



**HAL**  
open science

# Whose Heritage, Whose Investment, Whose Sustainability? Multi-actor Dynamics Around Green Space in Late-Modernist Residential Developments (Bordeaux, France)

J. Kent Fitzsimons, Fanny Gerbeaud

► **To cite this version:**

J. Kent Fitzsimons, Fanny Gerbeaud. Whose Heritage, Whose Investment, Whose Sustainability? Multi-actor Dynamics Around Green Space in Late-Modernist Residential Developments (Bordeaux, France). ARCC-EAAE 2022 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE. RESILIENT CITY: Physical, Social, and Economic Perspectives, AEEA, Mar 2022, Miami (FL), United States. halshs-04213418

**HAL Id: halshs-04213418**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04213418>**

Submitted on 21 Sep 2023

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

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

# Whose Heritage, Whose Investment, Whose Sustainability? Multi-actor Dynamics Around Green Space in Late-Modernist Residential Developments (Bordeaux, France)

J. Kent Fitzsimons<sup>1</sup>, Fanny Gerbeaud<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>École nationale supérieure d'architecture et de paysage de Bordeaux, Laboratoire PAVE, France

**ABSTRACT:** This paper presents research into tensions between private and public land ownership in light of debates about heritage architecture and urban sustainability. The project studied challenges faced by owner-occupants of two residential developments built around 1970 in greater Bordeaux, that are regarded as distinguished examples of late modernist residential architecture: the Hameau de Noailles (Salier, Courtois, Lajus and Sadirac, 1968-1973) in Talence, consisting of 40 semi-detached patio houses and 140 apartment units sharing a pool, tennis courts and green space; and Pontet-Lamartine (Pierre Calmon, AUA 33, 1970-71) in Pessac, consisting of 32 terraced patio houses and 80 apartment units sharing a tennis court and green space. The French word "*patrimoine*" is polysemic, meaning both *heritage* and *estate* in the sense of capital. Our research shows that both individually and collectively through the homeowners' association, the residents of these mini-neighborhoods may be torn between the cultural value of their property and its value as a long term investment. Contemporary injunctions about sustainable maintenance and renovation aggravate tensions along this axis and amongst homeowners in the co-property structure. The challenge is to adapt these examples of late modernist architecture and urbanism to expectations regarding sustainable development and lifestyles while preserving their qualities as "*patrimoine*". After a summary presentation of the research corpus, methodology and results, the paper focuses on the articulation between each development's inherent urban qualities and the broader local community's needs and desires. An important issue faced in both cases was how the co-property's quality common outdoor spaces might contribute to the larger area's sustainability performance, in terms of ground permeability, biodiversity, soft mobility and usable green space. This results in tension between diverse actors including individual homeowners, the homeowner association, and municipal authorities. The paper will explore the shifting articulations between the case for architectural heritage, homeowner interests, and urban community life under pressure of sustainability injunctions.

**KEYWORDS:** Architectural heritage, Sustainability, Green space, Home ownership, Public space

## INTRODUCTION

This paper presents research into the tensions between privately-owned land and its public uses in light of debates about architectural heritage and urban sustainability (Fitzsimons et al. 2019; Fitzsimons et al. 2021). It focuses on co-ownership residential ensembles whose outdoor space constitutes a potential resource for the broader community, as the surrounding neighborhoods densify and as the local climate increasingly reflects global warming. Such cases put into play different interpretations of what "heritage" means and to whom it belongs. They also break open the apparent homogeneity of the concept of sustainability by revealing different spatial and temporal scales and different interests at play in attempts to meet current human needs without compromising the natural substrate necessary to allow future generations to do the same (UN 1986: 16). Put simply, cases where private land may be a resource for the public good allow us to submit conventional ideas about architectural heritage to the scrutiny of another kind of heritage whose vitality has more recently come to the fore: a livable planet as a birthright, obliging us to protect it in the interest of those who will follow us (Caye 2020).

