

ID 1580 | FEDERAL MY LIFE MY HOUSE ENTITIES PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY ABOUT HIGH QUALITY HOUSING PROVISION IN BRAZIL

Camila D'Ottaviano¹; Adelcke Rossetto Netto²; Cecília Fiúza¹; Sara Uchoa³

¹FAUUSP; ²Integra; ³PUC-SP

camila.dottaviano@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This paper deals with the topic of self-build housing and local facilities in Brazil and Netherlands, as part of the comparative research “Between self-regulation and formal government: the challenges of self-build housing and facilities, BESEFOGO”. Self-build is defined as the practice in which people produce their own house and (collective) neighborhood facilities. This can be with or without the hiring of outside expertise (architect, constructor, workers etc.) or official funding outlets (bank loans, mortgages etc.). Formal institutions and governance systems face increasing difficulties in both countries to satisfy the need for good quality, affordable housing, which is an important condition for socially sustainable urban development. Brazil has a long history of low quality informal self-build housing areas that currently face the challenge to improve regarding tenure security, safety and access to basic needs like sanitation, energy, water and public transport. São Paulo has a long history of innovative policies regarding self-build housing. Initially, the self-help housing occurred mainly on individual lots purchased in peripheral areas, slums and squatter areas. In general, this form of self-help was domestic with possible help of friends and relatives, bringing together groups to a collective building task force. During the last two decades, self-help and collective task forces were steadily incorporated by government housing programs. Programs like São Paulo’s local Self-Management Housing Program (1989-1991), the statewide São Paulo’s Self-help Program (1995) and the federal Solidary Loan Program (PCS, 2004) and My Life My House Entities Program (PMCMV-E, 2009) show the consolidation of a different housing production in Brazilian context. The main research question is: how is the capacity for self-regulation in practices of self-build housing and facilities related to formal governance and regulation domains and how can this relationship be optimized to create more socially sustainable forms of urbanization? This paper analyses as specific case study: Ipiranga Building Project, a retrofit project of an old public empty building in São Paulo central area. This is the first renovation project of an existing building ever approved by federal government program PMCMV-Entities. The building was used as a Justice Court House during the 1970’s and 1980’s. It was left empty after 1992. The housing movement -ULCM – Unificação das Lutas de Cortiços e Moradia (Tenements and Housing Struggle Union) – occupied the building the first time in 1999 and again in 2007. In 2009 the housing movement succeeded to negotiate a donation of the 15-story office building for housing use. In 2012 the donation was reverted into a concession for housing purposes. It is the first time the concession is used within PMCMV-Entities and it also important because it changes the usual Brazilian public housing policy based on private property. The building was transformed completely remodelled and have now 120 apartments with areas ranging from 25.00m² to 58m², a ballroom and support areas for families with incomes up to 3 minimum wages. This paper analyses the opportunity of high quality affordable housing in central areas based on self-help and participative practices in the recent Brazilian experience.

1 HOUSE VERSUS HOME

Dream, shelter, home, place, domestic space, private space, social right, property, status, merchandise, investment, rentier, real estate speculation, freedom, security, problem, crisis, credit guarantee –in Brazilian society there are several meanings and values related to housing. The listed words have an adjective function or come from a direct relation of cause and effect.

Such diversity mirrors the scope and complexity of the theme, with meanings, conflicts, representations, materialization, causes and consequences. The direct confrontation of some of these words shows important relationships: Dream -Merchandise, shelter -property, place -status, social right -crisis, domestic space -rentier, home -credit guarantee, investment -house -speculation, problem -freedom. Such combinations are numerous, each one presents a different issue, focus, or context, with conflicting conceptualizations and approaches, interacting on different aspects -economic, social, environmental, physical -in different areas -architecture, sociology, law, economics, with different expectations -but always disparate looks on the same object (Rossetto Netto 2017).

They are facets of the same issue that exposes their tensions and limits. Housing is necessity, it is product, and it is right that can only be universalized through public policies.

The construction of this narrative that will approach the Brazilian housing scene starts from the primary function of housing, the "dwelling" as the need of every person. To live is to supply the basic needs of man in space, and in this way, more than occupying a place there is a need to exist. In order to exist, the space is occupied and physical and social needs are demanded.

A conflict is placed since housing is primary human need with high added value. And this need, in our extremely unequal capitalist society, has, besides its "use value", a disproportionate "exchange value". These exchange value is much higher than the financial resources of a large part of the Brazilian population.

In the Dictionary of Brazilian Architecture HOUSING is defined as: Place where one lives. It constitutes in architecture, the shelter or shelter that protects the man, favouring its life in the double material and spiritual aspects. Act or effect of dwelling. Home address. Residence (Corona & Lemos, 1972).

