

Received: 09/10/2021

Accepted: 11/24/2021

## **EXPERIENCES OF SOCIAL URBANISM IN LATIN AMERICA: APPROACHES IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF SANTA MARIA/RS<sup>1</sup>**

## **EXPERIÊNCIAS DO URBANISMO SOCIAL NA AMÉRICA LATINA: APROXIMAÇÕES NO MUNICÍPIO DE SANTA MARIA/RS**

Adriano da Silva Falcão<sup>2</sup>

Rogério Leandro Lima da Silveira<sup>3</sup>

### **Abstract**

The theoretical constructions that guide the work punctuate the correlation between social capital and its representations from the perspective of social and collaborative urbanism. Different views permeate this construction in the development of social cohesion, through cognitive aspects, the structuring of a discourse and its consequent social representation in the city space. The objective of the work is to resume concepts inherent to these collaborative practices under different names, identifying approaches and departures from these initiatives. It brings, in addition, an evaluation together with a localized perception in the development of Latin American and Brazilian public policies.

**Keywords:** Social urbanism; collaborative urbanism; Share capital; Public policy; Regional development.

### **Resumo**

As construções teóricas que norteiam o trabalho pontuam a correlação entre capital social e suas representações sob a perspectiva do urbanismo social e colaborativo. As diferentes visões perpassam por essa construção na elaboração da coesão social, através de aspectos cognitivos, a estruturação de um discurso e sua consequente representação social no espaço da cidade. O objetivo do trabalho é retomar conceitos inerentes a estas práticas colaborativas sob diferentes denominações identificando aproximações e afastamentos destas iniciativas. Traz, em complementação, uma avaliação junto a uma percepção localizada no desenvolvimento das políticas públicas latino-americanas e brasileiras. Por fim realiza um escrutínio às ações realizadas no território entendendo que a normativa existente se alinha aos preceitos das perspectivas analisadas sob o urbanismo socialmente construído.

<sup>1</sup> Article presented at the V Seminar on Regional Development, State and Society (SEDRES/2021) – Innovation, Society and Regional Development: Repercussions and contradictions in the territories, held on March 24, 25 and 26, 2021. Universidade de Taubaté/Taubaté /SP. ISSN 2358-5307.

<sup>2</sup> Doutorando do Programa em Desenvolvimento Regional (UNISC). Professor da Universidade Franciscana, Santa Maria – RS, Brasil. E-mail: adriarq@ufn.edu.br

<sup>3</sup> Doutor em Geografia Humana (UFSC). Professor do Programa de Pós-graduação em Desenvolvimento Regional da Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul, Santa Cruz do Sul – RS, Brasil. E-mail: rlls@unisc.br

**Palavras-chave:** Urbanismo social; Urbanismo colaborativo; Capital social; Políticas públicas; Desenvolvimento regional.

## Introduction

The current moments of social distancing arising from a pandemic that is spreading around the world in these first decades of the new 21st century make us want to review and resume the understanding of cities and their spaces. The momentary impediments to urban circulation have exacerbated the proportion and dimension of the need for the relationship with public environments.

This issue of cities for people has been discussed for a long time, from the perspective of Gehl (2013, 2018). However, we are now more alerted to these primary needs of individuals - social interaction. The urban development models presented in our societies as reflections of an understanding of growth allied to the logics of neoliberalism and its consequences end up echoing in urban representations reflecting our thinking as a city (see, for example, MARICATO, 2015 and ROLNIK, 2015).

However, the question remains whether what we perceive as representation would be what one wants to be as urban beings or are the thoughts and actions developed that are not being properly aligned. The many movements that arise in reaction to this logic signal the opposite (CO.URB, 2020), at least in parts of the communities, making a combative front, even if still in an embryonic form. Social urbanism, as a process of intervention in urban centers, is accompanied by a range of denominations: collaborative (LEITE et al., 2019), tactical and acupuncture (NOGUEIRA & PORTINARI, 2016). On the one hand, they are more effectively linked to the social constructions exercised by these initiatives. On the other hand, they are dissociated from these principles, as they may result from reactions to the very logics they wish to fight (BRAGA 2020).

In this context, the purpose of this article is to review the initiatives that can point out paths in the construction of fairer and more inclusive societies. In doing so, it reinforces the important peculiar roles of the formation of social capital and the strength of actors in the search for this intended development, having in first instance, the social, and later as a consequence, the sustainable, and as a result the economic and its various dimensions. To do so, we aim to evaluate the public policies constructed in the central region of the state of RS, more precisely in the city of Santa Maria. The idea is to confront existing public policies and their effective results in conducting local urban planning. The reference points are the social and collaborative urbanism built as an ideal concept of the development of contemporaneous cities.

