



## URBAN STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS AND POPULAR PARTICIPATION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN: THE CASE OF JARDIM LAPENNA, SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL

Bruna Moreiras Urbini<sup>1</sup> Cristiano Capellani Quaresma<sup>2</sup> Rodrigo Kuester<sup>3</sup> Diego de Melo Conti<sup>4</sup>

Cite as - American Psychological Association (APA)

Urbini, B. M., Quaresma, C. C., Kuester, R., & Conti, D M. (2023). Urban stakeholders' perceptions and popular participation in the implementation of the Neighborhood Plan: the case of Jardim Lapenna, São Paulo, Brazil. *Rev. Gest. Amb. e Sust. – GeAS*, 12(1), 1-27, e22229. <https://doi.org/10.5585/geas.v12i1.22229>

### Abstract

**Introduction:** The Neighborhood Plan is a participatory tool present in the São Paulo City Master Plan that seeks to reduce inequalities and improve the quality of life for urban populations at the neighborhood level. However, the lack of real examples of its implementation makes it difficult to analyze its potentials and challenges. In this context, the implementation initiative of the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan, based on the engagement of different urban stakeholders, stands out.

**Objective:** This article aims to analyze the perception of urban stakeholders on the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan, located in the São Miguel Paulista district, in the eastern region of the city of São Paulo.

**Methodology:** This is an exploratory study, with a qualitative approach based on a case study, document analysis, and semi-structured interviews.

**Originality/Relevance:** The preliminary literature review indicates a lack of studies that allow for a critical analysis, from the perspective of residents and experts, of the experience gained through this important urban planning tool. Thus, this article contributes to filling this gap.

**Results:** The results identified important actions to promote popular participation that highlight the relevance of the tool, as well as existing obstacles to the construction of a truly democratic urban space.

**Social Contributions/ to Management:** In this context, the results bring social contributions to urban management and planning at the neighborhood level, highlighting points that could serve for the improvement of the analyzed Neighborhood Plan or for the implementation of similar initiatives in other Brazilian urban areas.

**Keywords:** Urban planning; Community engagement; Neighborhood planning; Social inequality; Urban development.

<sup>1</sup> <http://lattes.cnpq.br/4657271375721436> - Master in Smart and Sustainable Cities - PPGCIS/Uninove / Universidade Nove de Julho – Uninove / São Paulo (SP) – Brazil - [burbini.arquitetura@gmail.com](mailto:burbini.arquitetura@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9287861770521337> - PhD in Geography - Unicamp and Professor of the Graduate Program in Smart and Sustainable Cities - PPGCIS/Uninove / Universidade Nove de Julho – Uninove - São Paulo (SP) – Brazil - [quaresmacc@uni9.pro.br](mailto:quaresmacc@uni9.pro.br)

<sup>3</sup> <http://lattes.cnpq.br/0120675386758307> - Master in Smart and Sustainable Cities - PPGCIS/Uninove / Universidade Nove de Julho – UNINOVE - São Paulo (SP) – Brazil - [kuester.rodrigo@gmail.com](mailto:kuester.rodrigo@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup> <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2098643827162361> - PhD in Business Administration from PUC/SP and professor at the Graduate Program in Sustainability at PUC-Camp / Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas - PUC/Campinas - São Paulo (SP) - Brazil - [diegoconti.prof@gmail.com](mailto:diegoconti.prof@gmail.com)



## Percepções dos stakeholders urbanos e participação popular na implementação do Plano de Bairro: o caso do Jardim Lapenna, São Paulo, Brasil

### Resumo

**Introdução:** O Plano de Bairro é um instrumento participativo presente no Plano Diretor de São Paulo, que busca reduzir desigualdades e melhorar a qualidade de vida da população urbana no âmbito do bairro. No entanto, a falta de exemplos reais de sua aplicação dificulta a análise de seus potenciais e desafios. Nesse contexto, destaca-se a iniciativa de implantação do Plano de Bairro do Jardim Lapenna, a partir do engajamento de diferentes stakeholders urbanos.

**Objetivos:** Este artigo tem como objetivo analisar a percepção de stakeholders urbanos sobre o Plano de Bairro do Jardim Lapenna, localizado no distrito de São Miguel Paulista, na Zona Leste do Município de São Paulo.

**Metodologia:** Trata-se de um estudo exploratório, de abordagem qualitativa e baseado em estudo de caso, análise documental e entrevistas semiestruturadas.

**Originalidade/Relevância:** A revisão preliminar da literatura aponta para a carência de estudos que permitam analisar criticamente, sob o olhar dos moradores e especialistas, a experiência adquirida por meio desse importante instrumento de planejamento urbano. Assim, este artigo contribui para preencher essa lacuna.

**Resultados:** Os resultados permitiram identificar ações importantes de incentivo à participação popular que destacam a relevância do instrumento, bem como obstáculos ainda existentes para a construção de um espaço urbano efetivamente democrático.

**Contribuições Sociais/ para a Gestão:** Nesse contexto, os resultados trazem contribuições sociais e para a gestão e planejamento urbano na escala do bairro, ao destacar pontos que poderão servir para a melhoria do plano de bairro em análise ou para a implementação de iniciativas semelhantes em outras áreas urbanas brasileiras.

**Palavras-chave:** Planejamento urbano; Engajamento comunitário; Planejamento de bairro; Desigualdade social; Desenvolvimento Urbano.

## Percepciones de los actores urbanos y participación popular en la implementación del Plan Vecinal: el caso de Jardim Lapenna, São Paulo, Brasil

### Resumen

**Introducción:** El Plan de Barrio es una herramienta participativa presente en el Plan Director de la Ciudad de São Paulo que busca reducir las desigualdades y mejorar la calidad de vida de las poblaciones urbanas a nivel de barrio. Sin embargo, la falta de ejemplos reales de su implementación dificulta el análisis de sus potenciales y desafíos. En este contexto, la iniciativa de implementación del Plan de Barrio de Jardim Lapenna, basada en el compromiso de diferentes partes interesadas urbanas, se destaca.

**Objetivo:** Este artículo tiene como objetivo analizar la percepción de las partes interesadas urbanas sobre el Plan de Barrio de Jardim Lapenna, ubicado en el distrito de São Miguel Paulista, en la región este de la ciudad de São Paulo.

**Metodología:** Este es un estudio exploratorio, con un enfoque cualitativo basado en un estudio de caso, análisis de documentos y entrevistas semiestruturadas.

**Originalidad / Relevancia:** La revisión bibliográfica preliminar indica una falta de estudios que permitan un análisis crítico, desde la perspectiva de los residentes y expertos, de la experiencia adquirida a través de esta importante herramienta de planificación urbana. Por lo tanto, este artículo contribuye a llenar esta brecha.

**Resultados:** Los resultados identificaron acciones importantes para promover la participación popular que destacan la relevancia de la herramienta, así como obstáculos existentes para la construcción de un espacio urbano verdaderamente democrático.

**Contribuciones Sociales/ a la gestión:** En este contexto, los resultados aportan contribuciones sociales a la gestión y planificación urbana a nivel de barrio, destacando puntos que podrían servir para mejorar el Plan de Barrio analizado o para la implementación de iniciativas similares en otras áreas urbanas brasileñas.

