privately rented and had low and frozen rents, jeopardising landlords' financial capacity and motivation to maintain and renovate their properties (Branco & Alves, 2020). With local elections beginning in 1976 and housing asserted by public opinion as a key field for government intervention, the governance of urban regeneration in Portugal, and Lisbon more specifically, became entangled with the narratives and practices of the country's democratisation process (Baptista, 2013).

Municipalities became responsible for managing and implementing the Urban Rehabilitation Program (PRU), a national policy instrument launched in 1985, and the first significant instrument of local urban regeneration policy. At first, local action was mostly constrained by national-level funding. However, funding increased with Portugal's accession to the European Economic Community (later the EU) in 1986 (Silva & Syrett, 2006). The goal of EU-funded projects was mainly to foster physical regeneration, with a strong focus on public spaces, streetscaping, pedestrianization, and cultural facilities (Brito-Henriques, 2017; Medeiros et al., 2021) failing to directly address the persisting problem of the large stock of poor-quality housing in Portuguese city centres (Branco & Alves, 2020).

Meanwhile, market responses to the shortage of adequate housing fuelled the flight of more affluent strata to the suburbs. Alongside an influx into the city of people from the countryside and former colonies that extended demographic growth until the late 1970s, this resulted in multiple areas of inner-city deprivation. Between 1981 and 2021, the municipality of Lisbon lost circa 40 % of its population (which dropped from about 800,000 to 540,000), while its metropolitan area grew about 7 % from 2.5 m to 2.9 m (Alves & Andersen, 2019).

Drago argues that the economic liberalism that followed Portugal's accession to the EU continued to fuel suburbanisation and inner-city decay (Drago, 2017). Low borrowing rates and pro-homeownership fiscal incentives sparked a surge of build-to-sell suburbanisation. The planning system, which enabled ad hoc individual land subdivision schemes (*loteamentos*), further fuelled suburbanisation (Almeida et al., 2013). Despite the metropolitan city population's expansion, the inner city's depopulation resulted in a high percentage of unoccupied dwellings (Seixas, 2021).

Since the 2008 Global Financial Crisis (GFC), Portuguese cities have seen growing foreign investment, mass tourism and population inflows (Canelas, Alves, & Azevedo, 2023; Carvalho et al., 2019). Urban

regeneration policy focused on private capital involvement has been in place since the 2004 urban rehabilitation regime but with limited effects (Mendes, 2013). In a short period, city-centre regeneration became a powerful vehicle for gentrification, interconnected with tourism activities and actively supported by public policy (Fernandes & et al., 2024; Sequera & Nofre, 2020; Tulumello & Allegretti, 2021). The private sector's involvement increased, in line with the Lisbon municipality's view that private investment was the main vehicle to achieve systematic rehabilitation of the city centre. This approach has been described in the literature as a vehicle to maximize private investors' profits through the internalization of redevelopment costs, highlighting the rise of a neoliberal agenda (Estevens et al., 2023).

With a dramatic rise in house prices, particularly in the historic city centres (Rodrigues, 2022), regeneration and housing became the centre of local politics. Despite attempts since 2017 to provide affordable housing – defined as housing for the middle class – this policy goal has encountered several challenges in Lisbon (Canelas & Alves, 2024). Both national and local government have pushed forward this agenda, with increasing emphasis being put in local agency, namely with the definition of local strategic policy documents by national law.

5. Methods

This paper offers an in-depth qualitative analysis of four decades of urban regeneration policies in the city of Lisbon by exploring urban regeneration reforms, as well as substantive and procedural aspects of policy design and implementation. The paper uses semi-structured interviews as its primary data source. These interviews were conducted online during the COVID19 lockdown restrictions in 2020 and 2021 as part of a wider research project, and were recorded, transcribed and coded. Research participants included policymakers, planners and other actors from the relevant organizations involved in urban regeneration policy design and implementation. We selected them by approaching organizations, via email initially, with a request for both data about specific programmes (particularly financial and technical reports about their execution), as well as the names of staff involved in these programmes' formulation and execution. We then contacted the staff (both retired and active) whose names we had been given, along with others working in various departments who agreed to talk to us, among which were several decision-makers from the different governance phases in the Municipality and central administration (IHRU). Additional actors were then contacted based on references from the first interviews. The ten interviewees had different academic backgrounds (architecture, engineering, political and social sciences) and were equally distributed among genders. Most participants were active during more than one of the governance phases (see Appendix 1).

Secondary data sources include relevant policy documents that are publicly available, such as the strategic documents that guided regeneration policy, as well as the legislation that enacted the main reforms in urban regeneration policy and in municipal governance structures. These official documents are used both to frame and discuss the perspectives from the ground provided by the interviews.

Together, this qualitative material enables us to explore the different conceptualizations and tools mobilized in the governance of urban regeneration over the years by the different players involved. This then gives us the empirical foundations to explore the forces behind continuity and change in urban regeneration policy and to reassert the importance of the role of local players in the different governance phases.

We address the following research questions:

- How and why has urban regeneration policy changed in the city of Lisbon over the last 35 years?
- Which are the forces impacting continuity and change in urban regeneration policy?
- How do local actors impact the direction and pace of change?

Key objectives derived from our research questions are:

- a) Characterise different phases of urban regeneration in Lisbon through the lens of urban governance models.
- b) Explore how different actors respond to (dis)continuities in urban regeneration policy.
- c) Explore how different actors mediate the pace of change.

Deploying a governance framework, we identify three distinct phases in urban regeneration governance in Lisbon, describing their key ‘participants, objectives, instruments and outcomes’ (Pierre, 1999: 372) and their relationships. We then focus on the moments of discontinuity to explore ‘what drives institutional design and institutional change’ (Pierre, 1999: 6) and the forces mediating the change and pace of change.