2 HOUSING POLICY IN BRAZIL

Historically, the access to housing for the low-income population in Brazil was obtained, in general, in a precarious way and consisted of three basic types of houses: tenements, favelas and land subdivision in the outskirts of the city, including homeownership and self-building. Since the beginning of 20th Century, favelas have been the landmark of the city of Rio de Janeiro. However, since the mid-century, a house in a shanty town has been an important option for the low-income population not only in metropolitan areas, but also in almost all the Brazilian medium-sized and big cities (Pasternak & D'Ottaviano, 2015). The growth of the Brazilian cities throughout the second half of the 20th century was characterized by the configuration of two distinct cities: a legal city, consolidated by the implementation of official land parceling (regularized), usually located in central areas, and designed for housing of middle and upper classes; and an illegal city, designed for housing of low-income class, characterized by the implementation of illegal (or irregular) land subdivision in the peripheral regions of cities, by the consolidation of favelas in diverse areas and by the provision of rooms in tenements in central historical districts.

In 1960, the urbanization rate in Brazil was 44.7%; since then, the concentration of the population in urban zones had gradually grown, changing from 55.9% in 1970 to 67.6% in 1980, and reaching 75.6% in 1991. The 2010 Census indicated that 84.36% of the Brazilian population lived in urban areas.

The demand for housing, urban services and infrastructure has followed the similar process. Brazil, like other countries of the Latin America, has presented an intense process of urbanization, mainly in the second half of the 20th century. In 1940, the urban population represented 26.3% of the total. In 2000, it was 81.2%. Such growth seems to be more impressive if we consider the absolute numbers: in 1940, the population living in cities was 18.8 million of inhabitants, and in 2000 it was approximately 138 million. Therefore, it was verified that in sixty years the urban settlements were increased in order to house more than 120 million people. (...) It is a gigantic movement of building a city, necessary for residential settlement of such population as well as their needs for work, supply, transportation, health, electric power, water, etc. Although the path taken by the urban growth has not responded satisfactorily in this space were established. In any case, offhanded or not, all of the 138 million inhabitants live in cities" (Maricato, 2002:16). The urban growth of the population has concentrated, mainly, in the peripheral regions of the Brazilian cities. In absolute numbers, during the last 40 years the urban areas incorporated virtually 108 million of new dwellers. The final result are cities with extensive peripheral areas, with a big concentration of inadequate housing located in favelas and illegal land subdivisions. Due to the lack of an efficient housing policy for low-income population, the informal housing market has been conclusive in the configuration of our cities (Pasternak and D'Ottaviano, 2015; D'Ottaviano and Quaglia-Silva, 2010).

Until the mid of 1980s, the local government and even the federal government strictly followed the legislation when dealing with such phenomena: according to the regulation, a city should not deal with this use of land. Favelas, for example, were seen as provisional housing and as an illegal solution and, for this reason, were ignored by the government.

According to public policies, innovative experiences, such as the intervention in favela areas of Rio de Janeiro, in the 1950s and, then, in São Paulo, in the 1980s, have paved the way for a new understanding of the ways in which the government could act in the vast irregular areas of the Brazilian cities. Under legal basis, the new Constitution of 1988 advanced by defining the need for an urban policy, as indicated in its articles 182 and 183 – Chapter II – the Urban Policy.

The closing of Banco Nacional de Habitação (National Housing Bank), responsible for the construction of big peripheral housing developments, and the new Federal Constitution marked a period of bigger participation of the cities, including in relation to the housing policy.

The approval of the Statute of the City (Federal Law 10.257), in 2001, defines the right to a city, the right to a respectable house and the social function of property as some of the paradigms of the national urban policy.

João Pinheiro Foundation (2016) estimates that the Brazilian housing deficit in 2014 was 6,068,061 units, 83.9% for families with incomes of up to 3 minimum wages (MW) and 48.2% due to the excessive burden on rent.

The methodologies used to calculate the housing deficit and the Brazilians housing plans show that not every housing problem requires the construction of a new house, and when the new houses are needed it is for families that cannot afford to pay for the unit. The range of housing needs mentioned is eye catching when looking at Brazilian cities. But one must look at the city in a complete and comprehensive way: in some cases the problem is wide open, in others it is spatially separated, but there are also those in which the issue is diffused, scattered or even camouflaged. In each of them the lower income population must find alternative ways to access a house, usually on informal ways (favelas, tenements houses, invasions). It is not by chance that such "solutions" are currently the major housing problems of most cities, especially in large cities.