**Palabras Clave:** Planificación urbana; Participación comunitaria; Planificación de barrios; Desigualdad social; Desarrollo urbano.

## INTRODUCTION

The construction of sustainable cities that allow greater socio-environmental equity and justice must be based on urban planning and design that put citizens at the center of decisions (Bento, Conti, Baptista & Ghobril, 2018). However, this is not the reality of most existing urban areas, especially those belonging to developing countries.

Thus, the rapid and unequal urban growth that marked the process of development of Brazilian cities, combined with the absence of planning, resulted in cities marked by socio-spatial segregation and poor infrastructure conditions, which culminated in the urban crisis (Maricato, 2015; Quaresma, Ferreira, Shibao, Ruiz & Oliveira Neto, 2017).

In this context, the city of São Paulo is characterized by an unbalanced distribution of land use and occupation, characterized by inequality and exclusion, which affect the poorest populations and those living in peripheral areas most directly (Maricato, 2000).

Therefore, we have a metropolis characterized by well-equipped central areas, with an abundance of public services, easy access, and better-quality public transportation, in contrast to peripheral areas lacking all urban infrastructure and equipment, which concentrate the majority of the low-income population (Quaresma et al., 2017).

In the face of this context and the problems arising from the lack of representation in representative democracies, some initiatives based on participatory instruments have sought to promote the inclusion of historically ignored segments of the population in the political spectrum (Guaraná & Fleury, 2006). Therefore, according to the City Hall of São Paulo (PMSP), since the creation of the City Statute in 2001, social participation "has ceased to be an option and has become an obligation to be fulfilled by any and every administrative management at all levels of government; therefore, we can say that it has become a State policy" (PMSP, 2013, p.9).

An example of such instruments is the Neighborhood Plan, provided for in the São Paulo Master Plan, which integrates the Planning System of this municipality. This instrument aims to encourage social involvement, with the objective of improving the quality of life of vulnerable segments of the population and building an urban space characterized by greater social justice. It is, therefore, an instrument for planning the city at the local level, whose goal is to gather the demands of the neighborhood, aiming at the development of transformation

strategies that start from the initiative of civil society, as well as the participation of public and private sectors.

In this context, this article highlights the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan (PBJL), developed by the Tide Setubal Foundation and through the consultancy of the São Paulo Research and Studies Center (CEPESP) of the Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV). This Plan was put into practice in the Jardim Lapenna neighborhood, located in the district of São Miguel Paulista, in the eastern zone of the City of São Paulo.

For many years, Jardim Lapenna remained neglected by the government, resulting in low social indicators. Thus, based on the 2013 São Paulo Social Vulnerability Index (IPVS), 53.5% of the population residing in Jardim Lapenna was classified as being in conditions of high and very high social vulnerability, a fact that demonstrates the precariousness of living conditions in this part of the São Paulo metropolis (Ruiz & Almeida, 2018).

Despite the government's distancing, Jardim Lapenna became a space for social mobilization due to the actions of the first residents of the neighborhood who engaged as community leaders, giving rise to the Jardim Lapenna Friends Society in 1981, which began to attract other institutions such as the Tide Setubal Foundation, which established a co-management partnership with the Society for an educational space in the neighborhood in 2007 (Ruiz & Almeida, 2018).

At this time, the Tide Setubal Foundation began to act in the process of social mobilization and composition of a group of various social organizations, which engaged in a set of initiatives aimed at strengthening local community organization around the participatory instrument called the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan (PBJL).

Therefore, in order to meet the legal requirements inherent in the Strategic Master Plan of the city of São Paulo, the PBJL was based on the combination of three pillars: the social mobilization pillar - through actions aimed at increasing the participation of the local population in the proposals for the plan's construction; the technical component pillar - with the participation of CEPESP/FGV, responsible for organizing the technical document systematizing the proposals; and the political articulation pillar - with the involvement of the municipal government, represented by the subprefecture, the legislative power, and municipal secretaries (Ruiz & Almeida, 2020).

Thus, the PBJL began in February 2017, based on popular opinion and participation. As a result, the plan brought 48 transformation actions for the neighborhood, organized into 4 challenges and 14 proposals (PBJL, 2019). According to the PBJL (2019), the first challenge was completed, namely, that of strengthening an active and effective community organization.

It is noteworthy that, despite the importance of the topic, a bibliographic search in the Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar databases revealed a lack of studies that allow the analysis of the experience acquired through the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan, in

order to understand the potentials and challenges of this participation instrument for the production of a democratic space characterized by greater social justice at the neighborhood level.

Aiming to contribute in this regard, this article aims to analyze the perception of urban stakeholders about the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan, located in the district of São Miguel Paulista, in the East Zone of the City of São Paulo.

To achieve this objective, this article is structured into five sections, in addition to this introduction. The first section presents the theoretical framework, in which the importance of representative participation and the attention that public managers should give to the interactions between the various social actors through participatory instruments is addressed, since these interactions are fundamental to improving local governance and democratizing decision-making and urban transformations towards inclusive, sustainable, and democratic cities. In the second section, the methodological procedures are presented, subdivided into general characterization of the research, presentation of the study area, and finally, description of the procedures adopted in the interviews. In the third section, results and discussions are presented. In the fourth section, final considerations are made, followed by the list of bibliographic references cited throughout the text.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Currently, there is a search for the democratization of State-society relations and the expansion of civil society and population participation in public management (Frey, 2020). Beck and Storopoli (2021) provide an important contribution by mapping and synthesizing literature on the use of stakeholder theory in urban studies. According to the authors, this theory, which is widely used in business and corporate analyses, can also be applied in other fields of study, such as urban management and planning.

Stakeholders are defined as agents who can affect or be affected by the achievement of an organization's purpose. In this sense, it is important that managers and planners take into account such agents, so that value can be generated for them in the medium or long term (Beck & Storopoli, 2021).

In the context of cities, urban stakeholders are fundamental for the formulation of public policies focused on urban sustainability, supported by ethics and collaborative governance, as well as to enable meeting the expectations of interested parties (Beck & Storopoli, 2021).

It is important to have representative population participation, as voting alone is not enough to ensure that the interests of the majority of citizens are considered in the decision-making process. It is known that the elites hold more power in decision-making. Therefore, it is necessary to rely on the ability of citizens to mobilize and exert pressure, which presupposes effective and prior organization (Freitas, 2012).



Public managers must be concerned with generating interactions among various social actors, which are essential to dealing with diversity and making public management more participatory and collaborative, with the dynamics and complexity that characterize urban transformations (Conti, Guevara, Heinrichs, Silva, Quaresma & Beté, 2019; Frey, 2020).

This has a direct impact on urban development policy, as Brazilian citizens have few mediation instruments with the government. When it comes to residents of peripheral areas, the inefficiency in communication is even more noticeable, especially those who live far from central neighborhoods and in more precarious conditions (Vialli, 2017).

Therefore, giving voice to the population is so important in order to find participatory solutions to their biggest problems (Conti et al., 2019). The democratic management of the city is guaranteed through social participation instruments, as can be observed in articles 319 and 322 (2014) of the São Paulo City Master Plan.

