Urban Agriculture and Circular Food Systems
https://ojs.ukscip.com/index.php/uacfs

Article

Integrating Urban Agriculture into Municipal Planning: Policy Frameworks and Stakeholder Engagement in European Cities

Jan Kowalski*
Faculty of Architecture, Warsaw University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland

Received: 17 July 2025; Revised: 20 July 2025; Accepted: 25 July 2025; Published: 30 July 2025

ABSTRACT
Despite growing recognition of urban agriculture's role in sustainable food systems, its integration into municipal planning remains fragmented. This paper examines policy frameworks and stakeholder engagement mechanisms across 12 European cities, analyzing how urban agriculture is institutionalized in land-use plans, zoning regulations, and sustainability strategies. Through qualitative interviews with planners, farmers, and community organizers, we identify three emerging models: regulatory integration (e.g., Berlin's zoning amendments), incentive-based approaches (e.g., Lisbon's tax breaks for urban farms), and participatory planning (e.g., Warsaw's community garden co-design). Barriers include land ownership conflicts, funding constraints, and lack of cross-departmental coordination. We propose a multi-level governance framework to streamline integration, emphasizing inclusive decision-making and adaptive policy tools to enhance food security and socio-economic equity in urban contexts.

Keywords: urban planning; policy frameworks; stakeholder engagement; urban agriculture; European cities

1. Introduction

Urban agriculture (UA) is increasingly recognized as a critical component of sustainable urban development. Defined as the cultivation, processing, and distribution of food and non-food products within urban and peri-urban areas, UA represents a convergence of ecological resilience, social equity, and economic innovation (FAO, 2019). Across Europe, UA manifests in diverse forms: from community gardens and allotment plots in Berlin and Warsaw, to high-tech rooftop farms in Paris and Barcelona, and urban vineyards in Vienna and Lisbon. Despite this proliferation, the integration of UA into formal urban planning systems remains inconsistent and often peripheral (Antonopoulos & Vakoufaris, 2019). This fragmentation undermines the potential of UA to contribute meaningfully to global sustainability agendas, particularly the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2 (Zero Hunger) and 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities).

The historical trajectory of UA in Europe reflects shifting paradigms of urbanism. During the post-war era, UA was largely relegated to the informal economy, associated with subsistence practices or wartime relief efforts. However, the rise of the environmental movement in the 1970s and 1980s, coupled with growing concerns over food sovereignty and climate resilience, has catalyzed a renaissance of UA as a legitimate urban land use (Morgan, 2015). Contemporary UA initiatives are lauded for their multifunctionality: enhancing local food security, mitigating urban heat island effects, improving stormwater management, fostering biodiversity, and creating spaces for social interaction and education (Cabannes & Marocchi, 2018).

Municipal planning policies are central to unlocking UA's transformative potential. Zoning regulations, land-use plans, building codes, and fiscal incentives collectively shape the spatial and operational parameters of UA. For instance, cities like Berlin and Copenhagen have embedded UA within their statutory frameworks, guaranteeing land access and operational continuity. In contrast, cities such as Lisbon and Madrid rely on incentive-driven approaches, offering tax rebates or grants to stimulate private and community-led UA projects. These divergent approaches reflect deeper institutional, cultural, and economic differences across European regions (van der Schans et al., 2019).

Despite these advances, significant barriers persist. Land competition, institutional fragmentation, funding volatility, and cultural biases against UA as a "non-serious" land use continue to hinder its mainstreaming. Moreover, the voices of UA practitioners—especially small-scale farmers, immigrant gardeners, and low-income communities—are often marginalized in policy-making processes, leading to interventions that are technocratic rather than participatory (Ostrom, 2005).

This study presents a comprehensive analysis of UA policy frameworks across 12 European cities, aiming to map the current landscape of UA governance, identify effective models of integration, and propose actionable recommendations for more inclusive and adaptive policy-making. By employing a mixed-methods approach—combining policy document analysis, stakeholder interviews, and participatory workshops—this research sheds light on the complex interplay of actors, rules, and outcomes that shape UA in contemporary European cities.

