The expansion of the urban perimeter of Londrina-Pr combined with the peripheral construction of housing complexes: in search of a sustainable development
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ABSTRACT
Under the dominance of the capitalist system, cities follow the logic of the market, since the interests of the most varied agents, such as land and real estate producers, with the consent of the State, determine the social production of urban space, a reality that can be found in the city of Londrina-PR. In this context, the objective of this article was to present what is - and if it exists - sustainability in the expansion of the urban perimeter of the city of Londrina-PR, having as a parameter the construction of housing complexes in peripheral areas of the city. To achieve this objective, the dialectic was used as a guiding paradigm, based on the document analysis method. It is concluded that despite being considered a relatively young city, Londrina-Pr was - and continues to be - the stage of an accelerated and disorderly territorial and population growth, where the construction of housing complexes contributed to the increase of the city's territorial area, placing in motion real estate speculation due to the emergence of large urban voids. This reality contributes to the perpetuation of a segregationist logic, where a large part of the population does not have access to basic infrastructure, demonstrating that the city does not have a sustainable development aimed at the quality of life of the population. There is an urgent need to change this reality.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The social production of space in a city under the dominion of the capitalist system will be the scene of various disputes and interests, which will have as a direct consequence an unequal and exclusive production. In this context, territorial ordering will occur from the actions of capitalist agents who are always looking for the highest possible profitability.

Brazil can be considered an extremely unequal country and a large portion of its population is unable to provide the basics for their families. This reality can be seen when we analyze the housing sector, where a large deficit has been accumulating over the years. As all people need to live, regardless of condition, many seek inappropriate places such as slums, tenements, valley bottoms, among others, putting them in a situation of great vulnerability.

Bonduki (1994) emphasizes that the low-income housing issue is not a direct interest of the capital and only with the intervention of the public power, does it become viable. As a result, public housing policies have been created over the years at the national level with the main objective of eradicating the deficit. Among the main and of greater magnitude, we can mention the National Housing Bank (BNH) and the Minha Casa, Minha Vida Program (PMCMV). However, despite advances, the real problem has not been solved, as today Brazil has a housing deficit of 5.9 million homes (FJP, 2021).

If, on the one hand, these policies are not effective in providing the Brazilian population with access to decent housing and do not put into practice the social function of property, on the other hand, they will act directly in the spatial and social production of a city. In this sense, public policies shape and modify the space according to the production and circulation demands of each period, which act from the union of several agents and the implementation of housing complexes will have direct consequences for the spatial configuration of the city (SCHEFFER; KACHAUKE, 2018), such as socio-spatial segregation.

This logic works against the expected practices for a sustainable city that prioritizes the well-being of the population, as it is known that

[...] every sustainable city develops from an adequate, respectable and considered connection between the built environment and the natural geography. Therefore, planning all stages of urbanization is essential so that the city can be well taken care of. Therefore, contemporary models suitable for sustainable development are needed, jointly reformulated by public and private action (MAULEN;
Among the twelve axes presented in the Sustainable Cities Program, for this research it is important to mention two: “Equity, Social Justice and Culture of Peace”, which has among its specific objectives to promote equal access to public services, such as health and education; and “Urban Planning and Design”, which aims to reuse abandoned and degraded spaces; and also “avoid urban expansion in the territory, giving priority to densification and urban development within built spaces, with the recovery of degraded urban environments, ensuring appropriate urban densities” (MAULEN; MARINHO; ETEROVIC, 2019, p. 11). It is evident that the development of a sustainable city, it is expected that the well-being of the population is placed in the foreground.

Based on this theoretical basis, this article aims to analyze how the process of expansion of the city of Londrina-PR occurred, correlating it with the construction of housing complexes and whether the identified actions present a sustainable development. To achieve this objective, the methodological procedures were based on document analysis through secondary data: at first, a theoretical framework was developed covering the theme presented; and in the sequence, data was collected from municipal bodies such as: City Hall of Londrina (PML) Housing Company of Londrina (COHAB-LD), Institute of Research and Urban Planning (IPPUL), City Council of Londrina (CML), among other statistical sources.

The research in question was guided by the dialectical paradigm and with a qualitative approach, where “[...] is what applies to the study of history, relationships, representations, beliefs, perceptions and opinions, products of interpretations what humans do about how they live, build their artifacts and themselves, feel and think” (MIYANO, 2010, p. 57). With this, it is expected to alert and contribute to modify this uneven production that has been perpetuated over the years.