Addressing our research questions has both practical and theoretical implications. Practical implications include informing existing and future urban regeneration policy in both Lisbon and other cities – in particular those where processes of local governance empowerment and sharp policy shifts are in place. As McCann (2017) notes, ‘the critical analysis of governance is of great importance as part of a wider urban (political) studies. It provides opportunities to diagnose existing conditions and point to potential alternatives’ (2017: 323). As for theoretical implications, by reconstituting the particularities of ‘participants, objectives, instruments and outcomes’ in urban regeneration outside the more amply studied anglophone geographies, we aim to continue an epistemological renewal in urban studies (Baptista, 2013). This continues the work of Robinson (2006), in particular, to more firmly establish the link between global and local forces, and clarify the role of different actors in change. In the next section, we delineate the three distinct governance phases relevant to the longitudinal analysis of urban regeneration in Lisbon. This framework enables us to substantiate the influential role played by local actors in mediating the direction and pace of change imposed by global forces.

6. Phasing of urban regeneration in Lisbon (1985–2020)

6.1. Phase 1 – consolidating democracy: 1985–2001

Phase one of the urban regeneration policy in Lisbon was a nearly two-decade-long phase between the mid-1980s and the early 2000s. This phase was marked by a high degree of national state-level control, namely in terms of funding, but also the gradual empowerment of the local level, illustrated by the creation in 1990 of the Municipal Urban Regeneration Office (*Direção Municipal de Reabilitação Urbana*). During this phase, local government was the coalface of welfare-state service delivery. This included working in proximity with communities to improve their living standards while guaranteeing their right to stay put. In the words of a research participant, the local state became ‘a support to populations, reaching out to residents to try and solve all kinds of problems’ [TEC-G]. The Communist Party had a marked leadership role during this phase. Given the critical part they had played in opposing the former dictatorial regime, and given the presence of housing and working-class living conditions at the centre of their political manifestos in the years that followed the 1974 democratic revolution, urban regeneration was an obvious remit for the Communist Party to take over within the left-wing coalition (of the recently-formed Socialist Party and the Communist Party) that made up the first elected Lisbon local executive between 1976 and 1980.

This phase was characterized by an area-based vision of urban regeneration. Local Area Technical Teams (*Gabinetes Técnicos*

Locais—GTLs) were first created in 1986. With broad powers, GTLs centralized competencies under a territorial approach and took responsibility for particular culturally- and historically-defined neighbourhoods in the city. They worked closely with residents and mostly small-scale, private property owners. GTLs were first created for the most rundown historical neighbourhoods (such as Alfama and Mouraria), but other neighbourhoods followed, not all in the inner city, for example, Carnide and Paço do Lumiar (added in the late 1990s). In the GTL’s early stage (1988–1992), the municipality’s investment in regeneration increased eight-fold (*Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2009a, 2009b: 237*).

According to our interviewees (TEC-E, TEC-F, TEC-G, GL-A), underpinning GTLs were aspects such as a solid technical methodology, a multidisciplinary team with many young professionals, and an area-based approach grounded on spatial plans. GTLs offered a comprehensive approach, effectively controlling all project stages from diagnosis to implementation. As others noted, ‘GTLs were like a mini-municipality which enabled an agile and local approach’ [TEC-B]. Despite their limited powers and resources, namely in terms of funding, GTLs developed a holistic and hands-on approach to urban regeneration.

Concerns about heritage grew following the dramatic August 1988 fire in Chiado — a historically significant part of downtown Lisbon — which raised further awareness of inner-city decay and the urgent need for urban regeneration policies to safeguard its architectural and cultural heritage. The Office for the Reconstruction of Chiado (*Gabinete para a Reconstrução do Chiado*), created straight after the fire in 1988, was led by the municipality and coordinated by the Pritzker Prize-winning architect Álvaro Siza Vieira. With a focus on heritage conservation, the mobilization of a young and motivated technical staff for this organisation was identified by our research participants as a successful part of the history of Lisbon’s urban regeneration.

These first two decades of Lisbon’s municipal urban regeneration policy were characterized by piecemeal ‘emergency urbanism’ interventions. With a strong focus on both welfare-state provision and heritage preservation, there was only limited consideration of the policies’ long-term and larger-scale impact. The archetypal program of this phase was the Special Regime for Assistance in the Rehabilitation of Rented Buildings (*Regime Especial de Participação na Recuperação de Imóveis Arrendados*—RECRÍA), a long-lasting, nationally-designed and municipally-implemented urban regeneration program (introduced in 1988, the programme lasted until 2011, undergoing several alterations). RECRÍA offered financial support to landlords for the rehabilitation of dwellings (and of shared parts of buildings such as stairs and roofs) with frozen rents that were generating insufficient profit to maintain or improve them.

However, RECRÍA was more of a quick fix to prevent buildings collapsing and/or to equip them with basic infrastructure such as toilets, than a real long-term solution to the problems of inner-city decay (Alves et al., 2024). Research participants underlined that RECRÍA did not aim to solve the vicious circle of the rent freeze problem. In the words of one participant, RECRÍA ‘was a mechanism to prevent buildings collapsing and provide basic living conditions; it was not, and could not be, the key to urban rehabilitation’ (NP-A). That would instead require substantial reforms in terms of regulation of rental markets and housing subsidies so that sitting tenants could afford rent increases and landlords the costs of maintaining their buildings, thereby tackling the inner-city decay caused by buildings lying empty or with extremely low rents.

Joining the European Union in 1986 was obviously a turning point for the country. European funds enabled large-scale urban regeneration strategies, including culture-led and waterfront urban regeneration projects. Two of Lisbon’s most paradigmatic European-led projects of

this decade were the 1994 Lisbon European Capital of Culture and the 1998 Lisbon World Expo. This marked the commencement of Lisbon's transformation from being the capital city of a newly-democratic country to aspiring to align with the living standards of other European capitals. However, the initial wave of EU-funded projects did not notably influence municipal governance structures. Instead, it fostered the development of an approach which integrated projects within existing GTLs. As expressed by one interviewee, 'the same ideas were implemented in smaller areas' (TEC-C). Urban regeneration was swiftly pushed into an indispensable component of economic growth policies. Aligning the goals of improving the existing housing stock and revitalising the city to facilitate economic prosperity proved challenging.

