

**THE VITALITY OF PUBLIC SPACE: CONSIDERING  
'DIVERSITY'**



<http://www.cci.utk.edu/diversitycharge>

Shristi Shrestha

# COLOFON

## **The vitality of Public space: considering 'Diversity'**

MSc Thesis Landscape Architecture and Planning  
Specialization Socio-spatial Analysis  
SAL 80424

Wageningen University and research Centre  
Department of Environmental Sciences  
Socio-spatial Analysis Chair Group

Author: Shristi Shrestha  
821216759090

Supervisor: Martijn Duineveld

Examiner: Martijn Duineveld, Karen Peters

August 2011

# **THE VITALITY OF PUBLIC SPACE: CONSIDERING 'DIVERSITY'**

Specialization Socio-spatial Analysis  
SAL-80424

Shristi Shrestha

## **Acknowledgement**

I was/am always interested in knowing people, study their behaviors and predict their actions. Crowded public spaces, especially the traditional market in Kathmandu, where people automatically follow an underlying orderliness always fascinates me. Thus the present study is a result of my interest in exploring the factors that enhance the liveliness of the public space.

For me, Martijn Duineveld, my supervisor, is a very critical examiner of people-space relationship.

And, because I thought I lack critical questioning and reasoning I was hesitant to choose him as my supervisor at first. For which I regret up till now. Therefore, I like to take this opportunity to thank him for not only guiding me as tutor and giving me critical feedback but also making me believe in myself.

Throughout the process and research I had support from various people. I am indebted to my parents for their patience. I invited them to the Netherlands and let them stay in their room and cook for me while I was busy working for my thesis in Gaia every day. My gratitude is extended to Emilia Zemplak and many other friends in Gaia Room. 309. They lend me their ears when my thesis ideas were not very clear and also suggest some ideas. My sincere thanks also extended to my friend Bikash Budathoki who did tedious job to read my report for grammar.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thanks NUFFIC for offering fellowship for my Master degree.

Finally, my deepest thanks go to all others friends and well-wisher who have been directly or indirectly involved in this report making. Their inspiration always motivated me.

I am deeply obliged to all the authors, whose literature has been cited.

## **Abstract**

The thesis *Vitality of public space: considering 'Diversity'* talks about the social role of public space. It looks at different cases from United Kingdom and the Netherlands to see what causes diversity in public spaces and if knowledge of ethnicity necessary for the proper functioning of public space. From the research it is found that diversity is necessary for the vitality of public. It should also be inclusive to all and 'publicness' of the place should also be considered. Although there are many discussion going on about the knowlwdge of ethnicity in public spaces but the researcher find out that knowledge about ethnicity is important to some extent in small neighborhood level public space but there are other factors like, age, gender, seasonality etcetera that are vital to consider for diversity of public space.

## Table of contents

Acknowledgement.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
1. Introduction.....	7
2. The social scope of public space.....	10
3. The everyday use of public space.....	23
4. Discussion.....	53
5. Conclusion.....	61

# *1 THE VITALITY OF PUBLIC SPACE: CONSIDERING 'DIVERSITY'*

## **1.**

### **Introduction**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

Public spaces includes different types of spaces such as streets, sidewalks, plazas, parks, playgrounds, city halls, city square, commercial centers, community centers, markets, shopping precincts, beaches, neighborhood spaces in residential areas and other forms of gathering places (Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009; Worpole and Knox, 2007; Carr et al., 1992). The Public space range widely. It can be town center spaces like, parks, high streets and markets; but, it can also be neighbourhood spaces like the residential streets, fore courts (Dines et al., 2006). In both the cases, they are freely accessible for everyone and are places for unexpected encounters and public discourse as well as for relaxation and passage (Carr et al., 1992; Cybriwsky, 1999; Madanipour, 2003 in van Melik, 2008).

Thus it can be said that public spaces are setting where people can exchange norms and values. Also by definition, public spaces are universally accessible place that offer one of the few opportunities for people to directly encounter other people with different behaviors and cultures (Shaftoe, 2008). This intrinsic relationship between people and public spaces can be best explained from Walzer (1986) remark, he said that public space is a “space we share with strangers, people who aren’t our relatives, friends, or work associates. It is a space for politics, religion, commerce, sports; space for peaceful coexistence and impersonal encounter. Its character expresses and conditions our public life, civic cultures, and everyday discourse” (in Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009, p. 15). As Walzer mentioned about the shared nature of public space, Young (1995 in Cattell et al., 2008, p. 545) has similar view towards public spaces. In addition, he emphasized that besides the shared nature of public spaces, public space is also a place to encounter different people who identify themselves with different groups and have different opinions of different forms of life. Young (1995) is optimistic that those differences are encountered and negotiated. However, the academic literature does not give a general definition of public space (Burgers, 2000 in van Melik, 2008). As van Melik (2008) suggested there are multiple and sometimes even contradictory meanings of the concept. For some public space is the place for meetings and exchange, in which the shared

experiences of different cultural backgrounds, the so-called cultural mobility, is central (Van Aalst & Bergenhenegouwen, 2003 in van Melik, 2008).

On the other hand, when we look from different perspective in the current world scenario, it has become huge trend in developed countries to promote diversification. Canada, Australia, England, and America are among those few many countries that promote diversity in their citizens by providing opportunities for skilled or unskilled people of other developing countries through different schemes like providing Permanent Resident (P.R.) or through diversified Lottery (D.V.).

According to the Minister responsible for Statistics of Canada it says, Canada welcomed more than 13.4 million immigrants during the past century. Among them the largest number having arrived during 1990's. According to the 2001 Census, 18.4% of the total population was born outside Canada. The figure is the highest proportion in past 70 years (Statistics Canada Housing, 2003). The rate of diversity in UK can be explained from the following statistical case. During 2001 Census in UK, 3 per cent of the total UK population was Muslim. The amount was 1.6 million (Hester, 2006). Thus, it can be said that it is easy for people to have a life in a totally different place than he actually belongs.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

It is very common that most of the cities have diverse people as their integral part; and alike many researcher Peters and Henk (2010) thinks that cities are now the 'multicultural and cosmopolitan melting pots'. They believe, in contemporary societies, the keenness on contact with diverse people is motivated since many of the contemporary research assumes that such contacts enhances more tolerance and acceptance among different ethnic people (Peters and Haan, 2010; Maria Hudson, 2007; Cattell et al., 2008). Meanwhile, while the countries are increasingly promoting diversity, however their citizen are suspicious about other people in their surroundings because of the events like, September 11; 2001 disturbance in Oldham and Bradford (Amin, 2002; Manzi et al., 2010). Means and Tims (2005) mentioned negative trends-social distrust, splintering cities, and privatized space-as the cause for decline of public life in the cities. Urban people have developed strategy of self-isolation and interact only in a small group of their own kind where people led 'parallel lives', containing highly segregated neighborhoods (Manzi et al., 2010, p. 36). The consequence of various racial events and terrorism in 2001 results that within a decade people are more individualistic. An interesting example can be found from Means and Tims (2005) article where they mentioned that more than two-thirds of the British population said most people could be trusted during a survey in 1950. But, when the same question were asked in late 1990s the



'trustees' had fallen to 29 percent of the population (Performance and Innovation Unit, 2002 in Means and Tims, 2005).

Similar to Means and Tims (2005) many experts realized that the disturbance in the world is due to a lack of knowledge of people's background in the areas that experienced the urban disorder (Cantle, 2001; Clarke, 2001; Denham, 2001; Ouseley, 2001; Ritchie, 2001 in Hester, 2006). Hudson et al. (2007) expresses that people from different background and diverse areas are becoming strangers to each other (p. 16) and that cities are an ethnic pool but fewer attempts are taken by concern authorities to motivate its resident to know about each other. Peters and Haan (2010) also believes that when people have different understandings of public space in multicultural society (p. 4) it unavoidably causes conflict and the result can be uncertainty, fear or avoidance.