## Social Urbanism, Discourse and Social Representation of Space

In the first decades of this new century, Harvey's conclusions were exacerbated (2014). He realized that people were living in extremely divided urbanities, often fragmented in their urban fabrics and in everyday actions and experiences and, as is well known, in territorial struggles with the aim of forming territorialities (HAESBAERT, 2007), fighting and conflicting in the search for space. All these elements will be geographically defined depending on their location in a given territory, or as Harvey says (2014) "depending on which side of the road you live on" and more precisely, the consumption possibilities, in the most varied forms, to which you have access. In the daily struggles to modify these realities, combative initiatives arise, represented by urban social movements, allied or not with state institutions that seek new models for better representation in the production of urban spaces.

From the perspective of social or collaborative urbanism, many of these pieces of articulation can be, however, the necessary tools for this embryonic construction in the development of cities should be centered on social actors and urban agents. Perhaps, in a particular perception, the belief of development centered on the economy as an end, where only the mass of wealthy global culture could enjoy urban spaces, even if fragmented and in constant conflicts is the impediment to such changes.

In the view of seminal authors for the theme (LEITE et al., 2019) the discussion has its place in the current concepts of social urbanism, with an emphasis on public policies and innovative urban instruments with the aim of promoting the social and territorial inclusion of different actors. Social

urbanism is considered an important aspect of the new urban agenda (ONU, 2004) with regard to social inclusion, notably as a new form of community involvement in participatory urban planning processes.

They also address the challenges perceived in this panorama of cultural, environmental and urban initiatives that fight the reduction of inequalities as being, above all, a necessary urban agenda. On a municipal scale, they present topics analyzed under institutional, financial and urban aspects, highlighting urban policy tools, financing instruments, planning approaches and processes that integrate technical competence with the participation of the local community, characteristic of decision-making processes democratic, as a source of transformation of cities in the Global South (LEITE et al., 2019).

Contrary to the understanding of social urbanism as loaded with intentions and aided by the discourse of good practices, some authors take a more cautious stance in acclaiming city-solving policies. In Montero's proposal (2020) a thought is constructed that is the opposite of the global discourse, as it considers the practices of social urbanism, found since Bogota (CO), as parts of a construction that he called leveraging cities' logic.

Through its theoretical construction, it is possible to understand that it sees social urbanism according to three distinct aspects: as a way of expanding the power of global philanthropy, as an action strategy designed in terms of solutionism<sup>4</sup>, which is linked to the neoliberal discourse, and, finally, the development centered on the local territory as a way to divert attention from the problems of the world order. The author maintains that there are many limits to these practices and that they do not have a clear framework for action, justifying that it seems to be an unwillingness of organizations (global philanthropy) to intervene in structural factors and multiple scales that would truly modify the production of environmental degradation on a global scale (MONTERO, 2020).

Other authors that corroborate Monteiro's speech (2020) are Levy and Davila (2017) when they sustain, specifically speaking of Medellin (CO), that the transformations felt and experienced by social urbanism are very much in line with the discourse of global cities and would greatly reflect the aspirations of the elite and their way of life. They believe that, through discourse, it was possible to build the idea of inclusive citizenship unified with the myth of citizenship created through the coalition of political, legal and economic leadership forces. However, they justify their resistance, concluding that the perceived planning was able to transform and improve the transitional and incremental changes, but not the structural changes that reproduce inequalities, as these are the result of global and not local forces. In this sense, the practices only partially modified the intended social justice.

Another way of perceiving, but in line with this thought, is the perception of Maclean (2015) who suggests that the transformations in terms of urban development within this social and collaborative perspective were much more complex than the term "miracle" implied. The author argues that constitutional changes at the national level are the result of global economic forces, consisting of a range of grassroots organizations and social movements that have joined the collaboration of local economic and political elites. Thus, she justifies that only the changes in the struggles for power allowed the results achieved. She then questions whether there really was a "miracle", because in her view, interventions cannot be isolated as the only ones responsible, but it is possible to affirm that the political context has changed.

In Maclean's construction (2015) the interests of local elites coincided with neoliberal diagnoses of attracting transnational investments and, as a result, structural policies were implemented, placing some Latin American cities on the global investment map.

