ID 1327 | NEW MECHANISMS OF INTERVENTION IN THE EXISTING CITY: RECUALIFYING THROUGH DEGROWTH. OBJECTIVE: A RESILIENT CITY THROUGH A CIRCULAR URBAN PLANNING

Gorka Cubes[1]
[1]Escuela Tecnica Superior De Arquitectura de Madrid. UPM.
gorkacubes@me.com

ABSTRACT: It is becoming widely accepted that the future of urban planning and the place of the satisfaction of our needs in our cities, will be based on urban redeveloping and regeneration, instead of continuing with the unlimited consumption of virgin land. Therefore, the challenge is to qualify and intervene on the existing city, otherwise we run the risk of incurring into greater inefficiencies and resources shortages. Hereby, urban qualification is understood as a model of efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. Once it is accepted the goal of effective intervention on the city, we must confront the systemic problem which concerns urban planning: the practical impossibility of intervention in the consolidated city, except by injecting public money (that we don't hace, and will not have) or by programming artificial re-densification. Both procedures cannot be considered as feasible methods. While the city is still growing and consuming large quantities of virgin land, there are no opportunities to generate the added value needed so that the existing city can reinitiate the redeveloping process. Therefore, we must catalyse urban redeveloping by limiting expansion and generating value. Reducing urban growth does not only diminish the ecological footprint, but it generates an increase in value in the already altered land, that facilitates the regeneration of the existing city. Concentration of value through physical net degrowth that generates net value growth. In other words, this approach provides a new mechanism to intervene in the existing city: active and programmed urban degrowth acts as a generator of value and as a redeveloping catalyst. This land use approach is the first step towards resilience and circular urban planning (brand new concept provided in this paper, as the closure of life cycle in land use). As a matter of fact, resilience can never be fully achieved if mechanisms that facilitate urban degrowth are not effectively implemented. Degrowth is itself resilient: In fact, the response of degrowth should be viewed as the most resilient of all. The background is the theory of the circular economy and the philosophy of cradle to cradle: waste should be understood as a food of a new parallel process. Garbage is food, as well as degrowth generates value.

1 STATE OF ART: SYSTEMIC CRISIS

There is no doubt about the fact that the urban network and the built-up building park around us, is close to reach its logical life cycle. It needs interventions to improve efficiency and sustainability; substitution, rehabilitation, redeveloping, regeneration and urban renewal that allow to realize for all, its social purpose. Operations of adaptation to the standards of sustainability, quality, comfort and accessibility.

We must be able to combine this need for renewal, with urban regeneration and the improvement of public endowments and facilities. In short, in improving the quality of space and urban land. As stated in the Leipzig Charter on sustainable European cities (UE 2th May 2007), an in the Toledo Declaration (URBAN Intergroup at the European Parliament 2010) a new urban alliance is needed to implement the strategic commitment towards integrated urban redeveloping.

Some of the foundations that have constituted the urban model that we have all met, with their lights and shadows, must be rethought and overcome. The model does not work 1. As Eduard Fúhr points out: Over the last few years the concept of 'shrinkage' has developed to a central category for urban design and planning 2. Concepts such as benefit, equidistribution, value, ownership model, how to finance urban conversion, relocation, insolvencies, public and private scope of action, gentrification and maintenance cost of the city, together with a context of flat population growth, are the basic elements of a reflection around the city, its state and its derivatives, which must be rethought in order to facilitate that urban planning fulfills its social purpose 3. The maintenance of the system in the current terms in urban planning and development, is a guarantee of more urban degradation and impoverishment for many, and more to come.

The urban planning as we know it has to undertake a paradigm shift, a deep and courageous change, because there is no other solution that is based on alterations to the current model. We must intervene or encourage intervention. Solutions based on continuing an expansionist city model cannot, and should not, continue to leave behind an inefficient, costly artefact that cannot be altered.

The public administrations do not have and will not have money to regenerate the city, it is impossible. Neither should they, it is not fair. We cannot continue to consume resources as if they were unlimited. We cannot wait, because there is nothing linked to the time that can be remedied, but to the contrary; aggravate. Waiting for the economic cycle to recover is denying the root problem: a way to make that is exhausted.

