



Norges miljø- og
biovitenskapelige
universitet

Master's Thesis 2022 30 ECTS

Faculty of Landscape and Society (LandSam)

**City lights, citizen rights - a critical
analysis of spatial justice in a
Norwegian context**

Halvor Alexander Olsen

Master in Landscape Architecture

Abstract

Contemporary trends in planning practices are often shaped by delegated participants; city planners, politicians and the free (economic market). Problems like gentrification, migration, identity loss/confusion and ostracizing are common in modern cities, and they have gathered much attention as we keep on expanding and developing our settlements. Participation by civil society in urban planning is in many instances quite superficial, and complete exclusions of some groups takes place, which is reflected in the image of the city. This research discusses the term spatial justice and how social structures manifests themselves in the physical space. First, I investigate the definitions and meaning of spatial justice and how it is described in academic discourses. Secondly, I provide some case studies to see how spatial justice is interpreted in real life planning practices. I follow this up with a case study of Olafiagangen, a temporary use project in Grønland, Oslo. The results indicate that spatial justice is a relatively unattended subject matter in Norwegian planning and planning practices make some effort to implement it, but not in a holistic matter.



City lights, citizen rights

- a critical analysis of spatial justice in a Norwegian context

Table of Contents

Chapter I

Preface.....	5
Introduction.....	5
Research questions and objectives.....	8
Limitations of the research.....	9

Chapter II

Theoretical background and definition of concepts.....	10
Mobility.....	12
Crime.....	16
Spatial justice.....	17
From spatial justice to participation.....	23
From participation to temporary use.....	28
Adolescents in planning.....	33

Chapter III

Methods.....	35
--------------	----

Chapter IV

Case studies - experiences learned.....	37
Lima.....	37
Berlin.....	40
Spain.....	44
Medellin.....	46

The way to spatial justice.....	47
The road to Olafiagangen.....	49
Olafiagangen.....	55
Chapter V	
Analysis.....	60
Conclusion.....	62
Chapter VI	
References.....	68

Chapter I

Preface

This master thesis marks the end of my studies in landscape architecture at NMBU. The work presented is based on relevant knowledge I have assessed during my years of studying and reflects my knowledge and academic qualifications within the study program.

Introduction

- Inclusion and participation in planning practices -

Contemporary trends in planning practices are often shaped by delegated participants; city planners, politicians and the free (economic market). Problems like gentrification, migration, identity loss/confusion and ostracizing are common in modern cities, and they have gathered much attention as we keep on expanding and developing our settlements. Participation by civil society in urban planning is in many instances quite superficial, and complete exclusions of some groups takes place, which is reflected in the image of the city. Is it possible to change these trends, providing citizens and communities with more autonomy and something to build their identity on?

I pondered a long time on how public space intervention could increase what has been termed *spatial justice*, and how design could be a direct influence on the occurrence of this notion. After reading theories and investigating empirical data, I found that that heavily depends on how our social narratives are being told and that injustice will never perish, no matter how much one tries to design it out of the public eye. Dealing with spatial justice is dealing with the social structures that are reflected and reinforced in physical structures. Empowerment and inclusion are key

elements in this discourse and are agents of social change and reduction of injustice, yet they are not common in modern planning practices.

My personal interest in the topic of participation related to urban planning surged from articles about case-studies of spatial justice in marginalized areas around the globe. The results of the projects vary, and as time passes and withers the potency of social and spatial mobilization, little seems to implicate more than that of a flicker of momentary hope for change, quickly diminishing as the public parade has declared success and the discourse travels onwards to new horizons. So why am I interested in writing about citizen participation projects within the context of spatial justice and empowerment? In defense of gentrification and social injustice: the fact that human use of space mutates at a steady pace and urban clusters seem to be constantly morphing is presumably natural and part of an unstoppable organic process, but the optimistic humanist in me would like to think that even the most marginalized community deserves a some form of recognition and justice. On the other hand, the pessimist in me find it arbitrary to engage in academic speculations about how our spatial relations could ever be a catalyst for greater change in a world that seems, by default, to be chaotic, random and polarizing in every context, and with great pace at that. Nonetheless, here I am trying to dissect certain aspects in this matter.

In this thesis I am not trying to propose a definitive plan of action. This is something even professional planners and the rest of civic society are struggling to do. In short, during my education at NMBU I have essentially learned but one thing, and I quote Jesse Michaels' interpretation of the great Platon: "All I know is that I don't know nothing". The more you learn, the more complex reality unfolds before you, and you see the cracks in all types of knowledge and preconceived notions. Utopia seems short of impossible, and the alternatives can make you want to run to the hills and die by any given fate the universe smacks in your face, wondering why the hell you opened Pandora's box in the first place. In truth, there is no such thing as Utopia. That is not exactly a revolutionary, mind-blowing notion. But mankind has always strived for some kind of livable environment. And sometimes, the struggle seems endless for a lot of people. So what I *am* trying to do is to shed some light on how alternative ways may be

done, that there is not one right way to do things, but that exploring different approaches may be valuable and fruitful in the long run. Trial-and-error is maybe the one option we can afford in these challenging times where the balance of life hangs by a thread and human life and diversity itself are in risk of disappearing. Business as usual does not work anymore, and it is time to explore different options. But then again..

Ah, you've been with the professors and they've all liked your looks
With great lawyers you have discussed lepers and crooks
You've been through all of F. Scott Fitzgerald's books
You're very well-read, it's well-known
But something is happening here and you don't know what it is
Do you, Mr. Jones?

-Bob Dylan, 1964

Key words: spatial justice, gentrification, equality, informal and formal urbanism, inclusive planning, autonomy

Research question(s) and objectives

As will be elaborated in this thesis, adolescents are one of the groups most excluded from urban planning and urban participation (Andersen), hence the focus on my research will be:

“In what ways can participation of adolescents in urban design projects of temporary nature contribute to spatial justice?”

The thesis will thus revolve around spatial justice, especially centered around youth. We have discerned that this group is considered a crucial factor for urban life and everyday use of public space, yet they are one of the most marginalized groups (PBL, Andersen). This poses a group of additional research questions that will have to be answered;

- 1 How do discourses treat spatial justice in planning practices?
- 2 What can we learn from existing empirical data regarding spatial justice in planning practices?

In order to establish the basis for the research question(s), I will proceed to anchor it to some theories and literature written on the subjects. Let's delve into some theories surrounding spatial justice, power dynamics and temporary uses, and cross-check them with case-studies, both international and national.

Objectives:

- 1 Identify what inclusion has meant and how it is understood by citizens and governmental institutions in planning practices.
- 2 Contribute to the discourse of spatial justice, especially in a Scandinavian context.

3 Reflect critically on the relationship between public space policies, design and societal structures with regards to spatial justice.

Limitations of the research

As a landscape architect student, my outlook has been formed from a spatial planning perspective, and I do not have a background in sociocultural, economic or political studies. It has therefore been necessary for myself to acknowledge these limitations, although the problems surging in this thesis do not only encompass physical design, but economic, architectural, political and sociocultural aspects as well. The theme of the thesis is social justice, and I have tried to limit the thesis to treat the planner's role in this regard.

My research has limited itself to the public space, the process and the participation from a landscape architect's point of view. To provide a full-scale analysis of every aspect taken into account would not have fitted neither my schedule nor my field of expertise, nor is it a job for just one person of one field of study. The full image of this context is complex, and as a landscape architect, I have focused on three bullet points;

- Public participation in planning practices
- Practices and uses in public space
- Management and regulation of public space

I have been forced to focus on these aspects rather than delving too long on sociocultural and economical aspects. Hence, I have limited the case in the thesis to the certain aspects of Tøyenløftet as seen necessary for the argument of *spatial justice*. The limitations have been made due to the limited time and resources available in the short time granted for writing a master's thesis of 30 ECTS, as well as the arguments mentioned above.

Chapter II

Theoretical background and definition of concepts

For future reference in this thesis, it is vital to assess definitions of some central terminology and concepts, and how they connect, thus giving relevance for further research on the subject. In this chapter I will discuss the relevance of theories regarding my research questions in order to establish the basis for the research question(s).

Prelude

The word *Landscape* inhabits various meanings to different cultures and societies, and a standard definition of the word has yet to be recognized (Egoz et. al., 2011:3). The European Landscape Convention manages to capture the word's complexity and multi-layered meaning, as an «arena, as perceived by people whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors» (ELC Article 1a¹). This introduces the problem, and possibilities, of personal and/or cultural perception when adding meaning to the word *landscape*. For example, Aboriginals in Australia state their relationship to their landscape as that of *belonging* to the Country and that it is the *landscape* that forms their identity, rather than claiming ownership to a restricted, geometric structure (Egoz et. al., 2011:128). This presents the tragicomic paradox of

¹ <https://rm.coe.int/1680080621>

common Western perception of the term *landscape*, in which legal frameworks to ownership of geometrical measurable areas and zoning are recognized and morally accepted, and in which *landscape* embodies an understated economical power structure that does not exist in other cultures, e.g. that of the aboriginals of Australia, or historically, Native Americans in the United States of America (Egoz et. al., 2011:43). If this historical aspect is recognized, one can then state that landscape planning and control has possessed the power of undermining certain societies and a way of exercising social and moral control. As mentioned, The New Frontier in the 19th century in America provides the perfect example of cultural clashes in which the definition of *landscape* has posed moral issues, delegating geometrical reservoirs to cultures that do not share the concept land ownership. In modern times, this social power structure is still upheld with modern planning exercises. With the introduction of modernism in architecture and the automobile as the new main form of transportation in the 20th century, there has been a major emphasis on accommodating infrastructure for automobiles, due to a common belief that it would provide transport efficiency and democratic mobility, in a future when everybody would own their own automobile. This has posed a dilemma in countries like Colombia, where up to this day, the private automobile is still considered an item of luxury, and other forms of transportation have been given secondary positions (EAFIT urbam, 2015:9). Modernist planning ideology has also posed an issue of space shortage, giving reason to question the applicability of modernism ideals in contemporary paradigms. More cars have resulted in comprehensive traffic problems and a halting efficiency in mobility. The solution to this has traditionally been to build more ample highways and car lanes trying to eliminate traffic, which only has generated more traffic, in addition to the massive deconstruction of public space and city sprawl due to the spatial demands of automobile infrastructure. This has resulted in social and spatial fragmentation of cities; accumulating into a physical manifestation of inequality and injustice through the tangible structures of the city, degrading both mobility, accessibility and quality of marginalized neighborhoods and communities (EAFIT urbam, 2015:9).

Mobility

Mobility means, in its simplest form, movement. Human geographical mobility refers to being able to move freely and without rather strong impediment. The phenomena *social mobility* refers to the ability of moving up (or down) in financial and social status². A central argument for this thesis is that geographical *mobility* has a great impact on the social narrative of human settlements and therefore their social mobility as well. While there is no lack of studies published on the subject, the relation between social and geographic mobility is still not fully understood, nor implemented in general planning practices around the world. In this section, I will examine the relation between geography and social constructs.

Cresswell (2010:20) states that all forms of physical mobility have a physical reality which is encoded culturally and socially and is experienced by humans through practice. Physical mobility is implicated in the production of power and relations of domination, and is therefore highly political and hierarchal. Social relations, like those of class, gender, ethnicity, nationality, and religion, that influence the production and distribution of power, influence mobility (Cresswell 2010:21). In this vein, Cresswell (2006:736) states that legal policy-making is a producer of social realities. Law-making is a force that drives the construction of cultural institutions (family, market, home, nation etc) which give meaning to our lives. It produces definitions of social relations (citizen, criminal, wife, husband etc), and thus becomes embedded in the social consciousness of our surrounding reality. In other words, laws and public policy produces context and definitions to our social perception, and our geographical mobility is created within that context.