So, now the question arises, is the knowledge of people ethnicity (their cultural background) necessary in public space to measure its vitality? What are the factors that help to increase the vitality of public spaces?

### **1.3 Research objectives**

The aim of this research is **to examine different cities to check whether diversity should be considered necessary in the effective use of public space.**

## The social scope of public space

Mitchell (2007 in van Melik, 2008) has analyzed 218 books and journal articles on public space that appeared between 1945 and 1998. The analysis showed that many authors refer to the physical setting (27% of the publications) or regard public space as a site of negotiation, contest, or protest (23%). However, many authors emphasize on the social meeting function (37%) of the public space. Public spaces are the reflection of society, and thus it is worthy to say that vitality of public spaces resemble vitality of society itself. Thus it becomes immensely important that the socio-cultural need of a society towards public spaces should be studied. By exploring the socio-cultural needs of a society, overview can be made about Public space concerning; what featured quality of public space are appreciated by public and what can be done to increase its vitality. However, the writer is aware that the socio-cultural needs of the society are always changing and thus the scope of public spaces should be modified constantly to cope with the reoccurring demand of the society. Only then the relation between public space and society will be harmonized otherwise the relation will often turn bleak.

### 2.1 Various roles of Public Spaces

#### 2.1.1 Public spaces as meeting and interactions place

It is by human nature that people have strong demand for social interaction. Human are social being and thus people always find it necessary to get connected with other being. The importance for opportunities to meet and casual interaction through local features of public space such as street, markets, residential squares, parks contributes towards inclusion and sense of community (Cattell and Evans, 1999; Cattell and Herring, 2002 in Cattell et al., 2008). Gehl (1987) mentioned that good quality public space has ability to build community in form of offering opportunities for maintaining established contacts; the company of **others** is enjoyed and ties with friends, relatives, and acquaintances are strengthened. He argues further that good quality public spaces are of importance for the isolated groups, those with no friends, families, and lacking social ties (Gehl, 1987).

Peters and Henk (2010) emphasize a step forward and say that social interactions are especially significant if new links are established with 'strangers' or, in general with people that do not belong to the close-knit circle of familiar

contacts. Such contacts may enrich social capital, influence prejudices and create more realistic images about the other (Van Ingen and Van Eijck, 2009; Putnam, 2002; Allport, 1954 in Peters and Haan, 2010, p. 2). Recently Shaftoe (2008) also mentioned that public spaces offer opportunities to build up a sense of solidarity with your fellow citizens, both through ad-hoc encounters and through organized events such as festivals and demonstrations (Shaftoe, 2008, p. 13). He says there are varieties of reason for people to go to public space. They can go to public spaces-to meet, to talk, to watch movie, to eat, to stroll around etcetera. For him Public spaces are places where people meet, exchange norms, values, behaviors and cultures with each other and come to know the ties that they share in common. In this way people develop their knowledge among each other as Richard Sennett (1986 quoted in Shaftoe, 2008 p. 19), 'people grow only by the processes of encountering the **unknown**'. By this what Shaftoe believe is by spending part of their everyday life in public space, and by encountering difference and the unfamiliar in public spaces people are more resistant to changes in their locality while learning conflict resolution, tolerance, and solidarity. Cattell et al. (2008) also mentioned that Social interaction in spaces can provide relief from daily routines, sustenance for people's sense of community, opportunities for sustaining bonding ties or making bridges, and can influence tolerance and raise people's spirits (Cattell et al., 2008).

### **2.1.2 Public space as Democratic shared space**

Public space can be referred as democratic space because it is freely accessible to everyone (Peters and Haan, 2010), open, non-discriminatory that are shared by **diversity of people** every day. In public spaces various people come for varieties of reasons. It is a place where people act more freely than when under constraints of home or workplace. Therefore by spending time in public spaces people not only utilize their leisure time and meet diversity of people (Jacobs, 1992; Peters and Haan, 2010) but also manifest public space to be more democratic. Since Public space can be changed by public action-as it is owned by all-it can offer a sense of power and control limited only by the rights of other (Carr et al., 1992). In public space, people can learn to live together.

Many public space activists (Lewis Mumford, Richard Sennett and Ken Worpole in Shaftoe, 2008, p. 12) argue that successful functioning public space is fundamental to the furtherance of democracy and civilized life. In democratic society public spaces can be used as a space of gathering where the citizen can expresses their solidarity and dissent; use the locations for demonstrations, pamphleteering and soapbox orations (Shaftoe, 2008, p. 15).

Thompson (2002) refer that public space is where democracy is worked out on the ground level. But to make a democratic public space designer and managers struggle hard to choose functions in public space that is inclusive to all diverse people and that design does not preclude provision for, and enjoyment by, another group.

Among the various ways described by Rishbeth (2001) one approach 'facility provision' describes how certain design elements can increase inclusivity and therewith enhance public space as democratic spaces. Through 'facility provision' he tries to explain that there can be different ways how social classes and ethnic groups use and value public sites as accommodated through design by offering a variety of facilities and activities. He believes the inclusivity of a place, the extent to which a park does not exclude groups of users, can be threatened when symbolic access limits the use of certain groups. Therefore leading certain groups prone to use park less often or avoid completely.

Another threat to the inclusivity of a public space mostly in multicultural society is the concept of territoriality. In general, spaces within the park are temporarily claimed when people use it. Certain spaces within the park can be used by different groups in different shifts in time. It is very important in terms that it helps to determines people's sense of belonging and their attachments. But there may be group/groups that identify in such way in public spaces that it implies exclusion of other people. Due to the presence of these groups other users may feel uncomfortable or even unsafe. And, therefore start avoiding certain spaces.

Another aspect that obstructs the democratization of park is the occurrence of privatization of space. In most setting people can use such public spaces even if it does not belong to them. Although, Democratic spaces protect the rights of user groups, freedom of action; it can also be used for temporary claim and ownership (Carr et al., 1992). This can be a result of private developers of projects, which want to provide entertainment to make business. These people indirectly tend to privatized public spaces and therefore there are chances that those public spaces lose their public character. Parts of the park may become controlled, owned with certain rules how they should be used (Cybriwsky, 1999).

### **2.1.3 Public space as meaningful convivial space**

It is known now that the success of public space is not only determined by the physical settings but is also determined by how much a person can experience form their everyday setting. The everyday experience of a person can be enhanced if a public space can host subjective meanings to them (Cattell et al., 2008). For that a place should be convivial. Convivial spaces are places where people can be sociable and festive. Such space provides opportunities for casual

encounters and positive interactions between friends and strangers; without convivial spaces any places will be mere accretions of buildings (Shaftoe, 2008).

In convivial public spaces people can display their culture and identities; it also provides opportunities for children and young people to meet, play or simply 'hang out'. Carr et al. (1992) puts forward that convivial spaces are the heart of democratic living which is not just an arena but also a place to have good time where difference encountered teaches understanding and tolerance towards other people. All these have important benefits and help to create local attachments, which are at the heart of a sense of community (Worpole and Knox, 2007, p. 2). Thus conviviality in public spaces is significant in a sense that it attracts people and brings them close.

But, conviviality of a place cannot be discussed in isolation. There is always an unavoidable relationship between people's attachments and/or non-attachments to their surrounding area and their fellow users (Dines et al., 2006). As Cattell et al. (2007) mentioned attachment to a place is considered a basic human need. Dines et al., (2006) elaborates further that the people's attachments or non-attachments to a place are dynamic (Tuan 1974 in Dines et al., 2006), contradictory, conscious or unconscious that are often mediated by people's multiple and evolving social identities, such as age, gender, social class and ethnicity. Such place attachment can be obtained through regular requirement, desires through refined design of Public spaces.