The use of participatory approaches and methods has improved local governance systems and contributed to democratizing decision-making about priorities in neighborhoods, as they are brought by the population (Conti et al., 2019). Unlike what has been happening in most contemporary cities, where market forces prevail, public spaces are built by official means, becoming increasingly impoverished in diversity, geared towards consumption and territorial circulation (Marino, 2018).

Thus, urban-participatory planning mechanisms and tools are instruments that can contribute to the development of inclusive, sustainable and democratic cities (Maricato, 2000; Fitzgerald, O'Doherty & O'Regan, 2012; Conti et al., 2019). Nevertheless, as demonstrated by Pedro Jacobi (2002, p.444), "what is observed is that, in general, participatory proposals still remain more in the realm of rhetoric than in practice" (Jacobi, 2002, p.444). In the scope of the Brazilian National Health System (SUS), for instance, social participation "although legally provided for, does not necessarily constitute a guarantee of its effectiveness in collegial instances" (Gomes & Orfão, 2021, p.1200).

Therefore, the instruments and methods used for more participatory local governance should encourage effective and appropriate participation in the reality of the neighborhoods where they will be applied, ensuring the collaboration of society in all stages and identifying the urban, social and environmental demands of the residents (Conti et al., 2019).

The different areas of a city present socio-spatial specificities (Quaresma et al., 2017), and consequently, the means of popular organization and participation must be adapted to distinct realities. The peripheries and socially underserved central regions are the ones that have the greatest need for representation (Calado, Quaresma, Rodrigues, Conti & Furtado, 2019; Furtado, Quaresma, Oliveira, Conti & Calado, 2020).

In this context, actions based on participatory instruments, such as the Neighborhood Plan, provided for in the São Paulo Master Plan and integrated into the Planning System of

this Municipality, can contribute to the inclusion of this portion of the population in decision-making processes, as already mentioned by Guaraná and Fleury (2006).

According to article 347 of Law 16.050/2014, which approved the Urban Development Policy and the Strategic Master Plan of São Paulo and revoked Law 13.430/2002, neighborhood plans are part of what is called the Municipality Planning System, subject to the aforementioned law, as well as the guidelines of the Land Use and Occupation Law and the Regional Plans of the Subprefectures.

The same law, in article 349, highlights that the Neighborhood Plan must be developed based on three guidelines: a) identification of different urban, social, and environmental demands; b) use of participatory methodologies throughout different stages of development; c) use of interdisciplinary approaches.

Regarding the demands referred to in item "a" of the previous paragraph, the same article highlights that their identification must be processed through: field research with neighborhood residents; analysis of secondary data from different research agencies; and analysis of existing studies.

Furthermore, upon analyzing the aforementioned law, it is emphasized that article 350 presents the objectives of the Neighborhood Plans, as provided in Table 01.

**Table 1**

*Objectives of Neighborhood Plans*

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Articulate local issues with structural issues of the city;	Strengthen the local economy and stimulate job opportunities ;	Establish guidelines for the implementation of urban furniture, flooring standards, and infrastructure equipment, ensuring accessibility and pedestrian mobility, especially for those with special needs;	Identify local needs for public, social, and leisure facilities.	Relate the landscape units in which the equipment, policies, and projects are located in urban sectors, considering sectoral plans regarding physical-territorial issues;	Indicate artistic and cultural expressions to promote the preservation of neighborhood memory, cultural and geographical identities, as well as support the preservation of intangible heritage;	Identify local environmental heritage, proposing strategies for its conservation.

**Source:** Article 350 of Law 16.050/2014 (2014). Adapted by the authors.

As seen in Table 01, Law 16.050/2014 (2014) presents seven objectives for the Neighborhood Plans, ranging from the articulation of local issues with structural city issues to the identification of local environmental heritage and the proposition of strategies for its

conservation.

In addition, article 351 of the same law presents proposals to improve 19 issues in the Neighborhood Plan, as described in Table 02.

**Table 2**

*Proposed improvements to the Neighborhood Plan*

I	Macrodrainage and public lighting infrastructure;
II	Provision and operation of urban and social equipment for health, education, culture, sports, leisure, and social assistance, among others, appropriate to the needs of each neighborhood's residents;
III	Accessibility to public urban and social equipment;
IV	Public sidewalks, urban furniture, and pedestrian, cyclist, and disabled or mobility-impaired circulation conditions;
V	Environmental quality of residential and commercial areas;
VI	Local road system and traffic control;
VII	Public use spaces, green areas, leisure, and social interaction areas;
VIII	Connectivity between parks, squares, and private green areas;
IX	Street commerce conditions;
X	Cleaning, tree planting, and gardening of public spaces and squares;
XI	Solid waste management, especially regarding selective collection and local composting of organic waste;
XII	Public safety conditions, especially around educational equipment;
XIII	Protection, recovery, and valorization of historical, cultural, religious, and environmental heritage;
XIV	Conditions for economic activity development;
XV	Public spaces suitable for gatherings and social interaction;
XVI	Signaling for vehicles and pedestrians and pedestrian adaptation and protection at the main corners and crossings;
XVII	Pedestrian circulation safety;
XVIII	Implementation of urban gardens;
XIX	Measures to make the road system as conducive and safe as possible for bicycle traffic, in addition to predicting a local bicycle lane system, articulated with the collective transportation system, green areas, and main urban and social equipment;
Sole Paragraph	The Neighborhood Plan may indicate necessary areas for the implementation of urban and social equipment, public spaces, green areas, new local roads, and solid waste management, including for recyclable material pickers' cooperatives.

**Source:** Art. 351 Law 16.050/2014 (2014). Adapted by the authors.

The City Hall will be responsible for coordinating and promoting the development of

Neighborhood Development Plans in the city, which may be conceived by residents' associations or subprefectures. In order to come into force, the Neighborhood Plans must be issued by decree, after approval by the Subprefecture Representatives Councils, and discussed by the Municipal Council of Urban Policy, according to articles 347 and 348 of Law No. 16.050/2014 (2014).

Law No. 13.399/2002 (2002) establishes the creation of Subprefectures in the Municipality of São Paulo and, according to article 3, the Municipal Administration, within the scope of the Subprefectures, shall be exercised by the Subprefects, who are responsible for decision-making, direction, management, and control of municipal affairs at the local level.

According to article 5 of this Law, one of the responsibilities of the Subprefectures is to coordinate the Regional Plan and the Neighborhood Plan, district or equivalent, in accordance with the guidelines established by the City's Strategic Plan.

## METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

Based on the overall objective, the methodology adopted in this study can be classified as exploratory (Calado, 2019), as it aimed to provide greater familiarity with the problem in order to make it more explicit, to establish hypotheses, as well as to refine ideas or discover insights.

In terms of approach, this study can be classified as qualitative, as it is based on a scientific investigation method that produces data from observations extracted from the analyzed object and aims to establish direct interaction for understanding the particularities of the studied phenomenon (Yin, 2005).

Regarding the procedures, this study is characterized as a Case Study, which according to Bauer and Gaskell (2017), Severino (2017), and Yin (2005), should involve planning, as well as data collection and analysis techniques. To describe the Neighborhood Plan, bibliographical and documentary analysis was carried out based on official documents of the Plan, as well as interviews with employees of the Tide Setúbal Foundation.