Methodologically, the João Pinheiro Foundation established a reference for calculating the housing deficit diffused by the country, through the composition of different forms of housing needs: those caused by housing and urban inadequacy, and the demands resulting from demographic growth. In the case of economic attraction poles, such as the Metropolitan Region of São Paulo, the demand stemming from economic dynamics is added.

Recently, in July 2016, the Municipal Department of Housing of São Paulo municipality (Sehab-SP) presented to the population the Notebook for discussion of the Municipal Housing Plan (PMH). This document counts the housing needs from updated numbers of the 2010 IBGE National Census, calculations of the Information System for Social Housing in the City of São Paulo (Habisp) from April 2016, the research of the Foundation Institute of Economic Research (FIPE) for the street population, in addition to the prediction of population growth of the municipality until 2024. Although preliminary, the quantification demonstrates the scope and diversity of the problem. There are different situations of urgency that require different forms of action.

In the composition of the deficit related to housing precariousness, the PMH counts as precarious settlements, in addition to the historically well-known ones -favelas and irregular subdivisions -the irregular housing complexes and the tenements. And in a pioneering way in the country, it adds to this amount the population in situation of street (homeless), understanding this group also as a housing problem. The figures presented for this type of housing demand depict 830,192 households in favelas and irregular subdivisions (445,112 in favelas and 385,080 households in irregular subdivisions), it considers the existence of 20,702 households in irregular housing complexes and indicates the existence of 80,389 households in tenements in the Municipality. The existence of 15,905 homeless in the municipality is added to this universe.

In addition to housing needs related directly to housing and urban precariousness, the PMH discussion notebook counts as housing needs the Family Cohabitation (103,664 households for income brackets of up to 6 SM), Excessive Rental Rent (187,612 households), Excessive Housing Dwellings (47,443 households for income brackets up to 6 MW), in addition to Demographic Growth with additional housing needs of type HIS 1 (up to 3 MW) and HIS 2 (up to 6 MW) by the year 2032 -a portion of the population corresponding to the family income of up to 5 Minimum wages -and premise of 3 inhabitants per housing unit, totalizing 147,151 households (Rossetto Netto 2017).

3 HOUSING IN CENTRAL AREAS

Besides the discussion of the housing deficit we would like to introduce the discussion about what kind of low income public housing we should produce. We note that the best way to meet the rights to housing and the city is through well-located housing what can be understood as have a place where the family nucleus is more appropriately equipped with urban life quality, equipped with public facilities, consolidated urban infrastructure (transportation, health, education, sanitation, culture and leisure), as well as the provision of services and jobs.

Well-located house are not confined to a single consolidated region of the city. In a large city like São Paulo, with expressive intra-urban dynamics, the places with high quality urban life are occupied by higher-income families, or are empty central spaces that have remained outside the real estate interests, or are subnormal enclaves (favelas or slums). The favelas are precarious housing solutions that break up with the formal urban logic of the environment and allow access to employment for lower income families close to their houses (Nakano 2015).

Therefore, a Housing Policy for the centre can reverse socio-spatial segregation identified in the process of emptying the centre (Villaça, 2001). Guaranteeing access to the well-located housing allows the existence of different social classes sharing a democratic space in the city centre. City centre housing policies are a way of breaking conception that only those who can afford the market prices can have access to well-located housing.

In São Paulo all the social housing city centre housing programs are results of the housing movements demands and political action since the 1970's Urban Reform Movement (Silva, 2000; Tsukumo, 2007), and also through the empty buildings organised occupations that started in the late 1980's (Silva, 2000, 2007, Anitelli and Tramontano, 2016). These actions aim to consolidate the revision of the traditional housing projects based on large housing estates implanted peripheral and unstructured areas and without jobs, demanding daily enormous displacements of masses of workers inside the city.

The historical process of urban growth in São Paulo, begun at the end of the 19th century and intensified in the first half of the following century, was based on the Rich Center-Poor Periphery model, in which the central area, a historical site of excellence valued and in the process of verticalization, expelled the lower income population to peripheral areas.

In the first half of the last century, the elite began to move to a sequence of real estate launches, Campos Elíseos, Higienópolis, Pacaembú, the Paulista avenue and Jardins neighbourhoods, which were well suited to modernity and social homogeneity. Sponsored by the State this displacement of the upper classes generated an emptying process at the central area, followed also by the displacement of large companies to other areas of the city, promoting the "decadence" of the centre, and an important socio-spatial segregation that is now São Paulo most important characteristic (Villaça, 2001).

