

AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPE PROTECTION AND ORGANIC FARMING ETHICS: THE ROLE OF ALTERNATIVE FOOD NETWORKS IN SPATIAL PLANNING. A CASE STUDY FROM SPAIN

Salvatore Pinna¹

Keywords: AFNs, landscape preservation, spatial planning, quality of food, Spain

Abstract: Alternative Food Networks (AFNs) represent a change in food production and consumption practices. Their importance has increased among consumers wishing healthier nutrition, farmers' support, and sustainable agriculture. Drawing upon the concept of landscape as expressed in the European Landscape Convention, the paper aims to study if, and to what extent, ethics of organic farmers being part of AFNs could be used as theoretical framework to boost spatial planning for agricultural landscape conservation. The paper analyses the case study of the Soto del Grillo Agro-ecological Park in Spain. In-depth interviews have been used in order to get spontaneous and complete information by farmers. In order to schematise the information, the theoretical categories described by Morris & Kirwan (2011) were considered: i) understanding relationships between production methods and ecological benefits, ii) realising methods, and iii) utilising the information provided by the previous dimensions to communicate with customers. Texts and images of farms websites have also been analysed, in order to see how traditional landscapes questions and ecological values such as biodiversity are associated with food quality. Results are discussed in the light of the park regulation and future development projects, especially focusing on the connection between food, territory and traditional landscape, in order to see whether the driving forces highlighted by farmers are taken into account in the practice. This relationship could open a new season in spatial planning processes, taking into account cultural and social aspects of food production and consumption, encouraging sustainable tourism and reinforcing the relationship between rural and urban spaces.

1. Introduction

This paper aims to discuss the role of Alternative Food Networks (AFNs) as example of traditional agricultural landscapes preservation through multifunctional agriculture. In fact, since the establishment of the European Landscape Convention (ELC), cultural and historical values have been included in the notion of landscape, along with the scope of its sustainable exploitation instead of a mere conservation. Europe has a big tradition in agricultural production, and today almost the half of European land is dedicated to food production (Eurostat, 2010). For this reason, the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has always been one of the most supported policies, and now it absorbs the 45% of the total European budget (European Union, 2012). The CAP has been changing since its establishment in the Sixties, passing from being a simple support to production to concern environmental issues with the Fischler reform in 2003. The new CAP 2014-2020 includes new environmental measures and food chains themes (European Union, 2015).

In the paper of Lefebvre et al. (2014), some reflections on the landscape management scales and the role of the CAP are presented. The authors identify three landscape governance scales: i) the farm level, where farmers' decisions shape the single parcels; ii) the landscape level, where landscapes recognisable for their homogeneous characteristics results from the aggregation of parcels; and iii)

¹ Università degli studi di Cagliari, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile, Ambientale e Architettura (DICAAR), pinna.salvatore@unica.it

the global level, i.e. the whole EU landscape. Lefebvre and colleagues argue that the CAP until now has been targeted to the first level. Drawing on these reflections, the paper aims to show how spatial planning for multifunctional agriculture -in particular through rural parks- can coordinate farms actions in order to get results at the landscape level. Socio-economic concepts of ecological, spatial, and social embeddedness (Penker, 2006) are useful instruments and fundamental behaviours in farms activities in order to create effective synergies between land use management and economic activity of food chains.

After a brief literature review, the paper presents the case study description and the methodology used for the analysis of in-depth interviews and websites. Then, results are presented and discussed. Finally, some conclusions and for future research aims, are exposed.

2. Literature review

Scientific research about Alternative Food Networks (AFNs) has started in the late Nineties, with the scope of understanding the development of "newly emerging networks of producers, consumers, and other actors that embody alternatives to the more standardised industrial mode of food supply" (Renting, et al., 2003, p. 394). Until now, a unique and broadly accepted definition does not exist, and 'AFNs' is used as an umbrella term (Forssell & Lankoski, 2015) comprising different types of production, distribution, selling, and even consumption methods (Sánchez Hernández, 2009). Notwithstanding, some common characteristics have been well described (Forssell & Lankoski, 2015).