Regarding the Case Study, the neighborhood of Jardim Lapenna, located in the Eastern Zone of São Paulo, was adopted in this work. This choice was due to the fact that, since the implementation of the Neighborhood Plans in the Municipal Master Plan of São Paulo, Jardim Lapenna was the only neighborhood that was able to develop the plan in a participatory way, that is, taking into account the popular participation, in addition to following through with the implementation of the plan since 2017.

## STUDY AREA

The Jardim Lapenna is a neighborhood located between the Tietê River and the Safira Line of the Companhia Paulista de Trens Metropolitanos (CPTM), whose land was a



subdivision of the Lapenna family, created in 1965. The well-defined borders of the neighborhood demonstrate its physical separation from the rest of the city, which can be perceived by the fact that, until the beginning of the 21st century, "the only pedestrian entrance to the neighborhood was a hole in the CPTM wall" (Ruiz & Almeida, 2020, p.226).

As an area of São Paulo delimited by the aforementioned railway line, Jardim Lapenna was neglected by the government for many years, a fact that can be observed through its poor social indicators. Thus, based on the Paulista Social Vulnerability Index (IPVS) of 2013, 16.3% of São Paulo's population was classified as high and very high vulnerability. This percentage reached 6.5% of the population in the district of São Miguel Paulista and 53.5% of the population living in Jardim Lapenna, which confirms the precariousness of living conditions in this part of São Paulo (Ruiz & Almeida, 2020).

However, despite the government's distancing, Jardim Lapenna has become a space for social mobilization, which began with the actions of the first residents who engaged as community leaders, giving rise to the Sociedade Amigos do Jardim Lapenna (Friends of Jardim Lapenna Society) in 1981, which began to attract other institutions, such as the Tide Setubal Foundation, which settled in the neighborhood in 2007, from a co-management partnership of an educational space with the aforementioned Society (Ruiz & Almeida, 2020).

Thus, the neighborhood stands out for its wide presence of civil society institutions, as well as for the social struggles that contributed to the conquest of public facilities, such as a Basic Health Unit, two nurseries, a state school, a reading point, and a Children and Adolescent Center (PBJL, 2019).

## INTERVIEWS

Based on Carvalho (2018), the interviews were based on the logic of valuing the social actors present in the reality of the Jardim Lapenna neighborhood, that is, the residents and those responsible for the drafting and/or implementation of the plan, considering them as protagonists, holders of information and experiences. In this sense, the investigation was based on the phenomenological-interpretive paradigm, since, according to the author, this paradigm preferably uses qualitative methods, appropriate for capturing and analyzing the subjective dimensions of reality.

According to Campenhoudt and Quivy (2008), observation is one of the stages of research and can be defined as a set of actions through which it is possible to test hypotheses and concepts, as well as confront them with observable reality in the study site. According to the authors, observation procedures are crucial in the research process. In this sense, it is possible to distinguish between two types of observation, namely, direct and indirect. In the first, the observer collects information directly through indicators, without the need to interrogate the subjects. In the case of indirect observation, the investigator must approach

the subjects to collect information, depending on the experience of other actors, in addition to the investigator.

Taking into account the objectives of the present work, namely, to analyze the perception of stakeholders related to the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan, especially residents, academic experts, and employees of the Tide Setubal Foundation, we opted for indirect investigation, since it will be necessary to approach these actors.

Regarding the technique employed, we adopted the interview, which, according to Mariano (2018), allows for a more direct and personal contact with the interviewees, unlike conducting an inquiry through a questionnaire.

The interview, according to Amado (2014), can be classified in different ways, among them the structured or directive, the semi-structured or semi-directive, the unstructured or non-directive, and the informal or conversational.

Taking into consideration such possibilities, as well as the objectives of the present study, the semi-structured interview was chosen, which assumes the elaboration of a guide with oriented questions, essentially linked to the research objectives.

According to Mariano (2018), in a qualitative study, the sample should be based on diversity, aiming to cover as many situations as possible. Therefore, the selection of residents for the interviews followed the methodology adopted by Chiaravalloti Neto, Moraes and Fernandes (1998), according to which the survey starts with the number of blocks and houses in the neighborhood.

Given the COVID-19 pandemic situation, it was necessary to group the blocks into groups of three blocks, resulting in a total of six groups. For each of the groups, the total number of existing houses was surveyed, followed by the elaboration of a sketch, with the assignment of a specific number to each group. Such data were tabulated in order to allow the disposition of the information of each block with their respective numbers of houses and the accumulated number of houses.

In order to cover the entire extent of the neighborhood, it was decided to randomly select one house per group of blocks, resulting in a total of 6 houses for conducting the interviews. Using Google Earth Pro software, the houses belonging to the selected blocks were identified and numbered. After this activity, one house was randomly selected within each block, following the principle of randomness, allowing the present study to select a group of 6 households. Subsequently, the respective residents were contacted to conduct the interviews.

Regarding the questions, it is noteworthy that they focus on the residents' perception of their participation in the elaboration of the Neighborhood Plan. To this end, the questions were based on the residents' representations, encompassing elements such as: memories before the intervention; current vision of the residents; whether the resident feels included or excluded from the process; whether the resident participated in any meetings, hearings,

events, and answered any opinion surveys, questionnaires, etc. In case of an affirmative answer, the questions investigated whether the search for participation came from the interviewee himself, and if negative, the questions sought to investigate whether he tried to participate and what prevented him from doing so.

In addition to the residents, an employee of the Tide Setúbal Foundation (referred to as F01), who has an important participation in the implementation of the Neighborhood Plan, and a research professor (referred to as P01), who has studied Neighborhood Plans and their applications, were interviewed. The relationship of the interviewees is illustrated in Table 3.

**Table 3**

*List of Interviewees*

Codes	Interviewees
F01	Foundation Tide Setubal Employee
P01	Researcher Professor on the subject
R01	Resident 01
R02	Resident 02
R03	Resident 03
R04	Resident 04
R05	Resident 05
R06	Resident 06

**Source:** Developed by the authors.

Therefore, in order to conduct the interviews, we sought the participation of individuals with recognized autonomy to express their experiences, opinions and feelings regarding the neighborhood, both through the testimony of residents themselves and professionals from different fields who directly experience and impact the local reality.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### The Neighborhood Plan of Jardim Lapenna

Jardim Lapenna neighborhood has an important history of social mobilizations regarding struggles and achievements. In this sense, the first inhabitants of the neighborhood were community leaders who initiated the process of articulating leaders and creating the Friends of Jardim Lapenna Society in 1981. Subsequently, other institutions were established in the neighborhood, including the Tide Setubal Foundation in 2007, through a co-management partnership of an educational space (Ruiz & Almeida, 2020).

Thus, the history of popular mobilizations prior to the Neighborhood Plan contributed to the implementation of improvements, such as the implementation of public facilities such as schools and Basic Health Units, and social projects (PBJL, 2019). The neighborhood plan was constructed in stages, divided into five moments, according to Figure 1.