2 THE FORMATION OF LONDRINA-PR: POPULATION AND TERRITORIAL GROWTH

The municipality of Londrina is located in the southern region of Brazil and is located in the north of the state of Paraná, with an altitude of 604 meters between parallels 23º 18’ 44” South latitude and 51º 09’ 46” West longitude of Greenwich, as can be seen in Figure 1 (IPARDES, 2022). Londrina can be considered relatively recent, it was founded on August 21, 1929 and became a municipality on December 10, 1934. As will be analyzed below, the municipality grew at an accelerated pace and currently has an area of 1,653 km² with a demographic density of 306.52 inhabitants/km² (IBGE, 2022).
The context of the emergence of the city was the world crisis of 1929 and the 1930 Revolution in Brazil. These events caused a recessive period in the development of world and Brazilian capitalism. It was at that moment that the process of industrialization in Brazil intensified in order to replace imports, financed by industrial capital and by large landowners, who, due to the fall in coffee production, needed to seek new sources of profit (FRESCA, 2007). Monbeig (1984, apud FRESCA, 2007, p. 146) points out that “[...] in this unfavorable situation for coffee production and social conflict between farmers and settlers, land deals gained prominence, the land speculation that had already had become an important activity in the 1920s on the pioneer fronts”.

As of Law nº 2,125 of March 31, 1922, the State started to allow the direct sale (or also through concessions) of land with more than 50 thousand hectares, which allowed the Companhia de Terras do Norte do Paraná (CTNP) to, with English investments, bought 515,017 bushels between 1925 and 1928 in northern Paraná (ROSANELI, 2009). These facts demonstrate that the CTNP was focused on starting a large land enterprise in the areas that would become Londrina.

Prior to the emergence of the city, the CTNP carried out several actions that made the undertaking viable, such as the construction of roads, topographical and architectural plans, among others. In this planning, the initial plan of Londrina was developed, being designed to accommodate between 20 and 30 thousand inhabitants, consisting of 85 blocks that already defined the use of some spaces, such as the main church, the railway station, school, cemetery, etc (FRESCA, 2007; PANCHONI, 2007).

In the 1930s and 1940s, urban expansion already occurred outside the original layout of the plan initially defined by the CTNP (CTNP, 1975 apud ANTONELLO; VEIGA; BERTINI, 2022, p. 4). Arias Netto (2008) complements by saying that the area initially planned to compose the city quickly overflowed. The author points out that just two years after its emergence, between 1936 and 1939, three villages emerged outside the urban perimeter. In less than ten years, that number rose to fifty-three villages (1944-1947) and continued to rise through the 1950s to sixty-seven.
It can be seen that the population growth of Londrina followed the same pace and happened very quickly: in 1950 there were 71,412 inhabitants and after 60 years, this total reaches 506,701 inhabitants, demonstrating a considerable increase of approximately 700% (IBGE, 2010, Graphic 1). It is worth mentioning that the latest official data are from 2010, when the last Demographic Census\(^1\) was carried out. Previous data from the 2022 Demographic Census indicate that Londrina-PR currently has 588,125 inhabitants (IBGE, 2023).

If initially the place of residence of a large part of Londrina's population was the rural area, Londrina quickly changed from a predominantly rural municipality to an urban one: in 1940, 63.9% of the population lived in rural areas, and 36.9% in areas urban. From 1960, the values are reversed and the urban population (57.4%) exceeds the rural one (42.6%). In the following years, the difference becomes increasingly accentuated and, in 2010 (date of the last official data), 97.4% of the population is considered urban and only 2.6% rural (Graph 2).

One of the main reasons for this reversal and accelerated increase is the rural exodus. Among the causes for this migration to occur so intensely is the drop in coffee production, the modernization of agriculture that reduced jobs in the countryside, causing a large contingent of people to seek the city in search of work and a better quality of life.

---

\(^1\) The Demographic Census must be done every ten years, therefore, it should have been done in 2020. Taking into account the home and in-person nature of the survey, it was postponed to 2021, to the detriment of the Covid-19 pandemic (IBGE, 2020). However, the 2021 Budget Law was approved without the resources to carry out the Census in 2021. As a result, the research was postponed again until 2022 (IBGE, 2021). In August 2022, the Demographic Census collection began and has not yet been completed due to lack of personnel to collect data. To date, only previous data, collected until December 25, 2022, has been released.
Graph 2 – Percentage of rural and urban population in Londrina-Pr (1940-2010)


Through the data presented, it is evident that the growth of the city of Londrina occurred in a very intense way and without adequate planning. It is important to mention that after the 1940s, the CTNP no longer had control over the production of urban land in the city, a fact that had direct consequences for territorial organization:

[...] the breakdown of the British complex and the end of the Estado Novo allowed the establishment of free competition in the sector - which led to the entry of several real estate agents in this process - , the result of which was the implementation of those countless subdivisions without planning, without infrastructure. In practice, this meant the emergence of neighborhoods without a water supply, without sewage, without public lighting, without sidewalks and without curbs (ARIAS NETO, 2008, p. 101).

