



Towards post-growth planning theory and practice

Co-chairs

Federico Savini (University of Amsterdam -TheNetherlands)

Antonio Ferreira (University of Porto – Portugal)

Kim von Schonfeld (Wageningen University - The Netherlands)

It is increasingly evident that the socio-ecological urgencies of our cities are rooted in the inner mechanics of economic growth. A transition to a sustainable form of urbanization is at odds with current logics of extractivism, productivism, consumerism, and globalized mobility.

The idea that cities cannot stop growing seems to be today internalized by contemporary planning institutions. This dependency on growth (more, faster, bigger) has become a necessary condition for the feasibility of the mainstream planning models dependent on permanently increasing land valorization, private investments, competitiveness, and consumption. While these pro-growth planning models persist, the de-growth movement is gaining renewed interest globally. Building on street-level activism and radical ecological economics, the ideas of 'post-growth' or 'de-growth' suggest a contradictory role for urban areas. Cities seem to be both the engines of economic growth as well as experimental fields for inspiring initiatives based on concepts such as co-housing, urban agriculture, basic and maximum incomes, alternative currencies, localism, and 'slow' mobility. In this special session we invite contributors to (dis)engage with the notion and mechanisms of 'economic growth' and imagine planning practices, instruments and institutions that deliberately de-construct these mechanisms.

The session invites theoretical and empirical contributions on the following themes:

- The socio-spatial impacts of the paradigm of urban/economic growth in contemporary capitalism and the role that planning processes, institutions and practices have in exacerbating or reducing these impacts.
- The intertwining between existing planning models and the institutions of economic growth, such as innovation, productivity, competitiveness, consumption, land-rent, commodification, and globalization.

The connections between de-growth notions, propositions and concepts with the planning studies, planning practices, urban geography and spatial sciences broadly (or vice-versa).

The (un)complementarity between the socio-economic assumptions of de-growth scholarship and planning scholarship. We welcome works considering ways in which planning can spatialize, substantiate de-growth propositions on urban change and complement existent ecological economics.