**Figure 1**

*Stages of the Jardim Lapenna neighborhood plan elaboration*



**Source:** PBJL (2019).

As observed in Figure 1, the plan elaboration stages began with data collection (orange box), followed by project launch and dissemination (grey box), participatory diagnostic workshops (yellow box), proposal construction (blue box), and ending with pactuation and prioritization strategies (green box).

The described neighborhood plan was structured around 4 challenges, namely: 1) strengthening an active and effective community organization; 2) promoting an environmentally harmonious neighborhood; 3) strengthening the Jardim Lapenna neighborhood; and 4) ensuring infrastructure and improving existing equipment (PBJL, 2019).

As stated in the neighborhood plan document, since 2011, the Foundation has been more actively involved in articulations between public and private sectors, attempting to engage the population in neighborhood-related issues. The Jardim Lapenna Residents Forum was created by the Foundation to help mediate the neighborhood's relationship with external actors (Vialli, 2017).

The importance of the power of networks is highlighted here, reflected through stakeholder engagement, interactions, and partnerships that are fundamental to promoting plural and sustainable urban governance (Beck & Storopoli, 2021).

The Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan document reflects the moment of a social and community initiative to transform the neighborhood into a territory of rights (PBJL, 2019).

To promote the Neighborhood Plan, a party called "Neighborhood Plan Launch" was held, promoted through posters in areas with "intense circulation of residents, leaflets delivered door-to-door, sound trucks, and word-of-mouth" (PBJL, 2019, p.5). The aim of these actions was to involve residents and stimulate their participation (PBJL, 2019).

As a way to aid the promotion of events, social media channels were created, such as

a Facebook page, a blog, and an Instagram account. The official Facebook page "Plano de Bairro Jardim Lapenna" shared an article on March 12, 2017, with the following description: "Do you know what a Neighborhood Plan is and what it's for?" linking to a blog post with an explanation about what a Neighborhood Plan is, which is still pinned to the top of the page to this day. The launch took place on June 10, 2017, from 10 am to 5 pm. At this event, people were able to interact and ask questions through activities (PBJL, 2019), as shown in Table 04.

**Table 4**

*Activities promoted in the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan launch*

Activities promoted in the Neighborhood Plan Launch		
TENT	OBJECTIVE	RESULTS
Dream Map	To record residents' future vision for the neighborhood in a territorialized map.	106 dreams recorded.
Affective Map of Lapenna	To record what residents love most about the neighborhood in a territorialized map.	78 notes of affection recorded.
Play Station	Various activities for children linked to the Neighborhood Plan launch.	Not measurable.
Dance	Cultural activity linked to the launch event.	Not measurable.
Street Reading Point	Cultural activity linked to the launch event. Plan launch, booth with children's books and drawings.	Not measurable.
Dream Clothesline	To awaken residents' memories of the neighborhood's good times.	Not measurable.
Lapenna Street Radio	To invite people to participate in diagnosis and proposal workshops and clarify doubts about the Neighborhood Plan.	Discussions promoted about the Neighborhood Plan.
Health Station	To raise awareness among the population about their socio-environmental duties and responsibilities. Circular dance and Chinese medicine.	Population informed about ecology and diseases.

Lapenna Sports Station	To recover the neighborhood's sporting memory and involve young people. Button football.	Moments of leisure and information for the young population.
Graffiti Invitation	To promote the dates of diagnosis and proposal workshops as an invitation, as well as artistically involving residents.	Mural painted on the second busiest street in the neighborhood.

**Source:** Adapted by the authors based on PBJL (2019).

The activities were announced through social media, including an event created on Facebook. In June 2017, three open workshops were held to discuss the neighborhood's situation (called diagnostic workshops) through a Collaborative Cafe. A total of 89 participants circulated among thematic tables, learning about the neighborhood's reality, expressing their opinions about its challenges, and presenting their ideas (PBJL, 2019). Table 5, in this sense, highlights the themes of the tables in the diagnostic workshops.

**Table 5**

*Themes of the tables in the diagnostic workshops*

Table Themes: Diagnostic Workshop	
TABLE	WORKSHOP
1	Population and Vulnerability
2	Equipment and Public Services
3	Lapenna Geography: Environment and Housing
4	Map of Potentialities

**Source:** Adapted by the authors based on PBJL (2019).

At the Pedro Moreira State School, a debate was held with young people from the neighborhood. 135 students from the first, second, and third years of high school attended. The result of this meeting confirmed that young people are interested in the process and reflect on their neighborhood. However, as stated in the consulted document, such young people are not attracted to more traditional spaces designed for adults (PBJL, 2019).

After the conclusion of the diagnostic stage, the proposal stage began. For five weeks (from July 13th to August 24th), six suggestion boxes circulated among various establishments that, according to the team from the Tide Setúbal Foundation, were reference establishments in the neighborhood. One box was also present at the Neighborhood Plan stand at the neighborhood's July Festival. The proposal boxes circulated together with the distribution of Neighborhood Plan booklets and forms to be filled out by residents. In total, 38 proposal forms



were collected (PBJL, 2019).

To present the selected proposals to the community, activities were carried out through diagnostic workshops and the next steps of the Neighborhood Plan were presented. The importance of mobilization to change reality was discussed, seeking to encourage the population to get involved in the activities inherent to the plan. At this point, topics of greater socio-environmental relevance were raised, such as the disposal of solid waste and materials, and reflection on ways to make changes. Like in the previous phase, the workshops had space, monitors, snacks, and activities for children, facilitating adult participation in the process.

As explained in the document, all this movement generated a reflection by residents on the fate of the neighborhood. Thus, the Neighborhood Plan gained greater visibility as an instrument for deciding but also for acting, in order to effectively transform the conditions of the neighborhood (PBJL, 2019).

At the end of the proposal stage, all the participation was collected, systematized, reviewed, consolidated, and organized into four major challenges of the Neighborhood Plan:

- 1) strengthening of community organization;
- 2) harmony with the environment;
- 3) strengthening the neighborhood; and
- 4) infrastructure and equipment.

From the challenges, proposals emerged, within which actions were defined. The document of challenges, proposals and actions was reviewed and discussed by the leaders and institutions of the Collegiate.

On October 23, 2017, 110 participants discussed the 78 actions and their priorities. After adjustments and improvements, a final total of 48 actions were arrived at, distributed in the four challenges. This set of challenges, proposals and actions constituted what was called the Neighborhood Plan.

The Collegiate resumes other moments of social organization already occurred in the neighborhood, especially the Residents' Forum. The first official meeting of the Collegiate took place on May 8, 2017, at 2 pm, at the Telecenter. The purpose of the meeting was to clarify among peers the purpose of the Neighborhood Plan and to commit to acting participatively and collectively in the stages that would follow. In this sense, a first relevant record of the participatory process is that all decisions about its stages were collectively taken throughout bilateral and plenary meetings of the Collegiate.

According to the Neighborhood Plan document of Lapenna (PBJL, 2019), the Collegiate has been established as an important space for community participation and organization for the neighborhood. It was possible to verify that a total of 25 meetings were

recorded between May and October 2017.