AFNs have been studied according to different schools of thought (Tregear, 2011): i) political economy. These studies are based on Marxism theories in order to see how AFNs develop and change under economy and politics influence. This approach has highlighted many problematics regarding social injustice and inequality within AFNs; ii) rural sociology, which describe AFNs contribution to the establishment of social values in food networks, contrasting the capitalist market de-humanisation. Micro-level focus and sociological approach are typical of this field; iii) modes of governance and Actor-Network Theory. Here, the focus is on vast geographical areas (regions or even countries), with the scope of describing AFNs relationships with regulations and institutions.

However, it has been only in recent times that AFNs role in biodiversity conservation has been recognised (Brunori & Di Iacovo, 2014), focusing for example on the interest in conserving traditional and local varieties that have been abandoned by conventional agriculture (Simoncini, 2015). Thus, their potential influence on landscape preservation remains today an underexplored field.

3. The Soto del Grillo agro-ecological park in Rivas-Vaciamadrid

The Soto del Grillo Agro-ecological Park (in Spanish: *Parque Agroecológico Soto del Grillo*) is located within the Community of Madrid, Spain. Its territory falls under the zone D of the South East Regional Park (a protected space established in 1994), dedicated to the regulated exploitation of natural resources (Romea Rodríguez, 2013). Established in 2013, the Park aims to promote fresh, local and seasonal food consumption, boost new jobs position, and improve short food supply chains, in accordance to sustainable development and to the conservation of typical landscape and natural resources (Ayuntamiento de Rivas Vaciamadrid, 2015). It extends for 85 ha, which have been divided into five zones: a) environmental protection; b) agricultural production; c) other agricultural uses; d) formation and community gardens, and e) equipment and services. At the park borders, some interventions for environmental protection and biodiversity improvement have been realised: reforestation, riparian forest, and delimitation of farms with live fences. The b) zone is partitioned

into 17 parcels, which are managed by farmers through a scoring based on different parameters provided that they enrol in the register of organic certification: i) project developer skills (experience and formation); ii) innovative aspects of the production process; iii) marketing strategies (distribution channels and promotion); iv) economic and financial viability; and v) other criteria (job creation and social and local initiatives).

The park is linked to the twice-monthly farmers' market, which takes place in a peripheral municipal space (Campelo & Piedrabuena, 2013). In April 2015, the project has been enriched with the creation of a quality label named "fresh product from Soto del Grillo Agroecological Park" (in Spanish: *producto fresco del Parque Agroecológico Soto del Grillo*). The label was created in order to boost the commercialisation of food produced within the park, through four objectives: i) promotion of agro-ecological practices: this includes food quality, economic viability, and water and soil protection; ii) origin and proximity, for the awareness of consumers about the origin of products and food miles; iii) quality: the cultivation practices guarantee people health, environmental protection, and assure that the product has been harvested at its best maturation point; iv) seasonality, which promotes good food consumption habits and varied nutrition.

4. Methodology

Seven of the 17 producers enrolled in the municipal project have been interviewed. Interviews have been structured in three sections: general data of the farm, questions about production methods, and selling methods. The reason of the division into two separate sections, one related to cultivation practices and the other to business aspects, is justified by the theoretical framework used for the analysis. The concept of embeddedness (Polanyi, 1944; Granovetter, 1985) has been chosen in order to see how the economy of food production is influenced by non-economic factors. Moreover, as described by Penker (2006) three dimensions where embeddedness works can be identified: ecology, space, and society. The first refers to ideas related to environmental practices, the benefits they produce, and to the quality of food. Spatial embeddedness is linked to the concept of food re-localisation (Sonnino & Marsden, 2006), meaning all the measures (above all the form of distribution, but also promotional and educational initiatives) that contribute to re-connect people to the place of origin of food. In such way, consumers are aware of the origin of the food they eat and in how its quality is related to the place of production. Finally, social embeddedness encloses those factors that, determines the 'socio-economic alternativeness' of AFNs: influence of ideas about collective benefits, generation of trust between producers and consumers, and contrast to capitalist economy in the business activity.