On the other hand, we should not persist in dysfunctional intervention models, such as subsidies, the non-application of the essential duty of conservation linked to the ownership and the indissoluble linkage of the use itself with the right of use of the land should not be persistent. The true cost of the maintenance city must be faced and clear out who and how must face it. We should not continue with this imperative model and move to a participatory and co-responsible model, going deeper into alternative modes of housing, tenure and ownership, typology, transformation and collaborative urban planning.

1.1 THE ECONOMIC UNSUSTAINABILITY OF THE URBAN PLANNING MODEL.

How is the regeneration financed? The question is: who pays redeveloping? 4 . We are witnessing the end of expansive urban planning that pays at its expense, and based on its own capital gains, the construction and maintenance of the city. It is an exhausted model. We must assume the conceptual shift from the analysis and the criterion of economic viability to the criterion of economic and long term sustainability of what we plan.

Urban redeveloping will be the central goal of urban action from now on, and one of its fundamental elements is the economic sustainability and assumption of financial charges. Who pays for redevelopment? It is usual to assume that the city is self-financing. The change of focus that urban redeveloping brings us, inevitably faces this question. The city has degraded with the use, has been consumed. Does the city really self-finance?

The answer is NO. Expansive urban planning, with its burdens, endowments and assignments, has financed the construction of the city, but when it comes to dealing with regeneration and redevelopment, the model does not work. In order to tackle the issue in its entirety, we must overcome the barriers of the scope itself and approach the intervention from the collective, putting collective rights before the individuals. The real challenge is: How can urban conservation be adopted as a strategic approach to spatial sustainable development? 5 How can we make it? How can we finance it?

2 SENSEMAKING.

2.1 DEGROWTH AND SOCIAL CHANGE. 6

Inexorably, in addition to start to think about articulating systems for the enhancement of urban land and reducing the ecological footprint, those two concepts must be combined with the necessary reflection on the limitation of expansion, mobility, uses mixtification and the study of the optimal urban density. Only from this profound reflection can we optimize the model and justify the effective and full fulfillment of the social goal that corresponds to urban planning.

This social purpose, and therefore that of urban regeneration, has a scope that goes beyond the simple spatial transformation and refers to the reorganization of social relations. We live in fragmented cities, due to the social differentiation in the use of space. How to rebalance this social-spatial distinction of the centre (with its different concepts of centrality) and the periphery, must be the motor and objective of the urban redeveloping strategies to be implemented. In this way, the implementation of these rehabilitation, redeveloping and urban renewal strategies will generate positive impacts that, in turn, can serve as an essential lever for the economic and social development of the city and its citizens. But the underlying problem is deeper: Should we satisfy demand or manage supply? Societies will have to learn to deliberate

under uncertainty within the scope of flexible management and to stop planning oriented either towards growth or decline, but towards the well-being of people.

The question on the one hand lies in the concept of finitude, of the existence of limits, in the reciprocity work and the implications for the formation of social capital in a context of degrowth. It is a mere physical, empirical question. And on the other hand -the fundamental one -the key is to increase in this context the welfare of the people. For this, the key is cooperation as a theoretical root, as an attempt to explain the concept of degrowth: the work of reciprocity 7 and the implications for the formation of social capital. in a context of degrowth 8. Facing the paradigm of the dominant sustainable development, the hypothesis of the sustainable degrowth 9. But degrowth not only as a decrease in consumption as we know it 10, but with the idea of strong and sustainable consumption 11.

It is possible to interpret this movement not as a depressive factor but as a catalyst 12 for the true fulfilment of the social function of urban planning. The argument is that -from an evolutionary perspective-, the fact that there are some potential elements for conscious social change, can be substantiated (one could imagine a democratic refoundation in the perspective of the decline, which includes ecological, social and anthropological challenges 13) even in a degrowth era 14.

The different variants of the strategies of degrowth 15, as an emerging concept, share the perspective of a greater democratization besides the environmental conscience 16. The degrowth is presented in this way as a way of transition towards a socially and ecologically sustainable future 17. Thus, the approach to degrowth is more fundamentally raised as questions relating to the relationship between material prosperity and individual and social well-being 18. The Cohousing movement, for example, is a model for making life more social and greener in an urban context. Cohousing fits perfectly well with economic theories and good practices of degrowth 19.