Although the Neighborhood Plan document includes activities until the end of 2017, it is possible to follow, through the Facebook page, other activities carried out since then until mid-2019. The role of social media has been important, especially in the current scenario of the COVID-19 pandemic, considering the need for isolation that compromised the holding of face-to-face meetings.

### **Perceptions of Interviewees regarding the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan**

Based on the data collected through interviews, responses were obtained regarding the residents' perception of the implementation process of the Neighborhood Plan in the area. During the interviews, it was noticeable that the name "Neighborhood Plan" is already known among residents, although not everyone knows exactly what it means. For most interviewees, the Neighborhood Plan is related to improvements and innovations that occur in the region.

According to the Neighborhood Plan document, the development and implementation process involved the social participation of residents, public managers, and professionals in the area. According to the interviewed professor, explaining:

"From it, it was possible to bring prioritization and organization of public investment actions and build a dialogue of the neighborhood with regional participation, which is the participatory council of the subprefecture (P01)."

For the Neighborhood Plan, whichever it may be, to be fully functional, it needs to be in accordance with the legislation and approved. According to Article 5, one of the subprefectures' attributions is to coordinate the Regional Plan and the Neighborhood Plan, district or equivalent, in accordance with the guidelines established by the City's Strategic Plan. P01 stated that:

"The participatory council of the São Miguel subprefecture was gathered for the presentation of the Neighborhood Plan before it was launched. There were debates and discussions of the initiative to later be approved by the São Miguel Council. Also, because it is one of the requirements of the Neighborhood Plan provided for in the Master Plan (P01)."

In June 2017, the "Neighborhood Plan" project began to be developed in Jardim Lapenna. In August, participatory workshops were launched to build proposals for improving the neighborhood. From these workshops emerged the Neighborhood Plan Collegiate, a group of social mobilization that remains united to the date of this article.

According to interviewee P01, the actions being implemented will generate improvements in the well-being of the population of Jardim Lapenna neighborhood. And, according to him, the process that allowed the identification of problems and the decision of priority actions was very important to assist in the development of the neighborhood planning.

The connection between the project and the residents is made through direct



communication between people, leafleting, and social media. In the process of dialogue, actions and games were carried out. According to P01, "for a good participatory process, it is necessary to carry out extensive dissemination so that people know what is happening in their neighborhoods. This helps generate more participation and engagement, as the Neighborhood Plan is built in different moments, requiring different formats of population and even local companies' involvement."

In the words of the interviewed professor, workshops and meetings are fundamental because they are a way of simplifying difficult issues and bringing residents to the center of the issue in a participatory and active way, with real engagement.

After conducting interviews with neighborhood residents, it was possible to observe that only 1 out of 6 interviewees had no knowledge of the Neighborhood Plan. In the words of R01, "I don't know much about these parts. I'm out of that."

However, despite residents' knowledge of the existence of the Neighborhood Plan, few demonstrated real knowledge about its effectiveness and content. Some stated that they did not know when the meetings occurred, while others pointed out that their participation in such meetings is hindered by the fact that the schedules conflict with their work schedules and/or the need to take care of their children.

Thus, R02 states that he did not participate in the activities because he had no information about the events, while R03 says that she cannot participate because she needs to take care of her children and her snack bar, which does not allow her to have free time. R05 reports that he only attended once and could not attend "because the schedules were at night and there was no one to leave the children with to go."

Nevertheless, R06 ensures that, as soon as the pandemic passes, he intends to participate, support, and be at the meetings. And R04, in addition to knowing the Neighborhood Plan, says that he participates regularly because "the Neighborhood Plan has a WhatsApp group - everything that will be done in the neighborhood is launched in this group."

This demonstrates that there was dissemination of the Neighborhood Plan, as it was desired that "as many people as possible knew that it was happening in that environment and that they had the chance to participate at some point" (P01).

The professor stated that, in addition to adults, they tried to raise awareness among children and adolescents by going to schools, as it was important to listen to actors who "sometimes are not present and do not participate in most events, but who may have interesting viewpoints. After all, what is the young person's point of view? What is the teacher's point of view? So, there were many activities."

Another form of communication adopted, in addition to the aforementioned WhatsApp, was through Facebook. However, as observed, they cannot reach the entire population, especially now, with the aggravating factor of the pandemic, in which the circulation of people

has been restricted, and not all of the neighborhood's population has easy access to the internet.

An important data point was the difficulty some interviewees had in talking via phone and/or internet for the interviews. One of the interviewees commented: "Sorry I can only answer now, but unfortunately, the internet only works on the corner. You need to come here to be able to speak with me." Another interviewed resident, after unsuccessful attempts at contact, returned the calls and explained that in his house, the cellphone does not work, only the internet.

Such observations, although not the focus of the questions used in the interviews, reveal an important aspect of the population's reality and their potential for participation, as their participation is hindered by the lack of access to efficient means of communication, demonstrating the structural problems of segregation that still exist.

In addition to the lack of access to communication means, the interviewed residents spoke explicitly about their discomfort with the local dirt and apparent pollution. Although all respondents mentioned having noticed changes in the neighborhood in recent months, they were emphatic in expressing their desire for improvements in their street and immediate surroundings. On the other hand, this does not prevent residents from considering the possibility of working together to develop the neighborhood, as stated by R02.

F01, on the other hand, sees the Neighborhood Plan in a positive light because they understand it as a joint effort, and because it was a joint effort, it makes sense to everyone.

"[...] because everyone built it together, and so everyone learned together, since they didn't have access to places, paths, or anything. [...] Our expectations are quite high, as the population sees themselves as conquerors of these small missions, and we hope they can achieve larger and more structuring actions and achievements for the neighborhood (F01)."

However, even so, interviewee F01 assures that "it was a very transformative movement." According to her, "I can express myself like this because I have followed the creation of the residents' forums. The residents' forums were a discussion space where the population felt they could be heard a lot. The forums happened once a month and were divided by themes, but when they realized they could cover more themes, more people would participate."

When F01 noticed that a larger number of people with different interests were participating in the forums, she began to give space for listening and, according to her, "this was a milestone for collectivity. It was when the Tide Setúbal Foundation began to realize that people were no longer just caring about their own lives or their own problems, they began to give assistance to the neighborhood."

The first improvements were made in the living spaces:



"[...] so, the square that was quite abandoned started to have housing and another space that was a space of debris on a square, and all of this was transformed into a community mutirão with outside supporters" (F01).

When the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan reached its purpose with the city hall as an important and cared-for place, it was possible to successfully request a drainage project. With a proven history of flooding, the drainage project was soon approved by the city hall (F01).

The idea for the drainage project came from a resident, who brought the idea to the Neighborhood Plan, and from there, the project was taken to the subprefecture and approved by them. Indispensable, however, was the resident who had knowledge of the location of the floods and where it flooded (in the UBS street and inside the daycare) (F01).

Resident R03 noticed the changes made since the beginning of the implementation of the Neighborhood Plan:

"[...] before, there were a lot of floods on the street, which people call the Marianos street. Then, they had to fight to be able to do piping there [...] and, if I'm not mistaken, it improved a lot. And other things they ended up doing, if I'm not mistaken, was through the people of the Neighborhood Plan" (R03).