What is noticed is that the construction of a socially constructed urbanism is still very permeated by public policies engendered from Colombian experiments and, many times, they are associated as discourse and practice. It is therefore necessary to specifically analyze the elements that make up this urbanism, which originated not in Latin America, but specifically in Colombian territory.

In the perspective of Lina Ocampo (2019), social urbanism is not about a movement or a current of thought or a model to be followed, but about possibilities of urban transformation, seen as a succession of processes that are felt and perceived throughout time. In addition, social urbanism can be linked to a thought of construction of a discourse that can induce behavior, legitimizing or

---

<sup>4</sup> Urban solutionism is a term coined for the aforementioned article that translates the contributions of the diffusion of limited approaches to sustainability discourses, being part of a recognizably neoliberal and of transmission of responsibilities (MONTERO, 2020, p. 2267).

not, the social actors linked to the idea of a city model and development management (ROLDÁN, 2013). These discourses, ultimately, allow, for example, the city of Medellín to productively connect to the understandings of global cities, the creation of markets, expanding the possibilities of generating wealth, cultural, identity and, as a result, development, including economic.

In the perspective of Roldán (2013), social urbanism is an example of a development process articulated to regional demands, against the background of understandings of global demands, where, based on this externality, a standardized city governance is sought, competitive and productive, constituted by an ideological content of discourse. These elements serve for a critical review of the planning and management processes of territories, where the function of discourse and ideology is also understood as building elements of a self-referential vision, and how these are articulated to the modes of power and control, legitimizing the model of social urbanism, significantly impacting the physical, spatial, social and political processes of the city.

Added to this perspective of discourse construction, the strength of the social representation of public space is still considered as a basic tool for this project structuring and management of sustainable territories, reflecting that this is capable of influencing how the individual perceives himself as a subject belonging to a collectivity. In other words, urban space is seen as the instigator of an intimate perception of the individual who is transformed when faced with the collective perception insofar as it communicates with the constructed urban image (CONTRERAS-LOVICH, 2016).

The same author defends that these new development models, with diversities of actors and multiplicities of thoughts, formed by the vision of integral management, constitute a possible reinterpretation of urbanism, being a triadic representation that starts from the humanized environment. This notion of triad is perceived and explained by the understanding of the subject and object relationship, that is, environmental stimuli, cognitive processes, conscious and unconscious perception processes, and behaviors, originated by social actions and practices (CONTRERAS-LOVICH, 2016).

It is possible to identify in the construction of Contreras-Lovich (2016) some concepts that guide these territorial projects with the broad participation of social actors, converting them into creative and participatory citizens, key pieces in this open experiment of constitution of lived spaces (LEFEBVRE, 2001). These representations are centered on the perception of urbanism as an environment, participating in a dynamic system and interpreted through its contexts. It is a lived cultural space, the result of internalized desires that can be exposed and represented in space, based on experimentation and on a more human scale (GEHL, 2013). It ends with participatory urbanism, seen as a compass in the construction of meanings in the light of social practices based on community knowledge.

Other approaches that can help in the construction of participatory proposals are related to the necessary "education" and community training of the participating actors, not with a cultural standardization bias, but in the sense of raising awareness and the convenience of public spaces in cities, that is, it is to equip the actors with a view to building a tool to help in the perception of urban spaces, in the initial stages of diagnosis, as a way of mobilizing and preparing territorial actors, also ensuring higher degrees of confidence for the adopted processes and stronger institutions (CONTRERAS-LOVICH, 2016).

## **The Perspectives of Latin American Social Urbanism**

In general, it is understood that social urbanism is considered an important part of the new urban agenda (ONU, 2004) with regard to social inclusion, notably as a new form of community involvement in participatory urban planning processes. Authors such as Leite et al. (2019) report experiences in São Paulo as relevant in the processes of participation and social inclusion in the city's cultural heritage and through urban policies and management instruments; of Medellín, with its public policies in the same participatory process considered a social phenomenon (OCAMPO, 2019), among others. They address the challenges perceived in this panorama of cultural, environmental and urban initiatives that fight the reduction of inequalities as being, above all, a necessary urban agenda, especially on a municipal scale (LEITE et al., 2019). One of these initiatives is the Colombian experience.

## **The experiences of Colombian social urbanism**



From the Territorial Development Law 388 of 1997<sup>5</sup> from Colombia that transforms the responsibility of urban development to the municipalities, Colombian cities have been making a great effort in the way of creating tools that support the planning of territories with a focus on local initiatives (OCAMPO, 2019). In these initiatives, the State consolidates them as social practices, transferring the responsibility for development to the municipalities, confirming the local territorial position as the base cell of social transformations resulting from its urban planning. To do so, the national state withdraws from these practices, and regional development is limited to municipal competences that are established as a public practice of governance (DAZA, 1998).