#### **2.1.4 Public space as a place to retreat**

The primary motive for the creation of public space is for public welfare. Carr et al. (1992) mentioned that Public life offers relief from the stresses of work; provide opportunities for relaxation, entertainment, and social contact. Parks like public space are often built for recreational activities. They are the 'lungs of the city', substitute countryside where exposure to fresh air and sunlight, with the opportunity to stroll freely and relax, would serve as antidote to the oppressive physical and psychological conditions of city life (Cranz, 1982; Heckscher & Robinson, 1977 in Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009, p. 10).

There are various ways through which people can retreat themselves in public space. They can simply watch people, hang around in cafe, or play music. The people in the public spaces are passive observer-as it is believed that people like to watch other people-where he is participating in the modest level but definitely participating. The other form of retreat is through entertainment. One form of entertainment is the opportunity to observe performers and formal activities (Carr et al., 1992). The entertainments in public spaces are also through passive engagement. Whyte (1980) termed special name for such engagement. He called

it 'Triangulation'. Triangulation is the process by which some external stimulus provides a linkage between people and prompts strangers to talk to each other as though they were not (Whyte, 1980). The open café are yet another form of entertainment. The company of a friends, drink or coffee provides excuse to observe the street scene (Carr et al., 1992). Musicians and entertainers also draw people together (Whyte, 1980). Now a day the scheduling of special events has become a popular management approach in many urban plazas and parks. In addition public spaces are now commonplace schedule of concerts and other formal event. All these types of engagement can lead to a sense of relaxation, and enjoyment that is derived from watching.

## 2.2 Types of contacts, its relationship and activities in Public spaces

Lyn Lofland (1998 in Rímanová, 2010) argued that contact and relationships between people are meaningful than it was initially realized by urban observers and sociologists. He outlines major four types of public relationships. First: fleeting relationships where people interact only shortly; second: routinized relationships as between costumer and client, sale person and costumer; third: quasi-primary relationships that are filled with emotion, like chats among mothers at park; and last, intimate-secondary relationships: that is develop after longer period of interaction. Such encounter teaches people to understand other people. From differences people learn, tolerate and adapt. Whatever be the type of relationship people have the tendencies to be in contact with other people and thus, people tend to 'fit' between settings and behaviour (Haan de, 2009). Gehl (1987) also emphasizes the concept of natural need for contact in public space that is, being among others seeing and hearing others, than to being alone. Thus, Gehl (1987) simplified 'concept of varying degrees of contact intensity' on the basis of following outline:

<b>High intensity</b>	<b>↑ Close friendships</b>
	Friends
	Acquaintances
	Chance contacts
<b>Low intensity</b>	<b>Passive contacts ("see and hear" contacts)</b>

Studying from the outline, public life in public spaces initially starts from the low-intensity passive contacts, which can be further uplifted to high intensity close friendship via regular encounter and meeting in public spaces.

As he mentioned again (p. 17), opportunities related to only be able to meet, see, and hear others includes:

→ contact at a modest level
→ a possible starting point for contact at other levels
→ a possibility for maintaining already established contacts
→ a source of information about the social world outside
→ a source of inspiration, an offer of stimulating experience

### **Types of activities in Public spaces**

Gehl (1987) outlined outdoor activities in public spaces into three types- necessary activities, optional activities, and social activities. They are described below:

#### **a. Necessary activities-under all conditions**

Necessary activities are those compulsory activities in which people have to participate at different degrees despite weather, will etcetera. Normally, it consists of daily work and recreation, for example, walking to school, shopping, waiting on a subway station. Because these activities are essential, physical environment can only have a slight influence over their occurrences. People have no rights to choose the external conditions.

#### **b. Optional activities – only under favorable exterior conditions**

Optional activities are activities when people are willing to participate. It is different from necessary activities in a sense that it can take place only if people want. Functioning of optional activities is influence by many factors, time and location. These activities occur under suitable outer conditions like, going for a walk to breathe fresh air, standing and enjoying the surrounding views, sitting and having a sunbath. Occurrence of optional activities relies particularly on outer physical conditions.

### **c. Social activities**

Social activities are activities that depend on the participation of others in public space. It includes children's playing, conversation and greetings, other various public activities, and most importantly seeing people passing by and hearing them. Social activities are not independent and thus depend very much with the other two activities – necessary activities and optional activities. When different people are walking, either to conduct necessary activity or strolling around for optional activity, social activities happen spontaneously. It means that the improvements of the conditions for necessary activities and optimal activities in public space have direct relation to support social activities.

## **2.3 Factors affecting the use of Public spaces**

With high importance of public space, it becomes crucial to investigate in the overall quality of these spaces. As Jacobs (1992) mentioned public spaces are volatile places. They tend to run to extremes of popularity and unpopularity. These popularity and unpopularity are determined by various factors. It can be also verified from previous cases. Keeping this into consideration, the vitality mentioned in the previous cases is categorized into three major factors: external factors, economic factors and social factors. External factors like weather, built environment, accessibility and seating can drastically determine the quality of open spaces while the economic factors like the food, market, music, and recreational activities contributes economic gain to many users and non-users of the public spaces. These external and economic factors are the determinants for the quality of public spaces since this has immense impact on people's behavior and their social life (Dempsey, 2009).

However, there are also certain social factors that determine the successful use of public spaces. Although there are many features to be considered for the success of a public space, only few are taken for discussion in this thesis. Since this study is dealing with the public space in a multicultural neighborhood, only those social factors were considered that were relevant to everyday life of multicultural people in neighborhood scale. They are:

### **2.3.1 External factors**

Among the many promoters of the importance of external factors, Whyte (1980) advocates in favor of demanding a new way of designing that take external factor and people into account. His book "The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces" promotes awareness that the design should always start with an understanding of people use of spaces in relation to external factors. In the same year, Norberg-Schulz (1980 in Thwaites, 2001, p. 251) also emphasizes the vitality to



understand relationship between space as a dimension of human existence and knowledge of build form. Other writer like Giles-Corti & Donovan (2002) also emphasizes Physical elements as the main constituent of the open spaces. Following the same ideology they also believe physical elements can have the access for recreational activities and healthy living that can be obtained if there is an interaction between the individual and social physical environment (2002, p. 1794). External factors can be categorized into: physical elements, natural elements, and the building design. These qualities govern the use of public spaces.

### **2.3.1.1 Physical elements**

Whyte (1980) emphasizes on the role of external physical factors like, food and, sitting space as a pivotal element in the use of open space. He mentioned people like to sit and watch other people and activities going on in their eye level. Even if, there are a lot of attraction in the outdoor space, but if there is no sitting then it cannot induce people to come and stay.

#### **a. Accessibility and proximity**

The accessibility of a place can be judged by its visual and physical connections to its surrounding. A successful public space is easy to get to and get through; it is visible both from a distance and up close (PPS.org). Accessibility can be physical accessibility, visual accessibility and social accessibility (Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009).

Physical accessibility is determined by contextual features such as proximity. Proximity to the public space from where there are people determines the success-failure relation of the use of public spaces. Proximity can be related to public transport, locality, activities and ease of access for pedestrians (Vanraaji, 1983 in Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009). There are many cases where public spaces are well facilitated with equipped physical elements but it has been hardly been used. While there are also cases where people are using telephone box and street railings for their hang-out purposes (Dines et al., 2006) in residential area which lack defined public spaces. The reason for this is because some parks are unfitted; some by location, and some by size, or shape to serve successfully (Jacobs, 1992). Proximity is also affected by age. It can be often noticed that younger people want to sit in silence in a group while older people wants to go where there are many people like, markets etcetera.

