



**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE**

**From CONTESTED\_CITIES to Global Urban Justice**

**Stream 5**

**Article nº 5-014**

**THE INSTITUTIONALISATION OF THE RIGHT TO THE  
CITY IN SPAIN AFTER THE 15M**

**VÍTOR PEITEADO FERNÁNDEZ**

## The institutionalization of the right to the city in Spain after the 15M

Vítor Peiteado Fernández

PhD Student at Roskilde University/Malmö University

[vitor@ruc.dk](mailto:vitor@ruc.dk)

### ABSTRACT

The 'right to the city' has become a popular claim in the last years, raising questions about its meaning and implications. Thus, besides the problematic around the definition of what this right really means, I consider relevant to ask if it is possible to implement it today. Therefore, this paper aims to analyse challenges and limitations for the implementation of right to the city within the institutions of the current political systems.

This paper utilises Lefebvre's conceptualisation as base to analyse the government action of two municipal platforms which won mayoralties in the Spanish elections of May 2015 and which claim to defend the right to the city: Barcelona en Comú and Marea Atlántica.

Due to the limitations of this paper, the focus is set only on two pivotal aspects for exercising the right to the city: participation and appropriation. By researching how the government action of these platforms tries to implement participation and appropriation, this paper finds some limitations and challenges for institutionalising the right to the city. Thus, the analysis finds that, despite the increasing in the involvement of the citizens, the participation is far from the self-management model proposed by Lefebvre. On the other hand, appropriation finds even more problems not only of the private space—which is almost inexistent—but for the re-appropriation of public space, which has to be done mainly through the purchase of these spaces—with the consequent transfer of public capital to private actors. In conclusion, these limitations show important constrains imposed specially by governmental scales and the legal framework for a full implementation of the right to the city. Furthermore, these tensions are a consequence of the main challenge found by these platforms in the institutional implementation of the right: the confrontation between two legitimacy logics, which dispute the hegemony over the political action.

**KEYWORDS:** Right to the city, Marea Atlántica, Barcelona en Comú, Participation, Appropriation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The right to the city has today almost as many conceptions as advocates. The concept firstly formulated by Henri Lefebvre in the 1960s has lately been picked up by many academics and activists to the point to be even defended by the United Nations (Unngls 2010). This popularity together with the vagueness of Lefebvre's formulation has derived in multitude of different conceptions, leading in many cases to a development of the concept in different ways to that initially created by Lefebvre (Mayer 2012; Purcell 2013a).

Recognising the challenge that this diversity of concepts implies, this paper intends to investigate if the right to the city can be institutionalised and how. The critical origin of the concept and its linkage to social movements poses relevant questions about the possibilities and tensions of implementing this right within institutional politics, especially considering that Lefebvre thought it as a revolutionary movement to go beyond both capitalism and the state (Purcell 2013a). Due to the limited length of this paper, instead of offering a full account on the topic, I focus here only on two main features for conquering the right to the city: participation and appropriation. This article asks how the radical participation and appropriation can be promoted by formal representative institutions—municipal governments—as well as its possible challenges. For answering these questions the paper researches the government action of two Spanish civic platforms which won the mayoralities of Barcelona and A Coruña in May 2015: Marea Atlántica (Marea) and Barcelona en Comú (BeC). I use Lefebvre's conceptualisation for two main reasons: (1) as mentioned, the right to the city defended by activists and certain legal frameworks are very diverse, so difficult to equate for this essay; (2) in many cases this right has been reduced to a mere list of individual rights, which in many cases are already protected, what reduces the right's interesting antagonist potential as originally formulated by Lefebvre. Besides, this codification empties these rights of part of its political meaning since as legally protected they are supposed to be fulfilled without considering the conditions to guarantee an effective access for everyone (Purcell 2013a).