After the launch of this territorial development brand, Alcaldía<sup>6</sup> de Medellín has sought to comply with territorial planning laws and ensure that these policies are fully followed, with a view to continuing these proposed directives (OCAMPO, 2019). There is recognition of the maintenance of these policies through the political instances of governance that elevate the maintenance of the city as a model known worldwide, at the beginning of the 21st century, to the category of cities built through social urbanism, even having as a nickname, the Miracle of Medellín (OCAMPO, 2019); (LEITE et al., 2019); (MACLEAN, 2015). This process intensifies with the election of Sergio Fajardo, Mayor of Medellín in 2003, having his work recognized by the population through policies that “relieved the city, and consequently, the community from an oppressive inhumanity” (OCAMPO, 2019, s/p).

In the new Colombian land use plan of 2014, there is an advance in the sense of programming the city for a new opening or extensive accessibility to the entire population, demonstrating a clear inclusive initiative of a population with serious problems of urban mobility, reducing the times of urban connectivity. These elements of infrastructure result in positive impacts on the landscape and understanding of community, for example, in the significant decrease in urban violence rates (OCAMPO, 2019); (LEITE, et al., 2019); (MACLEAN, 2015).

From the perspective of the authors, social urbanism is not about a movement or a current of thought or a model to be followed, but about possibilities of urban transformation, seen as a succession of processes that are felt and perceived over time and not as infallible tools that magically solve urban problems, because even in this example, it is possible to see positive and negative results.

Thus, what can be seen in this example is how the insertion of these urban policies centered on human development is linked to a growing and necessary social inclusion. It is possible to refer the experience of the city of Medellín (CO) as positive, even though it is not a perfect city (LEITE et al., 2020). In other words, the city of Medellín (CO) shows that it is possible to take large steps towards a more integrated and egalitarian development and, consequently, more sustainable. Even analyzing it from an urban policy vision, initiated by the State and, later, by local governance, Medellín's experience is formed from a great social “pact” arising from a reality of extreme violence and social fragmentation that affected the society as a whole (OCAMPO, 2019). Apparently, this urgent need for transformation leads to the integration of the desires of a population affected by the scourge of drug trafficking and the collaborative actions of public policies, designed and carried out by successive governors and their main stakeholders, the residents of this urban center (LEITE et al., 2019) (MACLEAN, 2015).

There were several proposals that supported this growing process of urban cooperation and it is seen that the main objective of the interventions was to connect people through an effective and inclusive mobility (OCAMPO, 2019); (LEITE et al., 2019). These actions transform the city, giving greater legitimacy to the population and, consequently, resulting in inversions of the violence. With this, the senses of belonging are reinforced and amalgamated by projects of cultural valorization and the knowledge of socially weakened communities, as well as by the creation of articulation equipment in the heart of urban problems, the so-called Articulated Life Units (EDU, 2020). These facilities, linked to culture, leisure and community care, recreate and enhance the aspects of urban coexistence and also help in the reconstruction of the city in the dimensions of space perceived, conceived and, mainly, lived (LEFEBVRE, 2001).

These discursive constructions, ultimately, allow the city of Medellín to productively connect to the understandings of global cities, the creation of markets, expanding the possibilities of generating wealth, cultural, identity and, as a result, development, including economic. In Maclean's Perspective(2015) the city builds this discourse based on international media coverage, as well as

<sup>5</sup> Colombia's Territorial Development Law 388 of 1997 transforms urban development responsibility for municipalities (COLOMBIA 1997)

<sup>6</sup> Alcaldía seen as city hall – local and municipal governance nomenclature, differences between Brazil and Colombia.

investigative literature and political circles, that is, it gained space in the country's new marketing along the same path as the global cities that preceded it (Barcelona, Bilbao, Curitiba). It was accompanied by a belief that the city was "free" through architectural and infrastructural interventions, and in this sense, they would be able to receive heavy international investments, reinforces the author.

### **The Experiments of Urban Micro revolutions**

In order to understand the different perceptions of social and collaborative urbanism, we review some advances achieved through local and regional initiatives and examples built in Brazil and Latin America, which are similar, in part, to the practices called social urbanism. The objective is to understand its limits, paths and contradictions inserted in these urban articulations known as tactics and collaboratives.