6.2. Phase 2 – converging with Europe: 2002–2007

Phase two was initiated with the election of a right-wing liberal mayor in 2002 who was the charismatic candidate of the Democratic Socialist Party. This second phase saw an increase in the local state's capacity to set policy goals and determine how they would be funded, namely through the EU but also private funding sources. This created discontinuity as the emphasis shifted towards larger-scale impact and transformation of urban structures (such as property, social composition and functions) although some continuity with previous urban regeneration can be traced back to the narrative of piecemeal emergency interventions to prevent building collapse. Research participants noted that the new mayor championed change in urban regeneration and the end of what was seen as discretionary, costly and ineffective policy. The urban regeneration policy of the 2000s looked for a larger scale and greater impact by setting *priority areas* (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2009a, 2009b: 240–241). These included key inner-city streets in the historic area (*Baixa* and *Alfama*), where physical rehabilitation of public and private buildings was delivered through different structures. Urban regeneration policy was now increasingly perceived as delivering important landscapes for economic growth.

Achieving urban regeneration's new goals meant retiring old structures and methodologies and bringing in new ones. For example, the landmark governance instrument of phase 1, the GTLs were dismantled in 2002.¹ Eduarda Napoleão, the then deputy mayor, argued that the GTLs' approach failed to provide a vision for the city as a whole, with too much focus on a piecemeal, building-by-building approach (Napoleão, 2009). However, as one research participant noted, this meant that 'the relationship between the planners and local residents was lost' [TEC-E]. Indeed, in subsequent years, the extent of RECRIA-funded rehabilitation dropped to approximately one-third of the number of housing units rehabilitated in 2001, contrary to the national trend of growth (Alves et al., 2024).

In spite of the new visions, goals and instruments, effective changes to planning instruments and plans were generally slow or ineffective. For example, Lisbon's 1994 masterplan review was not concluded, and in critical areas, such as downtown (e.g. *Baixa* and *Alfama*), building regulations stayed very strict until a detailed plan was approved in 2010.²

Europeanisation was most evident in the emergence of new governance structures. This phase was marked by the rise of Municipal Public Companies and Agencies. These included the existing Lisbon Urbanisation Public Company (EPUL) and three Urban Rehabilitation Societies (SRU).³ EPUL, which was created in 1971 and dismantled in 2012, was a

development company whose main mission was to assist the Lisbon City Council with the urban development of large areas of the city, as well as real estate development. This company was seen as a vehicle to boost the rehabilitation of municipal property and leverage private investment (Alves et al., 2024). SRUs, created in 2004, were entities charged in particular with implementing urban regeneration operations, aiming to maximize the attraction of investment and the involvement of private entities. SRUs regulated the exceptional legal regime for urban regeneration in critical areas for urban recovery and reconversion, defined by the municipality under national law. This agency-centered approach very much reflected urban regeneration's increasing focus on supporting economic growth, which was very much aligned with the European Union project.

However, the old problem of poor housing conditions persisted, and while European funds enabled the welfare-state project to continue, this phase saw an attempt to involve private actors in municipal programs with decreasing attention to residents and their interests. As one participant stated, 'this was a turning point in policy, (...) with a tendency to disinvest in tenants' rights' [TEC-C]. Urban regeneration was now more disconnected from people and places, and urban regeneration teams were asked to address problems 'with no knowledge of the place's past or future' [TEC-A]. Whereas before 'regulations were used with flexibility and adapted to our needs by talking to people' [TEC-G], during this phase, as research participants noted, 'there was a sort of boycott of urban regeneration's original goals, in terms of economic and municipal technical capacity, (...) and the liberalization of its conceptualization and practice' [TEC-C]. The conceptualization and practice of urban regeneration in Lisbon during the Europeanisation phase – which aimed at socio-economic convergence with other EU member states – never really managed to level up living standards and catch up with other member states. On the other hand, financial sustainability was also not achieved as, by the end of this period, municipal finances were under pressure.⁴

6.3. Phase 3 – responding to the Global Financial Crisis: 2008–2020

In 2011, when Portugal felt the full impact of the 2008 Global Financial Crisis (GFC), the country signed up to a rescue plan with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) which came with further liberal strings attached. Lisbon's urban regeneration strategy was now catapulted into the fast-flowing waters of ruthless market forces.

Phase three was marked by the return in 2007 of a left-wing coalition at the municipal level, this time one with a more pro-growth agenda concerned from the beginning of their mandate with attracting private investment, as interviewees emphasized. Market stakeholders gradually became one of the driving forces behind urban regeneration, due to the municipality's view that the urban regeneration effort was urgent and required such a large-scale mobilization of resources that it was impossible to do it without the mobilization of the private sector. The municipality developed a number of reforms aimed at implementing a new strategy based on incentivising market initiatives. These drew on the 2009 Strategic Charter (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2009a, 2009b) and included the Urban Rehabilitation Strategy for 2011–2020 (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2010) and the 2012 city-wide masterplan (*Plano Director Municipal de Lisboa—PDM*). However, these two reforms might have come at a time when markets no longer required incentives, as Portugal was now coming onto the radar of the tourism and real estate

¹ A global restructuring of municipal structures was enacted at the time (see *Aviso n.º 9769-A/2002 da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa*, 2002) which enacted this new governance model.

² *Deliberação n.º 608/AML/2010 da Assembleia Municipal de Lisboa* (2011).

³ These were a new form of agency created by the national government in 2004 (see *Decreto-lei 104/2004 do Ministério das Obras Públicas, Transportes e Habitação*, 2004).