Therefore, the paper starts making a description of the right to the city developed by Lefebvre. Afterwards, I make a description and analysis of how the mentioned platforms implement measures of participation and appropriation towards the right to the city. Finally, I conclude by pointing out at possible problems, tensions and challenges showed by the institutionalisation of the right to the city tried by Marea and BeC.

## 2. THE RIGHT TO THE CITY IN LEFEBVRE

Lefebvre proposed an integrated theory of the urban society using resources of science and art in order to overcome the partiality of social sciences to solve the dialectical tension in the capitalist city between integration and segregation (Lefebvre 1996). However, he refused to construct any formal description of an ideal city, focusing instead on an open-ended process for the creation of a new city. The right to the city is presented then as a reform which, without fearing the creation of an utopia, should be linked to the real (Lefebvre 1996, p. 155). The right to the city is a cry for a new city (Harvey 2013), a new way of experiencing the city opposing the consumerism and disciplination of the capitalist city. Moreover, exercising the right to the city is basic for recovering the use value of the city, which have been substituted in the capitalist city by the exchange value, not only of the space, but also of the time and of the symbolic capital of the city (Lefebvre 1996).

Lefebvre saw in the capitalist city a formalised constraining environment that promotes alienation by segregating the city and expelling the working classes to the peripheries. It is basic that the city can be experienced and used by its inhabitants, especially those who have

been displaced. It is now when it becomes fundamental the concept of centrality, understood not as a visiting right but as the recovery of the access to those parts which have been denied to the less affluent inhabitants (1996), promoting the use value in order to fight the privatisation and speculation provoked by the expansion of consumerism and the spatial dynamics within the capitalist city previously mentioned (Lefebvre 1996).

This centrality can only be implemented by promoting participation and appropriation, main focus of this paper. Lefebvre warns about how participation understood as simple involvement in the decision making process can be used to legitimise the decision taken by those powers—state and industrial enterprises—responsible for impoverishing city life. Lefebvre understood instead participation as *autogestion* (self-management) by the citizens and as a condition for fully exercise the right to the city (Lefebvre 1996; Purcell 2013b). Moreover, this participation cannot be fully developed without appropriation. Thus, the residents should have the right to appropriate the city, or more correctly to re-appropriate spaces from where they have been expelled (Lefebvre 1996). This appropriation would facilitate participation thanks to the expansion of random encounters which will enrich the city life, increasing the acceptance of difference, at the same time that confronts the routinisation of everyday life. Lefebvre pictures the urban “as a place of encounters, focus of communication and information, where the urban becomes what it always was: place of desire, permanent disequilibrium, the moment of the unpredictable” (Lefebvre 1996, p. 129).

Lefebvre’s construction characterises for a high level of abstraction. Besides, cities have changed since the time he wrote. As a consequence of this, other scholars have tried to update and develop Lefebvre’s construction. Among those, Mark Purcell (2002; 2013a; 2013b) has taken the appropriation and the participation further, by defending the right to appropriate private spaces (Purcell 2003) for the common good and a radical participation to materialise the autogestion. Whereas, authors like David Harvey (2008; 2013) and Margit Mayer(2012) have focused on the importance of social movements, origin of the two platforms analysed here, for developing the right to the city. Furthermore, Mayer makes an interesting linkage between the right to the city, the social movements and the importance of the concept to encompass different urban struggles in a globalised world.

### **3. THE RIGHT TO THE CITY IN SPAIN: MAREA ATLÁNTICA AND BARCELONA EN COMÚN**

As mentioned, the right to the city has received increasing attention to the point of being demanded by the UN or legally protected in some countries like Brazil (Purcell 2013a). Nevertheless, the mentioned limitation linked to the codification of the right separates it from Lefebvre’s and social movement’s conceptualisation. However, within the Spanish wave of protest started with the 15M movement, for the first time in Spain, urban social movements—integrated in electoral platforms with some political parties like Podemos—have conquered the power in many mayoralties all over the country—among others, 13 cities of more than 50 thousand inhabitants, including the three largest cities in the country. This has created an interesting new scenario for researching how the right to the city can be translated from the streets—the social movements—to the representative formal institutions—municipal governments. Among all these platforms, this paper will focus on Barcelona en Comú and Marea Atlántica. The reason for choosing these platforms is twofold: (1) the different size and relevance of the cities: while Barcelona is the second largest city in Spain, A Coruña is a middle size city with less political and economic relevance; (2) the platforms themselves: BeC was the first of these platforms formed in Spain and led by a famous activist, whereas Marea was created one month later, with less famous representatives and less conducted by the organisations. Besides, both platforms