This emptying process generated abandonment and underutilization situations were many high-rise buildings had only the first floor occupied by commercial activities. In other cases, the entire building had been vacated and sealed, like a box intended for storage. Many of those buildings owners failed to honour their taxes, making their property a speculative liability within the city.

Tsukumo (2007) presents the ideological structuring that reinforced this process, with the formation of the idea of degradation, reflecting the popularization of the centre, and the formation of the idea of emptying, motivated by socio-spatial segregation. Although other neighbourhoods emerged as highly valued segregated spaces, São Paulo city centre has never been completely devalued, with a strong popular dynamic. Ferreira (2012) points that the central area concentrates around 17% of formal jobs in the city.

To this ideological structure is added elements raised by Frugoli Jr (2000), such as the abandonment of the Centre by the Real Estate Market with the change in urban legislation, which reduces the coefficient of use (CA) of the lands of the region, fear of violence by the upper classes and the implantation of new infrastructures in the periphery.

The population loss of the central region persisted until the last decades of the last century, when new urban phenomena were also identified in the city, such as peripheral growth, the proliferation of favelas,

the emergence of new centralities and the dissemination of upper classes peripheral fortified enclaves (D'Ottaviano 2008).

The central area demographic dynamics inversion occurs at the turn of the XXth Century to the XXIst, however Nakano (2015) shows that this inversion does not change the inequality in the forms of housing provision for low income families.

4 MY HOUSE MY LIFE ENTITIES FEDERAL PROGRAM

The federal government's My Home My Life (PCMV) housing program was launched in 2009 (PMCMV-1 – Federal Law 11.977), and featured two more issues, PMCMV-2 in 2011 and PMCMV-3 in 2015. Each stage had a total number of new housing units as a goal to be achieved, with a budget corresponding to the specific percentages of the three different service ranges, Group 1 (0 to 3 MW) -Group 2 (3 to 6 MW)-Group 3 (6 to 10 MW). Each group has different grades of subsidy, which was the most important innovation of the Program.

Group 1 has the biggest subsidy, up to 90 % of the housing units' total value. With this subsidy, the PMCMV made possible for the first time to attend low-income families, and transformed smaller incomes into solvent demand for market production. With a national scope, the diversity of urban realities is met with the establishment of maximum values paid for each unit production according to the size and location of the municipality.

The Program was created based on economic objectives to cope with the 2008 global crisis, ignoring the entire structure of the existing national Housing Policy – SNH (Sistema Nacional de Habitação – National Housing System), PLANHAB (Plano Nacional de Habitação – National Housing Plan), SNHIS-FNHIS (Sistema e Fundo Nacional de Habitação de Interesse Social – Social Housing National System and Funding)-and electing private initiative as a promoter to achieve volume and agility. According to Cardoso (2015), the Program implementation process was fast and intense, based on the existing housing programs structures and also in the operation and management experience from the contractors.

As Group 1 production is heavily subsidized, the Program determinates minimum patterns for the housing units that includes size, materials and typology. With that the Program establishes a market anomaly once the Group 1 units are equal to or even better than those for Groups 2 and 3, since for these bands there are no previous requirements, generating commercial harassment on the production of the Group 1. The market seeks to rebut this issue by providing enterprises with better locations and differentiated products such as club condominiums and condominium-closed houses.

Another important point raised by Rossetto Netto (2015) is that as the Program has a physical goal and a pre-determined budget, it is possible to observe a dispute over resources among the Program's different groups, motivated by the economic agents who helped to format it (shimbo, 2010). Defending the PMCMV as a State Policy, the private formulators defend the permanence of the program to allow the agents involved a safe environment for proper planning and the consolidation of the Social Housing Market segment.

This structure of the Policy and the implementation of the program have other consequences. The various ranges, modalities, prices per unit, norms and ordinances issued are forms and attempt to adapt the PMCMV to a large diversity of needs, including for production in the central area. On this dynamic strategy, Loureiro, Macário and Guerra (2014) emphasize that:

“In PMCMV, as in other public policies, there is no clear separation between formulation and implementation, both in terms of participating actors and in relation to the decisions taken in its course, that is, part of the policy design was redefined at the moment of its execution as The response of the government and the management bureaucracy to the social demands not contemplated, the restrictions imposed by the control bodies and even the criticism of specialists and social movements” (Loureiro; Macário and War, 2014 p.24).

In São Paulo the PMCMV production was mostly concentrated in Groups 2 and 3. The Program enabled very few projects in Group 1 although it should be the Program priority as it concentrates more than 80% of the housing deficit.

