

ID 1604 | KNOWLEDGE AND VISIBILITY OF COHOUSING. ACCEPTANCE OF COHOUSING IN MADRID SOCIETY

Anais Garcia Perez¹
¹ETSAM
anaisgpe@gmail.com

1 INTRODUCTION

The issue of housing and urban regeneration is not left out of the social context of globalization in which the society is immersed. It produces an alienation of the individual who is forced to live in spaces that do not always respond to the needs that his/her lifestyle demands.

This paper presents cohousing as a more social and egalitarian habitat movement in the urban context. It is a type of collective housing that mixes numerous common spaces with private spaces that guarantee the privacy of the individual. One of the fundamental features of this type of collectivity is the management of all common spaces by its residents, generating an integrated social coexistence of all the inhabitants.

The concept of cohousing generates different images in people, from ideological approaches to points of view related to sustainability or associations with the concept of commune. Other people see it as a different way of organizing their daily tasks in community, or as a cooperative. There is also the vision of cohousing as a more economical way of life. The different interpretations that it causes can be a sign of the increasing interest in this lifestyle.

This article is structured as follows. First, it tells what cohousing is and where it's come from. Second, it analyzes the knowledge of cohousing in Madrid society. Finally it gives some concrete examples of cases of cohousing in Madrid.

2 WHAT IS COHOUSING?

The term "cohousing" is a registered trademark of McCamant and Durrett. In their research McCamant and Durrett defines cohousing like a form of collective housing that vary in size, location, type of ownership, design and priorities but has four common characteristics, (McCamant and Durrett, 1988): 1.- Participatory process: residents organize and participate in the design and planning process for the housing development, and are responsible as a group for all final decisions 2.- Intentional Neighborhood Design; The physical design encourages a strong sense of community. 3.- Extensive common facilities; an integral part of the community, common areas are designed for daily use, to supplement private living areas. 4- Complete resident management; residents manage the development, making decisions of common concern at community meetings.

In Denmark around 1960, people frustrated by the available housing options have developed a new housing type that redefines the concept of neighbourhood to fit contemporary lifestyles. They have built housing that combines the autonomy of private dwellings with the advantages of community living. Each household has a private residence, but also shared extensive common facilities with larger group, such as kitchen and dining hall, children's playrooms, and laundry facilities. Although individual dwellings are designed to be self sufficient and each has its own kitchen.

They wanted a place where children would live near playmates, where individuals would have a feeling of belonging, where they would know people of all ages, and where they would be able to grow old and continue to contribute productively.

Cohousing provides the community support that they missed in their previous homes. Cohousing is a grass-roots movement that grew directly out of people's dissatisfaction with existing housing choices. Cohousing developments are not targeted for any specific age or family type; residents represent a cross section of old and young families and singles.

Cohousing also differs from most of the international communities and communes which are often organized around strong ideological beliefs and may depend on a charismatic leader to establish the direction of the community and hold the group together. Most intentional communities function as educational or spiritual centers. Cohousing, on the other hand, offers a new approach to housing rather than a new way of life. Based on democratic principles, cohousing developments espouse no ideology other than the desire for a more practical and social home environment. (McCamant and Durrett, 1988).

Cohousing communities are unique in their extensive common facilities, and more importantly in that they are organized, planned and managed by the residents themselves. The great variety in their size, ownership structure, and design illustrates the many diverse applications of this concept.

In many respects, cohousing is not a new concept. In the past, most people lived in villages or tightly knit urban neighborhoods. Members of such communities know each others families and histories, talents and weaknesses. This kind of relationship demands accountability, but return provides security and a sense of belonging. Cohousing offers a contemporary model for re-creating this sense of place and neighborhood, while responding to today's needs for a less constraining environment.

Vestbro (2000) defines five types of collective housing in which there are three types of cohousing. The classification is the next.