The research is guided by three core objectives:

(1) To map the diversity of UA policies and regulatory frameworks across European cities.

(2) To identify and evaluate governance models that effectively integrate UA into urban planning.

(3) To develop context-sensitive recommendations for enhancing UA's contribution to urban sustainability through multi-stakeholder engagement.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows: Section 2 outlines the materials and methods, including case selection criteria, data collection techniques, and analytical frameworks. Section 3 presents the results, including a typology of UA policy integration, comparative outcomes, and key barriers. Section 4 discusses the implications of these findings, comparing models across regions and proposing a multi-level governance framework. Section 5 concludes with policy recommendations and directions for future research.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Case Study Selection

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to select 12 European cities that reflect diversity in population size, geographic region, and economic profile. This approach ensures that the study captures a

broad spectrum of urban contexts, enabling a robust comparative analysis. The selection criteria included:

·Population size: Cities ranging from 0.2 million to 3.7 million inhabitants to include small, mid-sized, and large urban centers.

·Geographic region: Representation from Northern, Western, Southern, and Eastern Europe to account for climatic, cultural, and institutional variations.

·Economic profile: Inclusion of post-industrial cities (e.g., Berlin, Warsaw), tourist-driven economies (e.g., Lisbon, Athens), and emerging economies (e.g., Bratislava, Edinburgh).

The final sample comprised:

·Northern Europe: Berlin (Germany), Copenhagen (Denmark), Stockholm (Sweden)

·Western Europe: Paris (France), Rotterdam (Netherlands), Vienna (Austria)

·Southern Europe: Lisbon (Portugal), Madrid (Spain), Athens (Greece)

·Eastern Europe: Warsaw (Poland), Bratislava (Slovakia), Edinburgh (UK)

2.2 Data Collection

Data were collected through three complementary methods: policy document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and participatory workshops.

2.2.1 Policy Document Analysis

A total of 87 official documents were collected and analyzed, including:

·Municipal land-use plans and zoning codes

·Urban development strategies and sustainability action plans

·UA-specific policies (e.g., urban gardening strategies, green roof ordinances)

·EU-funded project reports and evaluations

Documents were coded thematically using NVivo 12 software. Key coding categories included:

·Definitions and conceptualizations of UA

·Permitted locations and spatial zoning for UA

·Regulatory requirements (e.g., permits, health and safety standards)

·Support mechanisms (e.g., grants, technical assistance, tax incentives)

2.2.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

Forty-eight stakeholders were interviewed across the 12 cities, ensuring balanced representation among four key groups:

·Urban planners (12 interviewees): Responsible for land-use planning and policy design.

·Local government officials (12 interviewees): Involved in policy implementation, funding allocation, and inter-departmental coordination.

·UA practitioners (12 interviewees): Including community garden leaders, urban farmers, and cooperative managers.

·Civil society representatives (12 interviewees): Advocates, NGO staff, and researchers engaged in UA promotion.

Interviews were conducted in person or via video conference, lasting 45–60 minutes each. All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and anonymized for analysis. The interview protocol explored topics such as:

·Perceptions of UA's role in urban sustainability

·Experiences with policy integration and implementation

·Challenges and opportunities for scaling UA

·Recommendations for improving governance frameworks

2.2.3 Participatory Workshops

Three multi-stakeholder workshops were held in Berlin, Lisbon, and Warsaw—cities representing different governance models. Each workshop involved 15–20 participants, including planners, policymakers, UA practitioners, and community representatives. The workshops employed participatory design methods, including:

·World Café sessions for brainstorming policy innovations

·Scenario-building exercises to envision future UA landscapes

·Stakeholder mapping to identify power dynamics and collaboration opportunities

Workshop outputs were synthesized into draft policy recommendations, which were later validated through follow-up interviews with participants.

2.3 Analytical Framework

Data were analyzed using a modified Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework (Ostrom, 2005), which examines how institutional arrangements shape human interactions and environmental outcomes. The framework was adapted to focus on three dimensions:

2.3.1 Rules-in-Use

This dimension examines both formal and informal rules governing UA:

·Formal rules: Zoning laws, land-use regulations, permit requirements, and incentive schemes.

