

## CASE EXAMPLE 1 – BARCELONA

**1 Title:** «Accompanying programme for the rehousing of residents from “low price housing” of the neighbourhood of El Bon Pastor».

### 2 Case example Summary

It consists in the accompaniment for the rehousing of residents from “low price housing” (a complex of 784 old and damaged single ground floor family houses sized from 37m<sup>2</sup> to 54m<sup>2</sup>) to new social housing (apartments in a residential building). It is based on the active participation of residents through activities linked to 3 dimensions: individual/family (attention and support to residents in the process of rehousing); neighbour’s community (strengthening ties within the new buildings); neighbourhood life (how to normalise this process without disrupting the whole neighbourhood’s life). This program uses a community approach to address the change of moving from “horizontal” to “vertical” housing and its consequences, especially in terms of social relationships within the residential buildings.

### 3 Solutions offered by the case example

This program is not a conflict mediation service. It is a community project which, through a set of activities, creates the favourable conditions for helping neighbours to understand the challenges of “vertical” housing and, on the other hand, to self-organise to tackle collective issues and built a qualitative living environment. These main activities are: weekly information points (in the public space and in the office’s program), regular personal interviews, dissemination of informative documents (ex. flyers), thematic workshops, building meetings (output ex.: validation of an “Internal Agreements” for the good coexistence and use of common facilities and spaces), facilitation of psychosocial support activities (especially with women) and making-decision process for the definition of new public space. It is relevant to mention that a community and inclusive approach is developed to solve the challenge of coexistence in vertical housing, whose residents are a heterogeneous collective (owners and tenants, gypsy and non-gypsy, members and non-members of a neighbours’ association, etc.). This is the solution that this case offers. A solution that is linked to core ideas such as self-organization, autonomy, co-responsibility, inclusion, equality, proximity, respect, trust, empathy, etc.

### 4 Building on the sustainable and integrated approach

This case example illustrates an integrated perspective since housing quality is not just an issue of physical or material conditions; it is also an issue of managing social relations and guaranteeing civic coexistence. The process of rehousing seeks to improve living conditions of neighbours since they transits from low to high quality housing. But, achieving good living conditions also depends on the quality of neighbours relations. Therefore, this program integrates social and housing thematic scopes. Besides, the integrated approach is also embedded in this action since social, economic, cultural, physical and ethnical neighbours’ features are all taking into account. It is necessary to consider this complexity, as an integrate perspective, in order to build inclusive and egalitarian social relations. Integrated approach is the reason why, in order to achieve the most harmonious intervention in the neighbourhood, regular coordination and follow-up meetings are held with the unit of “Neighbourhood Plan for the Bon Pastor”, who has the overview of different actions taking place in the area.

## 5 Based on a participatory approach

On the one hand, the participation of neighbours is essential since the objective is to help them to be capable to self-organization and self-decision making. Empowerment and inclusion is central (everyone has the right –and in some way the duty– to take part on it). This is very important since the accompanying program has an ending date. At some point, neighbours will be alone facing the different situations of their common daily life. On the other hand, this program, which was a neighbours' demand, is running by a local development cooperative (called *La Fàbrica*) with the economic support of the municipality. This is also relevant since this actor has developed the methodology and has gained the legitimacy of all (neighbours and local authorities) thanks to its independence, competence and high social commitment.

## 6 What difference has it made? How did the result indicator shift?

Due to the fact that program is still running it is difficult to have qualitative data from outcome indicators that give information about, for example, increase of trust and security perception and reduction of conflicts within new buildings. Nevertheless, it has been an important change in terms of social conditions of living; in each building a board of neighbours has been set up and "Internal Agreements" are being implemented. Program activities are helping neighbours –especially women– to gain in self-confidence and autonomy to make decisions and increase their social capital and relational capabilities. The near future will give elements to evaluate how this autonomy is developing.

## 7 Why should other EU cities use it?

European cities have different models of Urban Regeneration Programs, not only with different funding schemes, but also based on various implementation approaches. It seems important to pay special attention on questions such as how to move from the "physical" to the "integrated and participatory-based approach", from the "building approach" to the "people-based approach". Among other questions, these kinds of transitions can contribute to strengthen social ties, avoid conflicts and discrimination, and generate autonomy and good coexistence. This case example can shed light on all these issues.

## 8 Key Facts and Figures:

**8.1 Start and end dates of case example:** the accompanying program with this specific community approach started in 2013 and it will likely end in 2019 (*to be confirmed*).

**8.2 Date of preparation of this case example:** November-December 2018.

**8.3 Who prepared the case example?** Sebastià Riutort (Social Rights Area of the Barcelona City Council) with information provided by Aritz Garcia and Mercè Zegrí (*La Fàbrica*) and Miquel Àngel Lozano (head of projects of the "Neighbourhood Plan for the Bon Pastor", Barcelona City Council).

**8.4 Budget:** 172.300€ (from 01/01/2018 to 30/06/2019, which is the current contractual term with La Fàbrica).

## 9 Extra information and hyperlinks

[https://www.barcelona.cat/en/conocebcn/pics/attractivos/el-barrio-del-bon-pastor\\_99400387432.html](https://www.barcelona.cat/en/conocebcn/pics/attractivos/el-barrio-del-bon-pastor_99400387432.html)

<http://pladebarris.barcelona/plans-de-barri/el-bon-pastor-i-baro-de-viver/concrecio-del-pla/programa-d-acompanyament-als-reallotjaments-de-les-cases-barates>

10 Annex at least 2 good quality photos



© Barcelona's Municipal Institute of Housing and Renovation (IMHAB)



© Massimiliano Rumignani



© Massimiliano Rumignani



© Massimiliano Rumignani



© Massimiliano Rumignani