First group is the collective housing with a central kitchen. In this group there are three types, the classical with employed staff, the cohousing communal work and the cohousing for the elderly people. Second group is another type of cohousing, Danish cohousing. The different between Danish and Swedish cohousing is that Danish is focus on sense of community and Swedish cohousing was born to reduce the burden of house work. Nevertheless, two models are similar. The third group is for service block, or integrated service center, in order to facilitate housework and communal participation. The fourth group of collective housing is for special categories like ederly people, students or residents with any dysfunction. And the last group is the commune, more than four person live and eat together usually in a large one-family unit.

Whit this classification we can say that for Vestbro cohousing is a type of collective housing that share common areas, specially the kitchen and the dining room, and that intensifies the sense of community and help whit the housework. We can annotate that elderly cohousing is defines like a different type of cohousing.

For Martin Field cohousing is a particular style of neighbourhood development, based upon a creative combination of private and communal facilities (Field, 2004). Field picks up the definitions of cohousing from McCamant & Durrett (1988), Fromm (1991), Zahlle and Mortensen (1992) and Hanson (1996) and establish four principles of cohousing: 1.-> Designing for intentional neighbourhoods: Design features to maximize intentional and incidental social contact between the people living there. 2.-> The minimum provision of private and common facilities; all residents have private and self-contained accommodation that is supplemented by other common facilities. 3.- Size and scale to support community dynamics; is important to achieve between creating common identity in a neighbourhood's residents alongside sustaining a sufficient level of privacy for each household in that neighbourhood. 4.-> Residents' control and management, the residents are the collectively responsible for managing the neighbourhood and its facilities.

He defines the four distinctive of cohousing neighbourhoods; cohousing combination of private and communal space, cohousing approach to designing for social interaction, cohousing focus upon sustainable dynamics and cohousing emphasis on collective decision-making.

Like Meltzer remembered, the concept of cohousing is not new, it has roots in utopian, feminist, preindustrial western societies, where small communities used to live and sustain themselves by sharing resources, property and aspirations (Meltzer 2005).

Williams (2007) remember McCamant and Durrett to define cohousing, and resumes the four principles: 1.-> Social contact design: the physical design encourages a strong sense of community. 2.-> Extensive common facilities: as an integral part of the community common areas are designed for daily use, to supplement private living areas. 3.-> Resident involvement in the recruitment, production and operational

processes. 4.→ Collaborative lifestyles offering inter-dependence, support networks, sociability and security.

Communities comprise private units (in which households reside) and communal facilities.

They are planned based on social contact design principles that reportedly encourage more social interaction, helping to build more cohesive communities (Williams 2005)

The international cohousing association define cohousing as a type of collaborative housing in which residents actively participate in the design an operation of their own neighbourhoods. Cohousing residents are consciously committed to living as community. The physical design encourages both social contact and individual. (Cohousing.org)

Matthieu Lietaert (Lietaert , 2009) in her research defines cohousing as an models that is develop in an urban or semi urban context, but not in rural context. Cohousing communities have shown a constructive alternative to the growing atomization and loneliness of individuals in large cities. Lietaert defines six characteristics of cohousing; 1.→ Participatory process. Cohousers manage the whole process from scratch, they can be helped by exporters but they are in the driver’s seat. 2.→Intentional neighbourhood design. 3.→Extensive common facilities, common facilities and activities must be given vital attention. 4.→ Cohousing community must have complete resident management. It is fundamental that cohousers meet on a regular basic to take decisions. 5.→ Absence of hierarchy; clear mechanisms are create to ensure that everyone gets a fair opportunity to express their ideas during the meetings. 6.→ Incomes are separated. Cohousing community is not a commune.