·Informal rules: Cultural norms, community practices, and unwritten agreements influencing UA activities.

2.3.2 Actor Interactions

This dimension explores the power dynamics and collaborative relationships among key actors:

·Planners and policymakers: Control over land allocation and regulatory frameworks.

·UA practitioners: Ground-level implementation and community engagement.

·Civil society: Advocacy, capacity-building, and bridging between communities and government.

2.3.3 Outcomes

This dimension assesses the tangible and intangible results of UA policies:

·Quantitative outcomes: UA coverage (measured in hectares per 1,000 inhabitants), participation rates, and funding levels.

·Qualitative outcomes: Perceived effectiveness, social cohesion, environmental benefits, and economic viability.

Cross-case synthesis was employed to identify common patterns, divergent approaches, and contextual factors influencing UA integration. This led to the development of typologies of UA policy models and the formulation of context-sensitive recommendations.

3. Results

3.1 Typology of UA Policy Integration

Analysis of the 12 cities revealed three distinct models of UA policy integration, each with unique characteristics, strengths, and limitations.

3.1.1 Model 1: Regulatory Integration

Cities: Berlin, Copenhagen, Stockholm

Key Features:

·UA is explicitly recognized and protected within municipal land-use plans. For example, Berlin's 2018 Urban Development Plan designates 500 hectares for community gardens and urban farms, with legal safeguards against redevelopment.

·Zoning amendments ensure that UA is included as a permissible land use in residential, commercial, and industrial zones.

·Minimum standards for UA integration are mandated in new developments, such as rooftop green spaces in Copenhagen's building codes.

Regulatory Tools:

·Zoning overlays and land reserves for UA

·Perpetual easements to protect existing gardens

·Mandatory environmental impact assessments for developments affecting UA sites

Stakeholder Role:

·Urban planners lead policy design, with structured public consultations during major plan revisions.

·UA practitioners are consulted but have limited decision-making power.

·Civil society organizations advocate for stronger protections and monitor compliance.

3.1.2 Model 2: Incentive-Based Approaches

Cities: Lisbon, Madrid, Paris, Rotterdam

Key Features:

·UA is promoted through financial incentives rather than regulatory mandates. Lisbon's 2020 "Green Roofs" program, for instance, offers tax rebates of up to 30% for buildings that integrate rooftop farms.

·Public-private partnerships are central to implementation, with municipalities providing seed funding and private entities managing operations.

·Flexibility is emphasized, allowing diverse forms of UA (e.g., hydroponic systems, vertical farms) to emerge based on market demand.

Incentives:

·Tax abatements and rebates for UA integration

·Grants for infrastructure development (e.g., irrigation systems, greenhouses)

·Low-interest loans for UA startups and cooperatives

Stakeholder Role:

·Local governments act as facilitators and funders.

·Private sector actors (e.g., real estate developers, agribusiness firms) drive innovation.

·NGOs and community groups provide technical support and outreach.

3.1.3 Model 3: Participatory Planning

Cities: Warsaw, Bratislava, Athens, Edinburgh, Vienna

Key Features:

·UA initiatives are co-designed with local communities through participatory mechanisms. Warsaw's 2019 "Neighborhood Gardens" program, for example, empowers residents to identify underutilized public lands and propose garden projects.

·Decision-making authority is decentralized, with neighborhood councils and community land trusts

managing UA sites.

·Capacity-building is prioritized, with workshops and training programs to enhance residents' skills in urban farming and governance.

Tools:

·Participatory budgeting allocating funds for UA projects

·Community land trusts securing long-term land access

·Citizen advisory boards overseeing UA implementation

Stakeholder Role:

·Residents and UA practitioners have significant decision-making power.

·Local governments provide technical support and logistical coordination.

·Universities and research institutions offer expertise and evaluation.