The key is whether this is possible without traumatic changes in the institutional framework 20. Under what conditions can it be socially sustainable? 21 An interlocking cultural and political shift is needed that embraces degrowth as positive social development and institutional reform. Therefore, sustainable degrowth is not only a structuring concept; is a political and social project that offers a new grouping motto for a social coalition built around the aspiration to build a society that lives better with less 22 23.

In the literature on degrowth, relocation in relation to the mobility of people towards overcoming urban petrification is widely considered as a strategic approach for the transition towards a society of decline. Spatial decentralization can lead to social and environmental consequences that confront the goals of a decrepit society. The maintenance of localization and the change only of the decentralization of decision-making in the planning process, do not necessarily lead to a just and sustainable society. It is essential to have multi-scalar transitional strategies, with careful steps 24, in the context of planning to pursue the urban renewal, based on the mobility of localization. This shows the complex relationship between paradigmatic social transformation and spatial development, and the significant role that urban planning can and should play in the transition to degrowth 25.

In short, the key is the degrowth as defined by Schneider 26 as "An equitable reduction of production and consumption that increases human well-being and improves local and global ecological conditions in the short and long term".

2.2 PARADIGM SHIFT

We operate with a model based on constant expansive growth that does not work when urban redeveloping must be faced. We are not prepared to assimilate and manage both the degradation of the urban environment, and the urban decline itself, because the natural (we think) is that the city grows as long as it does not meet its physical limits. Therefore, when we get signals that do not fit the paradigm we do not stop until we find the cause that allows explaining such behaviour against nature without having to question the paradigm. But the system does not respond. The change must be systemic, it must be total. The objective should be refocused and redefined purposes. That is, the need is to replace the traditional expansive model, for the regeneration of the current urban system.

To do this, new ways of proceeding should be programmed, and at the same time make citizens aware of their obligations and responsibilities, not just their rights. New models of strategic planning instead of shortened planning and millimetre definition. Regarding the way to approach the planning, the procedures and basic methodologies (ideas) that will have to be applied, will be:

a. Prospective planning. That who aims to show the opportunities and benefits of linking territorial foresight tools to urban planning procedures.
b. Management planning. The one that not pretends a direct relationship between needs and spatial display. The fact of granting specific intensities and uses to each and every part of the territory, in fact limits its development to that specification. It is necessary that the planning establishes the objectives, but without limiting their spatial development, in such way, that through that flexibility can be effectively implemented with greater effectiveness the determinations of the purposes of urban planning. Urban planning legislation has no obligation to guarantee the activity of speculators; on the contrary, it has, or must have, the obligation to avoid it. Therefore nothing forces to attribute in detail the buildability to the land. It could (and in my opinion, should) move to a goal-oriented model where the emphasis is on the goals pursued for the city without fossilizing the media. It is necessary to overcome the cult of the plan itself -which is only a mean-to work on planning. This would allow avoiding that the means substitute the ends, to adapt the means to the circumstances of each moment.
c. Continuous planning. Scrum planning. Based on: adopting an incremental development strategy, rather than complete product planning and execution. Basing the quality of the result more on the tacit knowledge of people and the local people involved in self-organized teams, than on the quality of the processes employed. And overlapping the different phases of development, instead of performing one after another in a sequential or cascade cycle.

In addition to emphasizing the objectives, it is necessary to reconsider them regularly and at high frequency. Social needs evolve rapidly and undergo changes that were unpredictable very recently and are elements that drastically condition social configuration. The capacity of adaptation of the urban activity to the new problems is null. It is not about putting planning upside down every four months, it is about outlining the variable parts so that the whole serves better the quality of life of the people.

Regarding the key ideas and concepts of the paradigm shift should be the following, and should guide the nomenclature of urban action in the coming years:

2.2.1 THE EFFECTIVENESS VS EFFICIENCY

The concept of efficiency is commonly accepted. Efficiency understood as optimization or maximization of work done. However, the concept of efficiency forgets the purpose for which the work is developed, so that its ultimate object is better understood by the concept of efficiency. Work can be very efficient, but not effective for the defined purpose. For this, it is critical to link the optimization of the work to the intended end, of the plan to the goal, because in the process of maximizing the performance, effectiveness can be lost if the functionality of the work is not taken into account: its usefulness.