The visually accessibility enables people to access for help when needed thus making it safe (Newman, 1972; Franck and Paxon, 1989 in Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009). Social accessibility refers to a notion stating 'who can access a place and how' (Carr, 1982). Social accessibility emphasizes on mental features such as cultural and symbolic elements (Rishbeth, 2001) or multifunctional places that help different groups feeling place belongingness (Molnar and

Rutledge, 1992; Lennard and Lennard, 1987 in Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009).

Thus for the public space to be successful it should be where there are incident/ activities happening, where people gather, which are accessible.

Generally, the accessibility of a place can be evaluated by its connections to its surroundings, both visual and physical. A successful public space is easy to get to and get through; it is visible both from a distance and up close (PPS.org).

### **b. Comfort and security**

Comfort and security are among the essential elements that have direct relation on place satisfaction (Baba and Austin, 1989; Carr et al., 1992, in Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009). For Gehl (1987), comfort refers to support the user's activities in public spaces, and security to protect users against crime, vehicles and undesirable weather conditions. Comfort includes perceptions about safety, cleanliness, and the availability of places to sit. (PPS.org). Charkhchian and Daneshpour (2009) mentioned that there are both physical and activity approaches to create secure and comfortable public spaces. By physical approaches they mean effective provision of lighting at night time, designing visible and focal gathering spaces, and limiting traffic (in Austin, 2003). By activity approaches they refer to programming of social events and different activities for different groups that keep public spaces active at all times (in Abbey and Butten, 1997). However, care should be taken to provide proper shelter from the sun, the rain, or inclement weather, which are often neglected (Carr et al., 1992).

Shaftoe (2008, p. 16) believes that a crucial influence on whether people will use or avoid urban public spaces is the degree to which they feel safe in them (Shaftoe, 2008). He adds, crimes are less likely to occur if potential offenders are aware that there are law-abiding citizens in the area who could witness, report or intervene (Shaftoe, 2008, p. 15). The safest places are well-populated with both user and casual passers-by who provide more 'eyes on the streets' to informally police public spaces (Jacobs, 1961 in Shaftoe, 2008, p. 19).

### **c. Endurance**

Endurance is continuity to use public space. Endurance affects the use of public space. As people has been continually using it with repeated common functions it help to form an individual sense of community which is perceived as a basis for establishing closer ties (Dines et al., 2006).

#### **2.3.1.2 Natural elements**

Natural elements like, green space, water, sun, trees tend to affect the use of public space more than any other elements. if there are services, facilities and green spaces in the neighborhood, residents will not only use them but will also use them to get engage socially with one another (Burgess et at., 1988 in

Dempsey, 2009, p. 319). Carr (1982) elaborates the importance of sun and the shades according to the geographical location. He explains, in cool places comfort is determined by the sun. In places like that the success of the public space is determined by how much sunlight is allowed. While in some places, where there is plenty of sun, like, in Chicago people want public space where there is relief from sun. At seaside recreation place, some people may not appreciate exposure to sunlight. For comfort they may choose shade from trees, umbrellas or some form of shelter from the sun (Carr et al., 1992). Whyte (1980) also mentioned the sun as one of the crucial factors in the success of the open public space. He considered that in the presence of sun people can have quality of experience and many choices. People can sit either in the sun, or in a shade or in between the sun and a shade. He puts further that the wind, the tree and water have a pivotal role to play. Adjacent to natural elements, food and sitting have a relevant effect on the use of outdoor spaces. Karen (2005) believes, food encourage social exchange and interaction. It brings vitality and conviviality to the open space.

### **2.3.1.3 Building design**

The use and quality of public space can differ drastically with the change in design (Jacobs, 1992). For instance, even though people want to sit in the sun but they often do not sit in the middle of a large space. They sit in well-defined space such as steps, or the edge of a pool. In term of design Jacobs (1992) believes the design elements like, intricacy, centering, and enclosure plays a crucial role for the use of open space. By intricacy she means the reasons for which people go to parks. She says people can have various reasons to go to the park. And, by intricacy she does not mean that the design should be intricate but what she means is that it should be intricate at eyelevel to the park user. In term of centering, she put it as the most important element in intricacy. It is important since it helps the park user to orient. Usually small parks have some place within them that is understood to be its center. It can be cross road and pausing point. But in many rectangular and riverside parks it is difficult to create center. And it is where the design is more crucial in terms of successfully creating center. She also emphasize on the presence of building as an enclosure around the park in design. Because the buildings make a definite shape out of space so that it makes park appears as an important event in the city scene.

Thwaites (2001) also puts forward his argument on the role of design to achieve quality open space. He argues that, there is a growing need to know what experience matter to people and how it can be interpreted in design. This implies that the design contributes to the quality of open space that leads to the place attachment. On the other hand, Frank & Engelke (2001) has a dual belief that building environment can either encourage or discourage physical activity. They believe that (p. 207) the built environment should provide a supportive environment that facilitates and promote physical activity.

However, Whyte (1980, p. 28) stresses that seating should be related to choice; the sitting should be socially comfortable and properly oriented that have access to sun light, trees, water, and food, among other amenities. By that he means seating should promote sitting up front, in back, to the side, in the sun, in the shades, in groups, off alone. The way we create our built environment has an impact on people's behavior and their social life (Dempsey, 2009). Comfort and seating is an important aspect of the success of an open public space (Carr et al., 1992). The places that are well-designed and cared for feel safer and people tend to use them more (Shaftoe, 2008, p. 20).

### **2.3.2 Economic factors**

Successful public spaces can generate direct and indirect benefits, both through the directly sale of refreshments, market produce and so on, but also indirectly by making the towns more popular visitors attractions (Shaftoe, 2008, p. 14). As well as social and environmental value, good public spaces increase property values and are good for business. Shaftoe (2008) says that, more people on the streets and squares mean more footfalls past and into shops and cafes. Because 'people attract people', cities with a lively public realm are more likely to appeal to tourists and other visitors (Shaftoe, 2008, p. 20).

Food as Karen (2005) believes not only brings vitality and conviviality to the public space but it will also boost economic capacities of many restaurants, fast food cafe etcetera. Events like musician playing, singing can also increase vitality and provide income for them. 'Triangulation' as termed by Whyte (1980) includes activities like people play, different kinds of attractions, people paintings, and street vendors can have economic benefits as well. Market is the other economic outburst area. Markets are among the liveliest public spaces where people can meet many other people and shop.

### **2.3.3 Social factors**

Although the use of public spaces is mostly determined by the external factors and vitality obtained by economic factors however, people are always the major factors for the use of public spaces since there is always a close relationship between quality of public space and its beneficial effect on users. The good quality public spaces are said to engender feelings of safety, a sense of community and mutual trust among user and residents as well as adhere to shared norms and values 'where ethnically and culturally diverse groups can co-exist peacefully' (Muglan et al., 2006 in Dempsey, 2009, p. 317).

Occasions for encounters and daily activities in the public space of the city create the opportunities for the interpersonal contacts and relationships, and make people take part in communication and experience others' activities in different status. By providing these opportunities the public space fulfills the natural needs and makes the social life joyful and meaningful.

If we look at the researcher like Whyte (1980), Carr et al. (1992), Shaftoe (2008), Gehl (1987), Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009, etcetera who based their study on people-based approach in creating Public spaces, their interest in doing research is varied. Like for example; Whyte (1980) is more interested in exploring external factors that make public space work effectively. His research is more focused on sitting space, microclimate, natural elements, and food etcetera. While Carr et al. (1992) mostly deals with the human qualities in public spaces. For him responsive and democratic public space is more important. Shaftoe (2008) believes in conviviality of public space while Gehl (1987) is more interested in learning the relationship between outdoor qualities and outdoor activities. Although their direction are different even if they follow people-based approach but all the above researchers mentioned 'different people', 'diverse people', 'others' to address various user of public space. The term 'different people', 'diverse people', 'others' etcetera used by different authors while discussion public space domain is to generalize diverse range of people in public spaces. In most of the cases 'the others' are not identified. They are frequently kept anonymous. However, these people are expected to be open to contact, to be warmly disposed towards the other users of the public space (Korosec - Serfaty, 1982). Lennard and Lennard (2004 in Rímanová, 2010) mentioned that people in public space do not encounter each other in terms of specific roles, as for instance employer-employee, or buyer-seller, but as complete human beings. The status of each, their social or economic position, knowledge or fame is not important as personal qualities, graciousness, cordiality and charm.