Exemplified, we have the social construct of public and private space, a form of geographical imagination that is rooted in a sociocultural paradigm. Hence, the permeability between public and private is a product of history that may be abolished in other paradigms, and has indeed been explored in variations of Marxism, feminism and anarchism (Cresswell 2006:736). Mobility however, is a geographical imagination much more difficult to abolish. To be human, or to be an

² <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/mobility>

animal, is to have some kind of capacity for mobility. So, mobility is a universal capacity, and a necessary one for most living things. But its universal nature, seemingly uninteresting and banal, is exactly what makes mobility a powerful part of the social narrative, seeing that *laws* provide the social framework to the *meaning* and possibility of movement.

For this reason, an understanding of the ways in which ideas about fixity and flow provide a profound undercurrent to thinking which is closer to the surface of cultural life- such as law- enacts a critical geosophy. Hence, law is expected as a forum where mobilities are constructed or impeded, manifested in citizen mobility (denominating our social status as «citizens», «aliens» etc), given context in the understanding of dominant institutions (national, regional norms and politics etc), and embedded in our collective consciousness (human behavior).

Mobility can therefore be seen as a necessary social production and seeing that it so deeply implicated in our politics, makes knowledge about mobility important. (Cresswell 2006:737).

Cresswell (2010:20) states that mobility consists of three aspects; that of movement, that of representation, and lastly, practice, and Cresswell stresses their importance to the study of mobility and the politics of mobility. He also suggests six facets of mobility to demonstrate the hierarchy of mobility. I will first examine his analysis on the politics of mobility in the context of material movement, representation and practice, and then go on to review his six facets.

The politics of material movement translates into *who moves furthest, fastest, most often?* These are important components of the politics of mobility. Understanding physical movement provides knowledge to make transport more efficient, or less environmentally harmful, or to reduce travel time between point A and B. Nevertheless, the politics of material movement doesn't explain what these mobilities are made to mean or how they are practiced.

How is mobility embodied? How comfortable is it? Is it forced or free? This is the politics of mobile *practice*. A man and a woman, or a businessman and a domestic servant, or a tourist and a

refugee may move from the same place to the same destination, but have wholly different experiences of the travel.

The fact of movement (who most furthest, fastest, most often?), the represented meaning attached to it (representation of mobility), and the experienced practice (how we travel) are all connected (Cresswell 2010).

Taking all these facts into consideration, Cresswell breaks the politics of mobility into six aspects (2010:22); the starting point, speed, rhythm, routing, experience and friction.

Motivation (why we move, forced or freely?), speed (who moves fast or slow?), rhythm (the production of everyday life activities), routing (connection or disconnection to places), experience (personal experience of mobility, comfortable, scary etc) and friction (when does the mobility stop or change?)

The starting point; Why does a person or a thing move? Is it forced movement or a free choice? Motivation for movement is starkly different for a tourist than that of a refugee (2010:22). Here politics enter, where difference in mobilities is central to the political hierarchy of power over mobility.

Velocity is subject of considerable cultural investment. Speed becomes immediacy. The speed with which information can travel around the globe have profound impacts on relatively solid, permanent places. Being speedy and highly efficient mobility is increasingly associated with exclusivity. Take benefits at airports for instance, where economical investment in upgrades provides faster accessibility, like the seemingly banal example of fast lanes and priority for passengers choosing to pay for said upgrades.

Rhythm is part of the production of everyday life, and is part of the production of social order, that is only changed when a social group intervenes by imprinting a rhythm on an era. The

breaking of the rhythm of mobility can provoke suspicion, correct mobility mixes with a politics of mobility.

Routing; What route does it take? Valued areas of the metropolis are targeted so that they are drawn into intense interaction with each other while other areas are effectively disconnected from these routes. In Los Angeles, commuter rail network built at huge expense to facilitate speedy transit from suburb to city centre, effectively bypassing the predominantly black and Hispanic areas of the city (2010:25). Thus, the majority of train riders were white, while bus riders were predominantly black, Hispanic and female. It is also worth mentioning that the Blue Line was built at grade rather than underground or elevated, resulting in higher numbers of accident and deaths in inner-city minority communities. This, in addition to the fact that with the arrival of the train line bus services were removed, *and* that the train hardly stopped at all while buses did, indicated that the train was intended for white commuters traveling relatively long distances. Indeed did the rail system produced tunneling effects («tunnels» facilitating mobility for some while slowing down others) by passing through minority areas, as well as being logically and economically related to a decrease in convenient bus routes and an increase in death rates and injuries among inner-city residents.

Experience; How does it feel? Human mobility has the notion of experience at its centre. Moving is an energy-consuming business, it can be laborious, but also a moment of luxury. First-class on flights for example, vs economy class. Traveling on foot has been seen as laborious, and the higher class has throughout history demonstrated power in the ability to move without effort. Only in the 19th century was walking considered an end in itself, not as a means, but confined to landscaped gardens or galleries, not outside of these scenic environments.

Friction; When and how does it stop? What kind of friction does the mobility experience? The distance between two points or more has traditionally provided its own friction, but in a world where connectivity has become the most relevant variable in assessing accessibility, forms of friction are more particular and varied. As with the question of reasons for mobility (motive

force) we need to pay attention to the process of stopping. Is stopping a choice or is it forced? Global interconnections between highly valued spaces, via extremely capable infrastructure networks, are being combined with strengthening investment in security, access control, gates, walls, CCTV and the paradoxical reinforcement of local boundaries to movement and interaction within the city. Consider a city like Mexico City, where high valued places are highly monitored, like gated houses and parks in affluent neighborhoods, criminal activity (robbery, sexual assault, kidnapping) occurs in lower valued places.

One of the effects of tunneling is to produce new enclaves of immobility within the city. Social and cultural kinetics means reconsidering borders. Borders, which once marked the edge of clearly defined territories are now popping up everywhere. Airports are clearly borders in vertical space. Black people are still far more likely to be stopped by police due to racial profiling in major cities in the Western world, as well as Middle-Eastern looking persons in London are increasingly stopped by the police on suspicion of activities associated with terrorism after 9/11.

These six facets of mobility is each linked to particular kinds of mobile subject identities (tourist, refugee etc) and mobile practices (walking to flying).

In summary, one might say that mobility is controlled by politics and social narratives, and control over physical mobility transcends into social control, seemingly how and why we move and practice exercised in every day activities.

Crime

Crime is often a result of exclusion and social control (Johansen, 2010). The unknown, or rather the unfamiliar, which is often perceived as a threat to the «normal» state of affairs, tends to be stigmatized and social control ensues to avert the unfamiliar behavior (Høigård, 2002). Take the Norwegian attempt to subdue graffiti in the 90's. Warping the general view of graffiti as a criminal and political problem, meant creating a common viewpoint for the general public and thus enacting social stigma and control of graffiti-related culture. Campaigns with slogans such as «Graffiti today, violence tomorrow», appealed to fear of the unknown, and provides a perfect

example of how a group with substantial influence tries to force upon a less powerful group their sense of order and the rightful use of public space and aesthetics (Johansen, 2010). This social control also pinpoints the social outcasts of a population, and their behavior is discouraged and efficiently repressed.

The broken window theory (Wilson & Kellings, 1982) depicts how the seed of crime is planted in the presence of chaos. A broken window signals that nobody cares, and that further destruction is widely accepted. Streets overflowing with garbage, broken windows, poor maintenance, alcoholics and unemployment indicate that nobody is surveilling the area, and opens up for criminal activities.

Mobility is political (spatial configuration, social control, etc), according to Cresswell (2006). The politics of mobility are manifested in spatial configuration, and crime surges from both social and spatial exclusion, consolidating the connection between mobility and crime. Concluding that both crime and mobility/urban planning are indeed political and social repercussions of social narratives, and that physical and social exclusion is a main factor in crime breeding, I perceive that it is vital to address spatial (in)justice as a phenomena and planning tool, not just CPTED (in its most primitive form) to be able to depict a more nuanced understanding of how to improve safety in public space via improving social justice.

Spatial Justice:

Spatial justice is based on the notion that social justice and injustice are apparent in the interaction between society and space (Schwab, 2018:2). While achieving equity by addressing distributional notions of justice is the basis of the concept of social justice, it also aims at people's empowerment, focusing on procedural aspects of justice. Distributional notions of justice revolves around the material quality of space (equitable distribution of resources, services and access to space), while procedural aspects touches on fair decision-making processes in urban planning and development to foster empowerment (Schwab, 2018), leading to questions of

representation of groups and people and their social practices, and the agents that influence said representations.

Cresswell's concepts of representation, movement and practice concords with Schwab's notion of empowerment via representation and distribution. According to their theories, equitable distribution and representation in spatial configurations mirrors a democratic society, which fosters stronger representation and less exclusion of social groups.

One of the earliest theorists on the subject of spatial justice, Henri Lefebvre, argued that space should be understood as a product of social structure, which implies that space is produced not exclusively by material design, but how the society relates to space and how it is used (Schwab, 2018). Restrictions or opportunities for use is dictated not only by institutions, but also by ourselves and how we relate to space. How we relate to space is conditioned by our social background, context and culture (Aufseeser, 2018), which means that everyone has a different relationship to any given landscape. Some places are thus welcoming for certain groups, while less inviting for others, and sometimes the powers that be systematically rejects or invites certain groups depending on their economic, political or socio-cultural desires and needs. This tension will always exist due to the socio-spatial relationship as mentioned above (Andersen, 2008). Beyond this, the city can be seen as a space where great economical and social assets culminate due to its compact nature, which creates a battle between its citizens for access to these assets (Schwab, 2018:40). Spatial justice calls therefore, on one hand, for a *fair* distribution of space and the right to take part in the production of this space. This *distributional* spatial justice discourse focuses on an equitable distribution of the material quality of spaces (Schwab 2018:43), which encompasses spatial resources, services and assets. If these material qualities are spread equally across the urban sphere, it would ultimately lead to a more just society, according to Harvey (2009:108-119). This understanding of spatial justice implies that responsibility falls ultimately on governmental institutions and stakeholders to democratically distribute space, but this top-down approach evades the question of inherent unjust processes behind the distribution and production of urban spaces (Schwab 2018:43). On the other hand,

what is just or unjust is a socially constructed term and therefore has the plasticity to change over time, therefore justice is not a “thing”, but rather a practice (Schwab, 2018:43). Fainstein points to three parameters of the concept of justice, in which *equity* essentially is a distribution of “material and nonmaterial benefits derived from public policy that does not favor those who are already better off at the beginning. Further, it does not require that each person be treated the same but rather that treatment be appropriate” (Fainstein, 2010:36). The other two parameters, *democracy* and *diversity*, are according to Fainstein of less importance because equal distribution would inherently improve the position of weaker, poorer groups (Fainstein in Schwab, 2018). This logic does not, however, take into account the people’s desires and needs, rather it argues that the powers that be have a predisposition to inherently know its subjects needs and the capability to provide given qualities to them. It provides slim chances of creating qualities independently. It does not change the fact that this hierarchal force still holds the necessary tools to manipulate needs and make the rules for a game everyone is expected to play.

Marcuse claims that “a desired city” should support the “full development of human capabilities”, which is not explicitly accounted for with solely a distributional equity (Marcuse, 2009:91). Furthermore, the traditional top-down planning approach with a strong institutional governance has its limits, especially in “fragmented societies” (Healey, 1997). As one can observe, there have been academic disputes stemming from these theories and questions, which has pointed scholars in the direction of not only addressing a fair distribution of resources, but rather examine the procedural forces and power dynamics behind the production and distribution of space.