The PMCMV -Group 1 has two different modalities: the MCMV-FAR (Housing Leasing Fund) and the MCMV-Entities (MCMV-E), each one with a different a set of rules. Despite this, the target audience and the expected maximum values per unit are the same as the minimum specifications of the product and the source of the resources that are fed by the General Budget of the Union (OGU).

The central difference between the two modalities is in the promoter agent. For MCMV-FAR the promoter is a private economic agent, with direct action in the civil construction sector, who is responsible for all the construction work. For MCMV-E non-profit private entities are responsible for the projects and work. In Brazil these entities are mostly housing cooperatives that are not included in the civil construction production chain but act politically to guarantee the right to housing for their associates.

As reported, the attendance of this income group was only possible given the high amount of subsidy predicted by the Program, thus achieving unprecedented within the Brazilian Housing Policy by attending the lowest income range of the population with volume, scope and certain continuity.

The requirements for the beneficiaries' framework in the program are: they cannot be holders of active real estate financing in the country, nor be owners of residential property in the national territory; cannot have any kind of direct or indirect housing subsidies with Federal Government funds (FGTS, FDS, FAR, FNHIS); cannot be contemplated before in a housing program; have no restrictions in any of the federal system or federal revenue..

The value allocated to the operation, in the case of a construction company, is the maximum value per unit and is not limited to construction costs alone. The same happens in the MCMV-E and in the execution of the work the entity can choose different construction regimes, being possible the Self-management by self-construction, by *mutirão* or by direct administration, or co-management (shared management) through the global work contract for a company construction company. In this modality, the maximum value per unit provided for the range is only possible for the global works regime, with the direct contracting of a construction company to take over the work of the enterprise. For all options linked to self-management there is a reduction of 8% (eight percent) of the maximum value per unit. For builders, the process requires working capital for the execution, since the remuneration of the program is given by measuring the service performed and for the entities there is the advance for the execution of the next month

In the composition of the Investment, the enterprise can count on a counterpart of the States, Municipalities and, in the case of MCMV-E, on the part of the final beneficiaries.

All costs of the operation -direct costs of land, project, technical advice, work administration, work execution, taxes, fees and related fees, social work, including the administration of the operating bank - must be paid by the project revenue: the amount raised by multiplying the number of units by the value of the operation plus the counterparts.

This format, which adopts as reference the maximum value for the production of a housing unit, was established by the PAR, and should guarantee: minimum square footage for unit, minimum architectural specifications as unit area, measurements of environments, finishes, beyond of specific percentages for budget and operation items, such as a maximum of 15% of the value to purchase the land, 1.5% -3% for the project, 1.5% or 2% for Social Work, among others.

The amount of the financing, which the beneficiary will pay, refers exclusively to the transaction value, the amount released by the MCMV without counterparts. This amount is amortized over a period of 120 months, with families paying instalments corresponding to a maximum of 15% of gross family income. The difference in the value of the financing is assumed by the FAR or FDS in the form of a non-refundable subsidy, divided into 120 benefits.

In the case of the city of São Paulo, the enterprises could also count on the possibility of contributing up to R\$ 20,000.00 (U\$ 6,000.00) per unit through the Casa Paulista -State Government Agency, once the program architectonic and urbanistic specifications are met. And since 2014, an additional contribution from the municipality, of same value, through the Casa Paulista Program was approved.

In addition to the direct subsidy to the beneficiary, the program also has production subsidy through the Special Taxation Regime (RET), in which there is the unification of federal and state taxes levied on housing production, with the definition of a value of 1% on the total cost of work for collection. The Municipal Service Tax (ISS) is exempt for PMCMV-Group 1. The RET is also available for the others Program groups, but with incorporations values differentiated by 4%.

Within the market segment, the format established for the PMCMV -Group 1 is understood as construction at cost price (Rocha Lima Jr, 2009). This range is not attractive to real estate developers, since the operation to be carried out is cost-effective, respecting the minimum specifications of the Program, without profit margins within the values practiced. And Gregorio (2013) demonstrates that even when working at cost, the result margins are negative with variations of more than 5% in deviations in the behaviour of key variables, such as construction costs, requiring a strict monitoring and control system.

Marques and Rodrigues (2013) point out the low production of MCMV-Group 1 in the São Paulo Metropolitan Region (RMSP) -about 35% of the total -almost half of the national average, and accounting for only 7% of the deficit of this specific band. If the representativeness of RMSP is already low, production in the city of São Paulo is also small, as it is verified that up to the middle of 2015, the largest municipality in population of the country had about 1% of the total produced in Group 1. In the central region, the projects are practically non-existent, reinforcing the peripheral pattern of low-income housing production. In this region, the authors only identify PMCMV-Group 2 and Group 3 production. (Rossetto Netto 2017).