But then the question remains, does ethnicity matter in public spaces? Therefore, I formulate my research question as

## **2.4 Research Questions**

The main research question is **Does people ethnicity play a role in determining the vitality of public space.**

For the ease of study, the main research question is further sub divided into Sub research questions to help support the main research question. They are:

1. How do people with different background appreciate using Public spaces?
2. What are the benefits and the problems diverse peoples' find in the city?

For this, I want to do literature study to investigate the various social role of public space. Later I will look at the examples of various diverse cities to see how public life is conducted there. My main motif will be to answer the sub research questions to achieve the answer of my major research question.

## **2.5 Structure of report**

This report consists of five parts. Chapter 1 is the introduction chapter where I dealt with the current societal problem of the cities and frame my research objective. Chapter 2 presents the social role of Public space. It will than talk about types of contacts, its relationship and activities in Public spaces; and the factors that affect the use of public space. It will than formulate research questions. Chapter 3 looks into the everyday life of the various cities, their public spaces and places where people like to frequent. Chapter 4 will be the discussion chapter where the focus will be in answering the research questions. Chapter 5, will be my last part of the report where I will conclude whether or not diversity is necessary to determine vitality of the public space.

# 3.

## The everyday use of Public space

The everyday lives of people are diverse. They tend to use their surrounding and public space differently. This chapter presents four cases that have diverse ethnicity and various forms of public spaces. It looks at how various public spaces (taken from different research) within the city are used by diverse people to find out how public spaces functions in all respective cities. The public spaces chosen based on the diverse population and various forms of public spaces the city offers.

No.	Name of the locations	Reasons to choose the locations	
		a. Ethnicity	b. Various forms of Public Spaces
1.	Newham	60.6% of the population are from Black and minority ethnic	<p>a. Main street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Street</li> <li>• East Ham High Street</li> </ul> <p>b. Markets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queens Market</li> <li>• East ham High Market Hall</li> </ul> <p>c. Parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plashet Park</li> <li>• Priory Park</li> </ul> <p>d. Residential areas and neighbourhood Centers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• school gate</li> <li>• neighbourhood parks</li> </ul>
2.	Aylesbury	94 % white 6% Asian origin	<p>a. High Street and Town Square:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aylesbury Town Centre</li> <li>• Market Square</li> <li>• Friars Square</li> </ul> <p>b. Residential areas and neighbourhood Centers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walton Court</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fairford leys</li> </ul> <p>c. Green open spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vale Park</li> <li>• The canal Towpark</li> </ul>
3.	Lombok	In 44 out of 4,000 neighborhoods, the population consists of more than 50% non-Westerner immigrants	<p>a. Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kanaalstraat</li> </ul> <p>b. Small leisure Area/playground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bankaplein</li> </ul> <p>c. Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Molenpark</li> </ul>
4.	Cardiff	91.6 % British 8.4% non-white British	<p>a. Commercial and civic places</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter Arts Centre</li> </ul> <p>b. Green spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pontcanna Allotments</li> </ul> <p>c. Residential areas and neighbourhood centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bute Town Youth Pavilion</li> <li>• Llanishen Skatepark</li> </ul>
5.	Preston	83.2 % British 16.8% non-white British	<p>Commercial and civic places</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Car Boot Sale</li> <li>• Morrison's Café</li> <li>• Harris Library</li> </ul>
6.	Swindon	95.2 % British 4.8% non-white British	<p>a. Commercial and civic places</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The University of the Third Age</li> <li>• Asda Wal-Mart</li> </ul> <p>b. Open spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coate Water</li> </ul>

**Table 3.1** Name of Locations and reasons to choose



## **Case 1. The neighbourhood in east London borough of Newham**

The case study is taken from 'Public spaces, social relations and well-being in East London' by Nicholas Dines and Vicky Cattell with Wil Gesler and Sarah Curtis in 2006. The study was conducted in the East borough of Newham, UK.

The aim of the article is to explore public spaces as social arenas. It also look about the ways in which spaces are used, and about their potential for enabling contact between different ethnic groups or for enhancing well-being in relation to everyday public open spaces.

Among the many reason presented, the reason to choose the location for the study is because the location has high ethnic diversity; and it has various forms of public space ranging from town center spaces like high streets and markets to parks and residential streets, forecourts and street corners.

### *i. Newham's ethnic diversity*

According to the 2001 Census, Newham had the highest non-white population in the UK, that is, 60.6% of its 237,900 residents were from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups. The minority ethnic composition of Newham is also very diverse. More than 120 languages are spoken there. The principal ethnic groups are: Indian (12.1%); Pakistani (8.4%); Bangladeshi (8.8%); Black African (13.1%); and Black Caribbean (7.3%). These populations include recent refugee and migrant populations too.

### *ii. Public spaces in Newham*

The research was conducted in six sites location- two main streets: Green Street, East Ham High Street North, two parks: Plashet Park, Priory Park and two markets: Queens Market, East Ham Market Hall. The paired site was selected in order to explore the differences and similarities between the uses of common types of public open space.

## **1. Green Street:**

Green Street is characterized by a busy, heavily trafficked retail and commercial access is used mainly for transit by many. Locals commonly called it as 'Asian street' because of high concentration of Asian owned restaurants and general food stores, jewelers and clothes shops. The other reason is that the street is located at the residential area that has one of the highest Asian populations in the Borough.

Since Green Street is used primarily as a space of transit therefore the researcher assumes that there may be chances that Green Street is less encouraging for

engagement between strangers however the researcher noticed that, the market-wide aisles and unused spaces in between stalls, were used by many local people to linger. Even if the encounter was not always meaningful, the market was an inclusive site of daily routines. The local resident of the area said:

*“You don’t have to have a reason. You might just go to have moseyed around. Or right, you might say, “I’m going to buy some fish”. Or, you are going to have a natter. It is a very inclusive space. You could be anybody.”*

Many of the interviewee did not describe Green Street as a place where different groups encountered one another but for the local resident, it was a place, where they regularly meet their friends and acquaintances. For many of the old Asian people who were not confident speaking English Green Street provided supportive environment. The Asian characteristic of a place also help the older Asian to get nostalgic of the place where they were born. This ‘comfort zone’ for many inhabitants creates ethnic labeling of the place.

However, the ethnic labeling holds different meaning to different people. At the one hand, it plays a positive role in expressing place identity and a sense of pride for mostly Asian community. But on the other hand, for many people who do not belong to such community, like the British informant from the south of the borough, tend to have negative image. They detach themselves physically and socially from the place. The British informant said:

*“The Asians here are nice people, but down there from the Green Street they think they rule he place!”*

Not only the British informants but also the younger Asian generation perceives Green Street as ‘dirty and smelly’. This generation has only functional relationships with the place. They do not consider the street as an important social arena in their daily lives. They only use Green Street to buy ethnic food and outfit. A 24-year-old Pakistani man does not like the street but he mentioned that street has therapeutic effects for his mother and grandmother. He said:

*“I may enjoy it in 30 years’ time, but not at this stage of my life where I want to get away from this business”.*

Some younger Asian informants also mentioned about the inter-generational tensions and different attitudes about public open spaces. A young Pakistani mother complained about the ‘chauvinistic’ behaviour of older Pakistani men who rarely helped her as she negotiates Green Street with her shopping and her child in a pushchair. She mentioned:

*"If I'm not going to buy clothes, I'd avoid that street. It's too busy first of all. I would say people are very rude such as like the older Asian generation- they don't hold the door open for you or anything like that".*

## **2. Queens Market**

Queens Market is a 24-hour accessible covered busy market located off Green Street. It sells food stuffs and household goods that are predominantly used by minority ethnic groups (Asian, Black African, Black Caribbean and East European). Unlike Green Street many informant regard Queens Market multicultural where no groups are dominant. This market is equally used by various Asians, African Caribbean groups, Somalis, West Africans and East European. Because of the variety of international products and food stuffs on sale and variety of people who trade and shop there it encourages casual encounters between different ethnic groups who would otherwise not come into contacts.