These initiatives can also be associated with micro urban revolutions that emerge as resistance practices (BRAGA, 2020), or even, of possibilities for the revitalization of small portions of urban space that demonstrate lack of assistance from the integral action of the State. These same initiatives are covered by discourses of collaboration and integration. However, they seem to be responses that are somewhat disjointed from the collectivity as a whole.

### **Tactical and collaborative urbanism**

Tactical urbanism emerges as a proposal that involves social actors, eventually supported by state interventions, much more in the form of collaborators, but which, at times, do not act as forceful interveners in urban practices. The proposals that have emerged in different realities (CO.URB, 2020); (OCUPATUCALLE, 2020); (FIIU, 2019) are considered commendable and have an apparent positive impact on the communities in which they are located. However, it is not possible to assert that these results will be positively effective without their careful assessment. The approaches adopted by these initiatives are almost always linked to methodologies of appropriation, self-management and, often, with a low budget or supported by private partnerships (NOGUEIRA & PORTINARI, 2016).

The practice of collaborative urbanism can be seen as an approximation of utopian practices of community participation, as they may contain a perspective of the lack of state presence in the modernizing urban practices of our cities. These findings are based on the perceptions of Nogueira & Portinari (2016) regarding the location of these interventions, realizing that they mostly take place in areas of sociability and leisure in city centers and, rarely, in unattended suburbs, where initiatives take place often through community efforts.

### **Collaboration networks and urban micro interventions**

The possibilities of collaborative practices have gained significant space in initiatives for the composition of more inclusive and participatory urban fabrics, even if they originate from small self-organized groups and invest in tiny samples of the territory where they interact. In research by the collaborative projects network (CO.URB, 2020); (FIIU, 2019); (OCUPATUCALLE, 2020), it is possible to see a large group of collaborative initiatives that aim to connect a plurality of actors that encourage each other to participate in collaborative solutions, based on tools of tactical urbanism, gaining expression in the many actions that bring together, adding networks of people and the most varied institutions, with or without observance of eventual state collaborations.

The groups' objectives show a growing desire to see the desired transformations happen, in the eyes of Harvey (2014), as a being who lives in a community. But one has to notice that the manifests of collective construction of cities (CO.URB, 2020), even with contributions from governance, are far from structured proposals such as effective public policies that extend to all collectivities, whether they are represented or not within these processes.

Also valuable can be the meetings with exhibition of intervention projects (FIIU, 2019) with a high degree of collective involvement that can give some answers of discontent with the direction cities have taken and how public spaces have been perceived by communities. It is evident that these initiatives, in addition to demonstrating the dissatisfactions, can be presented as support points for the much sought-after urban revolutions proposed by Harvey (2014).

Closer to the local reality and among the so-called embryonic actions, it is possible to perceive groups and communities engaged in attempts at urban development linked to these precepts, transforming the population into true protagonists of their territories of action - again the lived space - where they propose to introduce the concepts of a gradual, voluntary and low-cost construction, always aiming at the development of social capital and the autonomy of communities (FALCÃO & GUMA, 2020).

For example, in the city of Santa Maria, contrary to urban renewal movements centered on local economic development – the creation of urban crossings, the opening of closed shopping centers and the proliferation of high-class condominiums – movements of groups and organizations emerge that are inserted in the communities, taking technical knowledge as a driving force for improvements in the urban space and in the living conditions of these locations. The Santa Maria Development Agency (ADESM, 2020), through Protagonists of the Future is an example of civil society groups that organize themselves to create other possible realities. These initiatives are reinforced by extension projects linked to local universities, such as [com]VIDA (FALCÃO & GUMA, 2020), which also carries out actions that try to expand the sense of belonging and recognition of the city's public spaces, within the perspective of the total and unrestricted right to this that is so dear to us (LEFEBVRE, 2001).

### **Local Public Policies from the Perspective of Social and Collaborative Urbanism**

In the central region, more precisely, the urban center of Santa Maria, it is noted that, despite the efforts made by local authorities such as the Planning Institute (IPLAN) and, also, the Housing and Land Regularization Secretariat, political governance and conducting the planning, is not excluded from the social actors who lead the sewing of urban fabrics and, even less, alien to the forces of the speculative market embedded in the understanding of urban growth and development of the population as a whole.

It can be seen that governance actions are basically restricted to land regularization processes and also to the recognition and approval of housing projects in line with government proposals, in the wake of *Minha Casa Minha Vida*. In meetings with the secretariat, on several occasions, it became clear that, with the exhausting work of a reduced technical body, accompanied by the large housing deficit that is usually part of the realities of our cities, the task of these secretariats is quite limited.