The values of the land and the valuation of the central region, as well as the increase of a new middle class with capacity for payment, also potentiated by the Program itself, weigh on this competition. And so, housing in the Centre contradicts the foundations of MCMV: the primacy of private initiative involved in choosing which products to offer, where to deploy them and who to destine them, freely exploiting land rents. (Anitelli and Tramontano, 2016 p.86)

5 THE IPIRANGA BUILDING

The Ipiranga Avenue project is paradigmatic as a case study as it is an existing building reformation project for the PMCMV-Group 1 using the Entities modality. The project was possible after a partnership between Integra (Technical Assistance Studio) and Unificação das Lutas de Cortiços e Moradia – ULCM (Housing and Tenements Struggle Unification) – an old partnership between architecture and engineering technicians and one of the São Paulo housing movements.

The Ipiranga project is a reform with change of use. The building located at Avenida Ipiranga, 1225/1235 - Santa Ifigênia, approved in 1965, was purchased by the Federal Government on April 1, 1970, to be used by the 2nd Region Regional Labor Court. Until the beginning of 2000's the building was hosted 23 Conciliation and Trial Boards of the capital.

The first approach to the property was made in 2007, with negotiations initiated by the at the São Paulo State Department of Patrimony in São Paulo (SPU-SP). The feasibility process began in 2009, with the donation of the property to ULCM, and its contracting took place in August 2014. The works began in the end of 2014.

Despite the approach and prospection of ULC, the real destination of the property for housing production was only possible in 2006, under the government of then President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, in which Provisional Measure 335 was issued, transformed in the following year into Law n No. 11,481 (May 31, 2007), providing for the allocation of properties belonging to the Union Patrimony for social housing purposes.

In the survey conducted by the housing movement, which resulted in the construction of the Ipiranga Avenue building, the movement attempted to occupy SPU's property located at Avenida Cásper Líbero, 88, during the Scream of Excluded in September 2007. At the time of entry of the building there was an approach of soldiers of the Army present there, since the property had already been destined to the Brazilian Army. This apparent failure opened the possibility of identification of the building of Ipiranga, its occupation and following negotiation together to Secretaria de Patrimônio da União – SPU (Secretariat of the Union Patrimony).

At the first moment ULCM start a direct negotiation with the SPU. As the negotiation did not work, the movement occupied the building for a short time during 2009.

With the progress of the housing movement negotiations with SPU-SP, through the Working Group, considering the guideline for better utilization of the own nationals with potential of use for housing purposes of social interest, and with the deepening of understandings on the issue , in September 9th, 2009 the SPU issued Ordinance No. 179 in which declared a list of 33 properties in the State of São Paulo of Public Interest, with the building of Avenida Ipiranga in the list of these properties.

Implanted in plot with 520.00 m², the building has 7,123.00m², 18 floors -underground, ground floor, mezzanine, 15 Floors with 3 Types, and penthouse. The project enabled 120 UH with footages varying from 24.47m² to 46.21m², through the MCMV-Entities. The inauguration scheduled for March 2017 had to be postponed because of the federal financing bank rules.

The contract established the following resources:

- PMCMV – R\$ 76,000/unit (US\$ 23,000)
- São Paulo State Government / Casa Paulista – around R\$ 20,000/unit (US\$ 6,000)
- São Paulo Municipality / Casa Paulistana – around R\$ 3,900/unit (US\$ 1,200)
- São Paulo municipality budget was need due to the reduction of the federal transfer and consequent extension of the schedule. (Rossetto Netto 2017).



Figures 1-3 – Ipiranga Building and renovation project (Integra 2014) (Camila D’Ottaviano 2015)



Figures 4-7 – Ipiranga Building – Renovation Work



Figures 8-9 – Ipiranga Building Dwellers Meeting (Cecília Andrade 2016)



Figures 10-13 – Ipiranga Building – Renovation Work (Camila D'Ottaviano 2016)

6 CONCLUSIONS

We understand that the only way to achieve the desired right to housing is through the understanding that housing are both need and product. Housing in a central area, as proposed by the Ipiranga building project, presented in this article, aims to ensure in the context of the city of São Paulo full housing with access to all urban attributes of the city -infrastructure, services and public equipment, economic dynamics and employment opportunities, culture and leisure democratic supply, easily accessible and connected by the abundant public transport network. São Paulo city centre is a extremely qualified space, that was historically abandoned by the richer families.