⁴ Although official financial documents are not online, several media articles report the debate about the municipality's debts. See for example, *Jornal de Negócios* (23/05/2007), available at https://www.jornaldenegocios.pt/economia/detalhe/camara_de_lisboa_acumula_uma_divida_de_833_milhoes_de_euro_s_a_fornecedores and *Jornal de Notícias* (13/05/2008) available at <https://www.jn.pt/arquivo/2008/lisboa-assembleia-municipal-aprova-relatorio-de-gestao-de-2007-941052.html/amp/>.

investment industries (Canelas et al., 2023).

National level reforms with a significant impact on Lisbon's urban regeneration included a significant increase in property taxes approved in 2011 and the revision of rental law to liberalise contracts in 2012. It also included a temporary and exceptional regime for rehabilitation works that created exceptions in construction requirements⁵ (2014) and a local administration reform aiming to merge and empower sub-municipal structures (2012) that shaped Lisbon's new municipal government structure with a focus on efficiency, technical specialization and devolution of competencies.⁶

These legal regimes were imposed by the IMF as part of the 2011 Portuguese rescue plan and introduced significant changes to the urban regeneration context in Lisbon. The 2012 reform to rental law (*Lei n.º 31/2012, 2012*) set a five-year period in which tenants on pre-1990, rent-controlled contracts would transition to a new, non rent-controlled regime, with an exception for low-income tenants or those with disabilities. Full liberalization, accompanied by a new rent subsidy scheme, should have come into effect in 2017 but in 2015 stringent rent controls were implemented in the segment of older, open-ended contracts which are linked with low rents and often poor housing conditions (for more details see Alves et al., 2023). The 2012 local administrative reform reduced the number of parishes in Lisbon by redefining their limits and devolved small-scale interventions from the municipal level to these sub-municipal administration units. In a way, this came full circle back to the idea that efficiency requires proximity, but this time with the local state occupying only an enabler role and the private sector expected to play a bigger role.

Although the social concerns of the previous phases persisted, including for the most deprived areas of the city, urban regeneration in this phase focused mostly on economic recovery. This meant a shift from improving housing standards towards improving public space (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2010: 123). The then new deputy mayor, who before assuming the role was an architect with an established practice, imposed a design-led vision onto urban regeneration that marked this phase in indelible ways. His public space improvement strategy focused on the historic city centre. As one of our interviewees noted, 'the idea that the historic city is a very strong asset that can be valued in many ways is what is present now' [TEC-F]. Public space improvements encompassed the river front areas, extending both east- and westwards from Lisbon's Imperial square, *Terreiro do Paço*. These projects included the *Cais da Ribeira das Naus* in 2014, the *Jardim do Tabaco* Cruise Terminal in 2017, and *Cais do Sodré* in 2017.

Public realm improvements also included several other programs, some led by municipal agencies, namely SRU, and others wholly dependent on the private sector for their delivery. The former included design-led refurbishment of more 'everyday' public spaces including squares and square gardens such as the program *A Square for each Neighbourhood (Uma Praça Em Cada Bairro)*⁷, aiming to increase the quality and quantity of public space, mostly through redesigns and limiting car parking spaces. The latter included the so-called Refurbish

⁵ The government decree *Decreto-Lei 53/2014, de 8 de abril do Ministério do Ambiente, Ordenamento do Território e Energia* aimed to boost physical rehabilitation by exempting works in buildings with more than 30 years from certain regulations (energy efficiency and noise reduction, for example). The legislation argued that such norms were difficult to implement in these cases and would affect the economic return of regeneration investment and stated a seven-year period.

⁶ See *Despacho n.º 3683/2011 da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa* and *Deliberação n.º 1190/2011 da Assembleia Municipal de Lisboa* that re-defines the municipality's organisation principles.

⁷ For details about the design and results of this program launched in 2014 and currently ongoing see <https://www.lisboa.pt/cidade/urbanismo/espaco-publico/uma-praca-em-cada-bairro>.

First and Pay Later scheme (*Reabilita Primeiro Paga Depois*⁸). This was a program where the private sector would bid to buy municipal property in need of refurbishment, commit to refurbishing the property to standards previously established by the municipality, and only pay for the assets after completing its refurbishment, sometimes several years later, depending on the business model and specific contract with the municipality. This range of programs meant that urban regeneration was being carried out by all sort of actors, throughout the whole city, and no longer just by the municipality with a focus on rehabilitation and affordable housing in the inner-city alone, as had been the case to begin with.

The relationship between the municipality, public agencies and the private sector in this phase grew increasingly complex, as did the aims of urban regeneration. If we can see continuity in urban regeneration's focus on the physical built environment, present since its early days, its geographical reach had now expanded to virtually the whole city. In 2018, all significant regeneration projects were consolidated under SRU Lisboa Ocidental, the municipal agency now responsible for all city-wide interventions which was substantially empowered in the 2018 municipal structures revision⁹, and the whole city was defined as an urban regeneration area, which meant that the private sector could benefit from urban regeneration tax incentives for virtually all types of assets and across the whole city area (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2011).

This pro-growth governance model was in part a response to the market downturn and severe restrictions on public borrowing in place since the sovereign debt crisis of 2011, which preceded an IMF rescue. A policy lag meant the city was caught out, unprepared for a wave of tourism and international real estate investment interest that would have a strong impact in reversing physical decay in the city centre. This seems to be the defining characteristic of this phase. When the new city-wide, market-led masterplan was finally implemented in 2012, interest from the tourism industry and real estate investment were already strong in Lisbon. This generated the perfect storm, with housing prices skyrocketing. As noted by one of our research participants, 'urban policy was not able to keep up with market dynamics, [which] have been one step ahead' (TEC-E). The first regulatory, market-cooling instruments were put in place for tourism and housing only in 2018 when the Municipality of Lisbon defined containment areas to limit new short-term lets in certain parishes.