R04 also pointed out changes brought about by the Neighborhood Plan:

[...] It was launched in the street group: the little square, which needed cleaning. The city hall came, cleaned and fixed the square and put gym equipment here in the little square... Ermínia here. Usually, Anselmo, who is also part of the Neighborhood Plan, is always taking pictures of the points that need help (R04).

In the perception of R05, the Neighborhood Plan works for:

[...] the community's benefit, improvements, both in asphalt, sewage... they participate in the school, if there is any problem in the school, they go there to help... let me see more what... there was the ecopoint, which was brought here by them... some reforms in Berigam, which they are working on... the sewage down here, a lot of things like that, basic sanitation. They make an effort! Whatever problem there is and reaches them, they try to direct and help in the best way possible (R05).

R06 was excited about the changes already brought about by the Neighborhood Plan:

[...] from what I started to research about the Neighborhood Plan, which is a lot, right? Berigam street, which used to flood the most, I noticed that it was flooding less, like, it didn't stay flooded for days. The Baianos street with Nordeste too, but I didn't know who brought about this improvement, if it was a struggle of the residents... and it was! The other entrance to the station side, which is for the community entrance, had no means, but then I noticed that they put a sign there with a map saying they were going to open an exit there and everything, and I found out that it was a struggle of the Neighborhood Plan. So, these things make me very happy, to know that the residents have the same goal (R06).

However, more than the population's knowledge about the Neighborhood Plan, the main challenges faced by the frontline team and active residents of the Neighborhood Plan were budgetary issues and understanding the path to be followed for the creation, development, and implementation of the projects. F01 mentions that there are no other structured Neighborhood Plan projects to mirror, to follow the path, and that, in this sense, it is

difficult to understand the next steps without having a guide, an example.

This is because the Neighborhood Plan institution was recognized in 2014 with the new Master Plan law of the city of São Paulo, but Jardim Lapenna only started implementing the plan in 2017. In October 2016, there was a vote for new mayors, who took office in January 2017. Therefore, F01 claimed that the change in management harmed the project's effectiveness, as the responsible public employees did not know the necessary steps, did not know what to do with the documentation, and how to assist the Neighborhood Plan project managers. There was a real challenge of understanding with the public power, "which doesn't know what to do with its instruments... It doesn't have a super-structured path."

In terms of budget, projects compete with other city projects and need to fit in with other neighborhoods in the budget provided by the municipality. F01 exemplifies what this situation is like: in 2020, Jardim Lapenna, through the neighborhood plan, requested the "Walkability" project, with the aim of creating suitable and comfortable routes connecting public spaces. This project competed with other projects directly in the municipality. As "the municipality's time is slow, and we didn't get this project, and we had to enter another project that the municipality did and already decided." In other words, still according to F01, the population may even decide together on a priority, but in the end, "the municipality's role is important in the final decision of which project will be taken forward."

The Neighborhood Plan is still a new situation, even for public actors, who are used to determining priorities through internal meetings. With the implementation of Neighborhood Plans, this dynamic may change, as P01 believes. "By starting from a set of demands and actions that the population itself perceived as important and prioritized, it is these that will lead these political agents to make the negotiation that is part of democracy" (P01). Thus, there is a need for more expressive and organized participation of Jardim Lapenna's population so that the projects chosen by it can be implemented.

## CONCLUSIONS

The present article aimed to analyze the perception of urban stakeholders regarding the Jardim Lapenna Neighborhood Plan, located in the São Miguel Paulista district, in the eastern zone of the city of São Paulo. In this sense, the study highlighted that the Jardim Lapenna neighborhood had already demonstrated a history of mobilizations and social interactions among different stakeholders, which contributed to important social achievements prior to the implementation of the Neighborhood Plan. In addition, the stages of the PBJL development were presented, from data collection to prioritization strategies and agreements, through the launch and dissemination of the project through workshops, which helped to build proposals. The challenges of PBJL and the important role of networks, reflected by the engagement, interactions, and partnerships among existing stakeholders, in building a social

and community initiative to transform the neighborhood into a territory of rights, were also presented.

Regarding the interviewed stakeholders, it was possible to verify that all contacted residents had already heard of PBJL, although not all of them knew its meaning. However, most associate PBJL with improvements and innovations that happened in the neighborhood. The interviews also indicated that the development and implementation process of PBJL counted on the social engagement of residents, public managers, and professionals in the area. The important role of the Participatory Council of the São Miguel subprefecture, as well as the Neighborhood Plan Collegiate, the latter being fundamental for social mobilization and still active at the time of this article, was also observed.

One contribution of this study can be seen in a point highlighted by one of the interviewees, who emphasized that PBJL, which was an important initiative of positive transformations in the neighborhood and allowed engagement and interactions among different stakeholders, could not count on other experiences of implementing Neighborhood Plans, in which it could mirror itself. According to the interviewee, this made it difficult to understand the next steps to follow. In this sense, the results of this article, which not only rely on documentary analysis but also on interviews with important stakeholders engaged in the process of developing the plan, can contribute to fill this gap and serve as an incentive for other similar initiatives in other neighborhoods.

In addition, the interviews allowed us to verify different perspectives on the same reality and pointed out that, despite the important participation instruments used for the development of the plan, there are still challenges to be faced.

Thus, one of the identified challenges is the problem of management changes in city governments, which halt necessary actions and decisions. In addition, it is observed that issues related to the public budget also hinder the selection and implementation of projects, which, despite being thought participatively and expressing real neighborhood needs, may not be put into practice due to budget limitations. Also, regarding the public power, it was possible to verify the need for greater agility in the selection and decision-making procedures regarding projects to be implemented. However, these issues may improve considering that the Neighborhood Plan is a relatively new instrument that, from its implementation, will tend to generate changes in the involved agents, including the public power itself, with a view to expanding the potentials of the Neighborhood Plan as an important instrument for the construction of democratic and sustainable cities.

In addition, the work also identified an important obstacle to be overcome, namely, the difficulty of access to the internet and the inherent limitations of telecommunications coverage, which hinder popular participation, especially in moments of pandemic, such as the current one.

In this sense, this work also brings a contribution, as it allows pointing out obstacles that may serve as parameters for future actions to improve the Neighborhood Plan under analysis or other similar initiatives.

Thus, based on the presented and discussed results, at least five final considerations can be highlighted:

- The implementation of the Neighborhood Plan in Jardim Lapenna faced several challenges, including budgetary issues and lack of guidance from the government, which often did not know how to deal with the project.
- The participation of the local population was essential for the success of the Neighborhood Plan, as it was responsible for identifying the demands and priorities of the region and, thus, guiding the actions of public actors.
- The lack of examples of structured Neighborhood Plans made it difficult to implement the project, as public actors did not have a model to follow.
- The Neighborhood Plan can change the dynamics of priorities determined by internal meetings of public actors, allowing greater participation and organization of the local population in choosing priority actions.
- The success of the implementation of the Neighborhood Plan depends on the cooperation and articulation between the local population and public actors, in order to ensure the effectiveness of the project and its adaptation to the needs of the region.