We first present the research project that provided material for the conclusions shared here. The paper then addresses the polysemy of the French word used to denote cultural heritage: *patrimoine*. Indeed, *patrimoine* is also a synonym for inheritance or estate, in the sense of capital. Its use in the context of residential architecture is therefore complex, as it evokes both the general cultural interest of past aesthetics, techniques or lifestyles as inscribed in a house or apartment (Heinich 2009), and the particular financial interest of its owner – who may also have "invested" his or her home with sentimental value. This polysemy becomes particularly resonant when confronting sustainability's necessarily collective dimension, in which the idea of equity is at stake. With this matter of vocabulary addressed, we describe the two residential ensembles chosen to illustrate the phenomenon, focusing on their respective urban dimensions. Finally, in the last section, we analyze how the proprietary open spaces that structure and embellish these

ensembles animate debates at the intersection of heritage/estate and sustainability. We compare and contrast the two cases in order to explore how green spaces crystallize tensions not only between private and public interests as represented respectively by homeowners and actual or potential non-resident users, but also amongst homeowners in the co-property structures themselves. This part highlights the temporal dimension that sustainability imposes on considerations about how environments we inherit from the past might correspond to the new modes of dwelling that we must adopt. In this way, our research bridges from the notion of heritage as either general cultural or private financial value, to heritage as a common resource – not to say “capital” – for adapting to the needs of an uncertain future.

## **1.0 THE RESEARCH PROJEC: SUBJECT, CORPUS, METHODOLOGY**

The research from which this paper draws its results was carried out between 2016 and 2021 in the greater Bordeaux area (France). It was funded by France’s Ministry of Culture, through the 4-year research program *Twentieth-Century Architecture, Project Material for the Twenty-First-Century Sustainable City* (2016-2020). This program sought to develop theoretical and practical knowledge about how the heritage value of buildings and spaces built during the Twentieth Century might be fostered while also transforming them in light of the energy and ecological transition and changes in lifestyles. Our response to the call for proposals defined 1970 as a watershed moment after which the principles of modern architecture and urbanism that still held sway over development would unexpectedly be put into question. A nascent consciousness about the “Limits to Growth”, to cite the Club of Rome report of 1972, combined with geopolitical shocks starting with the 1973 oil crisis and spanning through that of 1979, troubled many assumptions underpinning such principles. These ranged from the architectural scale, such as full-width windows and spatial fluidity in plan and section, to the urban scale at which a rapidly expanding car culture drove functional segregation and decreased density. Based on a belief in the availability of unlimited energy and zero external costs for consuming it, much housing built around 1970 therefore corresponded to a future that would never be.

Fifty years later, such building stock has already been modified, whether through regular maintenance or through adaptations responding to changing standards for environmental performance. It faces even more pressure for modification today: newer, more strict regulations about energy consumption that enforce a rating system may encourage alterations in anticipation of property sales; and local development policies for densifying already urbanized land, notably in relation to public transit infrastructure (A’Urba 2011), threaten to alter the balance between built and unbuilt space that characterizes many noteworthy projects from the pre-1973 era. Yet in some cases, such ensembles have qualities that are not only emblematic of modernist architectural and urban design and therefore worthy of respect for historical reasons. They may also be assets when facing imminent challenges of the energy and climate transitions. Unfortunately, these qualities are often not recognized by piecemeal approaches to insulating, repartitioning or extending existing structures, or to adding buildings to an existing ensemble, leading to their being irremediably altered or even destroyed.