In summary, in phase three, market forces have taken hold of some of the same spaces urban regeneration had been working on for decades. Decaying historical city-centre neighbourhoods proved appealing for investors. Despite significant achievements, the municipality's focus on physical regeneration coincided with growing investment interest in the built environment, which happened alongside a market housing crisis. The last decade of urban regeneration incentives has come at a time when markets could benefit from being cooled.

In Table 1 we present the key features of governance phases according to Pierre's models of governance and then frame the major (dis)continuities and their drivers in the discussion section.

7. Discussion

In this paper, we aim to explore the factors influencing changes in the governance of urban regeneration policy over time. Existing research shows that urban regeneration is a complex process influenced by local and global factors (e.g. Magalhães, 2015). However, there is still limited

⁸ See *Câmara Municipal de Lisboa (2010: 30)* and *Deliberação n.º 348/2012, de 26 de Setembro (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2012)*.

⁹ Lisboa Ocidental SRU, the only urban rehabilitation society that was not dismantled in 2008, gained wide competencies transferred from internal municipal structures which were repurposed to manage maintenance and conservation of public spaces and buildings (see *Despacho n.º 8499/2018 da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa*).

understanding of how and why change occurs, as well as the factors leading to resistance to change. To better understand how local and global forces impact adherence to or resistance against change in urban regeneration, we focus on the case of Lisbon. By delving into the dynamics of Lisbon's urban regeneration efforts, we hope to shed light on problems affecting areas similarly facing significant pressure from foreign investment while looking for economic growth, as in Lisbon's case.

The three phases of Lisbon's urban regeneration governance identified and summarised in [Table 1](#) illustrate different paradigms in ways of thinking about problems and solutions, in both substantive, organisational and procedural terms. Drawing from [Pierre \(1999, 2011\)](#) and [Pierre and Peters' \(2020\)](#) models and other insights on urban governance, we identify three relevant models, each corresponding to a phase, that we use as heuristics models to explore urban regeneration governance in Lisbon over a 35-year period. These are welfare, managerial, and pro-growth models. As [Pierre \(2011\)](#) notes, theoretical models might not always be perfectly distinguishable in all instances. Distinctions between the different phases in terms of participants, objectives, instruments, and outputs are, nevertheless, clear, as summarised in [Table 1](#).

In the initial phase, under a welfare model, the focus was on residents, democratic consolidation, mobilising area-based plans, and halting city decay while preserving the resident population. This period witnessed the repurposing of post-industrial landscapes across Europe, with urban regeneration participants and instruments playing a crucial role ([Howlett, 2014](#); [Turok, 1992](#)). Portugal's case aligns with others, such as Spain, where processes like democratisation, the emergence of the welfare state, and urban regeneration unfolded concurrently (e.g. [Blanco et al., 2011](#)).

Examples of successful adherence to change in this phase include the local state playing a significant role in welfare-state delivery, despite a high level of control by the national level. Changes in central-local state relationship were led by the municipality, providing inputs to the central state based on their work on the ground. This resulted in, for example, adjustments to national instruments (e.g. RECRIA), expanding their scope and broadening their flexibility based on local experience. This dynamic aligns with [Henderson et al. \(2007\)](#) emphasising the local-central government relationships. Despite heavy reliance on central government financing and constrained action, the local state managed to exert influence on the overall direction. The significance of this period in shaping national identity and the profound meaning associated with planners' work at the local level may account for some of the resistance expressed by local planners during the transition to the next stage.

In phase two, the managerial phase, local leaders' alignment with the European agenda prompted a departure from a singular focus on improving housing conditions, ushering in significant governance changes. The transition marked a shift from prioritising residents to property owners, all while phasing out specific instruments aimed at enhancing housing conditions without pricing out residents. For example, local authorities tailored the national urban rehabilitation municipal companies to match urban regeneration based on a neighbourhood approach. However, this phase also showed how imposed fast changes, generated by the introduction of new legal and institutional frameworks both at the national and local level, may not be matched by a similar pace of transformation of local policies and practices, with implementation gaps the most obvious manifestation of this mismatch.

This period was also profoundly shaped by adjusting to new European funding sources. This resulted in a misalignment between the swift changes introduced by new funding streams and their legal and institutional frameworks, and the slower transformation in local policies and practices, leading to notable implementation gaps. On the other hand, it illustrates the inability to incorporate the competing goals of the welfarist early days of urban regeneration and the priorities that followed Europeanisation and focused on the space between buildings. Misalignment emerged between participants, objectives, and

instruments.

Shifting the focus of urban regeneration from adequate housing to public space meant that some of the old instruments were retired while new ambitious ones were introduced but with considerable practical limitations. For example, the newly created municipal agencies in the managerial phase were established while prior municipal structures were still in place, with some of these prior structures being dismantled, and others being adapted. Incoherent governance structures with, at times, overlapping competencies, stalled change. This, coupled with market constraints, led to the persistence of city centre decay and population shrinkage, setting the stage for the subsequent phase's investment landscapes.

Phase three, the pro-growth phase, denotes an inclination towards economic growth and market logics. Marked by accelerated growth in tourism and private investment flows into the built environment following the GFC our findings suggest that the local state could not escape or stop these global forces. The local state eventually ended up reinforcing them by implementing instruments targeting private investment. This was believed necessary under the circumstances that followed the 2008 GFC (interviews TEC-A, TEC-D, TEC-E). This finding complements a vast body of work ([Esteve et al., 2023](#); [Sequera & Nofre, 2020](#); [Tulumello & Allegratti, 2021](#)) that highlights the adoption of 'tourism and urban rehabilitation as the new pivotal sectors to overcome critical crisis-derived impacts on the economy and society' ([Sequera & Nofre, 2020: 3169](#)).