3.2 Policy Outcomes

3.2.1 UA Coverage

Regulatory integration achieved the highest UA coverage:

·Berlin: 0.8 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

·Copenhagen: 0.7 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

·Stockholm: 0.6 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

Incentive-based models showed moderate coverage:

·Lisbon: 0.5 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

·Paris: 0.4 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

·Madrid: 0.3 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

Participatory planning models had lower coverage but higher density of small-scale initiatives:

·Warsaw: 0.4 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

·Vienna: 0.3 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

·Athens: 0.2 hectares per 1,000 inhabitants

3.2.2 Participation Rates

Participatory models recorded the highest participation rates:

·Warsaw: 62% of eligible residents involved in UA initiatives

·Bratislava: 58% participation

·Athens: 55% participation

Regulatory models had moderate participation:

·Berlin: 45% participation

·Copenhagen: 43% participation

·Stockholm: 40% participation

Incentive-based models had the lowest participation:

·Lisbon: 38% participation

·Paris: 35% participation

·Madrid: 32% participation

3.2.3 Perceived Effectiveness

Stakeholder perceptions of effectiveness varied by group:

·Planners favored regulatory models for their predictability and scalability.

·UA practitioners preferred participatory models for their flexibility and community ownership.

·Civil society representatives highlighted incentive-based models as innovative but criticized their reliance on volatile funding streams.

3.3 Barriers to Integration

Several common barriers emerged across the cities:

3.3.1 Land Ownership Conflicts

·75% of interviewees cited competition between UA and commercial development for urban land.

·In cities like Paris and Madrid, rising property values make it difficult to secure long-term land access for UA.

·Privatization of public spaces further limits available land for community gardens.

3.3.2 Funding Constraints

·60% of respondents noted that UA programs are vulnerable to budget cuts during economic downturns.

·In Lisbon, the 2022 budget crisis led to a 40% reduction in UA grants.

·Short-term funding cycles hinder long-term planning and sustainability.

3.3.3 Institutional Fragmentation

·UA governance involves multiple departments (planning, agriculture, health, environment), leading to coordination challenges.

·In Warsaw, for example, overlapping jurisdictions between municipal and district authorities created delays in project approvals.

·Siloed institutional structures limit integrated approaches to UA.

3.3.4 Cultural Attitudes

·In Eastern European cities, 40% of officials viewed UA as a "temporary solution" rather than a long-term planning goal.

·Skepticism about UA's economic viability persists among policymakers in post-industrial cities.

·Immigrant and low-income communities often face exclusion from formal UA programs due to cultural and linguistic barriers.

4. Discussion

4.1 Model Comparisons

The three models of UA integration—regulatory, incentive-based, and participatory—each offer distinct advantages and limitations, reflecting broader trade-offs between stability, flexibility, and inclusivity.

Regulatory Integration: Stability vs. Rigidity

Regulatory models, as seen in Berlin and Copenhagen, provide the strongest guarantees for UA's long-term viability. By embedding UA within statutory frameworks, these cities ensure that UA is not displaced by competing land uses. However, this rigidity can stifle innovation and adaptability. For example, Berlin's protected community gardens require lengthy rezoning processes to accommodate changing neighborhood needs, limiting their responsiveness to emerging challenges such as climate change or demographic shifts.

Incentive-Based Approaches: Flexibility vs. Volatility

Incentive-based models in Lisbon and Paris offer greater flexibility, allowing diverse forms of UA to emerge based on local demand and entrepreneurial initiative. Tax rebates and grants stimulate private investment, leading to innovative projects such as vertical farms and aquaponics systems. However, this reliance on market mechanisms makes UA vulnerable to economic fluctuations. During Portugal's 2022 budget crisis, funding for UA programs was significantly reduced, disrupting ongoing projects and undermining long-term planning.

Participatory Planning: Inclusivity vs. Scalability

Participatory models in Warsaw and Athens excel in fostering social inclusion and community ownership. By empowering residents to co-design UA initiatives, these cities achieve high levels of engagement and local buy-in. However, grassroots initiatives often lack the resources and technical expertise to scale beyond neighborhood levels. This aligns with Morgan's (2015) observation that community-led UA struggles to influence city-wide policy without institutional support.

4.2 Regional Variations

The study reveals significant regional variations in UA governance, reflecting broader policy priorities and cultural contexts.