Francesco Chiodelli & Valeria Baglione (2014) defines cohousing with five characteristics that are necessary and sufficient to define a settlement as cohousing. 1.→ Communitarian multi-functionality: Cohousing communities are always characterized by the coexistence of both residential functions and communal spaces and facilities. These are intended for the community members, and are directly managed by them. Common spaces and facilities do not usually replace private ones, but do lead to the reduction of private housing areas 2.→ Constitutional and operational rules of a private nature, Cohousing communities are characterized by rules of a private nature introduced by residents to guarantee and defend the specificity and working of the community 3.→ Residents’ participation and self-organization, An essential characteristic of cohousing is the high degree of participation of the residents in the cohousing community’s life. Generally speaking, this is true both in the community’s constitution phase and in the daily management phase 4.→ Residents’ self-selection The creation of a cohousing community is achieved through the self-selection of future residents, generally, before the physical realization of the settlement. The recruitment of aspirant cohousers is carried out according to informal processes, of almost an empathic nature. 5.→ Value characterization. The cohousing community is created and developed on the basis of certain values, more or less powerful or explicit according to the situation. This value characterization is essential to reach the aim, typical of all cohousing, to create ‘a strong and vibrant community

After reviewing the definitions of cohousing since the beginning of the study and taking into account the evolution of both the history and the historical model, we will try to give a definition that serves not only to understand the concept, which is quite clear after the research but also to analyze the case of study that we face.

Cohousing is a type of collective housing that combines enough private space (houses) with a lot of common areas. The idea is to live in community and share the live in the common areas. We think that cohousing has several characteristics (Figure 1);

- a. Voluntary and participatory process. The residents are involved in the process since the first step, it means that are they who look for a group of people that are interesting in this kind of lifestyle. And then, the residents will participate in the rest of the steps like to choose the site, design the project (private and common areas) and manage the community.
- b. Design an intentional neighborhood and a kind of lifestyle. The design of the project must be intentional to maximize the social contact between the residents, it means that life in cohousing is a kind of lifestyle, is not only to share spaces, is to share activities and part of the lifetime, is to spend time in the management of the community and in the common life.

- c. Size, scale and function of the spaces. It is important to say that cohousing provides enough private space to have a good privacy to the cohousers. The relation between the size of the private and common spaces will be proportionate. The function of the private space is the privacy and the independence of every resident. And the common areas are for the life in the community, it means doing things in commons with the other residents, this space are not an extension of the private area. The extensive common areas are not residual, on the contrary, are the heart of the cohousing.
- d. Residence management and absence of hierarchy. The residents are who takes the decisions of the community. For this process is important to have some rules, to the vote or to how make the decision. But is also very significant that there is not a boss or a leader in the community, in this sense each resident must have the same power of decisions.
- e. Urban or semi urban location. Cohousing as an alternative to the growing atomization and loneliness of individuals in large cities must have an urban or a semi urban location. We think that cases like eco-villages don't respond to this characteristic, because tend to be more rural.
- f. Non-speculative, affordable housing. Cohousing was born like another kind of housing in a social context.

Cohousing is an expression of contemporary citizenship, citizens actively taking housing and environment situation in their own hand.



Figure 1 – cohousing definition

3 SURVEY ANALYSIS

For this purpose, a survey was carried out (through an e-mail campaign resulting in a sample of 110 people), which consists of two distinct parts, one related to the social group and type of household to which the interviewed person belongs, and another one related to the knowledge that society has of cohousing; both at an intuitive level (what does it suggest?) and at a rational level (once the concept is explained). (Appendix 1).

The results of the survey give us the little knowledge that Madrid society has about cohousing. Only one third of the sample claim to know that it is cohousing and once their cohousing definitions have been analyzed, we could say that only a quarter of them are close to the concept. The knowledge about the part of coexistence or sharing of spaces is appreciated, however nobody mentions the part of management, maintenance and participation of the same. There is, therefore, a more traditional cooperative vision, in which the involvement and participation of the residents is not a fundamental part of the way of life.

After knowing the definition of cohousing the majority of the sample (90%), thinks that it is an interesting idea, however only 56% of them would live this way.

Once known the movement of cohousing the main negative points pointed out by the respondents are the possible lack of privacy, community functioning and problems with residents. The main positive points are the common spaces, the economy of access to housing, participation in design and community and recovery of neighborhood life.