Proposing housing in the Centre for the lower income families is, therefore, to attack spatial segregation and social disparity through the same action. It is a guarantee of rights possible only through political action, with a public policy that enables trough housing a new redistributive access to the city, that provides a more democratic city in which inequality is not abyssal. Guarantee the right to housing and to the city for the lower income families is also to provide dignity and life meaning instead of mere survival (Rossetto Netto 2017).

A democratic Housing Policy needs a change in its productive base by altering its traditional patrimonialist logic, since the need is to live and not possess goods, besides understanding the reality of the city Centre, the specificities of the urban fabric, requiring change in the size of the interventions and incorporating the requalification of existing buildings as a premise, recycling the built heritage and the way to build the city at the same time. They are essential attentions related to the productive costs, including ensuring urban quality, meeting the specific demand profile and understanding the environmental appeal for the area, as well as for the growth of the city (Rossetto Netto 2017).

The analysis of the dynamics in the central area of São Paulo and its housing aspects since the end of XXth century, as well as the actions from the real estate market, the housing movements and public agents and public programs reinforce the importance to encounter the priority demand to guarantee democratic space, reuse of existing buildings, guaranteeing the public offer of housing.

For the feasibility of central areas social housing the first challenge to be faced is the land issue. The value of land and of real estate in central areas almost always makes social housing projects unfeasible.

The Brazilian legislation (City Statute) indicates that all property must fulfil its social function. However, in the legal sphere, the social function of property is always overlaid by the right to property.

In this sense, the Ipiranga Building project is paradigmatic because, despite all the restrictions and difficulties, it shows how it is possible to provide a housing project for the very low income population with a high standard architectural project in a central area, with the participation of the housing movements and not based on private property.



Figures 14-16 – Ipiranga Building – Inauguration (Camila D’Ottaviano, December 2016)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- ANITELLI, F.; TRAMONTANO, M. Abandonados por uns, Ocupados por outros: edifício de apartamentos no Centro Paulistano. In: Rev. Bras. Estud. Urb anos Reg., V.18, N.1, p.77D91: RECIFE,
- BONDUKI, N. Do Projeto Moradia ao Programa Minha Casa, Minha Vida. Revista Teoria e Debate. São Paulo, n.82, 2008.
- BRASIL. Lei Federal 10.257, July 10th 2001, Estatuto da Cidade (City Statute). Regulamenta os arts. 182 e 183 da Constituição Federal, estabelece diretrizes gerais da política urbana e dá outras providências.
- BRASIL. Lei n.11.977, July 7th 2009. Dispõe sobre o Programa Minha Casa, Minha Vida – PMCMV e a regularização fundiária de assentamentos localizados em áreas urbanas.
- BRASIL. Lei n.12.424, June 16th 2011. Dispõe sobre o Programa Minha Casa, Minha Vida – PMCMV 2 e a regularização fundiária de assentamentos localizados em áreas urbanas.
- CARDOSO, A.L.; MELLO, I.Q.; JAENISCH.S.T. A implementação do Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida na Região Metropolitana do Rio de Janeiro: agentes, processos e contradições. In: SANTO AMORE, C.; SHIMBO, L. Z.; RUFINO, M.B.C. [Orgizadores] Minha Casa...e a Cidade? Avaliação do Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida em seis Estados Brasileiros. Capítulo 4, p.73D102. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital, 2015.
- CORONA, E.& LEMOS, E. Dicionário da Arquitetura Brasileira. São Paulo: EDART, 1972
- D’OTTAVIANO, C. Condomínios Fechados na Região Metropolitana de São Paulo: fim do modelo rico versus periferia pobre? PhD Thesis. São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2008.
- D’OTTAVIANO, C. & QUAGLIA-SILVA, S.L. (2010). Regularização Fundiária No Brasil: velhas e novas questões. Revista Planejamento e Políticas Públicas – PPP IPEA, no 34, pp.57-84.
- FERREIRA, J. (coord.) Produzir casas ou construir cidades? Desafios para um novo Brasil urbano. Parâmetros de qualidade para a implementação de projetos habitacionais e urbanos. São Paulo: LABHAB; FUPAM, 2012.
- FRÚGOLI JR, H. Centralidade em São Paulo: trajetórias, conflitos, e negociações na metrópole. São Paulo: Ed. Cortez – EDUSP, 2000. Fundação João Pinheiro. Déficit Habitacional no Brasil | 2013–2014. Belo Horizonte: FJP, 2016.
- GREGÓRIO, C. Minha Casa Minha Vida (MCMV) Discussão sobre a atratividade dos empreendimentos voltados à Faixa 1 após alterações dos preços máximos das unidades. São Paulo: NRED POLI, 2013.
- LOUREIRO, M. R.; MACÁRIO, V.; GUERRA, P. H. Democracia, arenas decisórias e políticas públicas: o Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida. In: GOMIDE, Alexandre de Ávila; PIRES, Roberto Rocha C. (ed.) Capacidades estatais e democracia: arranjos institucionais de políticas públicas. pp. 113D136. Brasília: IPEA, 2014.
- MARICATO, E. (2002). Brasil, cidades. Alternativas para a crise urbana. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.
- MARQUES, E. & RODRIGUES, L. O Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida na metrópole paulistana: atendimento habitacional e padrões de segregação In RBEUR – Revista Brasileira de Estudos Populacionais, v. 15 n.2 , 2013.
- NAKANO, K. Desigualdades Habitacionais no “Repovoamento” das Áreas Centrais de São Paulo. Anais XVI Enanpur. Belo Horizonte, 2015. ASTERNAK, S. & D’OTTAVIANO, C.. Favelas: intervention policies and practices regarding precarious dwelling in Brazil. In ALDRICH, Brian and SANDHU, Ravinder. Low-income household in the urbanizing word: retrospect and prospects. Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 2015.ROCHA LIMA JR, 2009