Our research sought to identify ways to reconcile the injunctions brought on by sustainability considerations with the goal of preserving remarkable aspects of residential architecture from the twilight of modernism (Fitzsimons et al. 2019). To do so, we composed a pluridisciplinary team to study four residential neighbourhoods built between the late 1960s and the early 1970s in the Greater Bordeaux area, and that may be regarded as distinguished examples of late modernist architecture (Coustet and Saboya 2005; Ragot 1996). This paper focuses on the two ensembles that associate small- and medium-sized apartment buildings with terraced or semi-detached houses: the Hameau de Noailles in Talence (Salier, Courtois, Lajus and Sadirac, 1968-1973), and Pontet Extension 4 in Pessac, in particular a component called Pontet-Lamartine (Pierre Calmon, AUA 33, 1970-71 ).

Our multi-disciplinary team employed a variety of methods for studying the two neighborhoods. An architectural and historical analysis placed the qualities of the original designs into a disciplinary perspective. On the side of fieldwork, a sociological survey used semi-directive interviews and collective workshops to garner perceptions and opinions from owner-occupants and other stakeholders such as renters and municipal authorities. Likewise, an environmental study (*ambiances*) undertook multi-criteria quantitative and qualitative analyses of performance and comfort in the houses and open air spaces. In both residential ensembles, the research method led to interactions almost exclusively with owners of houses. Indeed, apartment unit owners appeared to be less concerned about the problem of reconciling architectural heritage issues with adapting buildings and sites to increasingly strict environmental and ecological imperatives, perhaps because building maintenance and improvement is managed collectively; in contrast, house owners are individually responsible for their building envelopes, utility networks and heating and cooling systems. Another factor may be that, in both developments, renter-occupation is higher in the apartment buildings than in the houses. This apparent self-selection by participants has been taken into account in interpreting results.

The rest of this paper presents results drawn from this study. It focuses on how the prospect of adapting these projects “inherited” from the modernism’s swan song to today’s urgent sustainability imperatives raises debates amongst diverse stakeholders, in order to better understand actor dynamics around these socio-spatial issues.

## 2.0 WHOSE HERITAGE? “PATRIMOINE” BEYOND PUBLIC CULTURAL HERITAGE PRIVATE AND INVESTMENT

The French word “*patrimoine*” is polysemic, meaning both *heritage* and *estate*, in the sense of capital. Our research shows that both individually and collectively in the form of the homeowners’ association, the residents of these micro-neighborhoods may be torn between the cultural value of their property and its value as a long term investment. Contemporary injunctions about sustainable maintenance and renovation aggravate tensions along this axis and amongst homeowners in the co-property structure. The principle challenge is how to adapt these examples of late modernist architecture and urbanism to expectations regarding sustainable development and lifestyles while preserving their qualities as “*patrimoine*”.

This question raises different issues depending on the scale observed. At the scale of the house or apartment building, conjugating heritage in both the cultural and proprietary sense on the one hand, and sustainability on the other, activates tensions between a building’s visible characteristics, its comfort, economic aspects of both its everyday use and exceptional investments, as well as its ecological and environmental qualities. The perimeter for these matters is generally constrained to the circle of individual owners within the co-ownership association. However, at the scale of the block and its environs, a whole other set of issues arises. In both areas studied, the private open space in particular constitutes heritage whose potential value for adapting the urban environment to sustainable lifestyles transcends the sole interests of its owners. Such a perspective requires not only assuming the primary polysemy of *patrimoine* in its collective cultural and individual financial dimensions, but also working it further to conceptualize the material substrate – the “earth system” – as a heritage that necessarily reconfigures private and public interests.

## 3.0 TWO LATE MODERNIST RESIDENTIAL ENSEMBLES

### 3.1 Hameau de Noailles

The Hameau de Noailles is a closed neighborhood that would be called a gated community in North America. The combination of this relatively rare status in France with the Hameau’s geographical situation creates a particularly interesting case to study adapting existing co-properties for global sustainability. Designed by the reputable Bordeaux architecture firm Salier, Courtois, Lajus and Sadirac, the Hameau was built between 1968 and 1973 (Jacques and Neve 1995). It consists of 140 apartment units and 40 semi-detached houses carefully distributed on a lot measuring about nine acres, for an average density of about 20 units per acre. (Figure 1) The apartment buildings vary in height between three and five storeys; the houses are either one or two storeys tall. A one-story clubhouse and a series of rooms in the semi-basement of one of the apartment buildings provide space for collective functions. The site is carefully landscaped to find balance between the internal street system, commonly-owned green spaces, outdoor amenities consisting of two tennis courts and an open-air pool, and the houses’ private gardens (backyards).