Gehl (2010) argues that there are some inherent qualities that make a space good. The “human scale”, i.e. buildings that are not too big, variation in facades, street width adjusted to human traffic and not car traffic, etc. Gehl also points to the quality of material design. It has to be inviting and the design has to be of good quality. But beauty is also socially constructed, so it changes not only over time, but also according to cultural and social practices.

According to López-Bahut (et.al 2018), there are three scales of justice; economic, socio-cultural and political, of which all three manifest themselves in physical space. As mentioned, spatial justice in mundane practice focuses mostly on “distributional issues of governmental action”, providing mainly public services or minimum standards needed to avoid injustice (Schwab, 2018). This distributional focus shallowly touches upon López’s three scales of justice and their relationship to space, meaning that equal distribution does indeed embody all three scales, yet there is still a strong hierarchal methodology behind this distribution and it does not tackle the core issues of any of the three scales. The practice is commonplace throughout the world, and though slightly effective in given instances, it cuts off a profound analysis of spatial justice at an early stage. Indeed, it evades a proper investigation of two issues that have been found to be critical to a true form of spatial justice; recognition and empowerment issues (Moreno Jiménez, 2006). The terms recognition and empowerment provides more in-depth knowledge of the parameters of spatial justice. It links spatial justice not only to the distributional equity of resources and assets, but to an *empowerment* of citizens, which in most cases involves the direct or indirect participation of citizens in the co-creation of space. This resonates with Lefebvres theory of space as a product of social structure. Shifting the focus from a discourse on distribution, which is recognized in the reviewed literature as a fairly hegemonic procedure of space-production and hence prone to faulty democratic practices, we find that the right to the city may demand a more direct involvement of its citizens, owing to the fact that it is those very citizens that influence the dynamics of the everyday use of the space. Lefebvre’s utopia of sovereign self-management at large may be a stretch in the current paradigm we live in, yet literature has linked the phenomenon of social empowerment to be an important factor for achieving more spatial justice.

Communicative planning theory emphasizes that empowerment is produced via fair decision-making processes in urban planning and development (Forester, 1999; Healey, 2003). The concept of communicative planning harbors ideas of true representation of people’s social practices in space, which agents influence these representations, and a more equal distribution of authority in overseeing and managing these processes among the agents involved and affected

(Schwab, 2018:44). It makes the recognition of the Socratic paradox that human knowledge in all forms is socially constructed (Healey, 1997:30), and consequently find it necessary to make partners out of planners and citizens in the planning process in order to fill the knowledge gaps concerning values and political judgement that may exist (Sager, 1994 in Forester, 1999). Empowerment can thus be connected to the power balance in López-Bahut's three scales of justice; economic, socio-cultural and political empowerment, creating in its process more autonomy and equality among citizens, but also weakening the position of traditionally powerful organisms like institutions and developers. Nevertheless, a static state of complete equality and justice can never be achieved, due to their sociocultural nature which changes over time. Soja argues that this leads to an inevitable examination of the "process-related understanding of justice, one which considers "the production of injustices and the embeddedness of this production process in the social order" (Soja, 2010:74).

This points toward an examination of participation in planning processes and the building and what is effectively encouraged to do in the space after completion (and who decides this).

One could argue that spatial justice is linked to the notion of a decline of physical manifestation of democracy/equality, a surge of top-down planning reality at the expense of physical marginalization of some groups in a landscape, whether intentional or not. Nonetheless, a democracy can only exist on the foundation of a collective effort (and accommodation) to make decisions which pleases a majority, or preserves the interests of a minority with the consensus of a majority. So spatial justice can play out in various microcosmos and macrocosmos. First of all, spatial justice may be viewed as a proposal for conflict solution or a more just distribution of space. But as Andersen states, there will always be tension in a cityscape, and participation in planning can lead to excluding and exclusive enclaves where some groups are strengthening their positions whilst restricting that of other groups (Andersen, 2008, see also Fainstein, 2014:13). This leads to the question of exactly whose interests should be promoted in the work of participation (Bodirsky, 2017; Røe, 2014).

“You can please some of the people all of the time, you can please all of the people some of the time, but you can’t please all of the people all of the time”. - Abraham Lincoln

Fainstein claims that, even though the goal is justice, the purpose of participation in planning is to make sure that various interests are represented. The goal isn’t participation in itself (Fainstein, 2014:13). Spatial justice strives for a *more* equal distribution of space, and in order to distribute said space more equally, its production has to be a process of fair representation. Harvey (2009) writes that distributing resources more equally around the city fosters more spatial and social justice, but also points out that the processes and the outcomes are important vectors to take into consideration of the production of (in)justice. In the process of creating space is where spatial injustice is often bred and only takes physical form after a project’s completion. In recent times this has been a focal point for studies and projects, and participation in planning processes has gained more attention.

In summary:

Spatial justice consists of three factors: distributional, procedural and recognitional.

Distributional: assets and resources equally spread to all parts of the city. Top-down approach, heavy responsibility on institutions. Distributional justice is often effective short-term to change an area superficially (design), but have questionable long-term effects by itself.

Procedural: co-production/ collaboration between institutions and citizens. Citizen participation, representational, distribution of authority.

Recognitional: symbolic power of design (and the procedural process of the making of this design), empowerment, representational.

Spatial justice may be viewed as a proposal for conflict solution or a more just distribution of space. But as Andersen (2021) states, there will always be tension in a cityscape, and

participation in planning can lead to excluding and exclusive enclaves where some groups are strengthening their positions whilst restricting other groups (Andersen, 2008, see also Fainstein, 2014:13). However, spatial justice strives for a *more* equal distribution of space, proposing a physical manifestation of democracy, the pillar of Western society. Harvey (2009) writes that distributing resources more equally around the city fosters more spatial and social justice, but also points out that the processes and the outcomes are important vectors to take into consideration of the production of (in)justice. In the process of creating space is where spatial injustice is often bred and only takes physical form after a project's completion. In recent times this has been a focal point for studies and projects, and participation in planning has gained more attention. In Norwegian law for urban planning (Plan- og bygningsloven) it is even manifested by law that public participation is mandatory for every Norwegian municipality. However, the details as to how this plays out is practically open to interpretation (Andersen 2008), and herein lies the complications.

From spatial justice to participation:

Participation and inclusion of civil society in planning has gained popularity the last decades. It has even been written down in legislation as a prerequisite for planning and development. The European Landscape Convention, article 5c, advocates parties “to establish procedures for the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities, and other parties with an interest in the definition and implementation of the landscape policies...” (CoE 2000:4). However, theoretical annotation of guidelines and recommendations is one thing. The impact of these well-intended ambitions in mundane practice is another thing entirely (Knudtzon, 2018:5).

When we talk about exclusion, it is usually based on gender, social class, age, race and ethnicity. These factors classify as external because they reflect how certain individuals and groups are kept outside of political processes. On the other hand, there is what is called internal exclusion,

which implies that certain people do not really have the opportunity to effectively influence public debate and discourse even though they have access to open forums and procedures of decision-making. (Young (2000:52-55). The dominant discourse in the planning fora is also an accomplice in actively excluding and rejecting defying arguments, understandings and alternative points of view to the discourse (Hanssen, 2010).

There are several different ways participation can be explored in a democracy. In other words, democratic ideals are subject to variation and they effectively regulate the intensity of civilian participation involved in its practice. In this study, a focus on how theoreticians conceive different modes of participation is, in my point of view, essential to understand the hows and whys of participation at a deeper level.

Challenges of public participation:

One problem with participation (or some might say interference) of the general public is that it may prolong decision-making processes, thus diminishing profit for actors with economical interests in the development (Knudtzon 2018:5). Another problem arises when participation processes favors the consultation of “networks of articulate, middle-class property owners to the exclusion of the voices of the marginalized and of planning officers. In such instances, public involvement is “skewed” and “public opinion” distorted.” (Hillier 2003:157).

Actors with economic interests in developments might oppose interference from civil society as it may imply a risk of prolonged decision-making processes and diminishing profit (Knudtzon 2018:4).

Modern planning engages a broad spectrum of stakeholders, institutions and agents in its implicit processes. Central to modern planning in the Western world are the public planners, politicians, (landscape) architects, designers and real-estate developers. These agents may agree on the necessity (or obligation) of a democratic legitimacy to planning processes, but what does this imply in practical terms (Knudtzon, 3:2018)? Who are the planning authorities, and for whom

are they planning? How do these decisions affect their subjects? Ranging from liberal understandings, where “individuals are the only relevant entities”, to republican understandings that is built on the collectiveness of communities and groups trying to identify a general will which is binding to everyone, there are several ways of understanding democracy and participation. Let’s explore the different ways Knudtzon conceives democratic approaches to planning.

Knudtzon lists four fundamental approaches to understand democracy and their relation to planning and the inclusion of civil society in its elaboration, which are; the liberal, the participatory, the deliberative and the radical (Knudtzon 2018:6-8).

First, the liberal. In Western democracies, the liberal form of democracy is the most prevalent in most countries and institutions. This democracy relies on election of representatives by means of public voting, in which elected representatives assume leadership and calls the shots until the next election proceeds. All decisions made by the representatives are legitimate, as long as individual rights to freedom and property are not violated. If citizens are not satisfied with the representatives, they get a chance to elect other candidates in the following public election. Public participation is therefore mainly based on enabling legitimate stakeholders and property holders to secure the interests of the public, mainly economic ones. Written inputs to hearings, protesting, lobbying and activism are legitimate tools to protect particular interests in this understanding of democracy. Powerful and resourceful citizens’ interests and accommodation are of particular interest to political representatives as they can secure re-election. Within this understanding, some are of the opinion that the market is a better indicator of public opinion in planning than participatory efforts (Pennington, 2002). This understanding of participation and democracy is time efficient and requires minimal effort from planners and stakeholders compared to other forms.

Second, the participatory. “The participatory gives prevalence to local and direct power, preferably in initiating phases” (Knudtzon 2018:5). Participatory democracy gives way to a more direct democratic decision-making (Vick 2015). Pateman (1970) suggests that this understanding

provides civic society with a genuine influence in the decision-making. Decisions are made based on elaborate public participatory processes. Those affected are not only consulted but are given a decisive role in the power play at stake, and decisions should be based on a consensus by the affected parties. In this understanding, citizens are the primary source for direct decision-making, and development depends on them to form solutions which are acceptable and viable to those affected.

This approach snowballs into a practical problem when the number of people participating becomes too high and it runs the risk of turning into a stalemate between groups of different interests. Knudtzon therefore mentions that this approach may work best on small-scale polities (Knudtzon 2018:6). Meetings, workshops and broad recruitment to reach all affected are prerequisites for applying this method. This implies that civil society (which holds a strong position in this approach) actively engages in the discourse. The problematic regarding imbalances of power, exclusion of women are practical tasks that are unfortunately too rarely addressed in practice and can lead to social elites taking the reins, suppressing groups and individuals who do not have a powerful voice. Not so democratic after all, in other words.. Protests and activism can surge from these tensions, and there goes the idea of consensus-based solutions out the window. Another problem is that the local scale prefers solutions only beneficial to the local communities, which may disregard national or global goals. For example environmental impacts (Knudtzon 2018:7).

Third, the deliberative. “The deliberative seeks construction of a best possible knowledge base through discursive representation as well as well-reasoned solutions.” (Knudtzon 2018:5). Deliberative democracy considers citizens as producers of political arguments and well-reasoned, striving for the best outcome and fair terms in co-operation with others. Therefore decisions should have a good foundation based on good reasoning. Processes should be inclusive in order for everyone to have a chance to challenge them. The deliberative democracy strives to find solutions for the society as a whole and citizens play a major role in conceiving these solutions.