The urgency for spaces for social housing determines, almost entirely, the destinations of the workforce of these secretariats, spending time registering needy families and also controlling the urban occupations that arise every day. Even though this is an urgent need, housing policies only achieve goals that border on superficiality, not because of technical incapacity, but because of the failure of political platforms that address the problems of rights to the city - here configured as access to the infrastructure necessary for a life worthy – as participants in a pressing agenda. According to Seixas (2013), these structural flaws in the composition of technicians belonging to these secretariats and, added to this, the distancing of political programs directed to the effective planning of cities, greatly reinforce the problem.

Another sector that has been following up with important advances in the city is the IPLAN, which, after the administrative reform carried out in 2013, establishes itself as a group of technical employees in the conduct of the 2005 Master Plan, recently modified. It should be noted that the city, through the support of this autarchy, carried out studies and urban mobility planning for the city as a whole. However, a few years after the launch of the innovative ideas contained in the Complementary Law 98/2015, little can be seen implemented with regard to pedestrian mobility in the city center (IPLAN, 2020). In an analysis of this legislation, one can see very clearly the alignment of the intended city with the discourses contained in the ideas of social and collaborative urbanism present in many cities planning in Latin America.

In this sense, some attempts were made to adapt the planned ideas and make them effective in local urban fabrics. However, what is still perceived is a setback or stalling of processes, such as the closing of some lanes for the transit of vehicles. The different actors involved still have clear difficulties in understanding the urban dynamics in this sense. They are, in most cases, opposed to these initiatives, anticipating, according to reports in the local press, negative changes in the frequency of their places of commerce and services (PMSM, 2019). These ideas of positive mobility have been, and are still widely discussed and proven by Jan Gehl (GEHL & SVARRE, 2018)

The Santa Maria urban crossing plan (IPLAN, 2020), consisting of major interventions carried out through the insertion of roundabouts, large viaducts and expansion of the BR 287 and BR 158 carriageways (Correio do Povo, 2020), which cut across the city, are innovations that impress everyone due to the grandeur and advances in the mobility system (Gaucha ZH, 2021). However, in a very particular view, these interventions still hold perspectives of monofunctional and modernizing planning (MONTANER & MUXI, 2014) that characterized cities in the mid-twentieth century, forgetting to put the most interested parties on the agenda. Thus, it is imperative to ask: in addition to cars and mass transport, how do people move around in these spaces? How is it possible, within urban limits, to forget to prioritize the main users of these changes – pedestrians?

These plans, obviously, are accepted as an evolution of urbanity and celebrated as elements of the progress of Santa Maria as a city. In this sense, they get the power of a political platform at the moment of their viability, as they reach the interests of the actors who dominate and condition the decisions in this urban center. However, these same plans are still aimed at specific sectors of society.

Returning to the primordial question of how urban governance contributes to regional development, it is not disputed that it evidently contributes to significant improvements in line with the ideas of economic and social “growth”. However, the question that still persists is, in whose eyes and under what perspectives these analyzes are being carried out. In this sense, we agree with Seixas(2013) that it is necessary to retake the place of the city, a paradigm shift that emphasizes the change of the logic of added value, aimed at a city experienced in everyday life. However, the task to be thought of is how to convince the residents of urban areas, as well as their planners and political actors that this place, which has been lost in time and space, needs much more resumption of the notion of urban and human development. more urgent than economic growth and expansion.

## Conclusions

Based on the previous discussion, it is important to rethink the level of lack and, consequently, of distance that society finds itself in relation to the public spaces of its cities. Such moments can serve as an inflection point to rethink as a society and truly visualize an effective paradigm shift in the thoughts of cities, as a set of human agglomerations that want to be human beings and that follow the deepest desires as a society.

It is possible to discern this feeling of solidarity, of co-participation, of sharing actions, at least on the scales of social networks and in isolated initiatives by more sensitive groups. In fact, it is hoped that, after the shock of the momentary loss of rights to use urban spaces and, for many, adequate housing, it is possible to rethink the true importance of adopting the use value at the expense of the exchange value we are currently experiencing. accustomed. The reassessment and revalidation of the concepts of cities and expectations of what is believed as development, and in this case from the urban perspective, are necessary *ad aeternum*, or every time, so we cannot forget the perspectives of the real reasons that led us to live in urban agglomerations.