Results also add to the literature debate on the neoliberal political-economic context, a governance perspective that integrates the local administration's structures and actors in the "dense urban space", to employ a concept used by [Tulumello \(2016\)](#). They show that the alignment of strategy, instruments and local administrative re-organisation were effective in dismantling resistance to change. These results reiterate the importance of practitioners' role, explored by [Falanga \(2018: 310\)](#) in the context of participatory processes, clarifying that the "institutionalization" of the pro-growth model led to broad and durable change in urban regeneration policy, and was influential in the reinforcement of more technocratic approaches.

Overall, when exploring the key factors contributing to the discontinuity in urban regeneration warranting a phase change, a complex interplay of both global and local forces emerges. These forces exhibit a relational nature that proves challenging to disentangle. Global forces, identified as Democratisation, Europeanisation, the Global Financial Crisis (GFC), and dynamics within the international property market, are noticeable major drivers of change, but they are contingent on state-local dynamics and other local forces. Adherence and resistance to change within the local state thus play out in a complex relational context, challenging dominant narratives that portray the inevitability of global forces.

8. Conclusions

Informed by urban regeneration and urban governance theory, our examination delved into four decades of urban regeneration policy in Lisbon. We traced the drivers, trajectory, and pace of (dis)continuities in urban regeneration policy. Overall, the case underscores the intricate interplay of forces that drive change within the governance of urban regeneration, shedding light on the ways in which adherence and resistance to global forces can take place at the local level.

While structural shifts often unfold swiftly under the influence of global factors, pockets of resistance emerged within the agency of the local state. In this context, individuals in local government wielded significant influence, functioning as key actors capable of either hindering or expediting the impact of transformative forces. Situated at the "coalface" of decision-making and implementation, these individuals played an active role in shaping the direction and pace of change of urban regeneration policy. This emphasises the role of local governments in shaping the speed and direction of change in the governance of

urban regeneration and urban governance more broadly. In Lisbon, the local government exercised this influence through various means, such as redefining participants and their relationships, as well as incorporating or rejecting specific instruments into the urban regeneration landscape. This illustrates some of the different ways in which local authorities can actively respond to pressures imposed by global forces.

However, an intriguing paradox emerges when considering the evolution of local governance over the past four decades in Lisbon. On the one hand, the scope of local government has expanded, demonstrating incremental growth in comparison to the national level. On the other hand, there is a noticeable decline in the capacity of local governance to resist external forces, particularly evident in the latest phase. This paradox suggests that resistance to change is not a straightforward process led by individuals resisting conflicting values and policy goals. Rather, effective resistance was only feasible during a transitional period when the local authority (both structures and staff) successfully stalled the pace of change by clinging to established procedures while adapting them to new scales and purposes. The evolution of Lisbon's local governance thus highlights a complex interplay between power, resistance and vulnerability.

Resistance gave way to adaptation not merely because of increasingly strong global forces, but also due to coordinated changes in policy strategies, instruments, and governance at the local level. This suggests that the capacity to navigate and mediate global forces relies on the ability to balance tradition with adaptation and the more broadly political-economic context in which decisions are made.

Future research must continue to better understand the key factors influencing the restructuring of urban governance and how these are shaped by processes of adherence and resistance to global forces. By examining the interplay between global pressures and local responses, researchers can uncover the mechanisms through which local

governance structures either accommodate or resist external forces.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Rosa Branco: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Methodology, Investigation, Conceptualization. **Patricia Canelas:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Methodology, Formal analysis, Conceptualization. **Sónia Alves:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization.

Declaration of competing interest

Rosa Branco reports a relationship of employment with Lisbon Municipality in the area of Geographic Information Systems which is not covered by this research.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

Acknowledgements

This research has received funding from Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, under the Norma Transitória [DL 57/2016/CP1441/CT0017] (Sónia Alves). Sónia Alves also acknowledges financial support from the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA) research and innovation programme of the European Union's Horizon Europe, under the grant agreement ID 101086488: Delivering sAfe and Social housing (DASH).

Appendix 1. List of interviews

Code	Profile	Interview date	Interview duration	Active in phases
GN-A	National policymaker	09/11/2020	01:39:57	1, 2, 3
GL-A	Local policymaker	27/10/2020	01:21:28	1, 2
GL-B	Local policymaker	05/02/2021	01:48:17	3
TEC-A	Technical staff	03/11/2021	01:29:54	2, 3
TEC-B	Technical staff	05/11/2020	01:37:51	1
TEC-C	Technical staff	04/11/2020	02:05:25	1, 2, 3
TEC-D	Technical staff	12/10/2020	01:22:28	1, 2, 3
TEC-E	Technical staff	16/09/2020	01:58:04	1, 2, 3
TEC-F	Technical staff	16/10/2020	01:37:53	1, 2
TEC-G	Technical staff	10/02/2022	01:32:46	1