Those affected should be legitimate decision-makers and justify the outcome of the processes. Dialogue is the key word in this approach. Argumentation and open dialogue are the ingredients that makes the soup in this context, and brings forth new insight and important aspects in the matter. This understanding argues that use of discursive representation, rather than people, can provide a solution to the problem of scale, as mentioned in the former approach. People and organizations should be politically active and mobilized in order to get all relevant arguments and perspectives across the table and taken into consideration. Argumentation is the main force in influencing decisions, yet activism is an important supplement.

Fourth, the radical. The radical “challenges the hegemonic power and seeks mobilization of marginalized voices” (Knudtzon, 2018:3). The theory proposed by Chantal Mouffe (2005a) argues that power imbalances and the hegemony of neo-liberal values create concealment of power, thereby rendering consensus-based decisions illegitimate and unrepresentative, as inherent power structures in the discourse is concealed through consensus. Civil society’s duty in this context is to uncover the differences in interests and recognizing the temporal nature of knowledge and paradigms, and therefore legitimizing and respecting pluralism in the understanding of knowledge. “Coalitions of marginalized and disadvantaged groups should work with strategies to counter current hegemonic power relations” (Mouffe, 2005b:6). This approach seeks to profoundly change the existing power relations and establish a new hegemony.

From participation to temporary use:

Temporary use of public space is, according to Hausenberg (2008), short term projects that ranges from projects installed for a few hours to projects that last several years. The primary function of temporary projects is to investigate new and/or experimental uses of an area, different from the pre-existing structure and spatial strategies. Temporary use is often used in areas which, in need of filling the “urban void”, are going through a process of transformation (Colomb, 2018:132).

Temporary uses can also be defined as uses that are “planned from the outset to be impermanent” and “seek to derive unique qualities from the idea of temporality” (Haydn & Temel in Colomb, 2018:134). Being previously discarded as dead “wastelands”, meaning that there is no profitable use for them anymore, informal activity often manifests itself. These in-between spaces are therefore often a breeding place for alternative cultures and marginalized groups, and this by-product of the “dead space” can spawn attractive sub-cultures and economies that are deemed ripe for investment by stakeholders and the market further down the line.

When the incentive to invest or reconfigure a space is in place, temporary use offers the possibility to rely on a process-based construction of space. This “trial and error” method provides the opportunity to provisionally test out different functions in an area, which can provide useful and important information for a more permanent solution. Lydon (et al., 2012) argues that the principal agents in these kinds of public spaces should be the affected public participants and users. This is why temporary use is a helpful tool in planning processes which includes active public participation of citizens. The actors in this context can be seen as three groups (Hausenberg, 2008), namely;

- 1) Temporary users.

The general public or local actors which are affected by the changes in the project area. This can be neighbors, visitors, local business owners, social organisations, etc.

2) Real-estate developers

Developers that can use temporary projects to their benefit in order to increase attention and popularity of an area soon to be developed as part of a marketing strategy, thereby increasing the real-estate value and reinforcing the desired public image of the area.

3) State-led developers

Municipal forces can use temporary projects in order to revitalize urban life, investigate an area's potential and reinforce public participation in urban planning.

In 2003, Studio Urban Catalyst issued a report named "Strategies for temporary uses". The report analyzed how temporary uses may influence a given area, based on case studies done in Berlin, Helsinki, Amsterdam, Vienna and Napoli. Torgrimsby (2016) summarizes six key factors from the report.

- 1) A democratization of the planning process: Temporary use as part of a spatial transformation opens up the opportunity to integrate affected parties in a direct manner as the transformation process takes place. Democratizing the planning process in this manner creates a lower threshold for parties to participate in the planning of their own realm of public space. With this form of active participation and ensuing dialogue between stakeholders and participants, awareness and active engagement has blossomed in the local communities in regards to planning and decision-making related to public space within their neighborhoods.
- 2) Improved efficiency of several planning processes: Public participation in the planning processes gives the participants an increased feeling of ownership to the place in question, as well as attention to how and why it is transforming. This type of ownership may reduce

the probability of unfruitful quarreling and uncertainty, as well as increasing the chance for reaching a consensus. These factors may lead to a more efficient planning process.

- 3) **Transcription:** Temporary uses provides the opportunity to test out new ways and uses for a space. Trials of different uses and observation of these may give planners insight as to what users of the public space want for the space. Well-functioning solutions can be applied in the new, more permanent planning proposal.
- 4) **Economic issues:** Temporary projects do not necessarily need to be expensive to execute, on the contrary, they can be cost-effective while yet still provide a big impact in notion of the public space. Official authorities and stakeholders may indeed save themselves a considerable investment in the long run by including citizens in the planning and transformation of an area. This depends on whether the new, “permanent” solution adopts elements from the temporary use that have been proven to provide positive results and recognition by citizens and stakeholders. Public and broad “ownership” of the space may result in less vandalism, which will reduce maintenance costs of the space. Pop-up businesses and offices may take advantage of temporary use, giving them a chance to grow. Temporary projects often attracts creative people and businesses, which in turn attracts other businesses and clients. These forces, gentrifying in nature, may create a positive effect on the local economy, even though gentrification is a double-edged sword and its’ effects on neighborhoods and communities are widely discussed in academic, political and public circles.
- 5) **Sociocultural values:** By offering the opportunity to participate actively in public forums regarding planning, stakeholders and citizens from all types of background are given the chance to meet and interact. Dialogue and cooperation can foster openness, new social relations and eliminate barriers within a community. Temporary projects can offer new gathering points for social interaction and new ways of using our public spaces. Temporary projects can also serve as a tool to bridge the gap between pre-existing characteristics and identities of a site and the development and fomentation of these with new characteristics. By paying attention to local stakeholders and giving them a space to utter their voices via temporary projects, one gives them a direct opportunity to express themselves and shape the

community and identity of the space. Culture and pedagogy can be included in these types of projects by involving artists and educational institutions.

- 6) Environmental impact: Temporary projects can be applied to spaces that have been abandoned and have no current use in order to exploit the area in a more effective, sustainable and productive way. Temporary projects can provide environmental benefits by testing new forms of using the area.

In summary: Temporary use provides a platform for public participation and active engagement of the citizens of an area. Active and direct participation leads to a democratizing of planning processes, a broader dialogue, awareness and ownership on behalf of the citizens and stakeholders and improved efficiency.

However, challenges has also been detected with temporary use. Torggrimsby (2016:25) summarizes a range of challenges:

Sosial challenges

Inconvenience for neighbors: Increased activity and use of an area can lead to a negative experience for some neighbors or businesses.

Uncertainty: As temporary projects often have inherently experimental qualities, it can lead to neighbors and businesses feeling uncertain about what the future will hold and how their neighborhood will be affected.

Gentrification: As temporary projects may lead to increased popularity of the project area, rent and housing may rise. These changes may lead to a forced relocation of residents and communities, which can lead to changes in the sociocultural fabric of the area.

Economical challenges:

Customers: New use of land can in some cases affect the economy of local businesses. For instance, removal of parking lots can reduce the attractiveness and availability for certain customers and affect businesses' income in a negative way.

Gentrification: As popularity of the area increases, prices may rise and limit the pre-existing community in economical terms. In worst case scenarios, whole communities cannot longer afford living or stimulating the local economy in the area and will have to relocate.

Administrative challenges

Juridical: Temporary projects have to abide local laws and planning regulations. Projects may face difficulties in their execution due to these limitations.

Communication: Poor communication between municipalities and stakeholders in the project areas may slow and halt processes.

Physical challenges

Condition: The physical boundaries and architecture of the area may make it difficult to implement temporary projects.

Laws and regulations with temporary projects

Plan- og bygningsloven (PBL) is the main legal document for planners in Norway. Temporary projects are defined in PBL as having a duration of less than two years and that the projects' impact can be reversible, meaning that the area is not permanently and visibly altered (physically), thereby returning to its' former state after the projects' duration³. PBL §20-1 orders that temporary projects cannot be set in motion without previously filing a request to the municipality, which will have to be approved before the request is accepted and permission is granted by said authority. However, exemptions to this legal process applies to projects with a low-impact which will only be in place for less than two months, or in cases where the projects

³ https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2008-06-27-71/*#*

are not in conflict with the municipality's current land-use part of the municipal master plan (kommuneplanens arealdel).

Temporary projects can also not inhibit traffic patterns or be of hinderance to the space and its' adjacent spaces. They also have to be in compliance to regulations regarding fire, distance, accessibility, environment and architecture, as well as the municipal master plan zoning restrictions and regulations (PBL §30-5).

Adolescents in planning

In Norwegian law for urban planning (PBL) it is even manifested by law that public participation is mandatory for every Norwegian municipality. However, the details as to how this plays out is practically open to interpretation save for a few basic guidelines (Andersen 2008), and herein lies the complications. In the PBL it states that one of the groups most crucial to urban planning and participation is youth (Andersen 2020). Paradoxically, the younger population is often one of the most excluded in city planning (Andersen) due to their particular situation. They are neither of age nor educated, which means they do not in theory have a right to vote in democratic elections, nor do they possess a formal training in what urban planning encompasses. Yet , their presence cannot be ignored. They are also participating in the everyday use of the city. Andersen (2020) states; "corporate developers with little political responsibility shape and influence the physical and cultural fabric of the city, fitting the middle class and the upper class' needs and desires". Indeed, developers and planners hold a monopoly on planning processes. In spite of the growing

traction that citizen participation has gained in planning rhetorics, most urban planners want to maintain control over the planning process (Andersen 2020).

They are thus one of the most ignored social groups in the cityscape. According to PBL, National goals etc., the city should be inviting for everyone. But this does not reflect in everyday use of space. Stories of children getting rejected from spaces, does not have the economical incentive to spend money, nor facilities where they can develop their capacities in an informal, low-cost manner. In Tøyen and Grønland we see this problem, especially with immigrant youth.

Chapter III

Methods

In this investigation I have used three methods in order to collect data for my research. In this chapter I will explain why I have used these methods.

Many research methods can be used to collect data. Two of the most common methods for collecting and analyzing data are quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative method is often used to analyze a hypothesis. The qualitative method is often used in research where the data is not measurable in standardized units. It can be applied in instances where one researches perspectives and interpretations of reality (Eiksund, 2018:26). In this thesis, I am exploring the role of spatial justice in Norwegian planning, and giving my and others' interpretation of it. This is why I have chosen to collect data mainly by way of interviews. I interviewed people from organizations, institutions, companies and users involved in the Olafiagangen project. For the interviews, I wanted the interviewees to remain anonymous because of the political nature of the subject matter. The interviews were semi-structured, meaning I had made a series of questions which I asked one by one and let the conversation unfold in-between each question. This structure was useful because it allowed the conversation to flow and I could ask additional questions if they said something of interest. The structure also gave the interviewees the freedom to steer their conversation in different directions, and I could ask additional questions if they said something of interest. I took notes during the interviews, which took place either by phone calls or meeting in person. In retrospect, I would have recorded the interviews in order to extract even more information.

The literature review presented in this work explains useful terminology and provides crucial information for understanding what spatial justice encompasses. This gave me a foundation to analyze my case study. I chose to investigate some case studies and provide my own as well. I

did this because I felt it was necessary in order to collect data regarding perspectives and results regarding my subject matter in the real world. A case study focuses on a unique situation with the objective of gathering information that colors the specific incident at hand. In case studies, one focuses on processes, and the causes for a development or a series of events that have occurred in the case study area. I also went through several documents and other case studies to find other experiences and perspectives in order to answer my research questions. I also made observations in Olafiagangen to create my own empirical data. I made observations during different hours of the day and weekdays to observe users of the study area.