Northern Europe: Climate Resilience

Cities like Berlin, Copenhagen, and Stockholm prioritize UA as a tool for climate adaptation. UA is integrated into flood mitigation strategies, green infrastructure networks, and urban cooling initiatives. For example, Copenhagen's "Cloudburst Management Plan" incorporates urban gardens to absorb stormwater runoff, reducing flood risks while enhancing biodiversity.

Southern Europe: Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

In Lisbon, Madrid, and Athens, UA is framed as a means of enhancing urban biodiversity and ecosystem services. Rooftop farms and community gardens are designed to support pollinator habitats and improve air quality. Lisbon's "Biodiversity Action Plan" explicitly links UA to the conservation of native plant species and the restoration of urban ecosystems.

Eastern Europe: Post-Industrial Regeneration

Warsaw, Bratislava, and Edinburgh emphasize UA's role in post-industrial regeneration. Brownfields and derelict sites are converted into community gardens and urban farms, revitalizing neglected neighborhoods and creating green jobs. Warsaw's "Garden Districts" initiative transforms former industrial zones into productive landscapes, fostering social cohesion and economic revitalization.

4.3 Toward Multi-Level Governance

The findings highlight the need for a hybrid governance approach that combines the strengths of regulatory, incentive-based, and participatory models. A multi-level governance framework could:

National Level

·Establish minimum standards for UA integration in urban plans (e.g., EU-wide directive on green infrastructure).

·Provide funding and technical assistance to municipalities for UA implementation.

·Promote inter-city knowledge exchange and best practice sharing.

Municipal Level

·Adapt national standards to local contexts using incentives and participatory tools.

·Create dedicated UA units within local governments to streamline coordination.

·Develop long-term funding mechanisms (e.g., green bonds) to insulate UA from budget volatility.

Neighborhood Level

·Empower communities to manage UA initiatives through participatory budgeting and community land trusts.

·Provide technical support and capacity-building to enhance local expertise.

·Foster partnerships between residents, schools, businesses, and NGOs to maximize impact.

This approach addresses the fragmentation identified in our results while leveraging the strengths of each model, ensuring that UA is both scalable and inclusive.

5. Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of urban agriculture (UA) policy frameworks across 12 European cities, revealing diverse approaches to integration and highlighting the complex interplay of actors, rules, and outcomes that shape UA governance. Three distinct models emerged—regulatory integration, incentive-based approaches, and participatory planning—each offering unique advantages and limitations.

Regulatory integration ensures UA's long-term stability but risks disempowering communities and stifling innovation. Incentive-based models foster flexibility and entrepreneurial initiative but depend on volatile funding streams. Participatory planning excels in inclusivity and community ownership but struggles with scalability and resource constraints.

To maximize UA's contribution to sustainable cities, we recommend:

(1) Adopting multi-level governance frameworks that combine national standards with local flexibility.

(2) Establishing dedicated UA units within local governments to streamline coordination and reduce institutional fragmentation.

(3) Investing in long-term funding mechanisms (e.g., green bonds, public-private partnerships) to insulate UA from budget cuts.

(4) Promoting cross-city knowledge exchange, particularly between Eastern and Western European cities, to foster learning and innovation.

(5) Integrating UA into digital planning tools (e.g., 3D city models, GIS platforms) to enhance spatial planning and monitoring.

Future research should explore UA's integration into digital planning tools and assess its impact on food security during crises (e.g., pandemics, climate shocks). Additionally, more attention is needed to the voices of marginalized communities—immigrants, low-income residents, and women—to ensure that UA policies are equitable and inclusive.

In conclusion, urban agriculture holds immense potential as a cornerstone of sustainable urban development. By adopting adaptive, inclusive, and multi-level governance frameworks, European cities can unlock this potential, creating more resilient, equitable, and livable urban environments for future generations.

References

[1] Ackerman, K. (2012). The potential for urban agriculture in New York City: Growing capacity, food security, and green infrastructure. Urban Agriculture & Regional Food Systems, 1(1), 1–12.

[2] Alkon, A. H., & Agyeman, J. (Eds.). (2011). Cultivating food justice: Race, class, and sustainability. MIT

Press.

[3] Artmann, M., & Sartison, K. (2018). The role of urban agriculture as a nature-based solution: A review of ecosystem services provided by urban agriculture. Sustainability, 10(8), 2755.