Above and beyond any technological advance, it is necessary to press on the need for efficiency, as a step prior to effectiveness, an idea that dismantles the paradox of efficiency -Jevons paradox 27 -which stated the final increase in the aggregate consumption of the system. The dilemma is between satisfying demand and managing supply. Only by acting, either from both sides, or only from the incentive of demand, goals can be achieved, never only from the stimulus of supply. Focusing on increasing efficiency implies the assumption of the obligation to satisfy demand, even though it may be growing steadily. An approach from sustainability must replace the satisfaction of the demand for the management of available supply, in our case, talking about available and buildable land. The key concept is to overcome efficiency for effectiveness. Because strategies that aim to satisfy the demand cannot be sustainable, ecological or viable.

2.2.2 THE RESILIENCE

Resilience is a dynamic process that ends with a positive adaptation in contexts of great adversity. Resilience is also the term used in ecology to indicate the ability of a sytem to absorb disturbances without significantly altering its structure and functionality characteristics; being able to return to its original state once the disturbance has finished. Factors that foster an ecosystem's resilience give way to sustainability.

What does this have to do with the urban question? 28 Urban resilience is the ability of a city exposed to a threat to resist, absorb, adapt and recover from its effects in a timely and efficient manner, including preserving and restoring its basic structures and functions. This resilience concept is linked to the dynamic concepts of urban development 29. In this sense, resilience is a process and not an immediate response to adversity 30. Being resilient has little, if anything, to do with being invulnerable, but with learning and adaptation 31. Resilience is the key response to climate change, and in that context, education, learning and training must be taken as a key element in strengthening the response to climate change 32.

What holds the present article as a novel concept is that the degrowth is itself resilient 33. As a reaction to aggression, the response of retraction must be considered as the most resilient and feasible of all. This is why a holistic approach to designing, planning and managing resilience is essential, including an assessment of the cultural dynamics and processes within cities as well as their physical elements 34.

The critical issue is what cities and their urban communities must do to move toward a more resilient state in the future. The concept of "urban governance", contributes to the comprehensive management of urban resilience. There is a significant need for a new approach to urban governance to address uncertainties and future environmental and climate change challenges 35.

2.2.3 CRADLE TO CRADLE36 . CIRCULAR ECONOMY. CIRCULAR URBAN PLANNING

In the ecosystems of the planet, there is no garbage, there is a complete closure of material cycles. Our societies can do the same by designing all the products so that the materials are recycled in the same use, or recycled "upwards", meaning that the next use has the same or more value than the current one. The paradigm shift will success with the idea that in any productive process, garbage should be understood as the food of a new parallel process. Abundance and diversity can and should be celebrated whenever the process is closed and the residue of a process serves either as a biological food of that same process, or as a technological food of a parallel process, but always in a circular feedback scheme system.

To understand this concept, in terms of urban land consolidation and therefore planning, it is essential to link with the obvious, but often infrequent: “the time”. Space and time must be linked, that is to say, occupation, land use and its schedule, and its expiration. The planning parameters and their value should be linked more strongly with the validity of the plan itself in their temporal scope and not beyond, and especially linked to the effective use of the land. The urban plan classify the land, but only in what they are in force, although we seem to forget it. The temporal dimension is not rigorously applied and must be indissoluble. The plan should be reviewed from time to time and give flexibility to land use. This is the first step towards resilience and circular urban planning understood as the closure of the life cycle of land use.

Circular urban planning: This new concept deals with incorporating the concepts of circular economy and circular production into urban planning and land use, with the aim of creating intelligent cities that are able to adapt and learn from their own mistakes: resilient cities. Definitely in the planning we must consider this flexibility, the end of life of the buildings, the linkage of the effective use of the classification of the territory, and the closing of the life cycle of the use of the land and to flee of the linear models. In order to reach it, the land must be able to occupy and vacate with the same ease. We must work for it.

2.2.4 SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY VS SUSTAINABLE ACCESSIBILITY: CONNECTED SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Capital in all matters relating to urban planning is the problem of mobility. How to face it? There are only two ways. The first is to mitigate through means of transport of greater environmental efficiency and social efficiency, in particular, the enhancement of collective transport. The second is to reduce the

environmental and social consequences of traffic by reducing physical mobility but increasing other means of connection.

Mobility seeks to bridge the gap between the members of a community and the places where they meet their needs or desires, that is, to enable accessibility. That is to say, accessibility is the objective that, through the means of transport, seeks mobility. The usual logic that equates mobility with accessibility. The confusion of both terms is the basis of the accepted formula that "greater mobility greater accessibility". Under this simplification we have been planning; a criteria that, without improving accessibility -and often worsening it -have had a main impact on mobility problems.