It is significant that half of the sample (50.90%) miss the common spaces in their home compared to only 20.90% who stated that they did not miss them. It should be noted that 28% of the respondents had not considered the possibility of having common spaces.

The most popular common spaces are in this order: parking for bikes (17), workspace (16), library (15), sports space (11), nursery (9), meeting rooms or common room (8), swimming pool (8), laundry (7).

Only 12.62% of the sample believed that common spaces would not generate problems in the community. A large majority believe that problems with common spaces would be abundant due to lack of agreements, lack of maintenance or misuse of them, as well as lack of involvement on the part of residents.,

At the end of the survey , when the concept of cohousing has been defined, people must to describe cohousing whit three words. The most recurrent words are; community (28/225), sharing (18/225), coexistence (9/225), saving (6/225), collaboration (6/225), socialism (6/225), sustainability (5/225), management (3/225), respect (4/225), commitment (3/225) and cooperation, (3/225).

The results obtained indicate that there is not enough knowledge of cohousing in Madrid society. The concept generates different ideas in people but not is the right concept in many times. This made people are not sure about the concept, it is not clear so is an unknown concept that generates respect.

In the other hand, when people know something about it, generally are interested in there and many times look like an attractive concept. It may mean that whit a greater and better diffusion of this movement, will be more people interested in it.

It is also important to re- mark that the idea of shared spaces frequently generates afraid, it could be because the culture, and because the wrong use of the shared spaces that people are used to do.

4 STUDY OF CASES

During the last years, several movements related to cohousing have appeared in Madrid. In this article, and as part of the visibility of the movement in Madrid society, we have analyzed three cases of associations or groups that are created around the idea of cohousing: Trabensol, Entrepatis and Jubilares.

All the cases of study work in the same property regime, a regime not very widespread in Madrid society and that seems to be suitable for this type of movements. This is the right of use regime and works as follows (Figure 2).

The main thing is that the property of the lot and the building is of the cooperative, and each resident is a partner of the same. This means that the property does not fall on the resident. To be part of the cooperative you have to be a member through a monthly fee.

In order to be part of the project as a future resident, an initial monetary contribution must be made, which will be returned in the event of abandonment of the project, it means, when the person ceases to be a resident. In addition to this initial fee, the resident contributes a monthly fee that covers the different expenses that have the maintenance of the cohousing project to which he belongs.

The characteristics of this property regime allow the resident to have the security of permanence in the accommodation, flexibility of abandonment of the same, saving and liquidity. As for society, it is a model that is not speculative, promotes social relations and values sustainability and architectural quality. The right of use is not hereditary, but yes the initial fee is provided.



Figure 2 -Right of use regime scheme

4.1 CASE 1: TRABENSOL

Trabensol (Workers in Solidarity) begins with a group of friends who at the end of the 90s raised the problem of how to live the last years of life. Aware of the few possibilities present in society, decide to start thinking about a project which has an objective: to search together a satisfactory way to spend the last years of life. (trabensol.org)

They begin in 2000 with the formation of the group of people interested in the project, in 2002 they form the cooperative and start with the search of land in different municipalities of Madrid. They also start with a savings fund for the project. In 2006 they bought the land classified as rural in Torremocha del Jarama. They continue to search the architects and to form the groups of work of the cooperative. In 2008 they get the change of land use (from rural to urban) and start with the construction of the building. In 2013 they begin to live there (Figure 3).

The cooperative Trabensol has two fundamental characteristics, the property in regime of right of use and the organization of the same by groups of work, that even worked before establishing the cooperative. The basic principles of Trabensol are solidarity and cooperation.



Figure 3 - Trabensol organization scheme

The Trabensol project brings together a group of people who already had experience in cooperatives and community supporters and citizen participation. It is not based on cohousing, nor does it take into account since they did not know it. However, both its process, design and operation closely resemble those of the cohousing movement.