According to a female member of the market campaign group, this applied to both shoppers and traders:

*"Next to the Bengalis selling biscuits is a Jewish guy selling curtains. They would never have met a Jewish bloke...It's most unlikely that they'd find themselves in a colleague situation where they can ask questions, they can joke with him....And he could ask them about their religion. I can't see another space where that could possibly happen. You could set up a society to bring Jews and Muslims together: he wouldn't turn up and they wouldn't turn up, because these sorts of outfits attract special people".*

Even though the physical structure of Queens Market is not very attractive but it holds special and unique elements for its everyday user. Therefore the local members of Newham form a committee to campaign for the proposed redevelopment scheme of Queens Market. A member of market campaign group claimed:

*"Regardless of the architecture, the human heart that is beating there and the community that is stimulating is something very special."*

The social encounters in Queens Market made some people feel happy, safe and relaxed, and could raise their spirits. This can be explained form Kosovan woman expression who lived above a shop:

*"Sometimes when I'm not all right or when I'm down, I sit by the open window and I just look out."*

Being appreciative towards Queens Market as multicultural and multilingual space makes many people feel comfortable towards the place. It was a place of interaction not only between people of a particular ethnic group but also between different communities. This was not simply because of the diversity of people using the space for the same purpose, but because of the openness of the market itself. According to one Pakistani woman, the market encouraged tolerance of others as well as providing a rare environment where she would find herself speaking to strangers.

*“People tolerate each other when they are in the market. You might bump into each other.... It doesn’t matter. You move on. In that sense, you get to know people.... We meet different cultures. I might be buying vegetables that I don’t know how to cook, and the lady from another part of India will tell me how to cook it. Normally I would never talk; I would never know such things. And you could hear the same story for many market users who go regularly.”*

### **3. East Ham High Street North and East Ham Market Hall**

East Ham High Street North is a semi-pedestrianized street with major national chain stores and few independent shops that are mainly run by ethnic minorities.

East Ham Market Hall is located off East Ham High Street. The market consists of a series of roofed arcades with fixed stalls and kiosks selling a wide range of products, from foodstuffs to clothes and electronic equipment.

Many respondents regarded East Ham High Street North and East Ham Market Hall as typically English. Although previously the high street was the commercial heart of the borough with a range of independent shops, but it is now associated with ‘Englishness’ due to the national chain shops, that has typically 9:00 to 18:00 opening hours and less crowded pavements.

However, in terms of the users, it is regarded as more ethnically mixed than Green Street. But despite the fact, various informants of different ethnic backgrounds regard East Ham High Street North and East Ham Market Hall as the uninteresting place as compared to Queens Market. A young Pakistani woman, for instance, commented:

*“That’s a weird market, and lots of weird stalls that don’t interest people. There is one stall that has been there for ages – I think it’s for English people – jellied eels and all that stuff that I’ve never thought of tasting!”*

#### 4. Parks: Priory Park and Plashet Park

**Priory Park** is a small, 8 acres, Neighborhood Park with a sports court and playground located between council estate and private terraced housing. It is used primarily as a sports field but is also a transit between houses and nearby main streets.

**Plashet Park** is a medium-sized, 18 acres, park situated among terraced housing with a range of facilities like; playground, sports courts, café, toilets, Bowling Green.

Parks in Newham were not generally perceived as the domain of any one ethnic group. For example, Plashet Park in East Ham was extremely popular among Asians as a place to play cricket, hockey and football and in the past it was also use for community events such as a Pakistani sports day. However, it is never described as an 'Asian' or 'Pakistani' park. Indeed, when it was not packed with Asian men and youths on Sundays, it was a very mixed space. The park was also used as the informal after-school football matches in the park involving both boys and girls from different ethnic groups.

Since, parks were not characterized by ethnic facilities, unlike Streets and Markets, people tended to perceive parks in terms of the range of activities they were able to support and their aesthetic qualities. When parks were used on a frequent basis, as cut through routes to somewhere else, or for mundane activities like walking a dog, people more acknowledge their everyday encounters with others. A white British woman, who had started to jog around a nearby park, had been able to become acquainted with her fellow keep-fit enthusiasts:

*“Because you’re doing the same thing and you’ve got a space in common. You might smile the first day you see them and you might the second day as well. And you might both collapse in a heap the third day and say hello and you do get to know people, not on a deep level, but if you saw them down the street you’d say hello. And that’s the beginning of a community.”*

The Parks were often seen as the settings for both routine and serendipitous encounters. For youths and parents with small children, parks provided informal places for meeting peers. They were associated with organized trips – for instance, a family outing – and tended to be perceived in terms of the facilities on offer and the activities that were conducted in them.

Therefore, of all the sites, parks in particular were seen to provide a less intense social environment that did not necessarily involve interaction. A young

Pakistani mother appreciated the sense of empathy between different users during her trips to one of the borough's principal parks:

*"You see everyone. You see old people, people just taking their dogs for a walk, and everyone is generally giving a little smile to each other."*

Although the Park was inclusive to all but it was also a site of tensions and racism. A 13-year-old Afghan male described that he stopped using Parks after being bullied by older white and 'Palestinian' youths.

## **5. Residential areas and neighbourhood Centers**

During interview many respondent also mentioned some semi private spaces as a setting that provided opportunities for informal social contact between different ethnic groups. They are neighbourhood and semi domestic spaces. In such places through continued and regular use it helps to develop good relations between neighbors. For some respondent they also referred to other public or semipublic spaces, which was not nearby their home. This can be explained from what Albanian Kosovan described. She consider local school gate as the only place where she could meet and talk to other non- Albanian speaking mothers. For many parents local primary school was where they meet other parents. They consider lobby of the primary school welcoming and relaxing where they pass time and interact. The meeting has been further enhanced by the presence of park nearby where they can visit after school with their children and other parents. The school and the park were seen by many as bringing different communities together. Many interviewees also mentioned games and sports as a way to encourage meeting between younger people.

According to an Asian youth worker at the new community center:

*"Before the school and park were built, the patch of ground had been a dividing line between the predominantly white housing estate on the west side and the mainly Asian area of privately owned terraced housing opposite, whereas now these facilities provided reasons for contact and exchange across potential cultural divides."*

- **Keywords for vitality:** age, gender, generation, equality, facility, informal opportunities, outlook of place, size

## **Case 2. The neighbourhood in Aylesbury**

The case study is taken from 'Social interactions in urban public places' by Caroline Holland, Andrew Clark, Jeanne Katz and Sheila Peace in 2007. The aim of this article is to explore how different public spaces are used by variety of people and to analyze how social interactions vary by age, gender or place.

### **Reason to choose the case for the current research:**

#### **i. Aylesbury ethnic diversity**

The major reason to choose the location is because of the 'Englishness' of the location. 94% per cent of the population was white; the majority of the remaining population is of Asian origin. The other reasons is, the Aylesbury Vale District has slightly younger demographic than the average for England in the 2001 Census. Children and young people aged less than 19 years formed 26.5% of the population in Aylesbury Vale (25% in England); while people aged over 65 formed 13% (compared to 16% in England).