are in a similar situation in the city hall as they needed pacts for reaching the mayoralty (El País 2015).

BeC was presented in June 26<sup>th</sup> 2014 as the result of the convergence of social movements and some political parties—Podemos, with five seats in the European Parliament, and ICV, with ten seats in the Catalanian Parliament, were the biggest—, to be validated by the citizens—the promoters of the project self-imposed a minimum of 30.000 signatures for the validation (Guanyem Barcelona 2014). The platform launched a campaign to present the project in neighbourhoods through open meetings and assemblies. Following these a program was co-created with contributions from individuals and different organisations. Consequently, primary elections were organised to elect the representatives running for the elections, with a system of closed and blocked lists, including representatives of every organisation within BeC—the list was completed by ten individual members representing each city district—, winning the list led by Ada Colau—the only list presented—, famous anti- eviction activist (Barcelona en Comú 2015a). In May 2015, BeC won the municipal elections with 25% of the votes (El País 2015), becoming Colau the new mayoress.

On the other hand, Marea Atlántica was launched on July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2014, following the model of BeC. It is also the result of a convergence and set a condition of 2.500 signatures to be validated. The platform followed a similar process of presentation and voting as BeC, including in the final platform social movements, political parties—Podemos again and Anova, with nine seats in the Galician Parliament, are the most significant—and individual activists. In the primary elections Xulio Ferrreiro was elected candidate for the elections—again the only candidate—, with the difference with respect to BeC that the rest of the list was voted in an independent election by a system of open and unblocked lists (Rodríguez 2015). Marea was the second party in number of votes in the elections, winning ten mandates, the same as Partido Popular, which won the elections by 28 votes. Marea holds the mayoralty thanks to the support of the social-democratic PSOE (El País 2015).

Since these platforms have been in the office for a short period of time, I look both at government action and projects, as well as their process of creation. As mentioned, the analysis of the right to the city defended by the platforms centers on how they implement policies to promote two pivotal aspects: participation and appropriation. Obviously, these are not totally independent and overlap, in ways that actions that promote appropriation can promote also participation, for example. I hope this offers a good insight for the aims of the paper: showing how the right to the city can be extrapolated from the social movements to the institutional politics and the challenges to its implementation.

It is necessary to remark that, although these organisations only started recently to make a direct reference to the right to the city, the frame they make of the problems and their actions follow most of the aspects previously mentioned as basic features for the right to the city. The first direct mention to the right to the city I could record from Marea is from January 2016 (Rodríguez 2016), while the first from BeC was in March 2016 (Barcelona en Comú 2016a). The reason for this lack of reference to the term can be that this is not a popular concept in Spain at the moment, so it would not be very resonant among the population.

#### **4. PARTICIPATION AND APPROPRIATION**

Both platforms claim to put the citizens in the front in order to recover the city for its residents. This resonates immediately with the expansion of participation and appropriation as main tools for promoting such political centrality. Thus, since the creation of the two

platforms, participation has been a main aspect of their discourse and repertoires, claiming for a more direct participation and respect for residents' wishes, being this implemented since the creation of the platforms. Thus, both organisations encouraged residents to validate the project and to vote in the primary elections (Barcelona en Comú 2015b; Marea Atlántica 2015a). Moreover, the programs were co-created by residents and social organizations which could make proposals to be included in the program. Besides, both organisations presented and discussed the programs in open assemblies and meetings, mainly on a neighbourhood scale (Barcelona en Comú 2015d; Marea Atlántica 2015c). The participation in this initial stage was characterised then by the direct involvement and horizontality, resonating with the autogestion defended by Lefebvre. Nevertheless, this initial phase is the closest to social mobilisation, which imposes less constraints than the consequent institutionalisation. After the elections both platforms kept the rhetoric of encouraging participation and re-appropriation of the city. Nevertheless, the forms in which these are articulated are different to the ones seen before reaching the office.