ROSSETTO NETTO, A. Política Pública Habitacional e sua Avaliação. Anais XVI Enanpur. Belo Horizonte, 2015a. Rossetto Netto, A. HABITAÇÃO CENTRAL Produção Habitacional no Centro de São Paulo, no âmbito do Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida – Faixa 1. Master Dissertation. São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2017.

SÃO PAULO – Prefeitura. Plano Municipal de Habitação PMH 2009-2024. Sao Paulo: PMSP, 2016.

SHIMBO, L. Z. Habitação Social, habitação de mercado: a confluência entre estado, empresas construtoras e capital financeiro. Tese de Doutorado. Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo – USP. São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2010.

SILVA, H. M. B. Habitação no Centro de São Paulo: como viabilizar essa idéia? São Paulo: LabhabFAUUSP / CEF, 2000.

TSUKUMO, I. T. L. Habitação social no centro de São Paulo: legislação, produção, discurso. Dissertação de Mestrado. Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo – USP. São Paulo: FAUUSP 2007

VILLAÇA, F. Espaço intraurbano no Brasil. São Paulo: Studio Nobel: FAPESP: Lincoln Institute,

ID 1603 | PROGRESSIVE CONVERGENCE BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INITIATIVES IN CITY PLANNING AND URBAN POLICY: THE CASE STUDY OF KERAMEIKOS

Gripsiou Argyro¹

¹Laboratory of Demographic and Social Analysis-University of Thessaly

yrwgrips@hotmail.com

1 INTRODUCTION

Urban rehabilitation is defined as a process of improving deprived urban environments through enhancing the physical structure and varying the density established within urban areas. Major initiatives have been introduced to attract residential, transport, economic and leisure uses and activities, resulting in mutations of the spatial, social and economic structure of urban spaces (Nobre, 2002).

During the last decades a great amount of urban and social studies has started to acknowledge the significant role and useful experience of these processes in cities on specific case-studies across the world. The de-industrialization and the loss of manufacturing employment in many urban areas have led to the prevalence of consumption-based, arts-led forms of economic regeneration intended to tackle urban problems (Raco, 2002). Extending this discussion to the Athenian context, this paper examines the strategies of urban rehabilitation-regeneration and gentrification in relation to arts-led regeneration, as well as the effects of the progressive co-ordination between private and public urban development initiatives in Kerameikos. This case study serves towards an optimum understanding of the phenomenon, analyzing the practices followed by local authorities and private investors in the regeneration scheme alongside their spatial, social and economic implications. More specifically, the study approaches urban governance policies, focusing on urban enhancement practices and particular policing measures which aim at the extraction of "social pollutants" from certain city neighbourhoods (Urry, 1995).

International competition among cities has led to the implementation of policies favoring investors and private capital to the detriment of the local population (Harvey, 2000). Further to a brief assessment of the evolution of urban policies in the Athenian context over the last thirty years, the paper interrogates the social and spatial landscape of Kerameikos, taking into account the obstacles posed by the financial crisis in implementing and evolving the gentrification agenda and, consequently, in developing the real estate market. Urban enhancement interventions regarding both the physical environment and the social composition had been made in the pre-crisis period, however the outburst of the economic crisis put an end to an era of soaring land prices and to the "intrusion" of higher income groups. It is worth noting that the population composition has been partially dominated by distinct cultural groups of middle-low social strata.