**Figure 1:** Hameau de Noailles, Talence, France; Salier, Courtois, Lajus and Sadirac, architects, 1968-1973. Aerial photo. Source: Google Earth 2020.


The architecture of the buildings and houses may be characterized as modernism informed by critical regionalism (Ragot, 1994). It combines expanses of white walls, flat roofs, and abstracted fenestration with climate-sensitive framing of outdoor spaces, expressed wood structural members, and ergonomic details in the same darkly painted wood for entry gates and guardrails. There is perceptible inspiration from Californian case-study houses on the one hand, and traditional Japanese architecture on the other. (Figure 2)

The Hameau's nine-acre lot is in fact a large parcel spanning from east to west in the middle portion of a very large block. (Figure 3) The rest of the block to the north of the Hameau is occupied by some thirty single-family houses in a conventional subdivision configuration. The remainder to the south is part of the university campus, where a former monastery now housing the institution's presidency sits in a landscaped park. On its long west side, the super block is delimited by a main artery that separates it from a vineyard (part of the Chateau Haut-Brion); on its east side, a meandering local access street serves a mostly residential neighborhood of single-family houses that also includes an important local youth center with indoor and outdoor recreational facilities.



**Figure 2:** Hameau de Noailles. Architectural characteristics. Source: (Author 2020)


As the Hameau gives onto roads on both the east and the west sides of the super block, it would seem to be a good place to divide the latter in two, and thus facilitate circulation in the area. And indeed, from the outset, the Hameau's internal street system includes a main road that links east to west, although with two right-angle turns. As there were originally no obstacles to accessing this private street from the public roads, through traffic was in fact common, as was non-resident use of reserved parking spaces. When tolerance for these practices declined on the part of Hameau residents, the co-owners' association decided to install code-access gates at both ends. We will see that local collective memory about the possibility of through traffic still informs perceptions about the Hameau's relative integration into Talence's civic body.



**Figure 3:** Hameau de Noailles. Situation plan. Source: (Author, 2017)

### 3.2 Pontet Extension IV

The second residential ensemble studied has the misleadingly less poetic name *Pontet Extension IV*. Situated in Pessac, it consists of one hundred twelve units of housing: eighty units in two apartment blocks of five and eleven storeys respectively, and thirty-two one-storey patio houses of which most are arranged as terraced housing and the rest as semi-detached houses. (Figure 4) For this project, developer Gilbert Saramite hired local architect Pierre Calmon (Callais, 2005). The ensemble was designed and built in 1970-71. Like the Hameau de Noailles, Pontet's overall property covers approximately nine acres, resulting in an average density of about twelve units per acre. Compared with the Hameau, Pontet's lower density translates as generous green space subdivided into a variety of atmospheres and amenities: two tennis courts, a planted garden, a children's play area, and a tree park. This latter element exists in great part because planned project's final piece was never built. The result is an impression of lush and generous green space for this co-property structure at the periphery of the Bordeaux agglomeration.



**Figure 4:** Pontet Extension IV, Pessac, France. Pierre Calmon, architect, 1970-71. Aerial view. Source: Google Earth, 2018.

Pontet's resolutely modernist architecture displays three variations. The ten-storey point block's pin-wheel plan expresses contrasts between full-width glazed bays in deep-set loggias at the extremity of each of the four "pins" and blind concrete walls along their sides. The five-story linear building adopts a stepped-back structure that provides large terraces for all apartments. Finally, the terraced and semi-detached houses differ from the apartment blocks, while maintaining a modernist language. (Figure 5) Their palette consists of white painted concrete walls and roof overhangs for the closed structures, bush-hammered raw concrete for the garden walls, and dark-painted wood doors and gates for forecourt and garage accesses. "Lanterns" rising above the ensemble's roofline mark each house's entry hall, thus achieving a sophisticated equilibrium between expressing the whole and expressing the parts.