Furthermore, the platforms claim to appropriate the institutions for the citizens—*mandar obedeciendo* (govern obeying) is a main motto of BeC—being more plural than the traditional political parties in the Spanish system, since members from social movements and associations hold core positions within the platforms. Moreover, the city hall is seen as the main tool to guarantee residents' appropriation without breaking the law or even for given legal coverage to actions, like occupation of houses, which the government in Barcelona intend to legalise in some cases of habitational emergency (Consorti de l'Habitatge de Barcelona 2016).

Nevertheless, once the platforms took the office found new constraints and challenges to implement that participation and appropriation in an institutional environment. Thus, they organized new ways or strengthened already existing institutions for promoting citizens participation and empowerment. Marea, for example, created the councillorship of Participation and Democratic Regeneration, and implemented experiences like *Escano Ciudadán* (Concello de A Coruña 2015c)—for posing questions in ordinary plenary sessions in the city hall—*A Porta Aberta* (Concello de A Coruña 2015a)—meetings in neighbourhoods with residents to discuss local problems and possible solutions—and *Dillo Ti* (Concello de A Coruña 2016a)—meetings with the local government the last Saturday of the month for the citizens to pose questions and demands. In the case of BeC, it organized participation mainly through already existing bodies like neighbourhood councils, the city council and the district city council. Thus, it existed also *Registro Ciudadano* (Ajuntament de Barcelona 2015b) similar to Marea's *Escano Ciudadán* and other punctual processes like consultation or open audiences (Ajuntament de Barcelona 2015a). BeC also implemented new channels of participation, like the website *Decidim Barcelona* (Barcelona en Comú 2016c) to mediate the participatory processes in relation to the Plan de Actuación Municipal—the general plan for the city for the next four years. In this process, residents, organisations and government make proposals—closed in April—which are presented and debated not only via internet but also in physical meetings. Moreover, BeC has also implemented periodical meetings of the mayor with the residents (Barcelona en Comú 2015c), similar to the *Dillo Ti* program of Marea.

In this sense, there is a first difference in the way the participation is organized. While in A Coruña new bodies which promote the direct link between institutions and citizens were created, in the case of Barcelona it is used a more “institutionalised” participation, through already existent hierarchical bodies—the novelty in these is based on bigger involvement of citizens and the election of the representatives by direct voting by the residents (Barcelona en Comú 2015d). The size of Barcelona, requiring higher levels of decentralisation, and the

fact that participation bodies existed already, could be behind the difference in the articulation of participation. Thus, it seems that the participation is more limited and institutionalized in the case of Barcelona, while it is more direct in the case of A Coruña. This could mark a first challenge for the implementation of participation in relation to the right to the city: the size, that makes necessary decentralization in certain cases and that, if organized through hierarchical representative bodies, can dilute citizens' direct empowerment and decisions. This has consequences on the impact of bottom-up participation, since the discussions and decisions reach the city hall after passing through intermediate institutions, especially in the case of Barcelona.