As a way of trying to contain this disorderly production, Law No. 133 of December 7, 1951 was created, which determined that all works intended for street layout and allotment should be approved by the city hall. In addition, the city's zoning was defined, which would be divided into commercial, residential, industrial areas and areas of various uses (civic-administrative, school, hospital, among others). It is interesting to mention that the residential areas were divided into nine zones and had a segregationist character, where the population with greater purchasing power could build in noble areas of the city and with greater access to urban infrastructure to the detriment of the less favored classes (ARIAS NETO, 2008).

Despite the creation of this law, the information present in the Master Plan of Londrina of 1968 corroborates the statement that the city had been developing without proper planning, as they demonstrate great concerns regarding the lack of control over the city's growth, which brought direct consequences for the well-being of the population, as “[...] the large number of recent subdivisions has dispersed the urban population and provoked an exaggerated demand for infrastructure (paving area, extension of the sewerage network) and public transport... .” (LONDINA, 1968, p. 63).

This movement continued to perpetuate itself over the years: it is possible to see how there was an intense growth: in 1934, the urban perimeter of Londrina had 2.50 km², in
1957 it became 8.30 km², in 1965 there was a great expansion, reaching 27.30 km². In 1970, it increased to 34.60 km², in 1980, 57.90 km²; in 1993, 85.67 km², in 2001, 106 km² (IMAP&P/UEL, 2004 apud PAULA et al, 2013). In 2011, the perimeter becomes 218.13 km² (NASCIMENTO, 2014).

As a new attempt to try to guide this growth, the Urban Perimeter Law is considered one of the specific laws of the Municipal Master Plan and its main purpose is to establish the limits of the urban and rural areas of a municipality, ensuring that the territorial order of the same is appropriate and public policies are directed in each zone according to their needs (LONDRINA, 2022).

It is important to consider that between 1941 and 1989, the city of Londrina did not have specific laws that defined the limits of urban areas. In this way, the urban perimeter was related to the urban area. This reality changed at the end of 1989, when the first urban perimeter law was approved. Since then, Londrina has passed through three laws: 1989, 1998 and 2012. It is expected that the fourth law will come into force very soon, as the new urban perimeter linked to the PDML 2018 Revision is currently in the process of being approved - 2028. It is clarified that in the context of legislation, urban zones are considered “urbanized areas or areas in the process of being occupied and plots of land with potential for urbanization that have not yet undergone a regular subdivision process” (LONDRINA, 1998; 2012).

The first law that defined these limits was Law No. 4,391, of December 21, 1989. After its enactment, 30 changes were made, including different lots and tracts of land to the urban perimeter. When comparing the urban perimeter between the years 1980 and 1990, shown in Figure 7, it can be seen that there was a great expansion of the urban area.

The increase can be seen between 1990 and 1998, when the second Law was enacted: No. 7,484 on July 20, 1998. During the period in force, there were 14 new changes, including lots and tracts of land in the then perimeter urban development, two of which are directly linked to housing developments. It is interesting to mention that from 1998 the Urban Perimeter Law also starts to contemplate and delimit the areas of urban expansion, which, according to Art. 3 corresponds to the area “[…] outside the Urban Zone where occupation or implementation of equipment and projects considered special and necessary for the urban structure is foreseen” (LONDRINA, 1998; 2012).

In addition, Law 7.842 of July 20, 1998, which establishes the Master Plan of Londrina, discusses in its Art. 21 that the alteration of the urban perimeter only occurs “[…] by means of a specific law, with the presentation of a bill preceded by a Prior Consultation on Technical Feasibility and accompanied by the Urban Environmental Impact Report (RIAU)” (LONDRINA, 1998), that is, for a new area to be included in the urban perimeter, prior approval by the city hall through a technical feasibility report is required.

From the mandatory review of the Master Plan every 10 years, in 2008 the Master Plan of Londrina was approved and came into force under Law No. 10,637, of December 24, 2008. presentation of the Neighborhood Impact Study (EIV) for the alteration of the urban perimeter to occur (LONDRINA, 2008).