In order to better divide farmers' insights into these three dimensions, the study draws upon the paper of Morris & Kirwan (2011b), who describe three steps that link ecology and food: i) understanding, meaning how farmers relate their production methods to ecological benefits; ii) realising, that is how farmers apply the previous concept to realise benefits, which could not necessarily be akin with food production (as for example particular land or water managements); iii) utilising, that is the information exchange with customers about the previous two dimensions. It has been chosen to extend this division even to the social and spatial dimensions, in order to discover how embeddedness influence farmers' behaviours within each step and to report results organised according to them.

Interviews contents have been analysed through the codification method (Burnard, 1991; Marshall, 1996; MacQueen, 1998), assigning a code to every smallest piece of information within the texts. This operation helps to schematise contents and to find recurring themes, according to the three types of embeddedness described before.

For the websites analysis, textual and visual contents have been analysed in the light of three 'geographical lores' or 'tales' as firstly described by Crang (1996) and modified by Morris & Kirwan (2010): i) geo-historical knowledge, where images and stories about history and geography are used to create a strong link between the products and their origin; ii) naturalistic knowledge, which contains the description of the whole production process, highlighting the environmental-friendly methods and practices, and iii) association between products and ideas. The category iii) has been modified in order to adapt it to the case of AFNs and their social embeddedness, thus it has been renamed 'socio-economic purposes and compromises', that include every references to the social embeddedness defined by Penker.

5. Results

Table 1 shows schematically the values expressed by farmers during the interviews (labelled as "ix", where x is a progressive number) and in the websites (labelled as "wx", where x is a number). Each theme (space, ecology and society) is presented alternating interviews and websites analysis, in order to compare how they are treated for the promotion of the business.

Table 1. Comparison of expressed values within the interviews and the websites

		i1	i2	i3	i4	i5	i6	i7	w1	w2	w3	w4	w5	w6	w7
Geo-historical	History	x			x										
	Family								x					x	
	Heritage/Trad.			x	x			x						x	
	Territory	x	x		x		x	x							
	Tourism	x									x				
	Landscape										x				x
	Climate	x			x										
Naturalistic	Natural methods	x					x		x	x			x		x
	Water		x	x	x			x							
	Soil			x	x	x	x	x		x		x			x
	Energy	x								x	x			x	
	Biodiversity				x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
	Landscape				x		x				x				x
	Certification								x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Socio-economic	Education	x		x	x		x				x	x		x	x
	Diversity	x		x	x										
	Health		x	x	x			x		x		x	x	x	x
	Economic														
	Social Goals	x	x	x	x			x		x			x	x	x
	Cooperation	x		x	x	x		x				x			x

5.1 Space

5.1.1 Spatial Embeddedness

In this category are enclosed all the ideas and actions that try to "re-embed food systems" (Penker, 2006, p. 369) generating trust through personal relation between producers and consumers, and concepts like 'zero miles' and localness. In this study, the following codes have been established for the definition of spatial embeddedness: references to history, familiar dimension of the business, heritage and recovering of traditional methods, place characteristics that determine the peculiarity of the cultivation, landscape as distinctive trait of the region, touristic attractiveness, and climate.

Territory is the most frequent mentioned theme (including climate references), together with heritage from ancient generations. For the former, producers point strongly to the importance of eating local and to lost varieties restoration as a form to maintain the environmental conditions that make every place unique and different from others. This issue is a problem for some producers, because they perceive as a limitation the obligation to use certified seeds:

It has no sense to use a seed produced by the multinational Battle, [...] and we cannot use it... that seed from Battle will produce more, but as we use it, someone from China can use the same... and we cannot use a typical seed from this territory. The INIA, the Institute of Agrarian Research... sells plants suitable to this region, the Jarama Valley, that is where we are right now, but again we cannot use it. So, we do not understand this obligation, and we do not agree with it. (i6)

Seasonality is another recurring theme regarding localness; among other characteristics, organic farming is considered a way to appreciate differences among places, each of them with their seasonality:

My project [for the assignation of the parcel within the park] is dedicated to seasonal vegetables, because here the weather, the climatology is very specific (i1)

The theme of local production [is important], I mean trying to make people accustomed to eat seasonal products, in order to avoid bringing products from far away. This happens very often, even though these products are organic, they are brought from far away. (i3)

For the latter, it is interesting to note that diversity is both an environmental and a cultural fact. Recovering antique varieties of vegetables from the region of Madrid, in form of seeds which are suitable to the specific climate, has a big relevance for biodiversity improvement, and it also stimulates the curiosity of that consumers who remember when families use to have gardens and food tasted differently:

This richness you are introducing in the kitchen of people, suddenly becomes something... again, something cultural (i4)

There are four kind of tomatoes and pears, which people usually eat. But there are many others that maybe are autochthonous or with different flavour and colour. Producing these new varieties, flavours that in some ways were lost, varieties that were no longer cultivated; evoking all these things, pushes people to look for lost things, tomatoes that taste as tomatoes! So, we try to recover lost things (i7).