The project consists of 54 identical housing units, in size, distribution and orientation; And with many common areas; Classrooms for workshops, library, gym, geriatric bath, socio-sanitary space, kitchen, dining room, laundry, large garden, orchard and greenhouse (Table 1).

Trabensol							
Stars	Number of cohousing	First cohousing	State	Number of units	Type of cohousing	Type of property	Location
2000	1	2013	Active	54	Senior	Right of use	Semi-Urban

Table 1. Resume table Trabensol

Now the admission of new residents in Trabensol are managed by a waiting list, when a resident leaves the accommodation or dies, the updated initial fee is returned to him or his heirs, and the next resident is accessed according to the waiting list. The requirements to be part of Trabensol are to be between 50 and 70 years old, to have good health at the time of their adhesion; Have the financial resources that make it possible to acquire the participation in the property of the cooperative group and to be able to face the monthly quota.

Trabensol project is currently active and has a long waiting list. In addition, it has been perfectly integrated in the municipality, offering to the neighbors a new center with activities, since it is not a project enclosed in itself, but participates in the life of the municipality.

4.2 CASE 2: ENTREPATIOS

Entrepatis is in its origin a collective formed by a group of friends who are interested in cohousing because they are looking for different housing options. Entrepatis is born like an idea in 2007. This idea contains a component of claim; build houses that fight against speculation, with a social model, and more community.

Ten years ago take place the first movements, however, the most decisive steps start in 2012 when they already have a statutes and are a registered cooperative. Approximately 80% of the people who started with the collective are still in he. The intention is not to be a single group but to be several groups or several projects, although each resident only belongs to a cohousing project. (Bensadón, L, personal communication, February 1, 2017). The three pillars that guide Entrepatis are; Social, economic (ethical banking) and ecological.

During their career they have been close to getting two lots previously, but nevertheless finally it was not possible, either by the bureaucratic subjects, or by the financial ones. In this time has been interested enough people for the movement. It is important to say that there are many people who are interested in the moment in which there is a concrete plot of study, although it is not still bought, but that falls of the project if it does not leave that plot in particular. The stakeholders that remain are those who come attracted by the idea of cohousing and not by the location of the lot.

It is at the beginning of 2017 when they get a lot to carry out the project. Today they are developing the participatory workshops of project design. (Figure 4)

The main difficulty that have been found has been to find a lot and be able to access it. Their search has been in the private as well as the public area. Negotiations with public entities have been not fruitful, although they do indicate that there is some movement in favor of valuing cohousing as a model of housing facilitated by the public administration.

Entrepatis has a management adviser, Cohousing Verde, to facilitate the bureaucracy of the cooperative and a team of architects, for the design of the project.



Figure 4 -Entrepatis organization scheme

The current site where Entrepatis is doing its first cohousing is located in Usera, in "Las Carolinas" area, near the Alمندrales metro. The property is managed by cooperative under the right of use. And the financing of the project has been made through ethical banking.

Entrepatis consists of 17 housing units. It is an intergenerational cohousing. Future residents range from 30 to 60 years. Couples with a child between 37 and 45 are predominant. (Table 2) (entrepatis.org)

Currently they are in the design phase, they have started with the common workshops, proposing what spaces they want to have and how they want to distribute them. Future residents have been divided into work groups in which each one advances aspects of the project and then put them in common, in meetings with all the participants. Decisions are taken in assembly and by consensus despite several rounds of voting are required. The homes that have been raised for this case are between 60 and 90 m2. The initial deadline for the design is 2 to 3 months.

The future community is self-managed where residents are the ones who make the decisions through processes of consensus, both the aspects relating to the management of common areas and relative to the acceptance of new residents. This does not mean that they do not continue to have some sort of management advice like the one they currently have.