With some delay, four years after the approval of the 2008 Master Plan, the third Law No. 11,661, of July 12, 2012, was enacted, which deals with the urban perimeter of Londrina and is in force until the present moment. This differs from the others, as in addition to delimiting the urban perimeter of the Headquarters District and the areas of urban
expansion, it will delimit the urban perimeters of the urban centers of the Districts: Guaravera, Irerê, Maravilha, Lerrovile, Paiquerê, Vilas de Espírito Santo, São Louis and Warta. It should be noted that for the development of the research in question, only the seat of the municipality (the city of Londrina) will be considered. It should be noted that so far the law has undergone three changes, including three lots and plots of land in the urban perimeter, two of which are linked to the PMCMV.

In total, 48 subsequent changes were made to the three laws, including lots and plots in the perimeter. However, only in four cases was it possible to state that the alterations were intended for social housing. Some of the other areas received ZR-3 zoning but do not directly specify whether the purpose is the construction of housing developments.

With the aid of Figure 2, it is possible to visualize more clearly how this expansion occurred. It is interesting to note that from the moment the city has specific laws for the urban perimeter, more areas are inserted and the territorial area of the city becomes larger. It was found that 25% of these areas are not occupied, that is, they become urban voids acting in favor of real estate speculation (LONDRI, 2022). As an example, areas that were included in the urban perimeter in 1998 and became part of the urban area only in 2017 can be used.

It is evident that these modifications are directly linked to investments in real estate and land capital in the city with the consent of the State. Amorim (2011, p. 47) complements by saying that the expansion of the city happened from "[...] real estate interests and
speculative practices, the appreciation of land prices, the cyclical nature of the real estate market, the supply of land in new subdivisions, civil construction in general”.

As much as the perimeter laws were developed precisely for greater control over the city’s growth, it is clear that the city’s territorial planning did not keep up with the demands of a population growing at an accelerated pace, that is,

[...] this fact deepened the problems of the lack of social equipment (health, education, leisure) and infrastructure (social housing, basic sanitation), which affected, mainly, the population with low or without purchasing power. This dynamic is linked to an accelerated and segregationist urbanization that constituted the hallmark of the urbanization process in Brazil, especially in Londrina (ANTONELLO; VEIGA; BERTINI, 2022, p. 3).

As seen, from the beginning it was possible to identify the first signs of urban segregation, with the specialization of some areas for specific activities, which, despite seeming spontaneous, was defined by the CTNP by land values (LINARDI, 1995 apud FRESCA, 2007) and later defined by municipal laws. Martins (2007) points out that the central areas had a higher price, which limited access for those with great purchasing power, placing the low-income population in the peripheral areas. This reality continues to occur in the city until the present day, as will be seen below.

3 THE PERIPHERAL CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSING PROJECTS

From the above, it is clear that the expansion of the city’s territorial area will bring direct consequences for the population that lives there, especially the portion with lower purchasing power, a fact that can be evidenced in housing. The value of land refers to the absence of direct access to the city for the poor population, so the first informal occupations of Londrina took place since its formation and were accentuated from the 1960s, forming slums in areas at the bottom of valleys and nearby areas, placing families, most of them numerous, in a situation of great social and environmental vulnerability, on the margins of society (ZANON, 2013).

As a justification for changing this reality, the Londrina Housing Company (COHAB-LD) was created based on the homologation of Municipal Law n° 1.008, of August 26, 1965 and can be considered a milestone for the development housing in the city of Londrina-PR. It should be noted that the Company is linked to the City Hall of Londrina and operates under mixed economy management, with the municipality owning 99.99% of the shares and its management being considered indirect. From a survey carried out with data from Londrina (2022), COHAB-LD (2022) and the Revision of the Master Plan of Londrina 2018-2028, it was found that the city has 197 housing complexes built over approximately 50 years (1967-2020) with a total of 38,454 housing units through various funding sources: BNH, Fundo de Garantia por Tempo de Servico (FGTS), FICAM Program, Immediate Action for Housing Program (PAIH), Popular Housing Program (PROHAP), Paraná Housing Company (COHAPAR), Habitar Brasil Program (HBB), Social Interest Housing Subsidy Program (PSH), Residential Leasing Program (PAR), General Budget of the Union (OGU), PAC, National Social Interest Housing Fund
It appears that only in the late 1960s and early 1970s were housing complexes built in areas already belonging to the urban design of the city. From the end of the 1970s, a pattern began to emerge: the construction of housing developments took place in peripheral areas. From Figure 3, it is possible to visualize the formation of a “belt”, practically circumventing the urban area, demonstrating that part of the occupation of these regions and formation of neighborhoods happened due to the construction and presence of housing complexes in these localities, contributing, therefore, to the production of urban space in Londrina and the accelerated growth of the urban perimeter. In addition, it is important to highlight that part of the housing complexes built in the 1970s are still considered peripheral.