As seen from the perspective of social or collaborative urbanism, many can be the key to urban development. However, the necessary tools for this embryonic construction for the development of cities could be centered on social actors and urban agents. Perhaps, in a particular perception, the belief in development centered on the economy as an end can still be seen as a major impediment to these changes, where only the mass of wealthy global culture could enjoy urban spaces, even if fragmented and in constant conflict. The presentation of initiatives, where civil society is articulated at different scales of action, seeks new models of production in the space where the realization of rights to the city is devised, conceived by Lefebvre (2001) precisely when an unimaginable and distant democratic management of the urban investments.

The roles assigned to the actors of these transformations appear in a way that it would also be up to technical professionals, architects and urban planners allied to partners (sociologists, geographers, psychologists, social workers, among others) to add their knowledge, their experiences to a broadly democratic attitude to seek alternatives towards a more collaborative, participatory and openly reflective, depolarized urban reform. They could, mainly, think of a form of construction inverse to the logic of the exclusionary social pyramid, attributing value to the place of speech for those whose voice is least heard in the design of our urban agglomerations, exemplified by the participatory models that emerge in Latin America in several jurisdictions. Thus, social inclusion and the right to participation would be fair, hybrid and multiple, reflecting the changing heterogeneity of our society, basic principles of socially and collaboratively thought-out urbanism.



Searching for new models of urban production still centered on the principles propagated by the new urbanism and the distant city of sustainable development can, momentarily, start in these small actions articulated between public authorities and civil society that moves towards seeking the real rights of resumption of cities with greater control of surpluses aimed at and applied to the evolution of urbanity as a whole. In this sense, urban planning and management can be seen as coexisting dimensions.

The challenges for this implementation are countless, but they seem to be centered basically on the real applicability of the instruments suggested by the different plans, on the replacement of managers capable of maintaining the medium and long-term plans, on the possible failures of the instructional capacities of managers and technical staff of support, as well as, in the removal of municipal realities weakened by weak democratic participation. Legally, the experience has proven to be quite innovative in the recognition of rights, but it is clear that little of the imagined city leaves theory and advances into practice, because, despite local and regional initiatives designed in the form of tactical urbanism and social or collaborative, as has been happening, it is important to remember that the State cannot be relieved of its responsibility as an institution capable of acting and collaborating with these changes.

The Urban Agenda brings pressing desires for the inclusion of different groups, for collective rights, to inhabit, produce, use fair and sustainable cities. However, the definition of these rights, by itself, does not guarantee their implementation, and it is also up to the various actors to rethink themselves as participants in these reproductive models of these logics of conformation of spaces.

These features of cities that are exposed could come from their own behavior and the way society represents itself in the territory, reflecting a lot on their way of thinking and acting.

## Referências

ADESM. *Sobre a cidade ADESM*. 26 de 05 de 2020. <https://www.adesm.org.br/nossa-cidade>.

BRAGA, Luciano. *O poder das microrevoluções urbanas*. 25 de 06 de 2020. <https://caosplanejado.com/o-poder-das-microrrevolucoes-urbanas/>.

CO.URB. 4º CO. *URB encontro de urbanismo colaborativo*. 26 de junho de 2020. <https://www.courb.org/pt/encontro/>.

COLÔMBIA. “Lei de Desenvolvimento Territorial.” *Congresso da Colômbia*. Bogotá: Diário Oficial do Senado, 24 de julho de 1997.

COLOMBIA. *Lei de Desenvolvimento Territorial*. 24 de julho de 1997.

CONTRERAS-LOVICH, Heidi Natalie. “La representación social del espacio público para el diseño y la gestión de territorios.” *Revista de Arquitectura* (Universidad Católica de Colombia) 18 nº1 (jan-jul 2016): 18-34.

Correio do Povo. “Travessia Urbana de Santa Maria entra em fase final - Renato Oliveira.” *Jornal Correio do Povo*. 13 de maio de 2020. <https://www.correiodopovo.com.br/not%C3%ADcias/cidades/travessia-urbana-de-santa-maria-entra-em-fase-final-1.351179>.

DAZA, Juan Carlos del Castillo. “Cinco fases do urbanismo na Colômbia.” *Diário Territorial Urbano* 1, nº 2 (1998): 20-22.

EDU. N.ºs. 10 de 04 de 2020. <http://www.edu.gov.co/edu/nosotros>.

FALCÃO, Adriano da Silva; GUMA, Juliana Lamana. “Como o Urbanismo Colaborativo pode melhorar nossas cidades?” *Agência de Desenvolvimento de Santa Maria ADESM*. 09 de Abril de 2020. <https://www.adesm.org.br/post/urbanismocolaborativo>.