**Figure 5:** Pontet-Lamartine. Architectural characteristics. Photo: (Author, 2020)

The architectural contrasts between Pontet's different housing typologies reflect the ensemble's complex co-property structure. One overarching co-owner's association regroups the house units, the two aforementioned apartment buildings, as well as another more recently constructed residential building. However, each of these four components forms a co-owners association of its own. In this nested management structure, the umbrella association takes care of the common open spaces and amenities, while each sub-association is responsible for its own building's maintenance. In the case of the grouped houses, while there is no collective structure, infrastructure or equipment *per se*, the co-owners association at this level allows in particular to define and enforce rules regarding the respect of certain architectural qualities. We will see that, overall, this specific co-property structure creates complexity for managing aspects that concern the overall site, in particular environmental subjects such as landscaping in both its technical and leisure dimensions.

At Pontet Extension 4, the quality open space at the center of the building complex is the private property of the co-owners. (Figure 6) However, it is not, and never was, enclosed by fences or gates. It is freely accessible, and seems like it is public. So while Pontet's development is one large block bordered by public roads, its heart seems naturally integrated into the continuity of public space. The main pedestrian path that traverses the block connects a broad sidewalk on the north side with a small intersection on the south side. This pedestrian path is dimensioned like a road; one has the impression of continuing on a public way, rather than crossing through private property. It leads to an intersection with a cul-de-sac public street that serves a dozen rowhouses and as many supplementary parking spaces. For a pedestrian, this cul-de-sac leads naturally to one end of the park space that, as we said, is private property. These few spatial cues that do not correspond to the usual devices used to delimit public and private outdoor spaces make the gardens, play area and park that sit on land belonging to the co-owners association feel like they belong to everyone.




Figure 6: Pontet Extension IV. Situation plan. Source: (Author, 2017).

## 4.0 WHOSE INVESTMENT? SUSTAINABILITY FOR WHOM?

### 4.1 The Context of densification

Both the Hameau de Noailles and Pontet Extension 4 are in areas that today are being densified as part of the Bordeaux urban community's plan to combat sprawl with a more sustainable urban model. Local government policy particularly encourages modal shift from motor vehicle use to active modes such as walking and cycling, as well as public transit in the form of buses and especially light rail. Indeed, taking advantage of recent extensions of Bordeaux's new light rail system opened in 2003, the program "50 000 units of housing on transit lines" is building projects on available land served by tramways (A'Urba 2011). The Hameau and Pontet are on such axes. If, on the one hand, this benefits their residents, it also urbanizes formerly open space and ushers in local population growth. For example, just to the north of Pontet, the metropolitan development agency is building three hundred thirty new units for a density of about twenty units per acre; comparable to the Hameau de Noailles, this density is 60% more that of Pontet. In this context, the respective urban qualities of these two existing ensembles may appear to constitute an important resource for their immediate urban environment's new configuration. This perspective of course questions the status of their privately-owned open space. Before exploring the related tensions and opportunities at this scale, it is useful to outline already existing conditions within each development's resident community.

### 4.2 Internal affairs: Strains on co-ownership structures

If these neighborhoods are emblematic for their architecture, they are also instructive for the debates about heritage preservation raised by their regular management and adaptation to sustainability goals. Heritage and architectural matters elicit misunderstanding and even discord among stakeholders, and lead to thorough interrogations about energy-saving regulations, assessments and interventions. Drawing from existing studies on the topic (Brisepierre 2020; Roudil et al. 2009-2012), our study delves into specific challenges faced by architecturally remarkable sites. These point to conceiving sustainability around a variety of scales and actors, thus going beyond conventional approaches to address these issues.