Accessibility not only has one variable -the transport-but it is the result of the interrelationship of multiple variables in which spatial planning and socio-economic organization play a fundamental role. Accessibility is a concept linked to the places, the spatial layout, and the territory.

The objective to be guaranteed should not be to have many means of transport that reach ever greater distances, but to have access to goods and services. Accessibility, therefore, is valued either in relation to the cost or difficulty of movement required to meet the needs, or in relation to the cost or difficulty of the supplies or customers reach the place in question.

Sustainable accessibility thus becomes a more far-reaching approach than sustainable mobility. By facilitating reflection on needs, it facilitates reflection on the construction of urban relations and, therefore, reflection on the city model.

To this end, it is not enough to improve and expand the transport system, it is also necessary to question the spatial or geographical level in which the inhabitants develop: increasing accessibility can only be achieved by increasing the proximity between the inhabitants and of these to their needs. Factors with a critical impact on the processes of construction of the city, in short, concepts that express a new model of society towards which we are headed. In this new scenario, the level of self-sufficiency of regions, cities, neighbourhoods, and buildings is a critical issue.

Everyone should try to solve most of their needs on their site in their territory. In the first place the energetics, but not only them. Cities must work with nature, not against it is the new paradigm. Urban processes will be more stable, the more integrated they are in natural processes and in biological cycles that feeds back.

Connected self-sufficiency 37 is a concept that seeks to opposite the established dynamics, breaking the limits and the usual practice of waste, and oppose the notion of freedom that is linked to the right to waste and abuse natural resources, processes that can forget the links between economy and nature. Connected self-sufficiency understood as optimization of the use of all existing resources, with a tendency to close the cycles of materials and energy in the sites themselves, and as a search for the balance between the logic of natural processes and the advantages of network interrelation.

3 THE IDEA: DEGROWTH GENERATES VALUE.

We are accustomed to deny certain realities: Housing prices never go down; the city expands by its own nature... Jew-Christian culture has taught us to conceive history as a linear progress, so we do not know how to read properly, and less to digest, the phenomena that do not fit in that conception. Other cultures focus on the cyclical aspect of history and are better equipped to understand phenomena that do not correspond to the linear progression paradigm.

Reality shows us that in order to mobilize consolidated urban land, any urban redeveloping operation must plan an increase in urban buildability in that concrete area (an added value), in order to be able to carry out and assume the cost inherent to the dismantling of the existing artefact, and to build the next one.

Given that it is necessary a contribution of an added value to achieve the intended mobilization (putted away the increase of buildability, nor of the public subsidy), taking into account the dispersion and effective loss of the urban critical mass of the periphery, a new mechanism of intervention arises as a way of contributing to that necessary increase of value that switch it on. Indirectly: and if that additional value, that increment, or question of opportunity, comes to be given exogenously?

The line of research that this article advances, matrix of development of the PhD thesis of the author, tries to contribute with a different answer, a new mechanism of intervention in the existing city: the degrowth as generator of value. Active and programmed degrowth as a means of concentration of demand, through the restriction of supply and catalyst of urban redeveloping.

For there to be intervention in the existing city there must be a profit, and as long as it continues to grow and consume virgin land, there will be no possibility of generating an added value in the existing city, so we must intervene in supply not only limiting expansion, but even reducing the occupation. Thus we can generate expectation and added value in the consolidated and non-consolidated urban land which may catalyse its redeveloping. As Brent D. Ryan notes, "Accepting the inevitable decline and abandonment of some neighbourhoods, while rebuilding others as new neighbourhoods with innovative design and planning, can reignite modernism's spirit of optimism and shape brighter future shrinking cities and their residents" 38, to which I add that not only with this resigned acceptance but proving it as a means of generating such added value.

Degrowth, not as a hygienic need or only to reduce the ecological footprint, but applying its effects as a method to generate an increase of value, which rise to the opportunity of redeveloping of the existing urban network. Degrowth not of value, but in terms of consumption of net land and built roof. A form of concentration of value, through the physical net degrowth, but net growth in terms of the resulting final value holistically measured. The challenge is to use the degrowth as a means to generate an increase in urban value and urban qualification.