#### **ii. Public spaces in Aylesbury**

9 study area chosen among Aylesbury:

- 1) Traditional market square: Market Square
- 2) Newly developed town Centre square: Kingsbury
- 3) Traditional shopping street: High Street
- 4) Recently redeveloped/refurbished shopping Centre: Friars Square
- 5) Older indoor shopping Centre: hale Leys
- 6) The Municipal Park: Vale Park
- 7) The Canal: the Grand Union Canal Basin
- 8) Public housing estate: Walton Court
- 9) New private housing development: Fairford leys

However, for the ease of study the various study location was further categories into:

1. Commercial and civic places: high streets and town squares
  - a. Aylesbury town Centre
  - b. Market square
  - c. Friars square
2. Residential areas and neighbourhood centers
  - a. Walton Court

- b. Fairford Leys
- 3. Green open spaces: town parks and canal towpaths
  - a. Vale Park
  - b. The canal towpath

### **1. Commercial and civic places: high streets and town squares**

During the research, observer noticed that among all the sites, the two town squares (Market square, Friars square) and the High Street (Aylesbury town Centre) was inclusive to all section of the 'community' whether they were young and old, or of different ethnicities, cultures and social groups. These various people were often seen around at the same time when there was market. Although it was inclusive it was used less. When there was no market, most of the square remained empty. The square was used very little and few people ever lingered or sat on the benches.

The same process was seen during winter, the square was little used during the day and most people only use as a pass through. There were very few people lingered at the benches on the edge of the new water feature, but most moved between the warmth of buildings as quickly as possible.

The study found that although most residents and visitors use these places only some of the time, but it was place where people can encounter both difference and familiarity, if consider that at some time, the site can be disincentive for some groups like the homeless and street drinkers.

As compared to the town square and high street covered malls were noticed to be used more frequently. Since it is covered, it protects user from all-weather condition and thus were used all year through. But for many instances people get inside the mall to protect themselves from the rain or cold. Such people also tend to linger more than compare to people passing quickly through the open streets in bad weather.

### **2. Residential areas and neighbourhood centers**

The public life of towns is not conducted in town centers alone, but also in 'local' public areas and streets.

#### **a. Walton Court**

In Walton Court the observer noticed that People from all ages were using the shopping area and the playing fields for variety of purposes ranging from going



to their business, to and from their homes, and walking the dogs. The observer also noticed that the activities vary according to the day time. The shoppers and shop assistants often used the grassed area to sit and eat sandwiches or have a cigarette and a chat with friends. Some retail shops, fast food restaurants, health training centers attracted people every day unless the weather was bad.

Despite the place was inclusive to all but young people were using the place more. They complain that there are no other places to go so they end up going to the central space more often. The young group comprises boys and girls or young men and women of similar ages.

By the end of the day these young group became very large with up to 20 or more people. They usually play skateboard and games ignoring the sign that mention the restrictions of such game in the court. However, these groups did not seem to bother other users. But many adults were seen to get threatened by these young group activities. Thus they put off some groups from coming into the shopping area.

#### **b. Fairford Leys**

Fairford Leys was considered 'typically English', because of its typical English architecture with 'winding lanes', mixing different old styles of housing – including court mews, townhouses and family homes without gardens with front doors opening straight onto the street.

Much of the time the public areas of Fairford Leys was almost devoid of human activity. It was only during the organized events that people gather in public areas. Even though children were seen playing between their houses and the riverine areas but the designated play areas were often deserted. Also, the shops were seen busy at times of day but people soon disappear after shopping and the public areas were silent again.

The public areas in Fairford Leys were only most used in summer. During summer people were seen lingering, eating outside the restaurant even during late evening. Therefore, the non-resident observers regarded the place as a 'ghost town', a 'fake town' that resembles a film set rather than a British village. But In contrast, people who lived at Fairford Leys (both observers and local interviewees), saw it as an ideal residential location, with the potential to meet most of their needs; although they mentioned that they may have specific complaints about the development. For young families, safety, security, good educational provision and relatively affordable housing were the paramount considerations that led them to choose to live there. These younger families had little interchange, and indeed little interaction, but few older people were

observed in conversation. In this place, older people and especially couples were often seen stopping and talking to people they knew.

### **3. Green open spaces: town parks and canal towpaths**

#### **a. Vale Park**

The observer find out that The park was inclusive to all people and that Seasonality, time of day and the prevailing weather and light conditions affects the use of park the most than in any other place in the study. The park was considered safe and was used by women during good weather who go there alone with their children.

For many the use of park was as a shortcut route to and from the town center and nearby secondary schools and the adjacent retail park. Beside the use of park as a shortcut route the park was also consistently visited by the group of street drinkers and homeless and unemployed people, and groups of young people.

The researcher also mentioned that people used the physical attributes of the park that did not always fit with the park regulations, like for example; despite of prohibitory notices people were seen playing football on the tennis courts, cycling on the paths and drinking alcohol on the grass or the benches in the formal garden areas. The research concluded that the official layout of the park determines the key activities that take place in the park and the age groups that engaged with specific spaces.

#### **b. The canal towpath**

The use of canal towpath varies differently depending upon the weather and time of year. In winter the towpath was rarely used except by people walking dogs. During the summer months the canal and the towpath were used by many more people for a variety of purposes.

The canal was noticed to be among few places where strangers interacted with each other as well as with their surroundings. For example, many observers commented that, people often said hello to them, and acknowledged them with a nod. But the same observers commented on how people passed each other on the narrow towpath by avoiding eye contact, and moving aside to make space on the narrow path.

- **Keywords for vitality:** age, seasonality, time of day, status, gender, architecture, location, accessibility, relax attitude

### **Case 3. The neighbourhood in Lombok**

The case study is taken from 'Everyday spaces of inter-ethnic interaction: The meaning of urban public spaces in the Netherlands' by Karin Peters and Henk de Haan in 2010. The aim of this research is to find out to what extent social interaction in public spaces creates acceptance of multiculturalism and how it affects private bonding. For that they investigate the use and meaning of urban public spaces from different multi ethnic groups of people.

The reason to choose this case for my research paper is that the research was conducted in the neighbourhood, which is known for its multicultural character. In 44 neighborhoods out of 4,000, the population consists of more than 50% non-Westerner immigrants the interview was carried out with 40 respondents out of which 24 were Dutch and remaining 16 were non-natives.

It consists of variety of small streets with rental and private houses and semi-public and public spaces like, shopping center-Kanaalstrat, playgrounds-Bankaplein, a park -Molenpark and squares- Muntplein.

#### **1. Kanaalstraat**

Kanaalstraat is renowned as busy multicultural street that attracts many people from all stages of life. Many characterize the street as lively where people can meet for chat with locals and shop owners. A Turkish woman describes the street as follows:

*"Shops, bikes, people, double parking. People of all colors, all languages; you hear a lot of different languages in the Kanaalstraat . . . It seems that there are more than 64 nationalities. Busy and sociable. Many opportunities for shopping. Faces, many faces. But also dogging and double parking."*

The liveliness is not only appreciated by immigrants but also by native Dutch. A Dutch woman is thrilled by the street scene and, like the Turkish woman, is most impressed by the encounter of diversity:

*"Every day I bike through the Kanaalstraat. I just like it to bike there, although it is sometimes unbearably busy. I buy my vegetables and fruit, which is very easy since I live nearby. I think the Kanaalstraat is fantastic, I really am a fan! I would describe the street as a street that always lives, no matter at what time of the day you are there. People of different ages are always awake, in a strange way. But mainly many foreigners, that I would say because, well, that is just how it is."*

The local shop owner was positive about the people experience of their everyday life in Lombok. He says:

*“Well, here there is more a social atmosphere, like the Mediterranean, more open with each other, also when people do not really know each other, they just have a talk. Like in my shop, I see people getting to know one another and having a talk. So it is, let’s say, more social . . . . Some kind of joy is ruling here, especially when it is very busy and when people are talking and laughing; people of various nationalities. So there probably live more Turks and Moroccans here, also other nationalities, yes every nationality present in the Netherlands or Utrecht, you see here in the Kanaalstraat.”*

A Dutch woman also has a same saying:

*“I go mostly to the same shops. I have a chat with the shop owners or with people that are standing outside. People I do not know, since I do not know that many people. People start talking when I get my bike. I always like that.”*

Here both respondents express how much they appreciate the fact that strangers talk and laugh together in a relaxed atmosphere, and that everybody, independent of ethnicity seems to be taken by the openness and inclusiveness of street life.