The other categories are only touched; a farmer spoke about people biking and riding in the paths around the cultivated field, and now he thinks to start a pick-your-own selling method for people who go into the park for field trips. He also cited Romans as the ones who started olive tree cultivation in Spain, while he was mentioning typical national cultivations. Another reference to history was done by a farmer (i4) in order to explain how organic farming is a traditional cultivation method from the prehistory, more respectful to nature. During the interviews there was no reference to Soto del Grillo landscape as historical heritage from the past, nor as a space traditionally dedicated to agriculture. This can be explained by the fact that the park is established in a zone formerly abandoned, as highlighted in the case study presentation.

5.1.2 Geo-historical Knowledge

References to space are very scarce in the websites; questions about local varieties and climate are absent. However, it is interesting to note that two websites mention the park and its surroundings, which in the interviews are not treated. One (w6) just dedicates few lines to this description, even though in a quite evocative way:

The farm is located in Soto del Grillo, a kitchen garden blooming within the boundaries of Rivas, to the edge of the Jarama river. It is a natural setting extending in the shade of Piul cliffs, embedded in the South-East Regional Park.

The other website, instead, allots a large space to the description of the landscape where the farm is located, also through panoramic images (Figure 1); the beauty of landscape is used to promote field activities as riding, biking and walking tours, with the possibility to know better the flora and fauna of the South East regional Park:

The whole region belongs to the natural protected space "South-East Regional park", which is characteristic for being a place of shelter and reproduction for protected avifauna in its many lagoons, as for some botanical peculiarity vegetal species existing in the zone.

The website also explains the project for the creation of a 'Madrid kitchen garden route', going over the municipalities belonging to the zone. Finally, there is a little reference about how the region has been historically suitable to agricultural uses:

Region of agricultural beauty and richness, shaped as a big valley with fertile irrigated plains embedded among gypsum hills and cliffs. In the past it formed the 'Madrid kitchen garden', whereas nowadays fodder and cereals (corn) cultivations predominate.

Unlike the interviews, websites do not mention specific climate characteristics of the zone influencing cultivation; history is absent, too.

There are some references to familiar dimension, in the form of tales about how the farm was founded and the reason of the farm ideology (w6), and as a justification for the product quality due to the avoiding of external people in the whole process of production and distribution (w1).



Figure 1. A lagoon within the South-East Regional park (from: www.vegafertil.es)

5.2 Ecology

5.2.1 Ecological Embeddedness

In this category, farmers express ecological values and ideas about environmental practices that distinguish business distinct from conventional channels; according to Morris & Kirwan (2011, p. 326), is the communication of the ecological methods of production to customers that can "contribute to on-farm environmental management", giving products an added value.

The codes included in this section are the following: explanations of how farmers replace chemical products with natural methods for illnesses prevention and fertilisation, soil and water protection, energetic issues, biodiversity improvement and shaping of agricultural landscapes.

As it can be seen in the table 1, references to ecology are more than space and history; protection of soil and water, and biodiversity improvement are the most named questions. At a first look, the reason could be the fact that all the interviewees are certified as organic; however, some of them go beyond the mandatory measures imposed by UE. For example, some farmers complain about the scarce attention to water contamination and a lack of the control bodies in analysing the soil:

[There is] a tremendous bureaucracy; it would be better that an inspector came here in order to... I mean, what's the advantage in knowing what I put in the soil? I could invent! I mean... the regulation only produce problems to me. An inspector should come here in order to analyse the soil, the leafs, the water (i3)

The cultivation methods could be more exhaustive, for example issues like CO2 emissions or water usage could be taken into account; it is not the same having a well to irrigate, which is a natural aquifer of alluvial waters, than a water supply from Murcia, through a diversion from Trajo Segura that dries headwaters (i4)

Another farmer (i5) expresses the importance of some measures that are not related to production but are fundamental for biodiversity improvement, and in his opinion it is maybe for this reason that they are not included in the organic regulation. He said he wants to put live fences in his farm, because they improve biodiversity and, as a side effect, his parcel has a highest ecological value than one without them.