The investigation will focus on the search for qualitative formulas and catalysts, which excel the increase of value and urban qualification, through land and built areas abandonment in parallel with retraining and integrated efforts in others. The purpose is to demonstrate that resilience and circular urban planning can be achieved through degrowth in the existing city. The ultimate aim should be the requalification to effectively fulfil the social purpose associated to urban planning.

The claim, logically is not to give a panacea that solves all the problems inherent to the sustainability and efficiency in our cities, but to propose a new path that contributes to the achievement of the intended accomplishment and serves as a catalyst for integrated actions.

The challenge is how to increase the quality of life in a context of degrowth 39. This is the real challenge: that degrowth may serve to increase the quality of life of people.

4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research delves into the search for qualitative elements that facilitate the implementation of hypotheses and catalytic formulas to achieve this; and the study of its consequences. The objectives of the research are:

1. Formulation of the hypothesis and the sensemaking process followed to reach to that conclusion.
2. Identification of boundary conditions that might change in other to allow the implementation of this theory, identifying current and future catalysts.
3. Identification of benchmarks, establishing weighting relations for a holistic and global calculation, necessary for identification of feasible actions to implement the scenario.
4. A real case of implementation study and its consequences: Bilbao and its next step of urban transformation. Contrast between actual growth plans and the application of this theory.
5. The study of cities in rebound: cities in which active hygienic degrowth programs were implemented in the recent past, and now are growing again. Where are they focusing their new growth? It`s interesting to see if this new resurgence is applied in the redeveloping of the consolidated but empty city.

The PhD thesis advances different qualitative aspects on which to influence in order to create the conditions and the appropriate ecosystem for the effective development of the hypothesis. Such as: 1) The review of the property rights. New models.

A. Differentiation between land property rights and built property rights.

- Between built property rights and its use. 2) Sustainable construction. Prefabrication and industrialization. Light construction. 3) The new concepts of urbanization (land transformation), occupation and land use. 4) New concept of relocation in urban redeveloping areas. 5) Investment vs. speculation. 6) Urban planning and foresight. Management planning 7) Continuous planning: Programmatic indeterminacy. Stratification of functions: flexible multiplication and mixed urban uses. 8) The non-place as work space ergo the non-place as living space.

The following are elements that may constitute factors of acceleration catalysts or triggers that facilitate the application of the hypothesis and are part of the PhD research:

1. New concept of the participation of the community in the capital profit of the urban action.
2. New concept of the distribution of benefits and charges in land transformation.
3. New concept of the delimitation of the distribution areas. New zoning.
4. Temporality of the classification of the land´s uses.
5. Reuse. Valorisation of the debris.
6. The duty of conservation by the owner.
7. The duty of disassembly after the use´s end.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Any reflection on Sustainable Urban Planning must start from these two basic assumptions: that growth has limits, and that we have already surpassed them, or we are very close to it. And therefore lead to an immediate corollary: we must stop growth. Degrowth is inevitable in physical terms in order to achieve a sustainable, efficient and effective urban balance. There is no technical solution to the problem 40.

There is an invertment in the pyramid of the population in our society and even a net degrowth in population in many cases. This downward trend has been maintained over time for decades, and all data point to a progression of this trend by the low birth rate. The next generations, those that will occupy what we plan today, will (must) generate a much lower demand for buildable land and buildings. If the empty housing stock data is joined, we will arrive at the rapid conclusion that the city runs the risk of diffusing its critical mass, within a consolidated urban network with multiple dotational deficiencies and low efficiency. We must try to turn this threat into an opportunity.

Likewise, the ecological crisis is a direct consequence of the current social and economic model, based on the exploitation of the resources of the planet beyond any limit. An economic model built on the absurd belief that perpetual and unlimited growth is possible. This is the real Gordian knot that must be eradicated 41.

The question of urban density linked to efficiency, sustainability and the mixtification of uses in the search for a rationalization of transport mobility, inexorably leads to start to think of articulating systems to give added value to the urban estate and to reduce ecological footprint. The problem has much to do with the inadequacy of our cities to the new requirements and demands, and with the lack and the physical deterioration of the endowments in urban land. The challenge is not only due to the intervention in the existing city, but also through the requalification of consolidated and non-consolidated urban areas. Requalification understood as the valorisation of the urban areas in all its extension and measure holistically in all its transversality of disciplines.