It would be difficult to overstate the exceptional quality of the Hameau de Noailles as architectural and urban space. Indeed, the ensemble obtained the Ministry of Culture's "Remarkable Contemporary Architecture" label in 2015 (formerly "20<sup>th</sup>-Century Architecture"). Interest for this recognition varies amongst residents. Some of the original "pioneering" buyers still live in the Hameau, and their knowledge of the ensemble's history often casts them as guardians of aesthetic orthodoxy. While some recent arrivals purchased here specifically for the architectural character, other owners and many renters are less invested in this aspect. In the Hameau, tensions thus arise amongst co-owners regarding a variety of subjects, from deviations from aspects of the original architectural design during renovations (regulated in the co-property rules) to divergences about the use and maintenance of common areas. Our research shows that this is the case in particular at the intersection between the desire to preserve the architectural and urban design heritage of the Hameau and the desire to adapt the built environment to current needs and expectations, with projects such as house extensions, improving insulation for walls and windows, or installing energy equipment such as heat pumps and solar panels. Ensuing tensions are exacerbated by a heightened awareness amongst many residents about the community's unique history, and not only amongst the pioneers who purchased in the early 1970s.

In Pontet's umbrella co-owners association, there are clearly difficulties for managing and financing the maintenance of the property's generous open spaces. This is due as much to cost considerations as to built-in structural limits to its organization. In general, short term interests tend to pass the hurdle of approval by co-owners more easily than long term perspectives (Brisepierre 2014). At Pontet, for example, humidity problems on the land cause a general mosquito problem for the whole site (and presumably beyond); they also cause particular comfort and perennity nuisances for the houses located at the site's lowest point. Some house owners proposed that the umbrella co-owners association order a study that would link the humidity problems to a global diagnostic of the co-property's green spaces, in the hopes of identifying measures associating water management and a planting strategy that would be beneficial for all. Despite its very modest cost, the measure was never adopted, in large part because co-owners in the apartment buildings were unfavorable. Water poses another kind of problem: as there is no water counter for the co-property itself, fairly dividing costs for watering the green spaces amongst co-owners would be difficult. The chosen solution is to have a water tanker truck deliver water and bill the association. This choice is criticized by some residents, who favor solutions that would be more sustainable ecologically and socially: collect rain water, and employ local youth for occasional gardening and other green space maintenance. Observing these dynamics in the main association, some frustrated members comment that it is easier to vote cutting down trees than it is to plant or to water them; others water saplings planted in common spaces on their own utility bill.

#### **4.3 External relations: Heritage as common resource**

Despite such built-in obstacles, Pontet's global co-owners association has adopted a number of positive measures reflecting ecological awareness. The grass in open areas is left to grow as much as possible, in order to favor insects. Meadows are left fallow to encourage the growth of wildflowers. Recently, fruit trees were even planted on an unbuilt lot, much less to provide food for residents than to diversity plant and animal species in the area. Interestingly, this was also a tactic on the part of some co-owners to forestall a hypothetical sale of this lot to the metropolitan development agency, whose aforementioned densification projects might take interest in such a site.

Such ecological measures, which at first appear to be self-serving for Pontet co-owners, in fact also benefit the broader neighborhood. A form of generosity also exists at the more prosaic level of leisure space. Many house owners encountered consider that the co-property's accessible land should continue to provide green space for the public at large, and necessarily the residents of neighboring blocks. On this note, it is interesting that Pessac's planning department considers that the municipality's most remarkable heritage is its quality green space. It is indeed a relatively low-density environment: Pessac's overall density is one-quarter that of neighboring Talence, home to the Hameau de Noailles (although most of Pessac's territory in fact lies beyond the agglomeration's ring road). That this quality dominates official discourse while the city is particularly cautious about its numerous significant landmarks of modern architecture and urban design, not the least of which is Le Corbusier's Cité Frugès (1923-1929), speaks to how the climate change emergency is refocusing priorities. Regardless, Pessac is not interested in participating in managing Pontet's green space. The municipality is wary of giving the impression that co-properties might benefit from the advantages of private ownership while having negative aspects weigh on public responsibility. On the other hand, the City is considering funding projects carried by co-property residents, in the context of experimental measures using its participatory democracy budget.