Biodiversity is also related to landscape:

As we are within the Regional park, garden diversity can also be part of the landscape diversity; I mean, having a diverse garden allows protecting the landscape (i6)

The vision of producers as 'nature protector' (Home, et al., 2014) is clear in a statement of one farmer, where he explains his personal vision of what is environmental protection; beyond the mandatory actions, he said that being ecologic consists in paying attention to many aspects related to farm activity. For example, caring the environment for example through a rational water usage, respecting bugs as important component of the ecosystem:

Protecting the environment consists in being polite; don't do to the land what you wouldn't like to be done in your house. No more. If your home is dirty, your garden will be the same (i1)

5.2.1 Naturalistic knowledge

Being a way to promote commodities, websites point quite enough to the whole process of production explanation and to what make the difference in respect to conventional farms. The treated themes are quite the same of the interviews, with the exception of water management, which is not mentioned. On the contrary, energy is a highlighted question; three websites report the advantages of cultivating seasonal, local vegetables and fruit. This choice allows spending less energy than the conventional chains, in addition to the fact that products are fresh and tasty.

Biodiversity is a recurring theme but, in opposition to interviews, is always in general terms and in association with the explanation of what is organic farming. However, some implicit references to landscape shaping through cultivations association could be find in the field images (Figure 2).

One website dedicates a quite long explanation for the utility of cultivation rotation, above all its effects on the maintenance of soil fertility.

All the websites declare their enrolment in organic certification. This observation confirms what farmers said during the interviews, that is, if certification is not useful in order to generate trust with customers in direct selling, it is an essential instrument to guarantee quality and freshness in distance sales.



Figure 2. Association of vegetable evoking agricultural landscape improvement

5.3 Society

5.2.1 Social embeddedness

In this study, all those ideas related to social benefits, alternative economy to the capitalist system, and relationships among actors of food networks are enclosed into the concept of social embeddedness. Unlike the previous two cases, there is not direct link with agro-food production. However, these aspects play a big role in the otherness of AFNs (Renting, et al., 2003; Venn, et al., 2006; Higgins, et al., 2008) and their importance in the 'new rural paradigm' (Goodman, 2004). This is the category about which farmers expressed more ideas, as it can be seen from the table 1. References are about education in consumption, supply diversity, attention to consumers' choices and habits, health, economic advantages for farmers, changes in society structure, and cooperation with other realities.

Producers recognise that educating people to organic consumption not to only would make them aware of the natural cycles and seasonality of food, but is also a way to develop an environmental sensibility:

People who buy organic are very interested in health, but not in where the product has been cultivated nor if it has environmental impacts. [...] They have not clear what environmental damage is (i3)

On the contrary, according to another farmer (i4), people are very interested in questions not directly related to the product quality, for example the business structure and its social characteristics. Indeed, she works in a cooperative; after having joined it for two years, workers become members and have vote right, which is independent from the time they have spent within the business. She considers that consumers choose to buy food produced by the cooperative also for this reason.

Eventually, education and generation of trust are strictly connected, due to the way of working of AFNs:

For consumers [our selling methods] are better [then the conventional ones] because they know at first hand where the product comes from, whom is cultivated by, how is produced. They came here to visit the farm, they can see how we work. [...] This generates a strong, mutual trust (i6)

Another social advantage is the diversity of the products supply within AFNs, which is strictly connected to themes like economic benefits, education in consumption, and cooperation. For example, a farmer complains about the fact that almost every producers belonging to the park sell the same products. For him, this causes an economic damage, and suggests a way to avoid the problem, and even improving the commercialisation:

In winter, all of us bring the same to the market: cabbage, cauliflower, and broccoli. Nobody has carrots, nor leek, nor any other product, because we use to cultivate the same products in the same times. Logically, the market cannot absorb this supply. This even causes aversion between us: "if you sell the cabbage for 1,90 €, I'll sell it for 1,85". This is a nonsense. The best option would be that we brought our products below a brand, for example "Soto del Grillo Producers' Cooperative", bringing twenty winter varieties (i1)

Cooperation reaches its top in one of the two cooperatives (i7), where members are not only producers, and consumers are strongly invited to join the cooperative. This, beyond giving more economic stability to the business, helps the generation of trust. The same cooperative wants to establish in Madrid a Participatory Guarantee System (PGS), where themes that are not included in the UE organic certification can help to develop a change in the society; PGSs take into account aspects like women conditions, workers' rights, food sovereignty, etc.

Social goals are mentioned by the majority of farmers, in different forms and degrees according to the structure and the philosophy of the farm. For example, one of the interviewees is part of an association, whose main scope is the working placement of people with disabilities, and the organic farm has been opened in order to offer a different type of employment for them.

5.2.1 Socio-economic purposes

This category encloses all the elements within the websites that are related to social embeddedness. As it can be seen in the table, websites do a large use of these values, in order to highlight the 'alterity' of the business respect to the capitalist market rules (Goodman, et al., 2011). Very few differences have been found between interviews and online contents; the only category not mentioned is the diversification of the supply respect to other producers, which is understandable in for the fact that each website promote its own business. The same reason could be applied to the less presence of references to cooperation among farmers.

It is interesting, on the other hand, to see how some websites mention issues related to economic advantages for organic farmers; the choice of eating organic food boosts little and familiar businesses, toward a society change that could contrast the effects of the green revolution, which gave power to big corporations:

During the green revolution, hordes of farmers all over the world emigrated to cities, depopulating fields, expelled by big combine harvesters and immense tractors that make people unnecessary. Land consolidation, introduction of hybrid seeds and rise of supplies (fertilisers, fungicides) brought farmers to multinationals. This has created a society that is distant from the productive dimension, depending on big enterprises for food provision (w3)

Finally, websites promote visits to farms in order to re-connect people with the agrarian world, and sometimes this mixes up with tourism and business promotion (w3). One farm (w6) offers periodically workshops in school and hospitals about organic farming.

6. Discussion

The analysis division in categories referencing to space, ecology, and society helps to well understand if and to what extent synergies between park and label objectives and farmers' practices exist.

Results show that interviews and websites contents match very well the heterogeneity of the park goals; the influence of cultural and socio-economic factors in agricultural production is important for biodiversity conservation (Simoncini, 2015). Furthermore, taking into account the considerations of Primdahl (1999), the case study goes beyond the problems generated by the separation between land owner and farmer. Although farmers cultivate parcels of municipal land, they do not show strong productivist behaviours, instead expressing the willing of putting in practice measures for environmental protection and landscape improvement. In this context, it is not important to know whether the Park principles influence farmers' behaviour or, perhaps, there is evidence of an influence of the socio-economic context in farm design (Lovell, et al., 2010). What is interesting for the scope of the study is to recognise the importance of the synergy among actors, and the potential role of the park in managing recreational and touristic aspects for farms.

This, in fact, can influence tourist experiences in the dimensions that are out of single farmers' control

(Brunori & Rossi, 2000), for example by improving the knowledge about the territory the farms is located in, and promoting single businesses.

The park, in these cases, plays the same role of the so-called *collective actions*: "the capacity to create alliances beyond the locality" that "enables small entrepreneurs to mobilize social relations to improve their economic performances" (Simoncini, 2015, p.409).

Some problems have also emerged, for example the lack of cultivated vegetable variety. This could be a hindrance for biodiversity improvement, beyond the excess of concurrency among farmers who produce the same crops. A possible solution could be a stronger planning action by the park administration, for example through dedicating some parcels to specific cultivations.

On the other hand, the link between the park and the monthly farmers' market is an example of coaction; the market is an indirect promotion of the park and its label quality, helping in reaching goals of health, nutrition, and localness. It is a way to make people conscious about food provenance, and a place where relationships with farmers are established. Said that, from the analysis emerges a guarantee system in which landscape and environment protection are strongly taken into account. This system can be considered a pioneer example of what multifunctional agriculture is able to become, also considering that some aspects highlighted here are contained in the Green Direct Payment of the new CAP, aiming at making the CAP a more environmentally focused policy (Erjavec & Erjavec, 2015).