The basic question is how to act in the existing urban network. Taking only the paradigm of efficiency through density, the urban redensification must inevitably pass through the liberation of part of the already built areas. It is not materially possible to achieve efficiency by increasing urban density, without achieving in parallel the liberation of the non-dense, or unconsolidated, otherwise the net built area of the urban system as a whole would be grown, obtaining the opposite effect of loss of efficiency (Jevons paradox). But it is not only efficiency the paradigm to follow.

We must reject the traditional urban development schemes: the consolidation of land transformation. Urban petrification should be attacked connecting it with land use. The objective should be to achieve the raise of the quality of life of the people. Urban planning is a public function with an inherent social purpose,

which should be no other than to end socio-spatial inequalities and the system that generates them. We must face the systemic problem that impinges on current urban planning: the practical impossibility of effective intervention in the existing city. Any urban redeveloping operation must plan an increase in urban buildable capacity resulting from the specific area in order to be viable. So we can be able to start assuming the costs of disassembling the existing artefact, in addition to the assignments of the future artefact, taxation and later the new development and buildings. In the current conditions it is necessary to program in the particular area an additional value to the previous one to be able to mobilize it. The new idea that this article presents, focuses on articulating a method that leads to the necessary increase of value, that generates the opportunity of action, allows the viability of the processes of urban redeveloping and makes them possible; through the active degrowth, through the liberation of the urban land and of the buildable areas, as a means of concentration of the demand, by reducing the supply and availability, that concentrates the opportunity, grows the value and catalyses the process of redeveloping.

The ultimate objective is to re-qualify and demonstrate that resilience and circular urban planning (understood as closure of the life cycle in land use) can be achieved through degrowth in existing and consolidated urban areas. Degrowth is itself resilient: Resilience is a process and not an immediate response to adversity. As a reaction to aggression, the response of retraction should be considered as the most resilient and feasible of all. The challenge is to degrowth, not as a hygienic need or only to reduce the ecological footprint, not as an action of mere collateral expense to the system, but as a method to generate an increase of value, that gives rise to the opportunity to the redeveloping of the existing urban network. A form of concentration of value, through physical net degrowth, but net growth in terms of final result value. That is to say:

a. The degrowth as a generator of value. Active and programmed degrowth as a means of concentration of demand, by restricting supply, acting as an urban redeveloping catalyst.
b. The key concepts of philosophy "cradle to cradle" are intuitive and rooted in the imitation of nature: garbage is food, as well as degrowth generates value. Circular economy, circular urban planning.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

1 M. Auken (2009). Informe sobre el impacto de la urbanización extensiva en españa en los derechos individuales de los ciudadanos europeos, el medio ambiente y la aplicación del derecho comunitario, con fundamento en determinadas peticiones recibidas. (2008/2248(ini)) UE. Comisión de peticiones.

2 E. Führ Cottbus (2003) How is it that cities can shrink. Public space in the time of shrinkage. Contents v8, nº1

3 N Smith, R. Rolnik, A. Ross, M. Davis (2009). Después del neoliberalismo: ciudades y caos sistémico. Macba, Observatorio metropolitano.

4 J. C. Brown. K. J. Briesemeister (2015). Reiventing your city. Urbanite Publishing.

5 D. IJsselstijn, D. Jacome, T. Kesarovski, J. Portheine, D. Radai (2014). Evolve, not change. Improve, not replace. Urban conservation as a strategy for sustainable spatial development. Delft University of Technology, Netherlands

6 E. García (2006). El cambio social más allá de los límites al crecimiento: un nuevo referente para el realismo en la sociología ecológica. Aposta. Nº. 27.

7 V. Andreoni, S. Galmarini (2014). How to increase well-being in a context of degrowth. Futures 55.

8 V. Andreoni, S. Galmarini (2013). On the increase of social capital in degrowth economy. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 72.

9 J. Martínez-Alier, U. Pascual, F.D. Vivien, E Zaccai (2010). Sustainable de-growth: mapping the context, criticisms and future prospects of an emergent paradigm. Ecological economics 69.

10 D. W. O'neill (2012). Measuring progress in the degrowth transition to a steady state economy. Ecological economics 84.

11 S. Lorek, D. Fuchs (2013). Strong sustainable consumption governance e precondition for a degrowth path?. Journal of Cleaner Production 38.