Chapter IV

Case studies - experiences learned:

Lima's youngsters and revitalization:

Aufseeser (2018) examined Lima's revitalization process and street kids and youth's perception of the changes. She concludes that their reaction has been ambiguous to the change.

Furthermore, she argues that the urban youth of Lima's formal and informal efforts in the revitalization processes reveals that perceptions of urban change and the success of these efforts among different agents are important.

Set in Lima, Peru, Aufseeser interviewed 42 street children and youth (seven to 18 years old, mix of boys and girls) as well as government officials, program directors and social workers about their perception of Lima's urban revitalization. She investigated how their spaces of everyday use (and consequently themselves) had been affected by two programs which focused on spatial reconfiguration and the kids' involvement in these programs.

By the turn of the century, Lima wanted to revitalize its urban center. There was little foreign investment and the center was in a state of "abandonment", meaning that it was mainly occupied by youth and migrants performing informal commercial and social activities in the area.

Government consultants claimed that "the city needed to act definitively and address "youth delinquency" (Aufseeser 2018:314). Urban revitalization was a way of reclaiming this space from youth delinquency and restoring public safety. The youth in the area was treated as a threat to civic order. Two programs, namely "Little Gardeners of My City" and "My Clean Neighborhood" were created and aimed to establish a partnership between groups of street kids and the municipality. The purpose was to help street youth find stable work and feel more responsibility for their everyday space.

In “Little Gardeners of My City”, started by two young adults, the youth was provided with training in landscaping and environmental conservation as well as social support in exchange for working as gardeners and beautifying the public space (Aufseeser 2018:315). Its’ aim was to improve the relationship between street youth and the police, and have the kids improve their everyday spaces and thus also help the municipality. This gave the youth a certain degree of leverage in negotiations, increased their sense of belonging and ownership to the public space and made them take responsibility and defend their work from vandalism. “Bazan (2006) emphasized two clear results from the program. First, “it directly favors the environment and ornamentation of the city, and allows a good environment for business and passer-bys.” Second, by providing paid work, street youth could invest in their education, create their own businesses or obtain a home” (Aufseeser 2018:316). The program made the youth more dilligent, showing them work ethic, responsibility, and changed the relationship between the municipality and the youth. Some of the adolescents involved went on to becoming gardeners later in life as well, and some working in the municipal administration. However, compared to the total number of participants in the program, ca. 400 kids, the formerly mentioned group is an exception to the majority. The program also it made it easier to enforce some aspects of neoliberal urban development. In the long run, they helped reshape and re-image the urban space of Lima’s city centre, but ultimately “facilitated their own removal” when the program was cancelled and they lost their jobs (Aufseeser 2018:316).

“A youth who participated in 1998 explained, “We got to take care of the spaces where we’d lived. Some of the municipality started to respect us a little bit. In combination with support from Generacion, I was able to move out of the street. We supported each other and rented rooms. I work in construction now” (interview, 2010)”. (Aufseeser 2018:317).

The program was renamed to “Ecological Kids” and altered in 2003. It stopped including the most vulnerable group, homeless street youth whose the public space was their home”. It also

removed the initiatives' reference center. By doing this, it was more difficult to challenge the negativity surrounding street youth and foment a more inclusive public space.

“We never had a good relationship with the government before this. [After] some youth were recruited to other areas of the government, such as water and sewers....Many of the youth had no experience in formal labor, and municipal workers had little experience interacting with youth. It was definitely a learning experience. The kids are loud, they talk, they stand on the desks. It was a shock for [government officials]. They were uncomfortable. The kids adapted to the language, vocabulary, and customs of the government, which in many ways helped them in other jobs too” (interview, 2017).” (Aufseeser 2018:317).

The study made by Aufseeser evidences that partnerships between institutions, organizations and citizens (in this case street youth) can have a positive effect on both the physical space and the social fabric of an area. It also makes clear that social relationships are important improve the structures within a public space.

Berlin and temporary uses:

In 2003, a European research project analyzed temporary uses and summarized five different variations of this (Colomb, 2018:136);

1 Start-ups; meaning new, small businesses and patent holders that are looking for an integration into the mainstream economy.

2 Migrants; people who falls outside of mainstream society, social networks and employment structures

3 System refugees; those who decide not to partake of mainstream society and live in an alternative ways

4 Drop-outs; homeless, illegal immigrants, etc.

5 Part-time activists; participants of regular society but with interests and engagement in alternative lifestyles

As one can see, most of these are not part of the same system that planners and policy-makers inhabit. Hence, the “temporary users” often claim disused urban space for their own, as it is being discarded by official institutions, and are developed in a grassroots-type manner. They usually have scarce financial investment and recycle existing structures (Colomb, 2012:140). More of a bottom-up development would be hard to find in an urban setting. Land owners grant permission for this kind of uses on vacant land for various reasons; they can be sympathetic or just wanting to reduce maintenance costs, etc. These alternative approaches to place-making differs from conventional state and market led development processes and “might change how planners, designers and managers think about the production of urban open space” in an era when “major flows of urban development finance are lacking” (Colomb, 2012:138).

Berlin takes on the underground

By the turn of the 2000s, the bankrupt city of Berlin struggled with low economic growth and high unemployment. The only sector which had been growing was the cultural industry, due to cheap living and working spaces, but also due to the fact that it had a well-established concentration of artistic, alternative enterprises and a history of being a haven for underground arts and cultural producers (Colomb, 2012:139). This provided the backdrop for the changes to come in Berlin during the following decade.

When the new coalition between the Social Democratic Party and the left-wing part PDS (Partei des Demokratischen Sozialismus) took control over Berlin in 2001, the new coalition started incorporating the phenomenon of temporary use of vacant spaces in their public policies. This promotion of temporary use was correlated to Berlin's new local economic development policies that wanted to rebrand Berlin as a "creative city" with the goals of integrating previously non-represented places and people in the marketing and media imagery, thus changing the image of Berlin and hopefully attract new economic growth and tourism. (Colomb, 2012:138). The temporary spaces were marketed as playgrounds, workspaces for "creative" entrepreneurs and firms related to the creative economy and as tourist attractions. The public intervention strategies implemented in the public policy facilitated this growth by providing affordable work spaces, start-up centers and digital platforms for cultural network formation. In 2005, given their strong efforts in this sector, the city won the UNESCO designation "City of Design".

In 2007, a study commissioned by the Senate Department of Urban Development argued that the transformation of disused urban spaces (formerly a sign of market weakness) into new creative clusters were a key factor to breathe new life into the city and attract more young, creative people (Colomb 2012:139). The local state, in a weak financial position, promoted temporary

uses of space via mediation, assistance in locating sites and making licensing and planning procedures easier.

In 2003, the district of Marzahn-Hellersdorf implemented a strategy of a coordination unit, whose task was to be a mediator between site owners and potential temporary users. This was complemented by soliciting “temporary use ideas” (Colomb, 2012:140). Later, the strategy migrated to other parts of the city, where publicly subsidized organizations took responsibility of mediation. State-owned real-estate companies modified their policies to allow temporary use contracts for nonprofit, community-oriented activities in the absence of potential buyers of the land.

It was also recognized that established planning procedures are not well suited for temporary use projects (Colomb, 2012:140). Surprisingly enough, the city of Berlin ratified a reform for this purpose in 2005, simplifying the licensing system necessary for temporary uses. Colomb points to three main reasons to answer why on Earth the (usually) rigid Germans would support such a reform;

- 1) “Free” maintenance of public property that prevents decay and vandalism
- 2) Temporary uses’ contribution to economic development (the most emphasized rationale)
- 3) The creation of new, low-cost, publicly accessible open spaces that contribute to the governments social objectives.

PR and economy was the two drivers that catalyzed the mobilization of temporary uses. The goals of job creation, tourist attractions and relocation of international companies were all arguments to stimulate Berlin’s economy via the creative impulses generated by temporary uses.

However, all positivity aside, the temporary uses in Berlin provided the backdrop for further development. The temporary uses were meant to initiate a more radical change of more profitable venues, “launched by the users themselves or by external investors” (Colomb, 2012:141). Changing the image of a disused location is seen as a prerequisite for further change and interest in investments in the area. The smell of gentrification can be sensed from a mile away. So maybe the intentions of Berlin’s city government were not as noble after all? Nonetheless, Colomb points out that this process is a double-edged sword for the small-scale cultural producers of Berlin; it provides an opportunity for more funding and audiences, yet they fall victims to an increasing pressure for commercialization, escalating rents and interest from powerful real-estate developers to redevelop the area (Colomb, 2012:140). So the question remains; are temporary users “to remain nothing more than gap-fillers until market demand permits a return to regulated urban planning” (Misselwitz et al. in Colomb 2012:138)? The struggle between non-commercial and potential commercial values of these temporary spaces is always present.

Berlin used place marketing imagery in order to exploit its’ potential for economic growth. The term “place marketing imagery” encompasses the joint effort of public and private actors to develop strategies of place marketing to brand, change the discourse on a particular city or area and make it more attractive to local residents, tourists and investors. It seeks to create an identity for the area in question, typically by means of spatial metaphors or architectural symbols. This marketing strategy therefore relies on the creation of cultural politics, collective identity and memory. This gets attached to place making activities created by architecture, urban design, urban planning and urban development (Colomb, 2018:142). The power of storytelling is a strong tool for cities in order to create an identity and distinguish itself from other places, creating a market for investment.

The place marketing strategy used by Berlin to attract investment from its thriving culture scene paradoxically both strengthened and debilitated its very essence. Counterculture and

underground, alternative subcultures are often the target of marketing forces in order to find something unique to give them a monopoly and make them competitive in today's global competition for creative industries, making them hip (Harvey in Colomb, 2018:145). In the process of making these experimental and temporary uses into more conventional spaces in a framework that investors see fit, the original uses and users may be forced to transform, relocate or disappear (Colomb, 2018:147). Temporary use is often permitted in the absence of market demands for development. But when value rises, this is no longer the case. The planning process goes from bottom-up grassroots-led development to top-down planning.

Marinaleda, Spain and its' spatial materialisation of democracy

López-Bahut and Paz-Agras (2018) did a case study of the town of Marinaleda in the southern region of Andalusia, naming it one of the most representative bottom-up processes in Spain. The power of the people in this particular case can not be understated. Starting as a defense for human rights, it ended up redefining the whole spatial and social structure of the town (López-Bahut et. al. 2018:178).

Marinaleda is a town of scarcely 2,734 inhabitants, and is only 24.8 km² big. Historically a docile town which economic activity derived mostly from seasonal labor at the olive plantations, run by the local aristocracy, poverty levels were high. Spaniards, with their strong anarchistic heritage, are no strangers to self-organizing and activism. This became evident in 1975 at the end of Franco's dictatorship when local workers in Marinaleda, fed up by the poverty produced from the hegemonic rulership of the aristocrats, organized themselves into the Sindicato Obrero del Campo (Workers' Countryside Union, or SOC). The union declared themselves leftist, anti-capitalist and in favor of direct action. Naturally, after the rebirth of democracy in Spain after Franco, all that was left to do was to form a political party in order to turn things around. The party, named Colectivo Unidad de los Trabajadores, won the first election held after its

formation, and still holds the absolute majority in Marinaleda to date. But political democracy wouldn't work without economic democracy, as Mayor Sánchez Gordillo stated in 2011 (López-Bahut et. al. 2018:180). After years of practically every type of activism imaginable (protests, occupation, obstruction, hunger strikes, etc), they were conceded permission to cultivate a 1,200 hectare property near Marinaleda in the early 1990s. Thus began what would be crucial to Marinaledas success; the creation of an agricultural cooperative. Instead of monocultural olive production, the workers planted vegetables that supplied them with work all year. In addition to this, they created factories for vegetable preservation and oil processing. All the profits were re-invested and all the workers were paid equally. This infrastructure still runs to this day and has provided the town with public services, such as a secondary school, a municipal swimming pool, a care centre, retirement homes, a cultural centre, and the list goes on.. (López-Bahut, 2018:181).