It is evident that the production of urban space via public housing policy has changed the territorial organization of the city. Over the years, the urban perimeter was gradually expanded. It is noticed that before the first law of the urban perimeter, the expansion of the city and the peripheral location of the housing complexes happened without any control over this, that is, the real estate developers and the State had the freedom to define the place where the buildings would be placed. housing complexes, regardless of distance and whether or not they were within the urban perimeter.

This reality changed after the approval of the first perimeter law, in 1989, when it became mandatory to pass complementary laws that allowed for an increase in the perimeter. However, instead of being strictly enforced by the laws, the perimeter was increasingly expanded and a greater number of idle lands were concentrated. It is noticeable the need for greater control to limit the increase in the urban perimeter, placing in the foreground the social function of property and the construction of sustainable cities, therefore the occupation of urban voids already mentioned.
Despite the housing produced and the advances made, the eradication of the housing deficit did not happen, as the city currently has 51,710 records of families with housing needs (COHAPAR, 2019). In addition, there are 3860 families living in 73 areas of irregular occupation. Of these families, 593 are in places subject to land regularization (LONDRINA, 2018). According to data from the 2010 Census, in the Metropolitan Region of Londrina, 40% of the city’s housing deficit is concentrated in the excessive burden with rent, which are families earning up to three minimum wages who spend more than 30% of their income on rent. However, it is worth mentioning that the data are insufficient and do not represent the totality, therefore, they are partial. There are no complete data on the conditions of existing households in the city of Londrina, there are only estimates (LONDRINA, 2018).

A great contradiction is perceived, because, in addition to the real problem not having been solved, the construction of housing complexes placed a large part of this population that most needs it far from urban equipment and the right to live in the city, presenting an imbalance between economic development and socio-environmental, which has direct consequences for the entire population.

4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

When analyzing the production and expansion of space in Londrina-Pr, there is the assertion that this was and has been marked by the action of capitalist agents that produce urban space, such as the owners of the means of production, the landowners, the real estate promoters, the State and excluded social groups (CORREA, 1989; CAPEL, 1974). These operate in varying intensities since their formation, always in search of the greatest accumulation of capital, a fact that can be evidenced when analyzing the construction of housing complexes in the city. It is evident that their peripheral location follows the logic of real estate speculation, contributing to the development of an unequal and segregated space, where a large portion of the population does not have access to urban facilities, such as health, education, leisure, culture, among others. Therefore, it appears that the production of urban space in Londrina does not follow the principles for it to be considered a sustainable city.

It is important to consider that the growth of a city alone cannot be considered the cause of so many urban problems (such as territorial segregation, lack of access to housing and basic infrastructure) but rather the lack of an effective policy for territorial organization. To change this reality and move towards the formation of a sustainable city, it is essential to break with the already established standards, aiming at a future in which the social production of space highlights and prioritizes more conscious choices.

It is necessary to develop laws that go beyond the barriers of theory and are properly applied, creating mechanisms that inhibit the increase in the urban perimeter for the purpose of real estate speculation, that is, where the population can concretely enjoy the city in which they live. For this to happen, the government must act in harmony at the municipal, state and federal levels, establishing strict mechanisms for controlling and managing the expansion of cities and also in terms of housing policies. It is clear, therefore, the need to articulate actions so that significant advances can occur to change this unequal and segregatory reality.

In this sense, the union of the whole society in search of these changes is extremely
important. Therefore, it is urgent and necessary that popular participation be effective and real in this process in order to monitor and be resistance to actions that do not prioritize the premise of the social function of property, a prerogative present in the principle of the City Statute. The path is long and with many barriers and interests of capitalist agents to be overcome. However, there is no way to be discouraged! It is necessary to establish mechanisms towards the emancipation of the population and the awareness of the popular force so that they act together with the sustainable production of the city.

REFERENCES

AMORIM, V. W. A produção da habitação social de mercado nas cidades médias de Londrina/Pr e Maringá/Pr.