12 A. H. Sorman, M. Giampietro (2013). The energetic metabolism of societies and the degrowth paradigm: analyzing biophysical constraints and realities. Journal of cleaner production 38.

13 M. Deriu (2012). Democracies with a future: degrowth and the democratic tradition. Futures 44.

14 E. Garcia (2012). Degrowth, the past, the future, and the human nature. Futures 44.

15 J. Van den Bergh (2011). Environment versus growth — a criticism of “degrowth” and a plea for “a¬growth. Ecological economics 70.

16 K. Ott (2012). Variants of de-growth and deliberative democracy: a habermasian proposal. Futures 44.

17 N. Videira, F. O. Shneider, F. Sekulova, G. Kallis (2014). Improving understanding on degrowth pathways: an exploratory study using collaborative causal models. Futures 55.

18 C. Bauhardt (2014). Solutions to the crisis? The green newdeal, degrowth, and the solidarity economy: alternatives to the capitalist growth economy from an ecofeminist economics perspective. Ecological economics 102.

19 M. Lietaert (2010). Cohousing’s relevance to degrowth theories. Journal of cleaner production 18.

20 F. Schneider, G. Kallis, J. Martinez-Alier (2010). Crisis or opportunity? Economic degrowth for social equity and ecological sustainability. Introduction to this special issue. Journal of cleaner production 18.

21 G. Kallis, C. Kerschner, J. Martinez-Alier (2012). The economics of degrowth. Ecological economics 84.

22 G. Kallis (2011). In defence of degrowth. Ecological economics 70.

23 A. Matthey (2010). Less is more: the influence of aspirations and priming on well-being. Journal of cleaner production 18.

24 J. H. Spangenberg (2010). The growth discourse, growth policy and sustainable development: two thought experiments. Journal of cleaner production 18.

25 J. Xue (2014). Is eco-village/urban village the future of a degrowth society? An urban planner's perspective. Ecological economics 105.

26 F. Schneider, G. Kallis, J. Martinez-Alier (2010). Crisis or opportunity? Economic degrowth for social equity and ecological sustainability. Introduction to this special issue. Journal of cleaner production 18.

27 A. Nilton, L. Sauer (2012). An ecological economic interpretation of the Jevons effect. Ecological Complexity 9. 2–9.

28 M. Kärrholm, K. Nylund, P. Prieto de la Fuente (2014). Spatial resilience and urban planning: addressing the interdependence of urban retail areas. Cities 36.

29 J. R. Fernandes, P. Chamusca (2014). Urban policies, planning and retail resilience. Cities 36.

30 J. Ahern (2011). From fail-safe to safe-to-fail: sustainability and resilience in the new urban world. Landscape and urban planning 100.

31 M. J. Collier, Z. Nedovic´-Budic´, J. Aerts, S. Connop, D. Foley, K. Foley, D. Newport, S. Mcquaid, A. Slaev, P. Verburg (2013). Transitioning to resilience and sustainability in urban communities. Cities 32.

32 H. Dieleman (2013). Organizational learning for resilient cities, through realizing eco-cultural innovations. Journal of cleaner production 50 171-180

33 K. Tidball, R. Stedman (2013). Positive dependency and virtuous cycles: from resource dependence to resilience in urban social-ecological systems. Ecological economics 86.

34 K.C. Desouza, T.H. Flanery (2013). Designing, planning, and managing resilient cities: a conceptual framework. Cities 35 89–99.

35 Y. Jabareen (2013). Planning the resilient city: concepts and strategies for coping with climate change and environmental risk. Cities 31 220–229.

36 W. Mcdonough, M. Braungart (2005). Cradle to Cradle. McGraw-Hill.

37 J. Requejo Liberal. (2009). Territorio y energía: la autosuficiencia conectada. Arenal grupo consultor s.l. Asistencias técnicas clave s.l.

38 B. D. Ryan (2012). Desing after decline. How America rebuilds shrinking cities. University of Pennsylvania Press.

39 V. Andreoni, S. Galmarini (2014). How to increase well-being in a context of degrowth. Futures 55.

40 G. Hardin (1968). The tragedy of commons. Science, v. 162 pp. 1243-1248.

41 L. Krier (2010). "Growth: maturity or over-development?" in Prashad, Deependra. New architecture and urban planning: development of indian traditions. Cambridge scholars publishing, Newcastle.