To reach a consensus, the municipal government only acts as an administrative tool. All decisions are run by a public assembly, held in public spaces and open for everyone in the town. The municipal government, led by the people, has bought land in Marinaleda and built a social housing program where people build their own houses. The municipality offers the plot and technical support to develop and build the houses, complementing the citizens own efforts. In order to purchase construction materials, citizens can apply for loans (via the regional government of Andalusia). Street art, planting of vegetation, all voted directly forth by the citizens, are symbols that have strengthened the identity of the town and its' citizens and reminds them of their history.

What can be learned from Marinaledas story is they have built their autonomy on these factors:

- Redistribution of resources
- Recognition of the citizens
- Involvement of citizens in political decision-making processes

As the authors of the case study finely puts it: *“They have ceased to be merely users, becoming definers of their own habitat at all scales and spatial dimensions. For all these reasons, as*

demonstrated in this case study, the third scale of justice that Fraser defined - authentic political representation - is the one that guarantees a democracy of the landscape. Here we have seen how this has been materialised directly in the habitat of Marinaleda: in its housing, its public spaces, the town and the agrarian landscape.” (López-Bahrut, et. al. 2018:188).

Medellin - spatial justice in informal settlements

Medellín, Colombia has attracted a lot of attention the last 20 years due to their reshaping of informal settlements. In that process, the city has been praised for its’ focus on public space design and public participation (Schwab 2018b:200). Eva Schwab has studied the relationship between “people’s everyday spaces and the public open spaces created by the municipality during the PUI (Proyectos Urbanos Integrales) in Comuna 13, a low-income neighborhood at Medellín’s western periphery.” (Schwab 2018b:200).

Medellín’s PUIs have been based on physical interventions that has been meaning to transform public open spaces into a) meeting points for the citizens with the goal of improving security and social interaction and b) accessible spaces, improving public transport services and peoples walking mobility. Schwab (2018:201) argues that the PUIs have contributed to improving living conditions, but have on the downside limited the settlers empowerment and recognition, decreasing chances of social mobility and active participation.

In the case of Comuna 13, which is an informal settlement, international urban ideas and design language are at odds with the landscape use of its inhabitants. Small scale farming and traces of “rural” traditions are often elements pertaining to the communal spaces in these settlements. “The integrity of the participatory processes” in Comuna 13 is one of the main reasons for the criticism the PUIs have faced. The concept of landscape democracy relies on formal planning and design processes, which Schwab questions are relevant to Comuna 13 because of its’

informal context (Schwab, 2018b:204). The participation processes, consisting of public hearings and expert decisions, did not allow the population of Comuna 13, who partook in the participation processes, to express themselves properly. Decisions were rather based on what experts from a professional perspective expressed as necessary, such as public space for play and social interaction, which the residents didn't see the relevance of. On the other hand, citizens who didn't partake in the processes were happy with the new public places. Schwab expresses two important factors: "decision-making processes and quality of spaces for a diversity of user groups". (Schwab, 2018b:205). Schwab concludes her research by challenging the PUIs focus on public spaces with "clearly defined urban functions and recreation as a form of consumption" (Schwab 2018b:207). The intervention and its design language integrates symbolically the informal settlements into the formal city, but neglects the types of spaces and uses which are more important to the most vulnerable social groups. "Outside issues" were introduced into the public space due to the participatory format the PUIs utilized. Schwab is of the opinion that a more open format could integrate more diverse spaces and uses in the cityscape, contributing to a "recognition of people's contribution to the production of space and culture" (Schwab 2018b:207). It may slow down processes and changes, and is more complex, but it could foster greater understanding of both participation and public space qualities.

The way to spatial justice

From the data gathered in the document review, I have found some factors that seem to provide pathways to foster more spatial justice. It should be noted that the success of projects are always highly context-based. Success story in one context is difficult to replicate in other contexts. But it is worth noting some lessons from theories and cases to have some guidelines.

1 **Distributional equity** of services, assets, resources, space and economy. - This seem to be the first step and the most easy to implement in planning practices. It still follows the traditional hegemonic top-down procedure of producing space, but material qualities are spread more

equally. It can be managed top-down, but also provide economic justice. However, it depends on the mainstream economy and a hegemonic distribution of economic assets and public services.

2 Fair decision-making processes. This generates procedural justice. Inclusion of everyone in the decision-making, diversity, and appropriate treatment of groups and individuals are key factors in this step. Power dynamics behind the production and distribution of space may change and disturb the hegemonic nature of the current power balances. It can strengthen socio-cultural and political justice. It takes shape in many ways: self-management, participation in planning processes, more autonomy etc. It can change the ways of participating democratically, which I explored in Knudtzon's four understandings of democracy. This factor can lead to the third factor;

3 Recognition and empowerment. Participation (and thus fair representation) of the citizens in the co-creation of space can lead to notions of empowerment and recognition.

The success rate of projects seems to correlate with how many of the factors a project complies with. I will use this as a scale to measure how spatial justice is fostered in my own case study. I also propose a hypothesis that temporary use can be a way of fostering spatial justice, and that adolescents can be important actors in the process because they are one of the most excluded social groups, yet do very much participate in the everyday use of public space. Temporary projects can also provide the plasticity to test various methods and breed experimental qualities that can promote spatial justice, by varying degrees of self-management, different ways of participation etc. It can also be cost-effective and create recognition qualities and ownership.

The road to Olafiagangen:

The revitalization of the city borough Tøyen is an on-going plan which started 01.01.2014. The municipality of Oslo granted the project an annual 25 million kroner for the period 2014-2017, which was destined to improve social conditions in Tøyen, in addition to a similar sum per year granted by the national government. Områdeløft Tøyen (urban renewal of Tøyen) was a deal struck by the Norwegian Socialist Leftist Party (Sosialistisk Venstreparti, SV) in 2013 with the former city council constellation consisting of the right- and middle-wing parties Høyre (H), Venstre (V), and Kristelig Folkeparti (KrF). The deal conciliated the relocation and reconceptualization of a new Munch museum (which was at the time located at Tøyen), in exchange for an urban upgrading initiative for Tøyen (Andersen 2020b:9). The city council ratified the decision 05.06.2013. The municipal funds were to be administrated by bydelsutvalget (District Council). A key argument was also that inhabitants of Tøyen, voluntary groups and organizations were to be given the opportunity for participation in the planning processes. Nonetheless, in 2017 the administration of the municipal funds were transferred to the City Council, arguing that it would contextualize and synchronize the distribution of municipal and state funds more efficiently. The period for the urban upgrading initiative was extended to 2020 by the municipality in 2018, and Grønland was also integrated into the plan.

The urban upgrading initiative aims to develop an integral city development strategy by creating a dialogue across sectors and administrations. It also aims to develop new methods and practices in the administration of the city borough. The initiative aims to improve and ensure sustainability of services and community qualities in order for more habitants to be economically independent

and active in the local and regional community⁴. The municipality's definition of urban upgrade initiative is that it is an integral and including commitment to improve living conditions in a borough, based on the inhabitants wishes, needs and resources. At its core is a bottom-up urban planning ideology, which aims at creating a productive dialogue between inhabitants, volunteers and private and public actors.

The municipality acknowledges housing issues at Tøyen and Grønland. Housing is expensive and unfitting the citizens needs, lacking in outdoor spaces for recreation. As a consequence, or in some relation, there is not a stable community, and people move in and out of the area quite often. In June 2020, the district committee of Gamle Oslo approved a proper strategy in order to tackle the housing issue in the area (Programplan for områdeløft Bydel Gamle Oslo 2021). This was aimed at improving the following conditions:

I Geographical dispersity of social housing

II Mandate for housing buildings

III Regulation for social housing application

IV Consequences of the drug reform: needs for politics and tools pertaining to use of private rental housing objects

V Development of governmental housing support

Furthermore, six focal points were according to these assessments of a priority for the strategy:

I Communication and guidance to people struggling with their housing situation

II Visitation and control process of social housing applicants

⁴ <https://www.oslo.kommune.no/getfile.php/13395929-1613634734/Tjenester%20og%20tilbud/Politikk%20og%20administrasjon/Slik%20bygger%20vi%20Oslo/Bydel%20Gamle%20Oslo/Omr%C3%A5del%C3%B8ft%20Gr%C3%B8nland%20og%20T%C3%B8yen/Forslag%20til%20programplan%20for%20omradeløft%20BGO%202021%20rev%2012.2.21.pdf>

III Cooperation between the actors in the social housing department

There was also expressed a need for strengthening backyards, streets, parks and plazas of poor quality. There was expressed special concern for the areas plagued by addicts and open sale of drugs in Urtehagen, Elgsletta, Vaterland, Breigata, Grønland (gate) and Teaterplassen.

At the same time, according to the program plan, people in the area want diverse public spaces, cross-generational, cultural and organizational wise.

“The inhabitants are impatient and want to see improvements. As a paradox, the plan states that planning processes are a time-consuming activity and that this poses a challenge to meet with the inhabitants lack of patience. In 2020, the concept “Supergrønland” was announced and developed at Olafiagangen, among several others projects in the area. However, there is a lack of capacity and cooperation routines between BYM, EBY, PBE and OBY/Oslobygg. As a remedy, in-between use of spaces and immediate action has been utilized in some places, awaiting a more “permanent” solution (Oslo Kommune, 2020:8)..”

NAV Gamle Oslo reported 3676 unemployed inhabitants in the borough in august 2020. There has been voiced complaints about the high unemployment-rate. Adolescents in the area need help to get part-time and summer jobs, and Gamle Oslo needs to further develop methods and cooperation with employers to give more young people work experience.

The municipality’s goals and strategies:

Program strategy:

1. Safe environment for living and growing up

2. Create and improve public space
3. Facilitate participation and health-promoting activities
4. Make Tøyen an environmental friendly neighborhood where making environmental friendly choices is easy (Added in 2016).

For the four goals above, there were outlined specific goals;

For goal 1:

- Tøyen schools and activity centers as the schools of choice among parents at Tøyen.
- Tøyen to have active joint-ownership and public estate boards, housing cooperatives.
- Tøyen to offer diverse activities for all social groups.
- Tøyen to have a stable environment, safe for children and families.
- Tøyen to have varied architecture and housing alternatives that makes it easy to enter the housing market.

For goal 2:

- Tøyen has accessible and robust public spaces which incorporates activities for everyone.
- Tøyen offers attractive recreational activities for youth.
- Tøyen offers public space of high quality and good maintenance.
- Tøyen houses an activity center that suits varied activities and aims to include various target groups.

For goal 3:

- More participation and creation of voluntary organized activities (sports and culture).
- Inhabitants have an equal access to information about activities.
- Tøyen have functional forums for cooperation, transversing social groups.
- Facilitation for less apt citizens to participate in the activities at Tøyen.
- Tøyen's citizens increases their skills and competence and are solidly qualified to participate in society.
- The citizens general health is increased.

For goal 4:

- There is a diverse range of urban agricultural areas that reflect the diversity of the citizens of Tøyen.
- Tøyen citizens can easily make environmental friendly decisions.
- Private cars is less visible in the public space, and Tøyen's citizens prefers bicycle or public transport as modes of mobility.
- Swap meets are established, with a permanent swap meet store in K1, extended with an annual swapping festival.
- Urban gardening and an environmental friendly lifestyle is implemented in local education agendas at the schools within Tøyen borough.