7. Conclusions

The paper shows that scientific research about embeddedness in agro-food system is far from being complete; the role of AFNs actors in landscape conservation, which until now has been scarcely analysed (Simoncini, 2015), in the case study appears essential for the achievement of the multifunctional goals of the Soto del Grillo Agro-ecological Park.

AFNs practices are not limited to cultivation methods, instead embracing different approaches within the distribution and selling phases, that influence directly or indirectly (through affecting the production phase) the environment. This, beyond being characteristic of alternative food supply, shows how valid could be the association of a farmers' market (or any communal selling method) to a structured space of production; in fact, in the case study the cycle of producing, distributing and selling is closed within the local boundaries. This association is considered fundamental in order to better promote the park and its multifunctionality, also considering the relevance of the territorial identity that the park can help developing (Simoncini, 2015). With no desire of falling into the 'local trap' (Born & Purcell, 2006), the case study highlights a big potential for the park in order to improve consumers' knowledge of the environmental impacts of their diet. Moreover, it is highlighted how a multifunctional park could forge people's imagination, knowledge, and practices of supporting traditional landscapes, responding to the need for cities of "changing attitudes of customers into reasons for changing landscape plans" (Brunori & Di Iacovo, 2014, p. 142). In this sense, the potential of the park is realised in shaping and modifying the conceived, perceived, and lived food, which need to be changed together in order to have a real effect (Brunori & Di Iacovo, 2014).

Further studies are needed for a better understanding of how food networks can interact with planning, including all the actors belonging to the network (Lamine, 2014) in order to consider as many aspect as possible of their complexity (Santhanam-Martin, et al., 2015). Moreover, as the Soto del Grillo Park works at a local (municipal) scale, studies at different scales could reveal if and to what extent the geographic dimension influences effectiveness and failures of such realities. This could respond to the question posed by Lefebvre et al. (2014) about the role of policies (and, in particular, of the CAP) in managing the different agricultural landscape scales. Such additional research should be conducted also through the theoretical framework of the Ecosystem Services, which are strictly related to agricultural landscape multifunctionality (Lovell, et al., 2010).

8. References

- Ayuntamiento de Rivas Vaciamadrid. Concejalía de Medio Ambiente, 2015. Parque Agroecológico. [online] Available at: www.rivasciudad.es/portal/sotodelgrillo/site_contenedor_ficha.jsp?codResi=1&codMenu=749 [Accessed 1 September 2015]
- Born, B. & Purcell, M., 2006. Avoiding the Local Trap. Scale and Food Systems in Planning Research. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Volume 26, pp. 195-207.
- Brunori, G. & Di Iacovo, F., 2014. Urban food security and landscape change: a demand-side approach. *Landscape Research*, 39(2), pp. 141-157.
- Brunori, G. & Rossi, A., 2000. Synergy and coherence through collective action: Some insights from wine routes in Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40(4), pp. 409-423.
- Burnard, P., 1991. A method of analysing interview transcripts in qualitative research. *Nurse Educatron Today*, Issue 11, pp. 461-466.
- Campelo, P. & Piedrabuena, I., 2013. De la huerta a la mesa. *Rivas al día*, May, pp. 4-11.
- Crang, P., 1996. Displacement, consumption, and identity. *Environment and Planning A*, Volume 28, pp. 47-67.
- Erjavec, K. & Erjavec, E., 2015. 'Greening the CAP' - Just a fashionable justification? A discourse analysis of the 2014-2020 CAP reform documents. *Food Policy*, Volume 51, pp. 53-62.
- European Union, 2012. The Common Agricultural Policy. A story to be continued. [online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/50-years-of-cap/files/history/history_book_lr_en.pdf [Accessed 1 Sept. 2015].
- European Union, 2015. The history of the CAP. [online] Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-history/> [Accessed 1 September 2015].
- Eurostat, 2010. Agricultural census 2010 - main results. [online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Agricultural_census_2010_-_main_results [Accessed 11 June 2015].