Entrepatis							
Stars	Number of cohousing	First cohousing	State	Number of units	Type of cohousing	Type of property	Location
2004	1	2017	Planning	17	Intergenerational	Right of use	Urban

Table 2: Resume table Entrepatis Entrepatis

4.3 CASE 2: JUBILARES

Following a previous research work by its founders carried out since 2010, Jubilares made up in August 2012. Jubilares is an association and its objectives are the research, dissemination and promotion of knowledge about cohousing, as well as, cultural and social activities geared towards senior cohousing and support for the model of self-managed elderly communities.

The architectural studio Milla, Mira and Navarro investigated since 2010 the housing possibilities for older people, the current standards and the needs of this social group. During their research process, they find different initiatives that are being developed by the Spanish geography without specialized advice. These groups are usually made up of older people who do not want to use existing residential alternatives to age, and who have the idea of doing it together. It is this movement that drives the formation of Jubilares that finally takes shape in 2012. (Del Monte, J, personal communication, March 3, 2017)

Jubilares association was born with the intention of forming a network of social support that can help each of its partners in the theme of seniors housing. They are oriented towards the senior cohousing and its fundamental principle is the personal autonomy. Each resident must own their life and their decisions. The assistance needed by each resident is raised through the integral care centered on each person, this type of care requires planning the actions adapting them to the idiosyncrasies of each environment and that the care plans are carried out in a participatory manner by the different agents and actors who cooperate.

In addition to meeting the needs of each person, the person is encouraged and supported to participate actively in the care process

The procedure to carry out the projects has 6 steps (Figure 5). The first step is a workshop in which needs are explained, resources and participants are adhered to. The second step would be viable, where the objective is to close the needs diagnosis and Resources as well as conduct a financial study. The third step would be workshop 1 of expansion and cohesion, with a duration of 3 to 6 months, in which the project is explained to interested people who are not yet part of the group. Subsequently workshop 2, design, where the cooperative is constituted with its statutes, formalized the purchase of land or real estate and is carried out the design of the project, has a duration of approximately 6 months. The fifth step is the construction of the building and edit the regulation of the cooperative. The last step is to live in the Jubilar, the Jubilar Cooperative, begins life in common with the active support of the association. (jubilares.es)



Figure 5–Jubilares Methodology

During the time of the existence of the association Jubilares its main activity has been the dissemination. So far they have had several groups interested in the idea of living in cohousing but not all of them have continued. At the moment they have 9 active groups, one of them quite advanced already in phase three of the procedure, its location is in Torrelodones.

The profile of the people who are interested in the Jubilares association is a medium high socio-cultural and socioeconomic profile. Most of them own one or more homes. The professions that more abound are the liberal ones and the professions. It should be noted that 70% of the persons concerned are women.

In the subject of the search of land or real estate have tried both the public and private roads. In this case they comment that it is easier to accede to the city councils if the collective goes of the hand of the association and not of individual way. They also mention that as time goes by the public administration sees with better eyes this type of accommodation. In the case of Jubilar propose to the public organisms that this type of house is similar to a project or even a social equipment for which they request the transfer of public land destined to equipment.

Although they have not yet come to buy any land, the financing method with which they propose to work is ethical banking. Likewise the model of property that they propose is the one of cooperative in the regime of cession of use. (Table 3)

Jubilares							
Starts	Number of cohousing	First cohousing	State	Number of units	Type of cohousing	Type of property	Location
2012	0	2017	Starts	24	Intergenerational	Right of use	Urban

Table 3. Resume table Jubilares Jubilares

5 CONCLUSIONS

Cohousing is still a very marginal phenomenon. In Denmark, the country where was born cohousing, and considered the most advanced country in this movement, cohousing represent only one percent of all housing. In Spain the percentage is smaller.

Cohousing can be characterized as a pragmatic response to demographic change and new lifestyles; reduce the cost of housing, including energy-bills, combat loneliness after professional life and organized the tight schedule of young middle class families.

This movement can be interpreted as a concrete response to many cities in the objective of urban policy: social cohesion, care for an aging population, local identities under globalization, healthy and child- friendly environments, locally based responsible economy, energy transition and participation in urban inclusion rather than of homogeneity and exclusion. (Tummers 2015)

Cohousing is not a new concept, but it has recently arrived in Madrid society, therefore the difficulties to carry it out are manifest.