The strategy plan for 2018-2021 centered around four areas of desired improvement:

- 1) Create holistic and accessible solutions in cooperation with inhabitants of the area
- 2) Preventative measures that eases future challenges
- 3) Create a safe community with good qualities for children's upbringing
- 4) The leadership should be brave, strategic and based on trust.

The plan was also to contribute the development of areas that affect vulnerable groups positively and ensure participation and involvement of citizens in the development, specifically in planning and processes which would ensue, emphasizing the development of new solutions in a partnership between volunteers, social entrepreneurs and private stakeholders. (Oslo kommune 2020:5).

There is an emphasis in the plan to focus on "new and better solutions". These solutions are mandated to happen in a collaborative setting with participants from diverse workfields.

OLAFIAGANGEN

The official documents for Tøyen and Grønland Områdeløft, including planning documents for Olafiagangen, is replete with statements and goals of improving safety, including and participatory planning structure and goals of a utopian atmosphere. According to an analysis made by the municipality of Oslo, the Olafiagangen-project aims to⁵;

I Contribute to the general plan of making Tøyen and Grønland safe and including, making inhabitants want to stay in the area and be active participants in social and economic activity in the area.

II Contribute to making the area a good place for living and raising children

III Contribute to safer, illuminated and implementation of more maintenance in public space at Tøyen and Grønland.

IV The project area should be a space open for all Oslo citizens, but also be a space for the neighborhood, and serve as a good space for different target groups year-round.

V Contribute to the participation of citizens and based on their needs.

VI The space shall be analyzed and developed within the context of current regulation schemes for the area and is limited to physical changes that can be implemented during a 5-10 year period.

It also states that it aims to augment the participation of citizens to CREATE and DEVELOP their community.

⁵ <https://www.oslo.kommune.no/getfile.php/13314144-1550474422/Tjenester%20og%20tilbud/Politikk%20og%20administrasjon/Slik%20bygger%20vi%20Oslo/Bymilj%C3%B8etaten/Olafiagangen/Situasjonsbeskrivelse.pdf>

On the 15th of January 2019, Bymiljøetaten organized a workshop to assess concepts for future development of Olafiagangen⁶. Approximately 80 individuals assisted. Participants ranged from citizens living close to Olafiagangen to business owners to representatives from various NGOs, the police department and the municipality proper. Suggestions were discussed and formed in groups and later compiled in the written document published. Two main problems were highlighted; traffic issues and the open drug market in Olafiagangen. No adolescents were present at the workshop.

In my observations, which were made during daytime at various times, and some in the evening and night, in the period between September 2021 and January 2022, I found that there are four groups that occupy the area:

1 Children, either accompanied by adults or by school administration, playing using FRIGOs resources and structures

2 Drug dealers

3 Table tennis players

4 Bypassers, sitting down on benches to talk on the phone, or just crossing the area

The only group that was in the area at all times were the drug dealers. Children were there in the daytime between 09-17, and the table tennis players were there from 18-24. Bypassers was the least prominent group and appeared sporadically. The tennis players and the drug dealers were the only groups socializing with each other of all the groups.

⁶ (<https://www.oslo.kommune.no/getfile.php/13314138-1550474346/Tjenester%20og%20tilbud/Politikk%20og%20administrasjon/Slik%20bygger%20vi%20Oslo/Bymilj%C3%B8etaten/Olafiagangen/Verkstedrapport%20%28endelig%29.pdf>)

Various data found from the official documents from Tøyenløftet and the observations matched the information provided to me in interviews. At the initial meeting in January 2019, no adolescents were present. This is because adolescents are hard to engage in social and community work, especially if it is voluntary. An informant confessed that in order for adolescents and kids to participate, one have to target these groups specifically. Because of this, after the initial workshop was held, specific workshops targeted at adolescents and children were arranged. These workshops were also held separately from other groups of interests in order for them to express themselves more freely and without fear.

Several try-outs of mini-projects took place in the following months in order to establish what kind of project was to be installed. The current installation, “Supergrønland”, was elected. Politicians and feedback from public meetings stated that “it’s childrens’ turn”, thus “Supergrønland” was selected. The design was not designed or influenced by the public, but done by a landscape architect, even though the institutions and organizations were involved in the process.

A broad range of private commercial companies, organizations and social groups were involved in the next activities in Olafiagangen. Public participation took form in workshops mostly and volunteer work. The municipality also held a competition and delegated money to the organization who pitched the best suited idea for a project. The public could vote in this competition. Several activities were tested in the spring of 2021 and were overlooked by municipal authorities in order to establish what worked best. In order to analyze this, people engaging in the activities were consulted and questioned. In the summer of 2021, Agenda X and Kunsthall Oslo engaged adolescents in art projects in the area, including the painting of a wall and creating billboards with poetry made by the youth, as well as dance performances. Because of the projects’ experimental character it has not gone through a formal planning process yet, so the bureaucratic formalities has not been a hinderance to the project.

It was very hard to find out who had been engaged in which processes and projects, sometimes the answer even varied. However, the common denominator was that there was always a short period of engagement from the different actors, except FRIGO. There was also always the issue of financing the projects. In terms of adolescents, they were engaged in jobs during the summer vacation, working with FRIGO and the maintenance of the area. This was a positive experience for many of them and many have asked to come back. But they were not engaged in the design processes in any way. In Grønland there are a lot of communities which are hard to access also. An informant mentions the culture clash as a big part of this isolation, and some immigrant groups do not want to participate in the general society.

The municipality's goal of a safe environment at Olafiagangen has been improved, but informants mention that activity 24 of the day would be best to secure this in the best possible way. The only thing that seems to stop this is presumably economic resources. Therefore a collaboration between the municipality, businesses and organizations is essential. The drug market is still there, and the traffic has been reduced, but is still present. The main problem for the traffic issues is the commercial traffic that supplies the grocery store nearby. This will be analyzed and solved as part of a bigger traffic plan for Grønland and adjacent surroundings in the near future. The drug market is an issue which is harder to resolve. The market is similar to those of other European cities, centered around the biggest transportation hubs. The main focus for the parties involved in the revitalization of Olafiagangen has been to win back the territory taken over by dealers in the area and reduce their "ownership" of the area. In order to do this, they have provided new activity to the area with the FRIGO activities, as well as inviting the table tennis club to engage in the area at night time. But there is still need for more activity in the night time. There are also incentives to remedy the situation in terms of social work with the adolescents, even though this is not a spatial design matter. My informants have given different answers to the question of whether the dealers (which are adolescents) should take part of the project or not. Some say that they are very hard to deal with and are incapable of fitting into the molds society wants them to fit in. Many struggle with trauma and drug use themselves, and

have a hard time adjusting to work and other positive activities. But there is a recognition that they need help and as mentioned, there are some instances where they are provided with help. Others say that they have been approached by the dealers and that they want to engage in activities, especially the table tennis. In a public debate at a festival, however, a young resident of Tøyen mentioned that troublemakers at Tøyen Biblio had been hired as security guards at said place, and that it had changed the whole dynamic and given them a sense of pride and ownership (in a positive way) to the library.

Other adolescents in the area are more expressive of what they don't want in the area than what they want. An informant put it quite well: "I don't know about you, but when I was a kid I avoided municipal activities as much as I could". Most of the adolescents consulted have very specific interests, want to do their own thing, and very little will to follow through on projects. But my informants have expressed a desire for more cultural activities in the area.

The trial-period for Olafiagangen is coming to an end this year. Now the primary functions will be decided and established in a more permanent manner.

Chapter V

Analysis

I will now compare my collected data from the case study to the dimensions identified in the theoretical part for fostering spatial justice.

1 **Distributional equity?**

The Olafiagangen project follows a fairly hegemonic structure of distributing spatial justice. It follows the typical top-down approach. The municipality distributes services and resources, sometimes outsourcing them or collaborating with commercial partners. Management is done by the municipality, and all the processes are managed and ultimately considered and decided by it. It's efforts has mainly been to distribute services and assets in order to claim Olafiagangen for children, since this group was poorly provided for in the district. In this way, distributional equity is in place for one group, the kids. This approach has also helped keeping the dealers at bay in the day-time when children are in the area, and there are few signs of vandalism, indicating that people respect the place.

2 **Fair decision-making processes?**

This generates procedural justice. Inclusion of everyone in the decision-making, diversity, and appropriate treatment of groups and individuals are key factors in this step. Power dynamics behind the production and distribution of space may change and disturb the hegemonic nature of the current power balances. It can strengthen socio-cultural and political justice. It takes shape in many ways: self-management, participation in planning processes, more autonomy etc. It can change the ways of participating democratically, which I explored in Knudtzon's four understandings of democracy. This factor can lead to the third factor;



Photo: Halvor Olsen

The municipality has included by giving civil society an opportunity to attend public hearings, workshops etc. There has also been workshops directly aimed at specific groups. The decision-making is ultimately made by the politicians, so there has not been a change in the power balance. Nevertheless, it has aimed to include a diverse crowd and given them a voice. Adolescents have co-created some features in the space, namely the street art and poetry billboards, as well as giving performances etc. But these projects seem to be isolated and have no continuity, which provides little sense of ownership, autonomy or belonging to the area. There seems to be a lot of external actors that seems to disorient the citizens and it weakens the empowerment and management of the local community.

3 Recognition and empowerment?

From my research, it seems that there have been great efforts to try to engage the local community in the planning process. The municipality has seemed to strive for fair representation of interests, and to some degree co-create the space. The introduction of a children's arena has been very beneficial for children and parents, and has given them an arena. This can be seen as an recognition of their needs. The introduction of table tennis courts has also given an arena for adults, and to some degree helped the integration of the marginalized adolescents in the area, namely the “drug dealers”. Nevertheless, the drug dealing adolescents are still fairly antagonized and there is still tension between them and the rest of the community. However, all the activities have provided residents with a space and given them more ownership to it.

Conclusion

In the beginning of this thesis I proposed some research questions. After collecting data and analyzing these, I will now answer my research questions to the best of my abilities.

1 How do discourses treat spatial justice in planning practices?

In order to establish what spatial justice is, I dived into literature to find out how spatial justice can be interpreted. The theoretical part gives a varied perspective on different interpretations of this and elements that seems to constitute the definition of spatial justice.

2 What can we learn from existing empirical data regarding spatial justice in planning practices?

There are many interpretations, but throughout the texts there seems to be a set of factors that the research points to as being elements that can pave way for more spatial justice in communities and planning practices, which I summarized in chapter IV:

1 Distributional equity of services, assets, resources, space and economy. - This seem to be the first step and the most easy to implement in planning practices. It still follows the traditional hegemonic top-down procedure of producing space, but material qualities are spread more equally. It can be managed top-down, but also provide economic justice. However, it depends on the mainstream economy and a hegemonic distribution of economic assets and public services.

2 Fair decision-making processes. This generates procedural justice. Inclusion of everyone in the decision-making, diversity, and appropriate treatment of groups and individuals are key factors in this step. Power dynamics behind the production and distribution of space may change and disturb the hegemonic nature of the current power balances. It can strengthen socio-cultural and political justice. It takes shape in many ways: self-management, participation in planning processes, more autonomy etc. It can change the ways of participating democratically, which I explored in Knudtzon's four understandings of democracy. This factor can lead to the third factor;

3 Recognition and empowerment. Participation (and thus fair representation) of the citizens in the co-creation of space can lead to notions of empowerment and recognition.

In the analysis part I connected these definitions to the data I collected for my case study.