- Forsell, S. & Lankoski, L., 2015. The sustainability promise of alternative food networks: an examination through "alternative" characteristics. *Agriculture and Human Values*, Volume 32, pp. 63-75.
- Goodman, D., 2004. Rural Europe redux? Reflections on alternative agri-food networks and paradigm change. *Sociologia ruralis*, 44(1), pp. 3-16.
- Goodman, D., Dupuis, E. M. & Goodman, M. K., 2011. *Alternative Food Networks. Knowledge, practice, and politics*. s.l.:Routledge.
- Granovetter, M., 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), pp. 481-510.
- Higgins, V., Dibden, J. & Cocklin, C., 2008. Building alternative agri-food networks: Certification, embeddedness and agri-environmental governance. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 24, pp. 15-27.
- Home, R. et al., 2014. Motivations for implementation of ecological compensation areas on Swiss lowland farms. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 34, pp. 26-36.
- Lamine, C., 2014. Sustainability and resilience in agrifood systems: reconnecting agriculture, food and the environment. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 55(1), pp. 41-61.
- Lefebvre, M. et al., 2014. Agricultural landscapes as multiscale public good and the role of the Common Agricultural Policy. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*.
- Lovell, S. T. et al., 2010. Integrating agroecology and landscape multifunctionality in Vermont: An evolving framework to evaluate the design of agroecosystems. *Agricultural Systems*, Volume 103, pp. 327-341.
- MacQueen, K. M., 1998. Codebook Development for Team-Based Qualitative Analysis. *Cultural Anthropology Methods*, 10(2), pp. 31-36.
- Marshall, M. N., 1996. Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, 13(6), pp. 522-525.
- Morris, C. & Kirwan, J., 2010. Food commodities, geographical knowledges and the reconnection of production and consumption: The case of naturally embedded food products. *Geoforum*, Volume 41, pp. 131-143.
- Morris, C. & Kirwan, J., 2011b. Exploring the ecological dimensions of producer strategies in alternative food networks in the UK. 51(4), pp. 349-369.
- Morris, C. & Kirwan, J., 2011. Ecological embeddedness: An interrogation and refinement of the concept within the context of alternative food networks in the UK. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 27, pp. 322-330.
- Penker, M., 2006. Mapping and measuring the ecological embeddedness of food supply chains. *Geoforum*, Volume 37, pp. 368-379.
- Polanyi, K., 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Primdahl, J., 1999. Agricultural landscapes as places of production and for living in owner's versus producer's decision making and the implications for planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, Volume 46, pp. 143-150.
- Renting, H., Banks, J. & Marsden, T. K., 2003. Understanding alternative food networks: exploring the role of short food supply chains in rural development. *Environment and Planning A*, Volume 35, pp. 393-411.
- Romea Rodriguez, J., 2013. Parque Agroecológico de Rivas. [online]
Available at: http://www.reseaurural.fr/files/contenus/8477/4-parque_agroecologico_de_rivasvaciamadrid_jorge_romea.pdf [Accessed 17 August 2015].
- Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S., 2011. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Sánchez Hernández, J. L., 2009. Redes alimentarias alternativas: concepto, tipología y adecuación a la realidad española. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, Volume 49, pp. 185-207.
- Santhanam-Martin, M., Ayre, M. & Nettle, R., 2015. Community sustainability and agricultural landscape change: insights into the durability and vulnerability of the productivist regime. *Sustainability Science*, 10(2), pp. 207-217.
- Simoncini, R., 2015. Introducing territorial and historical contexts and critical thresholds in the analysis of conservation of agro-biodiversity by Alternative Food Networks, in Tuscany, Italy. *Land Use Policy*, Volume 42, pp. 355-366.
- Sonnino, R. & Marsden, T., 2006. Beyond the divide: rethinking relationships between alternative and conventional food networks in Europe. *Journal of Economic Geography*, Volume 6, pp. 181-199.
- Tregear, A., 2011. Progressing knowledge in alternative and local food networks: Critical reflections and a research agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Issue 27, pp. 419-430.
- Venn, I. et al., 2006. Researching European 'alternative' food networks: some methodological considerations. *Area*, 38(3), pp. 248-258.