[4] Barthel, S., & Isendahl, C. (2013). Urban gardens, agriculture, and water management: Sources of resilience for long-term food security in cities. Ecological Economics, 86, 224–234.

[5] Bell, M. M. (2004). Farming for us all: Practical agriculture & the cultivation of sustainability. Penn State University Press.

[6] Campbell, M. (2004). Building a common table: The role for planning in urban food systems. Journal of Planning Education and Research, 23(4), 341–355.

[7] Cohen, N., & Reynolds, K. (2014). Urban agriculture policy making in New York City: A social-ecological system approach. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 13(4), 837–845.

[8] De Bon, H., Parrot, L., & Moustier, P. (2010). Sustainable urban agriculture in developing countries: A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 30(1), 21–32.

[9] Deelstra, T., & Girardet, H. (2000). Urban agriculture and sustainable cities. In Growing cities, growing food: Urban agriculture on the policy agenda. DSE/ZEL.

[10] Dubbeling, M., de Zeeuw, H., & van Veenhuizen, R. (2010). Cities, poverty and food: Multi-stakeholder policy and planning in urban agriculture. RUAF Foundation.

[11] Ericksen, P. J. (2008). Conceptualizing food systems for global environmental change research. Global Environmental Change, 18(1), 234–245.

[12] FAO. (2014). Growing greener cities in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

[13] FAO. (2019). Urban and peri-urban agriculture: Food, jobs, and sustainable cities. Food and Agriculture Organization.

[14] Grewal, S. S., & Grewal, P. S. (2012). Can cities become self-reliant in food? Cities, 29(1), 1–11.

[15] Horst, M., McClintock, N., & Hoey, L. (2017). The intersection of planning, urban agriculture, and food justice: A review of the literature. Journal of the American Planning Association, 83(3), 277–295.

[16] Kaufman, J., & Bailkey, M. (2000). Farming inside cities: Entrepreneurial urban agriculture in the United States. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

[17] Lovell, S. T. (2010). Multifunctional urban agriculture for sustainable land use planning in the United States. Sustainability, 2(8), 2499–2522.

[18] McClintock, N. (2010). Why farm the city? Theorizing urban agriculture through a lens of metabolic rift. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 3(2), 191–207.

[19] Mendes, W. (2008). Implementing social and environmental policies in cities: The case of urban agriculture in Vancouver, Canada. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 32(4), 925–943.

[20] Morgan, K. (2015). Governance, participation and urban agriculture: The case of Detroit. Geoforum, 66, 138–147.

[21] Mougeot, L. J. A. (2005). Agropolis: The social, political and environmental dimensions of urban agriculture. Earthscan.

[22] Ostrom, E. (2005). Understanding institutional diversity. Princeton University Press.

[23] Pothukuchi, K., & Kaufman, J. L. (1999). Placing the food system on the urban agenda: The role of municipal institutions in food systems planning. Agriculture and Human Values, 16(2), 213–224.

[24] Purcell, M., & Tyman, S. K. (2015). Cultivating food as a right to the city. Local Environment, 20(10), 1131–1147.

[25] Santo, R., Palmer, A., & Kim, B. (2016). Vacant lots to vibrant plots: A review of the benefits and limitations of urban agriculture. Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future.

[26] Smit, J., Nasr, J., & Ratta, A. (1996). Urban agriculture: Food, jobs and sustainable cities. United Nations Development Programme.

[27] Tornaghi, C. (2014). Critical geography of urban agriculture. Progress in Human Geography, 38(4), 551–567.

[28] Schans, M., de Zeeuw, H., & Dubbeling, M. (2019). Policy and governance for urban agriculture: An analysis of four global cities. Journal of Cleaner Production, 231, 1281–1290.

[29] Viljoen, A., Bohn, K., & Howe, J. (2005). Continuous productive urban landscapes: Designing urban agriculture for sustainable cities. Architectural Press.

[30] White, M. M. (2011). Sisters of the soil: Urban gardening as resistance in Detroit. Race, Class & Gender, 18(1), 1–13.