My final thoughts:

I will try to summarize answers to the main question of my thesis, "*In what ways can participation of adolescents in urban design projects of temporary nature contribute to spatial justice?*"

The success rate of projects seems to correlate with how many of the “spatial justice factors” I have listed a project complies with. It is however difficult to measure how much spatial justice is fostered, because the justice as a concept varies so much depending on the context. I also proposed a hypothesis that temporary use can be a way of fostering spatial justice, and that adolescents can be important actors in the process because they are one of the most excluded social groups, yet do very much participate in the everyday use of public space. Temporary projects can provide the plasticity to test various methods and breed experimental qualities that can promote spatial justice by varying degrees of self-management, different ways of participation etc. It can also be cost-effective and create recognition qualities and ownership.

Proceedings of appropriate actions are dependent on context, institutional frames, civic culture, development types and existing and potential conflicts (Knudtzon, 2018:12). Genuinely redistributing power to non-elected local communities can challenge existing political structures (Knudtzon, 2018:13), and while this can be a facilitator for a more profound democratic process, it demands that power structures and social relationships be reshaped. There is evidence that the municipality wants to delegate more power further down the line, but there seems that they lack the procedural capabilities to do so. They haven’t successfully engaged the right people or are too busy to organize with the organizations they are in contact with. The participation processes also seem scattered, spread among different companies, and it think this weakens the participation and empowerment of the local community.

There seems to be a loss of communication the further one goes down the rabbit hole. One organization, maybe a cultural centre (given that this was a wish according to my informants) with a small team of various disciplines, could be a better solution than outsourcing all the tasks to companies. If the social structure becomes part of the spatial grid, then the production of space will follow, as Lefevbre argued. It could provide more economic autonomy that could be distributed directly to the community in forms of activity and purchasing of material. It would gather all the information in one place and be more organized for both civil society as well as the

municipality and stakeholders to correlate and address. Stability would be beneficial for all parties. It could improve recognition and empowerment among the community, and especially adolescents, by providing them with tools and allowing them to coproduce the space. It could provide more autonomy, responsibility, financial and social stability and engagement in the spaces. Actively engaging troubled adolescents has also proved to be effective (Tøyen Biblio Deichman), and FRIGOS proposal of a youth-driven café at Olafía could be an idea. Delegating more power and flexibility to smaller organizations who are familiar and trusted by the inhabitants can be an effective method. Continuing the temporary use, thus coining the projects “temporary projects” would also give some wiggle room to see if the actions indeed are effective as well, and provides the project the flexibility they need to adapt to the citizens and municipality’s needs as well. Examples of this can be found in the Maldinava project. Expresses of concern for a more citizen-based model is also present in Scwhabs conclusions in Medellin. All this points urban planners and bureaucrats to slow down, let loose some grip of power. But this contradicts the concerns expressed for rapid change by the citizens in Grønland. Adolescents are the next generation, and by involving them one can expect more moldable results than that of older citizens. They also serve as an intermediate group between kids and adults, and are not only lacking public spaces and offers, but some also actively want to be engaged in something positive (for the most time).

Temporary use can be an experimental approach to find out what works best in an area. Therefore, in an area as ambiguous as public participation is, this is a good tool to use in order to establish the best possible solutions. As discovered in the theory, there are good arguments that these projects should involve those affected in order to establish the best solutions for the area (neighbors, communities, businesses, social organizations, developers). It can also construct feelings of ownership, which may reduce internal quarreling and a more efficient planning process. It is also an economically cost-effective in the long run, with reduced vandalism, an end-result which proves pleasing to those affected, etc. Temporary projects can also counter gentrification by delegating the locals more power and decide if they are happy with the

temporary project. If not, it can be replaced. I think that the municipality has tried out different forms, taking advantage of the temporary quality of the project, but it has not been able to empower adolescents especially.

There are some efforts to work with adolescents and engage them in the activities there, offering them summer jobs mostly. Other resources are the organizations working with trying to get the adolescents in the criminal sector off the streets. There have been more distributional justice for other groups, such as children and their parents (FRIGO activities), as well as adults (table tennis). However, this is as far as it has come to as of now. There is what I would call indirect participation in co-creating the space in terms of everyday use (publicly provided activities are engaged in).

The adolescents in Gamle Oslo are included in the planning practices by having a right to participate in meetings. So the municipality does not externally exclude anyone on paper. However, the inclusion has its limits. By only offering summer jobs, not delegating responsibility. So the exclusion at hand has more the character of that of the internal exclusion (as mentioned by Young 2000). Adolescents do not have a proper opportunity to effectively influence the discourse. But it is not as black and white as it would seem. As asked rhetorically by an informant; “how much did you want to participate in activities endorsed by the municipality?”. The backside of gentrification is that it has gotten a bad reputation among marginalized groups. Of course, the reasons are obvious. Displacement, ostracizing, discrimination and economic status comes into play with gentrification. When the market and municipality (often in collaboration) wants to “revitalize” a neglected area (and its communities/citizens), it turns into a game of cat and dog. I think a vital part of what the municipality of Oslo is doing is providing activities for kids in order for them to establish good relations with organizations and the municipality. What is lacking is a follow-up when the kids turn into adolescents. The fact that kids in Oslo is growing up with more workshops and education in planning and their participation in democracy is also a step in the right direction. Spatial justice wasn't a specific goal in the Olafiagangen project either, and it hasn't gotten a lot of attention in

Norwegian planning practices. More research needs definitely to be done regarding spatial justice in a Norwegian context.



Photo: Halvor Olsen

Chapter VI

References:

Aufseeser, D. (2018) *Challenging conceptions of young people as urban blight: Street children and youth's ambiguous relationship with urban revitalization in Lima, Peru*. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*. 2018;50(2):310-326. doi:10.1177/0308518X17742155

Andersen, B. (2008). Eksklusive fellesskap: Et kritisk blikk på nyurbanismen i lys av Kentlands, USA. *FORMakademisk*, 1(1), 58-69.

Andersen, B., Eline Ander, H. & Skrede, J., (2020a). The directors of urban transformation: The case of Oslo. *Local economy*, 35(7), pp.695–713.

Andersen, B., Kadasia, V., Dalseide, A. (2020b) Trivsel og usikkerhet på Tøyen: En studie av foreldrebilder av et løftet byområde. pp. 164-179
Oslo:Universitetsforlaget. <https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2535-5988-2020-02-05>

Andersen, B. & Skrede, J., 2021. Medvirkningsideologiens inntog i byplanleggingen - en invitasjon til grubling. *Kart og plan*, pp.Kart og plan, 2021.

Bodirsky, K. (2017). Between equal rights force decides? *City*, 21(5), 672-681.
[doi:10.1080/13604813.2017.1374773](https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2017.1374773)

CoE (Council of Europe) (2000). *The European Landscape Convention*, Florence: European Treaty series No 176.

Cresswell, T. (2010) 'Towards a Politics of Mobility', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(1), pp. 17–31. doi: [10.1068/d11407](https://doi.org/10.1068/d11407).

Cresswell. (2006). The Right to Mobility: The Production of Mobility in the Courtroom. *Antipode*, 38(4), 735–754.

Claire Colomb (2012) Pushing the Urban Frontier: Temporary Uses of Space, City Marketing, and the Creative City Discourse in 2000S Berlin, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 34:2, 131-152, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9906.2012.00607

Eiksund, M. (2018) Kjønn i norsk romlig planlegging - diskurs, institusjonalisering og praksis. Ås: Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet

Egoz, S., Makhzoumi, J. & Pungetti, G., 2011. *The right to landscape : contesting landscape and human rights*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Fainstein, S.S. (2010). *The just city*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Fainstein, S. S. (2014). The just city. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 18(1), 1-18. doi:[10.1080/12265934.2013.834643](https://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2013.834643)

Forester, J. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gehl, J. (2010). *Cities for people*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Hausenberg (2008). Midlertidige aktiviteter som værktøj i byudviklingen. Århus: Århus kommune

Hanssen, G.S. and Saglie, I.L. (2010). Cognitive closure in urban planning, *Planning Theory and Practice*, 11 (4), 499-521.

Harvey, D. (2009). *Social justice and the city* (revised ed.), Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Healey, P. (2003). Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning theory*, 2 (2), 101-123.

Hillier, J. (2003). Commentary: Puppets of populism? *International Planning Studies*, 8 (2), 157-166.

Høigård, Cecilie (2002). — “Gategallerier.” Pax forlag A/S, Oslo

Johansen, L.K. (2010) *Innvandrerungdom i møte med det norske samfunnet : en studie av forhold som inkluderer eller medvirker til utstøting og kriminalitet*. Universitetet i Oslo Det juridiske fakultet.

Kelling, G. L., & Wilson, J. Q. (1982). *Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety*. The Atlantic, March 1.

Knudtson, L. (2018). Democratic theories and potential for influence for civil society in spatial planning processes. In *Defining Landscape Democracy. A Path to Spatial Justice* (pp.178-188). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

López-Bahut, E. & Paz-Agras, L. (2018) Landscape as the spatial materialisation of democracy in Marinaleda, Spain. In *Defining Landscape Democracy. A Path to Spatial Justice* (pp.178-188). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Lydon et al. (2012). *Tactical Urbanism 2 - Short-term action, long-term change*. Miami, New York: The Street Plans Collaborative

Oslo kommune (2020). Programplan for områdeløft. Bydel Gamle Oslo 2021. Available at: <https://www.oslo.kommune.no/getfile.php/13395929-1613634734/Tjenester%20og%20tilbud/Politikk%20og%20administrasjon/Slik%20bygger%20vi%20Oslo/Bydel%20Gamle%20Oslo/Omr%C3%A5del%C3%B8ft%20Gr%C3%B8nland%20og%20T%C3%B8yen/Forslag%20til%20programplan%20for%20omradeloft%20BGO%202021%20rev%2012.2.21.pdf>

Marcuse, P. (2009). From justice planning to commons planning. In P. Marcuse et al. (Eds.), *Searching for the just city: Debates in urban theory and practice* (pp.91-102). New York, NY: Routledge.

Moreno Jiménez, A. (2006). En torno a los conceptos de equidad, justicia e igualdad esecial. *Huellas, 11*, 133-142.

Mouffe, C. (2005a). *On the Political*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Mouffe, C. (2005b). *The Return of the Political*, London: Verso.

Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pennington, M. (2002). A Hayekian liberal critique of collaborative planning. In Allmendinger P, and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (Eds), *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*, Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

Røe, P. G. (2014). Analysing Place and Place-making: Urbanization in Suburban Oslo. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(2), 498-515.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12113>

Schwab, E. (2018). *Spatial justice and informal settlements. Integral urban projects in the comunas of Medellín*. 1st edn, Emerald Publishing Limited

Schwab, E. (2018b) Landscape democracy in the upgrading of informal settlements in Medellín, Colombia. In *Defining Landscape Democracy. A Path to Spatial Justice* (pp.178-188). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Soja, E. W. (2010). *Seeking Spatial Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Torgrimsby & Lillebye, Einar, 2016. "Å planlegge det uplanlagte" - retningslinjer for gjennomføring av temporære byromstiltak i Oslo : Case: Thorvald Meyers gate. Ås: Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet.

Chigorodó et. al. (2015). Planes municipales integrales para Urabá. Proyectos y estrategias urbanas y ambientales para el Polo de Desarrollo Regional. Medellín, Colombia: Urbam Universidad EAFIT.

Vick, J. (2015). Participatory versus radical democracy in the 21st century: Carole Pateman, Jacques Rancière and Sheldon Wolin, *New Political Science*, 37 (2), 204-223.

Young, I.M. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.



Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet
Noregs miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003
NO-1432 Ås
Norway