In addition to these, another issue that deserves attention is the importance of active participation of the population in the implementation process of the Neighborhood Plan, from the survey of demands to the monitoring of actions. This allows the needs and interests of the community to be effectively addressed, strengthening participatory democracy.

Furthermore, the articulation and collaboration between different instances of the government, such as subprefectures and municipal secretaries, were crucial for the success of PBJL. This demonstrates the importance of integrating public policies and a systemic vision of the urban territory.

Finally, this study highlighted the need to invest in participatory and collaborative processes in urban planning, in order to strengthen citizenship and the collective construction of more just and sustainable spaces. The experience of PBJL can serve as inspiration and reference for other similar initiatives in other regions and cities.

One limitation of this study was the lack of inclusion of other stakeholders, such as local merchants and representatives of social organizations that operate in the neighborhood. It is important to emphasize that the perception of these actors can add new perspectives to the topic and should be considered in future research. Thus, considering the presented results, it

is suggested that, in future studies, the sample be expanded, especially in the number of interviewed residents, in addition to the inclusion of other important stakeholders, such as those belonging to the government and planning agencies.

Furthermore, there is a need for studies that allow the analysis of the effectiveness of strategies to include stakeholders in the planning and implementation actions of the transformations envisaged in the Neighborhood Plans. In the same direction, it is also important to highlight the importance of new works that analyze the role of technology in expanding popular participation and in including stakeholders in the urban planning process.

## REFERENCES

- Antonio, E. M. M. [. (2011). *A independência do solo que habitamos: autonomia, poder e cultura política na construção do império brasileiro*. Sergipe (1750-1831) [PublishedVersion, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP)].  
<http://hdl.handle.net/11449/103096>.
- Bauer, M., & Gaskell, G. (2000). *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*. SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209731>.
- Beck, D., & Storopoli, J. (2021). Cities through the lens of Stakeholder Theory: A literature review. *Cities*, 118, 103377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103377>
- Bento, S. C., Conti, D. D. M., Baptista, R. M., & Ghobril, C. N. (2018). As Novas Diretrizes e a Importância do Planejamento Urbano para o Desenvolvimento de Cidades Sustentáveis. *Revista de Gestão Ambiental e Sustentabilidade*, 7(3).  
<https://doi.org/10.5585/geas.v7i3.1342>.
- Calado, J., Capellani Quaresma, C., de Sá Rodrigues, M., de Melo Conti, D., & Brainer da Silva Furtado, D. (2019). Acessibilidade urbana e vulnerabilidade socioespacial: avaliação de aspectos físicos das calçadas dos distritos Jardim Ângela e Moema– São Paulo/SP-Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento*

*Regional*, 15(6), 308–322.

Campenhoudt, L. V., & Quivy, R. (2008). *Manual de investigação em ciências sociais* (5ª ed.). Gradiva. (Obra original publicada em 1995).

Conti, D. d. M., Guevara, A. J. d. H., Heinrichs, H., Silva, L. F. d., Quaresma, C. C., & Beté, T. d. S. (2019). Collaborative governance towards cities sustainability transition. *urbe. Revista Brasileira de Gestão Urbana*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-3369.011.e20190046>

Chiaravalloti Neto, F., Moraes, M. S. d., & Fernandes, M. A. (1998). Avaliação dos resultados de atividades de incentivo à participação da comunidade no controle da dengue em um bairro periférico do Município de São José do Rio Preto, São Paulo, e da relação entre conhecimentos e práticas desta população. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*, 14(suppl 2), S101—S109. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0102-311x1998000600009>

Fitzgerald, B. G., O'Doherty, T., Moles, R., & O'Regan, B. (2012). A quantitative method for the evaluation of policies to enhance urban sustainability. *Ecological Indicators*, 18, 371–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.12.002>

Freitas, J. P. (2012). Os mecanismos de democracia direta e os movimentos sociais: considerações sobre o aperfeiçoamento da cultura política. Constituição, Economia e Desenvolvimento. *Revista da Academia Brasileira de Direito Constitucional*, 4(6), 75–99.

Frey, K. (2020). Governança Urbana e Participação Pública. *Rac-Eletrônica*, 1(1), 136–150.



- Furtado, D. B., Quaresma, C. C., Oliveira, E. A., Conti, D. d. M., & Calado, J. (2020). Iniciativas sociais na superação da crise de mobilidade urbana em áreas segregadas: o caso da Jaubra na Brasilândia, São Paulo, Brasil. *Humanidades & Inovação*, 7(5), 52-67.
- Guaraná, J., & Fleury, S. (2008). Gestão participativa como instrumento de inclusão democrática: o caso dos Comitês Gestores de Bairro do Programa Nova Baixada. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 48(3), 94-103.
- Gomes, J. F. d. F., & Orfão, N. H. (2021). Desafios para a efetiva participação popular e controle social na gestão do SUS: revisão integrativa. *Saúde em Debate*, 45(131), 1199–1213. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-1104202113118>
- Grinover, L. (2006). A hospitalidade urbana: acessibilidade, legibilidade e identidade. *Revista Hospitalidade*, 3(2), 29-50.
- Jacobi, P. R. (2002). Políticas sociais locais e os desafios da participação cidadina. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 7(3), 443–454. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-81232002000300005>
- Mariano, A. F. D. C. (2018). A entrevista como tema de pesquisa no campo da comunicação. *Revista FAMECOS*, 25(2), 28307. <https://doi.org/10.15448/1980-3729.2018.2.28307>
- Marino, E. C. (2019). Ativismo e apropriação do espaço urbano em São Paulo. *arq.Urb*, (23), 170–184. Recuperado de <https://revistaarqurb.com.br/arqurb/article/view/46>
- Maricato, E. (2000). Urbanismo na periferia do mundo globalizado: metrópoles brasileiras. *São Paulo em perspectiva*, 14(4), 21-33.

Maricato, E. (2015). *Para entender a crise urbana*. Expressão Popular.

Malta, C. (2003). *Reinvente seu bairro*. Editora 34.

Plano de Bairro Jardim Lapenna (2019): Rota para um território de direitos. DIREITO SP. EAESP. EESP. CEPESP. O bairro: uma Ilha. *DIREITO SP*. São Paulo.

Prefeitura do Município de São Paulo (2013). *Guia Metodológico dos Processos Participativos: A participação como Método do Governo e sua Dimensão Formativa*. São Paulo.

Quaresma, C. C., Ferreira, M. L., Shibao, F. Y., Ruiz, M. S., & Neto, G. C. de O. (2017). A crise de mobilidade urbana brasileira e seus antecedentes socioespaciais. In T. Tucunduva, C. Kniess & E. Maccari (Orgs.), *Cidades Inteligentes e Sustentáveis*. Manole.

Ruiz, A. T., & Almeida, M. V. (2020). Políticas públicas e participação social: o caso do plano de bairro do jardim lapenna como um caminho da democracia para um território de direitos. *USP*, 225–241.

Severino, A. J. (2017). *Metodologia do trabalho científico* (2ª ed.). Editora Cortez.

Vialli, A. (2017). Articulação, palavra-chave. *Página 22 - FGV*, (107), 32–36.

YIN, R. K. (2005). *Estudo de caso: planejamento e métodos* (3a ed.). Bookman.