Nevertheless, the biggest challenge seems to be the lack of autogestion, which is not present in the participation model implemented by the two platforms. The previously described ways of participation cannot be considered self-management, as they are conceived to connect residents and the institutions, so the first ones can address and make recommendations to the second. In other words, although both platforms claim to improve participative processes, and they definitely do it, they are organised as a mere way of consultation and influence by the residents, far from the concept of autogestion defended by Lefebvre. The only exception seems to be A Porta Aberta, which had as first topic the discussion for the creation of districts through the deliberation among the neighbours (Concello de A Coruña 2015b). What is relevant here is that the districts, their functions and their limits will not be established by the municipality, but discussed by the neighbours, who decide the limits and how big each district will be (Concello de A Coruña 2015b). I see this as an innovative way of trying to break the positivists vision of space of which Lefebvre was so critical (1991), by the implementation of a more relational view in order to respect the social fabric of the city. Moreover, this is the first step for the development of participatory budgets—the municipality plans to start implementing it for the budget of 2017—, which I consider an example of self-management and appropriation of public funding, since are the residents who decide the use of the money. In the case of BeC, apart from a claim—without more specification—for the promotion of communitarian management of cultural equipment and public spaces, only the application of participatory budgeting for at least 5% of the budget (Barcelona en Comú 2015d) planned for 2017 can be considered a form of promoting self-management.

More problems seem to face the two governments in relation to appropriation. I would like to distinguish here between the appropriation of public space and the appropriation of private space defended by Purcell (2003), as well as the appropriation of municipal services. More than appropriation, we should speak of re-appropriation, since many of the spaces or services were public in the past. Moreover, I consider the three fundamental for implementing a right to the city able to challenge the neoliberal city, with the problematic that they respond to different legal frameworks and different dynamics and typology of use. In line with Lefebvre, I understand this appropriation directly related to measures to stop commodification, as this is produced in many cases by the privatization of public spaces or by the use for private uses and private benefit of public spaces and services. Thus, regarding public space and services, both platforms have made claims and movements towards their (re-)appropriation: the attempts to stop the private development of the harbour in A Coruña (Marea Atlántica 2015b); the stopping of the development of an automobile museum in a public park (Gutiérrez 2015); the proposal for buying the sportive premises utilised by a licensed private company in a plot belonging to A Coruña's harbour authority (Concello de A Coruña 2016b); the moratorium for the development of new hotel accommodations in Barcelona or the re-municipalisation of social services—e.g. water supply in Barcelona (Barcelona en Comú 2015d).

Moreover, both platforms defend in their programs mobility measures like pedestrianisation of streets and the enlargement of sidewalks (Barcelona en Comú 2015d; Marea Atlántica 2015c). Thus, some of the most important measures developed by Marea has been the plan for “humanizing” A Vedra (Concello de A Coruña 2015d) the main entrance to the city, which has faced a big opposition by the Ministry of Infrastructures, owner of the road: the municipality intends to transform a highway of six lanes without traffic lights that directly connects the exit of a highway with the centre of the city into a street with two boulevards on the sides, bike and bus lanes and green areas. Ministry’s plan is simply to expand the road with two extra lanes, provoking a long conflict between the two governments. In the case of Barcelona, another example is the intention of BeC government to implement a pilot project to create superblocks of buildings, where the traffic will be canalised through the external streets of the blocks, pedestrianising the inner streets (Barcelona en Comú 2016d). However, these measures are still under study and face strong opposition from different groups and governments.

In spite of the progression in the appropriation of public spaces, the case of private spaces and services is more complicated to implement as implies the appropriation of private property for the common. In this sense, this has been more limited, not only by the legal framework, but also by general values which make private property the base of the market based society. Nevertheless, some interesting initiatives can be identified, especially in Barcelona, like being more permissive with occupation of empty houses by people being evicted from their houses. However, I consider the most interesting and innovative the pilot-scale plan intended by Barcelona municipality for all those detected illegal touristic flats (not declared as touristic and rented by sites like Airbnb) to become apartments with social rent in order to avoid the fine (João França 2015). This policy tries to reduce massive tourism—predatory tourism, as they label it—which they consider the main driver of the rise in prices and constant speculation.

Both participation and appropriation are fundamental and related to each other in order to advance to the right to the city. Nevertheless, it seems that the two platforms see and implement them independently, without for example articulating any form of participation in order to promote and discuss measures of appropriation. However, the platforms have been in the office for only one year at the moment of writing this article, so there is a time span limitation that needs to be considered.