Such a measure might only partially satisfy Pontet co-owners. Not only is managing the green space a complex logistical problem and at times a significant supplementary expense. In recent years, residents have noticed a distinct increase in inappropriate uses of their park, including drug dealing and suspected prostitution. A particularly disturbing event was when vandals lit a car on fire in the ensemble: parked on the street, the burning vehicle damaged the new external insulation of a recently renovated patio house. In the face of what is perceived to be increasing insecurity and incivilities, the co-owner association signed an agreement allowing the municipal police force to patrol the off street accessible areas that, as private property, are usually beyond its authority. But the hypothesis of fencing off Pontet's open spaces is voiced more and more frequently.

In echo to this situation, the Hameau de Noailles's main contribution to adapting the city to sustainable practices might be opening its access, if only partially. As mentioned, the internal street system was originally accessible to non-resident traffic, even though the property rights were unambiguously private. Some outsiders still criticize the Hameau for having become a "gated community", despite this having been its legal status from the start. Today, some residents owners of the Hameau wonder aloud whether it would be appropriate to allow unobstructed through traffic for walkers and cyclers by removing the pedestrian gates at both ends, while maintaining reserved resident access for automobiles. Located in the middle portion of a



very large block that separates some other residential blocks from a main artery, the Hameau de Noailles site could indeed provide a very useful shortcut for many users. Major bus line serves its east side, while its west side give access to nearby light rail station.

City officials are interested in this hypothesis; an added benefit would be exposure for the site's recognition as Remarkable Contemporary Architecture by the Ministry of Culture. This would be an interesting application of leniency regarding the public use of private property. In France, this kind of arrangement is foreseen in law. Legal dispositions provide for example that an alleyway in a dense urban environment that is co-owned by the buildings that line it, may be open for use by all in exchange for lighting and maintenance managed and financed by the public authority. Applying such a measure at the Hameau de Noailles would propel a project designed in an era when the personal motorized vehicle was the undisputed horizon for all of society into a future in which the responsible and collectively sanctioned choice is to limit individual car use to a bare minimum. And in doing so, it would question how the principle of private property may be subordinated to the interest of the common good, in the name of equity at a time when radical action is necessary in order to minimize climate change. Were this to transpire, the generally negative outside perspective on the Hameau's *entre-soi*, corresponding to a sentiment of either exclusion on the part of residents of neighboring streets or selfishness on the part of city officials, would likely evolve positively.

## CONCLUSION

This paper aimed to delve into the socio-spatial dynamics at play in two residential co-property structures whose respective configurations could provide an interesting resource for meeting the need for lifestyles changes in their broader urban contexts. Research revealed that an important issue faced by the homeowner's association in both cases was how the co-property's quality common outdoor spaces might contribute to the larger area's sustainability performance, in terms of ground permeability, biodiversity, soft mobility and usable green space. This results in tension between diverse actors including individual homeowners, the homeowner association, and municipal authorities. Based on the two case studies, the paper explored the shifting articulations between the cause for architectural heritage, homeowner interests, and urban community life under pressure of sustainability injunctions.