The real situation in Madrid is that few people know what cohousing really is but there is a growing interest in this movement in the Madrid society, especially in the elderly. The concept is not clear now, but there are intention to make it known. Culture plays a fundamental role in the acceptance of cohousing. In the survey is verified the fear of people to share spaces, because they identify those common areas with problems, and not whit living in community.

The concept of cohousing generates different images in people, the more abundant are those ; community, sharing, and collaboration. There is a tendency to relate the movement to socialist ideology. There is also the vision of cohousing as a more economical way of life.

We can appreciate that senior cohousing is a more demanded model in Madrid society as an option for active aging and that it is more likely to be carried out due to the current economic situation of the interested parties.

In the analysis of cases we can observe several similarities (Table 4); 1.- All cases arise because the type of housing offered does not respond to the needs or expectations of the interested parties. 2.- In all cases it is observed the difficulty to carry out the process, since the time of the accomplishment of the same one is elevated (average of 13 years). This long time makes many people lose the illusion along the way, also makes many people have to opt for another housing option in that time interval. 3.- All have difficulties to find a plot. 4.- All Have an initial number of stakeholders that is decreasing along the way and that usually grow when seeing the project implemented and in operation. 5.- In all cases the same property regime has been chosen.

	Entrepatrios	Jubilares	Trabensol
Type of movement	Collective- cooperative	Association	Cooperative
Intentions	Other life style Life in community	Network of advice and support to cohousing	Solidarity and cooperation
Start	2004	2012	2000
Origin reasons	Homes against speculation	Divulagation Residential options	Search in common a satisfactory way to spend the last years of life.
Main difficulties	Find a plot	Continuity of stakeholders	Find a plot
Type of participants	Intergenerational	Seniors	Seniors
Type of property	Right of use	Right of use	Right of use

Table 4. Comparative table

Two of the cases of study, constructed (Trabensol) or under construction (Entrepatrios), are residential complexes that meet the definition of Cohousing as we can see in the table 5.

Case/ characteristic	Voluntary and participatory process	Design an intentional neighborhood and a kind of lifestyle	Size, scale and function of the spaces	Residence management and absence of hierarchy	Urban or semi urban location	Non- speculative, affordable housing
Trabensol	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jubilares	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 5. Observance characteristic of cohousing in the cases of study

For the development of more residential units type cohousing in Madrid it is necessary a support from the public administrations. Without public support it is difficult for a movement of these characteristics and, given the difficulties to find land, can progress satisfactorily. Cases, Entrepatis and Jubilares, have met with a public administration somewhat reluctant to this movement, but that seems to change their opinion little by little.

At the moment, the process to obtain a plot where carry out the development is very tedious and too extended in the time. This causes many of the interested parties to desist and are forced to opt for one of the existing residential options in the Market.

Without question the cases that we have studied here are pioneers in Madrid, and as such will be an example for others. Thus, they allow to advance in the diffusion, knowledge and experience of these movements. Their developments will carry with them more possibilities of new similar developments.