The purpose of this section has been twofold: on the one hand, to describe and explain the implementation of measures related to the promotion of the participation and appropriation in connection to the right to the city by Marea Atlántica and Barcelona en Comú; on the other hand, an analysis of the level and intensity of this measures and its possible effects in the right to the city. In the next section, I will summarise the analysis, linking it to the aims of the paper.

## **CONCLUSION**

As showed, Marea and BeC have commonalities among themselves and with Lefebvre’s right to the city, although these vary depending if we look at participation or appropriation, where we can see some important limitations. Thus, although they implement ways of involving the residents, the model is far from autogestion, as the participation is ordered around the idea of influencing the institutions, becoming this a main challenge for the translation of the right to the city from social movements to formal institutions: the latter acquired bigger relevance, reducing the influence of the former and, in consequence, the self-management.

Regarding appropriation, the platforms have been active in the appropriation of public space but have been less forceful in the re-appropriation of private spaces and public services. The legal framework seems to pose a fundamental limitation for implementing appropriation, both in the public and in the private space. Sometimes, like in the case of the harbour in A Coruña or the re-municipalisation of water supply in Barcelona, the appropriation is impossible or complicated due to the bonds of a contract signed between private companies and the previous mayor, reducing the legal manoeuvrability of the new government—another example is the fact that municipalities will have to pay to recover the spaces and services in most of the cases reflected in this paper. For example, the municipality of Barcelona admitted its inability to do anything else than mediate or offering alternative locations in the eviction of a social centre occupying an abandoned bank branch, since that is private property and a case between privates (Barcelona en Comú 2016b).

A second main source of limitation comes from other government administrations, like in the case of A Vedra, which oppose to the measures proposed by the platforms. This proves the relevance of further governance scales to constrain and limit the nearer scales of governance.

In summary, the Spanish experience shows that the institutional implementation of the right to the city faces important challenges, especially in relation to the governance scales and legal bonds, as well as the own logic of representation. Therefore, I consider that the most relevant problem has to do with the institutionalisation itself in a representative regime. Even if the institutions are co-opted by actors who defend the right to the city, participation seems to change from a radical self-organised movement to a more hierarchical, translated into a mere consideration of citizens' opinion. Despite some attempts, the right seems to be very limited in this political context, what makes necessary to reformulate the question and ask if it is possible to apply the right to the city within a liberal representative regime. The experience of these platforms shows how the main challenges have their origin in the existence of two competing sources of legitimacy, which poses important constraints for the incorporation of one legitimacy within the other—a good example is that the reduction of the budget for the councillorship of Participation and Democratic Regeneration was an essential requirement from other parties to support the 2016 budget in A Coruña (Concello de A Coruña 2016c) or the constant criticism by the other parties in the City Hall of the Dillo Ti program as a form of populism and self-promotion.

Finally, one important related question to the discussion presented in this paper is if the right to the city imply automatically an alternative to the neoliberal city. The answer is no, at least yet! Despite some inspiring experiences, like the stalling of big projects for the re-appropriation of public spaces, this is far from building an alternative to neoliberalism. I think the potential of the right to the city still exists, so it will be fascinating to witness how this process develops and if further implementation helps to create a new city based on the use value instead the predominant exchange value.

## REFERENCES

- Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2015a. Procesos puntuales de Participación. *Ajuntament de Barcelona*. Available at: <http://governobert.bcn.cat/es/participacion/espacios-puntuales-de-participaci%C3%B3n> [Accessed December 10, 2015].
- Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2015b. Registro Ciudadano. *Ajuntament de Barcelona*. Available at: <http://governobert.bcn.cat/es/participacion/registro-ciudadano> [Accessed December 10, 2015].
- Barcelona en Comú, 2015a. ¡ Participa: la política la hacemos entre todos ! *Barcelona en Comú*. Available at: <https://barcelonaencomu.cat/sites/default/files/pdf/primaries-cast.pdf> [Accessed

December 7, 2015].