In France, there is a precise term for the architectural intervention through which private land whose spatial characteristics lead to it being confused with public space is closed off from free access: "*résidentialisation*". It was done long ago at the Hameau de Noailles, when entry gates effectively put an end to through traffic. Today, a partial reversal of this measure may perhaps transpire. At the same time, the prospect of *résidentialisation* at Pontet is a real threat. It would remove a quality amenity from public access, at a moment when local densification will likely increase need for it. In both cases, it seems urgent to put stakeholders around the table, including the co-owners association, municipal authorities and reliable representatives of existing or potential external users, in order to identify alternatives to *résidentialisation*. Indeed, many post-war residential developments in France tested the same principles of spatial organization in which generous common open space mediates between the public street and the private court or garden, beyond the scale of what was common in the city inherited from the nineteenth century and earlier. Similar spatial questions about limits between public and private domains, and organizational questions about property management, security and expenses, arise in those situations. Lessons learned at the Hameau de Noailles and Pontet could inform measures in other cases where rethinking boundaries, shared use, maintenance costs and responsibilities is necessary for developing urban resilience.

Finally, we may also note the value of the Hameau and Pontet as examples for contemporary development. The Cities of Pessac and Talence expressed interest in our research because they perceive these ensembles as qualitative projects that are aging well. Taking into account lessons learned over fifty years of history, they could be models for future development that responds to the imperatives of global sustainability.

## REFERENCES

- A'Urba. 2011. *5 dialogues pour 50000 logements autour des axes de transports collectifs : synthèse du dialogue compétitif*. Bordeaux: Communauté Urbaine de Bordeaux, 73p.
- Brisepierre, G. 2014. « Comment se décide une rénovation thermique en copropriété ? Un nouveau mode d'organisation de l'habitat comme condition de l'innovation énergétique », Flux n. 96, pp. 31-39.
- Brisepierre, G. 2020. *Le grand jeu social de la rénovation énergétique : un tour d'horizon des acteurs*, Leroy Merlin Source research report.
- Callais, C. 2005. « Trois variations pour vivre moderne : Pessac-Talence, 1965-1970 », in *Le Festin*, Bordeaux, n° 52, pp. 88-91.
- Caye, P. 2020. *Durer : Éléments pour la transformation du système productif*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Coustet, R. and Saboya, M. 2005. *Bordeaux, la conquête de la modernité : architecture et urbanisme à Bordeaux et dans l'agglomération de 1920 à 2003*. Bordeaux: Mollat, 402 p.
- Fitzsimons, K., Gerbeaud, F., Godier, P., Barlet, A. and Mazel, C. 2019. « *Redivivus : Les mouvements modernes rattrapés par la marche du durable. Leçons, adaptations et inventions des lieux du quotidien*. Bordeaux, France | Cincinnati, Etats-Unis ». Research report for the French Ministry of Culture, 258p.
- Fitzsimons, K., Gerbeaud, F., Godier, P., Barlet, A., Mazel, C., Labarchède, M. and Georges, A. 2021. « *Réaliser le potentiel REDIVIVUS des quartiers d'habitat moderne : expérimenter des méthodes d'accompagnement au carrefour du patrimoine et de la ville durable* ». Research report for the French Ministry of Culture, 95 p.
- Heinich, N. 2009. *La fabrique du patrimoine. De la cathédrale à la petite cuillère*. Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 288 p.
- Jacques, M. and Neve, A. 1995. « Salier, Courtois, Lajus, Sadirac, Fouquet. Atelier d'architecture. Bordeaux 1950-1970 ». Bordeaux: arc en rêve centre d'architecture.
- Ragot, G. 1994. « Le Hameau de Noailles » in *Le moniteur d'architecture*, Paris, n°51, mai.
- Ragot, G. 1996. « Bordeaux et son agglomération, 1945-1995 ». *Guide d'architecture, Bordeaux*. Bordeaux: arc en rêve centre d'architecture / Centre régional des lettres Aquitaine / Confluences, 248p.
- Roudil, N., Flamand, A., Beillan, V. and Douzou, S. 2009-2012, *La consommation énergétique : de la résidence à la ville. Aspects sociaux, techniques et économiques*. Research report for the Agence nationale de la recherche.
- UN United Nations. 1987. *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*. New York.