FIIU Fórum Internacional de Intervenciones Urbanas. *Vulnerabilidad en el Espacio Público*. Lima: CONCIBA S.A.C., 2019.

- Gaucha ZH. *GZH Travessia Urbana*. 2021. <https://gauchazh.clicrbs.com.br/ultimas-noticias/tag/travessia-urbana/> (acesso em 26 de junho de 2021).
- GEHL, Jan. *Cidade para pessoas*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2013.
- GEHL, Jan; SVARRE, Birgitte. *A vida na cidade: como estudar*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2018.
- HAESBAERT, Rogério. "Território e Multiterritorialidade: um debate." *GEOgraphia - Revista do Programa de Pós Graduação da UFF IX n°17* (2007): 19-46.
- HARVEY, David. *Cidades Rebeldes: do direito à revolução urbana*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2014.
- IPLAN. *Instituto do Planejamento de Santa Maria*. 11 de maio de 2020. <http://iplan.santamaria.rs.gov.br/index.php>.
- . "Plano Diretor de Mobilidade Urbana." *Instituto do Planejamento de Santa Maria*. 13 de maio de 2020. [http://iplan.santamaria.rs.gov.br/lista\\_mobilidade\\_urbana.php](http://iplan.santamaria.rs.gov.br/lista_mobilidade_urbana.php).
- LEFEBVRE, Henri. *O direito à cidade*. São Paulo: Centauro, 2001.
- LEITE, Carlos, et al. *Social Urbanism in America Latina. Cases and Instruments of Planning, Land Policy and Financing the City Transformation with Social Inclusion*. Cham: Springer Nature, 2019.
- . *Social Urbanism in Latin America*. Gewerbestrasse, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG, 2020.
- LEVY, Caren; DÁVILA, Julio. "Planning for mobility and Socio-Environmental Justice: The Case of Medellin, Colombia." Cáp. 3 em *Environmental Justice and Urban Resilience in the Global South*, por Adriana ALLEN, Liza GRIFFIN e Cassidy JOHNSON, 37-55. New York: Palgrave macmillan, 2017.
- MACLEAN, kate. *Social Urbanism and the politics of violence - the Medellin Miracle*. London/UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- MARICATO, Ermínia. *Para entender a crise urbana*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2015.
- MONTANER, Josep Maria; MUXI, Zaida. *Arquitetura e Política: ensaios para mundos alternativos*. Tradução: Frederico BONALDO. São Paulo, SP: Gustavo Gilli, 2014.
- MONTERO, Sergio. "Leveraging Bogotá: Sustainable development, global philanthropy and rise of urban solucionism." *Urban Studies Journal limited 2018 57* (2020): 2264- 2281.
- NOGUEIRA, Pedro C.E.; PORTINARI, Denise B.. "O urbanismo tático e a cidade neoliberal." *Arcos Design* (PPD ESDI - UERJ) 9 (dezembro 2016): 177-188.
- OCAMPO, Lina Maria Escobar. "Transformación Urbana de Medellin." *Apresentação em Powerpoint*. 02 de setembro de 2019.
- OCUPATUCALLE. *Nós*. 26 de junho de 2020. <https://ocupatucalle.com/nosotros/>.
- ONU. *Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável. Agenda 2030*. Kenya: United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2004.
- PMSM. "Intervenção experimental na segunda quadra da Bozano, no Centro de Santa Maria, está suspensa." *Prefeitura Municipal de Santa Maria*. 15 de 05 de 2019. <https://www.santamaria.rs.gov.br/noticias/18617-intervencao-experimental-na-segunda-quadra-da-bozano-no-centro-de-santa-maria-esta-suspensa> (acesso em 25.09 de 2020 de 2020).

—. *Secretaria Municipal de Habitação e Regularização Fundiária*. 11 de maio de 2020. <https://www.santamaria.rs.gov.br/habitacao/>.

ROLDÁN, Suly Maria Quinchia. “Discurso y Producción de Ciudad: un acercamiento al modelo del urbanismo social en Medellín, Colombia.” *Cuadernos de Vivienda y Urbanismo*, 2013: 122-139.

ROLNIK, Raquel. *Guerra dos Lugares: a colonização da terra e da moradia na era das finanças*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2015.

SEIXAS, João. *A cidade na encruzilhada - repensar a cidade e a sua política*. Porto: Afrontamento, 2013.



*Esta obra está licenciada com uma Licença Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional.*