Barcelona en Comú, 2016a. Barcelona en Comú defends the Right to the City. Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/bcnencomu/?fref=ts> [Accessed April 25, 2016].

Barcelona en Comú, 2015b. Colabora con Barcelona en Comú. *Barcelona en Comú*. Available at: <https://barcelonaencomu.cat/es/colabora> [Accessed August 12, 2015].

Barcelona en Comú, 2016b. Comunicado sobre los hechos acontecidos a raíz del desalojo del Banco Expropiado. *Comunicado*. Available at: <https://barcelonaencomu.cat/es/prensa/comunicado-sobre-los-hechos-acontecidos-raiz-del-desalojo-del-banco-expropiado> [Accessed May 26, 2016].

Barcelona en Comú, 2016c. Decidim Barcelona. *Decidim Barcelona*. Available at: <https://decidim.barcelona/?locale=es> [Accessed April 24, 2016].

Barcelona en Comú, 2015c. Encuentros con la alcaldesa. *Encuentros con la alcaldesa*. Available at: <http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/alcaldessa/es/encuentros-con-la-alcaldesa> [Accessed April 10, 2016].

Barcelona en Comú, 2015d. Programa. *Barcelona en Comú*. Available at: <https://barcelonaencomu.cat/es/programa/navega> [Accessed August 12, 2015].

Barcelona en Comú, 2016d. Superbloks. *Facebook Barcelona en Comú*. Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/bcnencomu/?ref=ts&fref=ts&qsefr=1> [Accessed May 22, 2016].

Concello de A Coruña, 2015a. A Porta Aberta. *Concello de A Coruña*. Available at: <http://www.coruna.es/servlet/ContentServer?argIdioma=gl&c=Page&pagename=CorunaPortal/Page/Generico-Page-Generica&cid=1442193363673> [Accessed December 10, 2015].

Concello de A Coruña, 2016a. Dillo Ti. *Dillo ti*. Available at: <http://www.coruna.es/servlet/Satellite?c=Page&pagename=Participacion%2FPage%2FGenerico-Page-Generica&cid=1453570531635> [Accessed May 10, 2016].

Concello de A Coruña, 2015b. El Gobierno de A Coruña inicia el proceso participativo para delimitar, junto con el vecindario, los límites de los distritos de la ciudad. *Concello de A Coruña A Coruña*.

Concello de A Coruña, 2015c. Escano cidadá. Available at: <http://www.coruna.es/servlet/Satellite?c=Page&pagename=CorunaPortal%2FPage%2FGenerico-Page-Generica&cid=1440465106598&argIdioma=gl> [Accessed December 1, 2015].

Concello de A Coruña, 2015d. Humanizacion-avedra. *Concello de A Coruña*. Available at: <http://www.laopinioncoruna.es/estaticos/humanizacion-avedra.pdf> [Accessed December 1, 2015].

Concello de A Coruña, 2016b. Intención do goberno local na Solana. *Noticias*. Available at: <http://www.coruna.es/servlet/Satellite?pagename=CorunaPortal/Page/Generico-Page-Generica&cid=1421634029670&argIdioma=gl&itemID=1453592025756&itemType=Suceso> [Accessed May 22, 2016].

Concello de A Coruña, 2016c. O Pleno dá luz verde a os Orzamentos. *Noticias*. Available at: <http://www.coruna.es/servlet/Satellite?pagename=CorunaPortal/Page/Generico-Page-Generica&cid=1421634029670&argIdioma=gl&itemID=1453592701596&itemType=Suceso> [Accessed May 24, 2016].

Consorci de l'Habitatge de Barcelona, 2016. Proposta de Reglament per a l'Adjudicació d'Habitages per Emergència Social per Perdua d'Habitatge Revisat. *Ajuntament de Barcelona*. Available at: <http://www.bcn.cat/consorcihabitatge/files/16chb1reglamentemergenciesrevisatfebrer2016.pdf> [Accessed May 24, 2016].