References

- Almeida, J., et al. (2013). Municipal urbanization tax and land-use management – The case of Tomar, Portugal. *Land Use Policy*, 31, 336–346.
- Alves, S. (2017). Assessing the impact of area-based initiatives in deprived neighborhoods: The example of S. João de Deus in Porto, Portugal. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 39(3), 381–399.
- Alves, S., et al. (2023). Urban regeneration, rent regulation and the private rental sector in Portugal: A case study on Inner-City Lisbon's social sustainability. *Land*, 12(8), 1644. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land12081644>
- Alves, S., et al. (2024). *O município de Lisboa e a execução do Regime Especial de Participação na Recuperação de Imóveis Arrendados (recria): entre as estruturas e a agência. Análise Social*, 252, LIX (3.º) (pp. 2–34). <https://doi.org/10.31447/202311>
- Alves, S., & Andersen, H. T. (2019). The social and non-profit sectors in Portugal and Denmark: Issues of supply, housing quality and affordability. In E. Bargelli, T. Heitkamp, H. Simon-Moreno, & C. Vazques Varela (Eds.), *Housing Policy and tenure types in the 21st century. A southern European perspective* (pp. 73–108). Pisa University Press.
- Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2016). *Handbook on theories of governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Arbaci, S., & Tapada-Berteli, T. (2012). Social inequality and urban regeneration in Barcelona city centre: Reconsidering success. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 19(3), 287–311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776412441110>
- Aviso n.º 9769-A/2002 da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. (2002). Diário da República, Apêndice 148-A/2002, 1.º Suplemento: II Série, N.º 271, de 23 de Novembro. Available at www.dre.pt.
- Baptista, I. (2013). The travels of critiques of neoliberalism: Urban experiences from the 'borderlands'. *Urban Geography*, 34(5), 590–611.
- Bevir, M. (2009). *Key concepts in governance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Bevir, M., & Rhodes, (2010). *State as cultural practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blanco, I., Bonet, J., & Walliser, A. (2011). Urban governance and regeneration policies in historic city centres: Madrid and Barcelona. *Urban Research & Practice*, 4(3), 326–343.
- Booth, P. (2005). Partnerships and networks: The governance of urban regeneration in Britain. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 20, 257–269.
- Branco, R., & Alves, S. (2020). Urban rehabilitation, governance, and housing affordability: Lessons from Portugal. *Urban Research & Practice*, 23(2), 157–179.
- Brito-Henriques, E. (2017). Arruinamento e regeneração do espaço edificado na metrópole do século XXI: o caso de Lisboa. *EURE (Santiago)*, 43(128), 251–272.
- Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. (1996). *A Evolução Municipal de Lisboa*. Pelouro da Cultura, Divisão de Arquivos: Câmara Municipal de Lisboa.

- Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. (2009a). Carta Estratégica de Lisboa 2010–2024. Um compromisso para o Futuro da Cidade. Available at https://www.lisboa.pt/fileadm/in/municipio/camara/documentos/Carta_Estrategica_Lisboa_2010_2024.pdf.
- Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. (2009b). Programa Local de Habitação. Relatório da Primeira Fase. Volume 1. Available at: https://www.lisboa.pt/fileadmin/cidade_temas/habitacao/documentos/2_Anexo_I.pdf (11/01/2024).
- Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. (2010). Estratégia de Reabilitação Urbana 2011–2024. Available at https://www.lisboa.pt/fileadmin/cidade_temas/urbanismo/reabilitacao_Urbana/documentos/estrategia_reabilitacao.pdf.
- Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. (2011). Proposta n.º 730/2011 da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. approved in 21//12/2011. Available at https://www.lisboa.pt/fileadmin/cidade_temas/urbanismo/reabilitacao_Urbana/aru/ARU_Lisboa/aruLisboa_Proposta_730_2011.pdf (11/01/2024).
- Candido de Oliveira, A. (2021). *A Democracia Local em Portugal*. Lisboa: Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos.
- Canelas, P., & Alves, S. (2024). The governance of affordable housing through public-private partnerships: Critical entanglements. *Land Use Policy*, 143, Article 107193.
- Canelas, P., Alves, S., & Azevedo, A. (2023). Lisbon. In C. Whitehead, K. Scanlon, M. Voigtländer, J. Karlsson, F. Blanc, & M. Rotolo (Eds.), *Financialization in 13 cities - An international comparative report* (pp. 128–131). Realdania and London School of Economy.
- Carvalho, L., et al. (2019). Gentrification in Porto: Floating city users and internationally-driven urban change. *Urban Geography*, 40(4), 565–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2019.1585139>
- Chamusca, P. (2023). Urban planning and policy in Portugal: An overview on the role of EU funds and guidelines. *Urban Research & Practice*, 16(1), 44–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2021.1980607>
- Cocks, M. (2013). Conceptualizing the role of key individuals in urban governance: Cases from the economic regeneration of Liverpool. *European Planning Studies*, 21(4), 575–595. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.722955>
- Cocola-Gant, A., & Gago, A. (2019). Airbnb, buy-to-let investment and tourism-driven displacement. A case study in Lisbon. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X19869012>
- Colantonio, A., & Dixon, T. (2011). Introduction. In A. Colantonio, & T. Dixon (Eds.), *Urban regeneration and social sustainability: Best practice from European cities*. Dublin: Research and Markets.
- Couch, C., Fraser, C., & Percy, S. (2003). *Urban regeneration in Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Decreto-lei 104/2004 do Ministério das Obras Públicas, Transportes e Habitação. (2004). Diário da República: Série I-A, n.º 107, de 7 de maio. Available at www.dre.pt.
- Decreto-Lei 53/2014, de 8 de abril do Ministério do Ambiente, Ordenamento do Território e Energia. Diário da República: Série I, n.º 69 de 8 de abril. Available at www.dre.pt.
- Deliberação n.º 1190/2011 da Assembleia Municipal de Lisboa. Diário da República: II Série, N.º 101, de 25 de Maio. Available at www.dre.pt.
- Deliberação n.º 608/AML/2010 da Assembleia Municipal de Lisboa. (2011). Diário da República: II Série, N.º 55, de 18 de março. Aviso n.º 7126/2011. Available at www.dre.pt.
- Despacho n.º 3683/2011 da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. Diário da República: II Série, Nr. 39, de 24 de fevereiro. Available at www.dre.pt.
- Despacho n.º 8499/2018 da Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. Diário da República, II Série, Nr. 169, de 3 de setembro. Available at www.dre.pt.
- Drago, A. (2017). Is this what the democratic city looks like? Local democracy, housing rights and homeownership in the Portuguese context. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(1), 98–119.
- Engberg, L. A., & Larsen, J. N. (2010). Context-oriented meta-governance in Danish urban regeneration. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 11(4), 549–571.
- Estevens, A., et al. (2023). The role of the state in the touristification of Lisbon. *Cities*, 137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2023.104275>
- Falanga, R. (2018). Critical trends of citizen participation in policymaking. Insights from Portugal in Marina Costa Lobo. In F. C. da Silva, & J. P. Zúquete (Eds.), *Citizenship in crisis: Vol. 2. Changing societies: Legacies and challenges*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais. <https://doi.org/10.31447/ics9789726715047.12>.
- Fernandes, J., & at al. (2024). Tourism-led change of the city centre. *Land*, 13(100). <https://doi.org/10.3390/land13010100>
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society, Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hall, P. (2014). *Cities of tomorrow: An intellectual history of urban planning and design since 1880*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hansson, A. (2019). Inclusionary housing policies in Gothenburg, Sweden, and Stuttgart, Germany: The importance of norms and institutions. *Nordic Journal of Surveying and Real Estate Research*, 14(1), 7–28.
- Healey, P. (2020). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Henderson, S., Bowlby, S., & Raco, M. (2007). Refashioning local government and inner-city regeneration: The Salford experience. *Urban Studies*, 44(8), 1441–1463.
- Howlett, M. (2014). From the 'old' to the 'new' policy design: Design thinking beyond markets and collaborative governance. *Policy Sciences*, 47(3), 187–207. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-014-9199-0>
- Igreja, J., & Conceição, P. (2021). The influence of EU policy on local policy-making, governance and urban change. Evidence from Porto, Portugal. *Urban Research & Practice*, 4(4), 372–396.
- Keogh, G., & D'Arcy, E. (1999). Property market efficiency: An institutional economics perspective. *Urban Studies*, 36(13), 2401–2414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098992485>
- Kindgon, J. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Leary, M. E., & McCarthy, J. (Eds.). (2013). *The Routledge companion to urban regeneration*. Routledge.
- Lei n.º 31/2012: Novo Regime do Arrendamento Urbano - NRAU. (2012). *Diário da República: Série I, N.º 157, de 14 de agosto*.
- Lowndes, V. (2005). Something old, something new, something borrowed ... how institutions change (and stay the same) in local governance. *Policy Studies*, 26(3–4), 291–309.
- Lukas, M. (2019). Urban governance. In A. M. Orum (Ed.), *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of urban and regional studies*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Magalhães, C. (2015). Urban regeneration. In (2nd ed.), Vol. 24. *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioural sciences*.
- McCann, E. (2017). Governing urbanism: Urban governance studies 1.0, 2.0 and beyond. *Urban Studies*, 54(2), 312–326.
- Medeiros, E., et al. (2021). Urban planning policies to the renewal of riverfront areas: The Lisbon Metropolis case. *Sustainability*, 13(10), 5665.
- Mendes, L. (2013). Public policies on urban rehabilitation and their effects on gentrification in Lisbon. *AGIR – Revista Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais e Humanas*, 1(5), 200–218.
- Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (2023). Urban renewal policies in the Netherlands in an era of changing welfare regimes. *Urban Research & Practice*, 16(1), 92–108.
- Napoleão, M. E. (2009). *Lisbon, Urbanismo e Política*. Lisboa: Enomics.
- Pierre, J. (1999). Models of urban governance: The institutional dimension of urban politics. *Urban Affairs Review*, 34(3), 372–396.
- Pierre, J. (2011). *The politics of urban governance*. UK: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2020). *Governance, politics and the state* (2nd ed.). UK: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Pierre, J., & Stoker, G. (2000). Towards multi-level governance. In P. Dunleavy, et al. (Eds.), vol. 6. *Developments in British politics* (pp. 29–46). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Rabbiosi, C., Coletti, R., & Salone, C. (2021). Introduction to the special issue: Between practices and policies. Rethinking urban regeneration in Southern European cities after the crisis. *Urban Research & Practice*, 14(3), 217–222.
- Robinson, J. (2006). *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Rodrigues, P. (Ed.). (2022). *The real estate market in Portugal. Prices, rents, tourism and accessibility*. Lisboa: Francisco Manuel dos Santos.
- Sager, T. (2011). Neo-liberal urban planning policies: A literature survey 1990–2010. *Progress in Planning*, 76(4), 147–199.
- Seixas, J. (2021). *Lisboa em Metamorfose* (Lisbon in Metamorphosis). Lisboa: Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos.
- Sequera, J., & Nofre, J. (2020). Touristification, transnational gentrification and urban change in Lisbon: The neighbourhood of Alfama. *Urban Studies*, 57(15), 3169–3189. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26959626>.
- Silva, C. N., & Syrett, S. (2006). Governing Lisbon: Evolving forms of city governance. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(1), 98–119.
- Skifter-Andersen, H., & Leather, P. (1999). *Housing renewal in Europe*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Teles, F., Romeiro, P., & Pires, S. M. (2021). Thirty years of urban policy in Portugal: Challenges and multilevel governance. In *A modern guide to national urban policies in Europe* (pp. 176–194). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Thelen, K. (2000). Timing and temporality in the analysis of institutional evolution and change. *Studies in American Political Development*, 14(1), 101–108.
- Tulumello, S. (2016). Reconsidering neoliberal urban planning in times of crisis: Urban regeneration policy in a “dense” space in Lisbon. *Urban Geography*, 37(1), 117–140.
- Tulumello, S., & Allegretti, G. (2021). Articulating urban change in Southern Europe. Gentrification, touristification and financialisation in Mouraria, Lisbon. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 28(2), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776420963381>
- Turok, I. (1992). Property-led urban regeneration: Panacea or placebo? *Environment and Planning A*, 24(3), 361–379.
- Van Bortel, G., & Mullins, D. (2009). Critical perspectives on network governance in urban regeneration, community involvement and integration. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24(2), 203–219.
- Van der Heijden, J. (2010). A short history of studying incremental institutional change: Does Explaining Institutional Change provide any new explanations? *Regulation & Governance*, 4, 230–243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5991.2010.01075.x>