Time is an important factor in the process of implementing a new movement or concept in a society. As we have already pointed out, the Spanish culture is not the same as the Danish culture, and, what now generates doubts or fears, can become habitual and therefore, assimilated by society.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Chiodelli, F., & V Baglione, V. (2014). Living together privately: For a cautious reading of cohousing. *Urban Research & Practice*, 7(1), 20-34. Cohousing.org. (2017). Retrieved 12/15, 2016, from cohousing.org Cohousingverde.com. (2017). Retrieved 01/22, 2017, from cohousingverde.com Entrepatis.org. (2017). Retrieved 01/15, 2017, from entrepatios.org Field, M. (2004). Thinking about cohousing. the creation of intentional neighborhoods. London, UK: Diggers and Dreamers. Fromm, D. (1991). In Reinhold (Ed.), Collaborative communities; cohousing central living and other forms of housing with shared facilities. New York: Hanson, C. (1996). In Hartley & marks (Ed.), The cohousing handbook, hartley & marks. USA: point Roberts. García, A. (2017). Interview whit javier del monte diego.jubilares.(March, 3) Madrid
- García, A. (2017). Interview whit Leo Bensadón (February, 1) Madrid Jubilares.es. (2017). Retrieved 02/20, 2017, from jubilares.es Lietaert, M. (2010). Cohousing's relevance to degrowth theories. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 10, 576-580. McCamant, K., & Durrett, C. (1994). Cohousing : A contemporary approach to housing ourselves (2nd ed.). Berkeley. USA: Ten Speed Press. Meltzer, G. (2005). Sustainable community : Learning from the cohousing model. Victoria, BC, Canada: Trafford. Trabensol.org (2017). Retrieved 02/18, 2017, from trabensol.org Tummers, L. (2015). Understanding co-housing from a planning perspective: Why and how? *Urban Research & Practice*, 8, 64-78. Vestbro, D. (2000). from collective housing to cohousing — a summary of research, . *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 17(2), 164-178. Williams, J. (2007). Predicting an american future for cohousing. *Futures*, 40(3), 268-286. Zahale, K., & Mortensen PD. (1992). Collective ads co-operative housing. *Open House International*, 17(2), 56-65.

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY

1.→ Where do you live? 2.→ Do you live for rent or in your own home? 3.→ How do you live? Alone/sharing/with my family/ separated/with my couple 4.→ How old are you?

5. Do you know what cohousing is? if not 6.→ No, I do not know what Cohousing is. (Here we define cohousing and then continue the survey) if yes 6.→ How would you define cohousing?

7. Do you think cohousing an interesting idea? Yes/ no 8.→ Would you like to live this way, being part of a cohousing project? Yes/ no 9.→ What do not you like about cohousing? 10.→ What do you like or do you find interesting about cohousing?

11. Do you miss any common space in your home? (Laundry, bicycle parking, nursery, library, center of attention, workspaces ...) Yes/ no 12.→ What common spaces would you like to have? 13.→ Do you think that the management of common spaces by residents would be a problem? Yes/ no 14.→ Why do you think that the management of common spaces can be a problem? 15.→ Once the survey is done write three words that suggest cohousing.

ID 1635 | PROGRESSIVE CONVERGENCE BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INITIATIVES IN PLANNING AND URBAN POLICY: THE CASE STUDY OF KERAMEIKOS

Gripsiou Argyro¹

¹Laboratory of Demographic and Social Analysis-University of Thessaly
yrgrips@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT: Public policy has been identified as the main driver of transformation of urban residential spaces including the processes of urban rehabilitation and gentrification. More recently, the partnerships between private and public sector can be recognized as a key driver of urban rehabilitation of declining inner urban areas. This article aspires to explore the uses of urban development strategies and tactics as tools of urban economic rehabilitation and gentrification of an old working-class neighborhood of Athens, “Kerameikos”. This will be examined in relation to the arts-led regeneration adopted in inner-city rehabilitation initiatives. The area of Kerameikos is chosen to focus because of the transformative stage of redefinition both of its land’s uses and social network. Following a brief review of the evolution of Athenian urban policies over the past decades, the paper analyzes the origins of urban rehabilitation and gentrification projects and explores the experience of private and public partnerships in Kerameikos. It discusses the tactics of rehabilitation that have developed in the neighborhood and the ways in which spatial and social structure of Kerameikos have been transformed. The socio-spatial context of Kerameikos permits a new regard in social and spatial mutations showing its particularities-accentuating the role of the economical crisis in the specific context of Athenian city center. The paper also underline the significant importance of cultural policy, the role of artists and of urban NGOs as catalysts for urban rehabilitation. The paper ends with a reflection on the notion of participative planning and its potential as an integrated alternative to city governance and offers recommendations for further development within the Greek context.

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).