Guanyem Barcelona, 2014. Guanyem obtiene las 30.000 firmas que validan el proyecto municipalista. *Guanyem Barcelona*. Available at: <https://guanyembarcelona.cat/es/press/30000-firmas-validan-el-proyecto-municipalista/> [Accessed December 9, 2015].

Gutiérrez, J.M., 2015. El Concello paraliza el proyecto del Museo de Automoción previsto en el parque de Bens. *La Opinión de A Coruña*. Available at: <http://www.laopinioncoruna.es/coruna/2015/06/22/concello-paraliza-proyecto-museo-automocion/969186.html>.

- Harvey, D., 2013. *Rebel Cities: from the right to the city to the urban revolution*, New York: Verso.
- Harvey, D., 2008. The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 1(53), pp.23–40.
- João França, 2015. Barcelona impulsa un plan piloto para convertir pisos turísticos ilegales en viviendas sociales. *Eldiario.es*. Available at: [http://www.eldiario.es/catalunya/politica/Barcelona-convertir-turisticos-ilegales-viviendas\\_0\\_416808512.html](http://www.eldiario.es/catalunya/politica/Barcelona-convertir-turisticos-ilegales-viviendas_0_416808512.html).
- Lefebvre, H., 1991. *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H., 1996. *Writings on Cities*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Marea Atlántica, 2015a. Manifiesto. *Marea Atlántica*. Available at: <http://mareatlantica.org/manifiesto/> [Accessed December 9, 2015].
- Marea Atlántica, 2015b. O Porto a Debate. *Marea Atlántica*. Available at: <http://mareatlantica.org/o-porto-a-debate/> [Accessed December 10, 2015].
- Marea Atlántica, 2015c. Programa. *Marea Atlántica*. Available at: [http://mareatlantica.org/programa/#radical\\_democratica](http://mareatlantica.org/programa/#radical_democratica) [Accessed August 3, 2015].
- Mayer, M., 2012. The “right to the city” in urban social movements. In N. Brenner, P. Marcuse, & M. Mayer, eds. *Cities for people, not for profit: Critical Urban theory and the Right to the City*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 63–85.
- El País, 2015. Resultados Elecciones Municipales 2015. *El País*. Available at: <http://resultados.elpais.com/elecciones/2015/municipales/09/08/19.html>.
- Purcell, M., 2003. Citizenship and the right to the global city: reimagining the capitalist world order. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), pp.564–590.
- Purcell, M., 2013a. Possible Worlds : Henri Lefebvre and the right to the city. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1), pp.141–154.
- Purcell, M., 2013b. The right to the city: the struggle for democracy in the urban public realm. , 43(3), pp.311–327.
- Rodríguez, A., 2016. El Concello pedirá 15 millones a la UE para integración, movilidad y espacios públicos. *La Opinión de A Coruña*. Available at: <http://www.laopinioncoruna.es/coruna/2016/01/08/concello-pedira-15-millones-ue/1029891.html>.
- Rodríguez, M., 2015. Cinco candidaturas competirán por el resto de la lista de la Marea. *La Opinión de A Coruña*. Available at: <http://www.laopinioncoruna.es/coruna/2015/02/26/cinco-candidaturas-competiran-resto-lista/931351.html> [Accessed December 7, 2015].
- Unngls, 2010. UN-HABITAT WUF-5: The Right to the City – Bridging the Urban Divide. Available at: [https://www.unngls.org/index.php/un-ngls\\_news\\_archives/2010/758-un-habitat-wuf-5-the-right-to-the-city-%E2%80%93-bridging-the-urban-divide](https://www.unngls.org/index.php/un-ngls_news_archives/2010/758-un-habitat-wuf-5-the-right-to-the-city-%E2%80%93-bridging-the-urban-divide) [Accessed November 24, 2015].