However, some people consider the street too crowded and overwhelming and tend to avoid; these people especially want to avoid going to Kanaalstraat on Saturday because there are many Turkish people visiting then. Also some Dutch people noticed this place as a ‘non-Dutch street’ because it is mainly visited by Moroccan, Turkish and Surinamese descent. They got a feeling as the outsider when being in this street. But, for the majority of users the street confirms the multicultural character of the neighborhood, and they feel that they are part of it, that they contribute to shaping that identity.

## **2. The playground Bankaplein**

Another popular place is the playground Bankaplein, where the children with different ethnic backgrounds spend their leisure time. It is often visited by its residents with (grand) children and by children who come on their own without parents. Most of the Inhabitants who grew up there has many personal memories and thus showed high place attachment to Bankaplein. Most respondents talk with much passion about the Bankaplein. They mentioned that Bankaplein is well organized and thus many activities can be carried out at the same time and the possibilities it creates for children. A Dutch woman:

*“Well, it is just a meeting point. Even when my children are not around, I pass by at the Bankaplein . . . I am not going to sit down at home the whole day, I am not going to drink a coffee at a neighbor, for a coffee I am going to the Bankaplein.”*

Contrasting to the Kanaalstraat, the playground is less inclusive in its use by residents. Mostly Dutch grandparents are taking their grandchildren to the park while non-native children are more often visit the playground alone or with their brother or sister. As a result, Bankaplein is mainly a meeting point for Dutch parents. One Dutch visitor, a 62-year old woman, emphasizes the calm, social and familiar character of the playground. You see people you know, you can trust people and it is enjoyable for children:

*“Bankaplein is sociable; my grandchildren always ask me, granny are we going to the Bankaplein? And then I am going because it is nice for children to play there. I see a lot of acquaintances that I talk with. It is just fun, also when you see the people that are working there. They also come to you to have a small talk. So, it is a well-organized place.”*

Non-Dutch parents are only infrequently coming to the playground. Although during observation there was no sign of non-Dutch parents present, in an interview, non-Dutch parents also mentioned that they infrequently visit the playground when the weather is good. A Turkish woman mentioned:

*“I am going with other mothers and sit in the sun when the weather is okay. When the weather is not okay, we will go inside. The children are playing and we are chatting. Many nationalities are visiting Bankaplein. You say hello to each other or the children are playing together and you observe them.”*

The place is also appreciated for its quiet, social and familiar characters; it seems to be a great place to escape for particular groups. Playgrounds attract both children and their parents and it increases a possibility of social interaction amongst them.

### **3. Molenpark**

Molenpark is the only park in Lombok. Although it is used by many inhabitants but it is not used intensively. The inhabitants showed no personal feelings towards the park; it was an ordinary park for casual walk or a visit the Sawmill. The park was characterized as selective in the users it attracts.

Respondent associate it with specific ethnic identities and sub-cultures. They mentioned that this park has fewer places to sit, to linger or to hang around.

Apart from the regular dog-owners, the park attracts mainly non-Dutch youth groups. The descriptions of Molenpark are quite straightforward. A Dutch woman finds the park not very inviting:

*“Well, how to describe the Molenpark? A place where young and old people hang around. In the football cage, people play a lot of football, and there is childcare for the little ones. It is a place to hang around for young and old. I think the place is okay but I’d rather stay at Bankaplein. Because there it is much more sociable. Molenpark is just not that attractive, you know, it is just a park, and it is not a place where you can meet each other. I have some contact with people that you just meet outside, and I say hello, even only saying hello, but then, everything is said.”*

The park is most attractive during cultural activities and festivals that attracts many visitors from various ethnicities and provide inhabitants reason to visit the park. The Events are often organized in order to bring different ethnic groups into contact with one another. People, then, have a strong reason to come to the park and social interaction can happen during those events. The importance of organized activities is emphasized by a Dutch man:

*“I only have contact with others when there is a performance at the sawmill or an event in the park . . . It is not a meeting point, it is too big. The Molenpark is a place that is about the mill. The meadow and the grounds around it, but no place to sit, no place to hang around, it does not invite people.”*

Many respondents also mentioned the excessive size of the park as a problem. They find the park unattractive because it is too open and there are not many things to do. However, a Turkish woman illustrated that she and her children enjoyed being in the park, because she can meet some other Turkish people and had a small talk with them. Others state that small talk with strangers is highly valued, but these are mostly limited to short, fleeting encounters, as illustrated by the words of a Turkish woman:

*“Well, when I am in the Molenpark I have a chat, and that is nice. The children are playing, and you say hello to strangers who are also there with their children. It does not bother me, so that is all I want. There are enough benches. It is easy and natural to have contact with people of the same nationality, with Turkish people. You have your own language; you can easily talk and understand each other. For me, it is also easy to talk with people of my own nationality. But, because I live here, I consciously have made contact with different kinds of people and being more social. I really do not have a choice . . . . In the Molenpark I see many local residents, mainly women. I think they have good contact with each other.”*

However, negative remarks are also made about the fact that young people are staying in the park until late. A 49-year old Moroccan man, living nearby the park shows his frustrations as:

*“Guys of 12, 13, 14 year old are coming from the railway station to the Molenpark and sometimes stay until two o’clock at night. This creates a lot of noise and nuisance.”*

#### **4. Muntplein**

Muntplein is a small square in Lombok. The square is located in favorable location of the neighborhood among young middle-class professionals and students, who show tendency to mix up with the original older Lombok population. It is regularly visited by only native Dutch. In Muntplein Dutch natives hang out during the summer evenings and nights, chatting and drinking wine. The image of an exclusively white space is confirmed by a shop-owner from the Kanaalstraat:

*“Well, it is a nice place, quiet. There are more students in this place . . . But when you compare Lombok with Muntplein, no, Lombok is different from that place. More, let’s say Dutch people, older people, are visiting this place.”* A 23-year old Dutch woman typifies the square as Dutch, relaxed and safe: *“Well, really everybody is visiting Muntplein. But people who hang around are mainly Dutch people. That is something you notice, but well, people of various ethnic backgrounds are passing by, people who live here. And sometimes it is indeed the case, and then you will see a group of Moroccan boys or so. But no, not very much that typical youngster behavior of hanging around, say with that negative image, you do not see that often. I think that is very relaxed.”*

While other places, like the Kanaalstraat, attract a diverse group of people, leading to more inter-ethnic encounters but it does not necessarily means that it leads to more enduring inter-ethnic contacts.

- **Keywords for vitality:** frequent encounter, experience, equality, appreciation, safety, size, status, length of stay, network

#### **Case 4. The neighbourhood in three cities-Cardiff, Preston and Swindon**

This case study is taken from 'People Make Places: growing the public life of cities' by Mean and Tim in 2005. The aim of the article is to explore good hanging out places in Cardiff, Preston and Swindon where people spend quality times. The researchers observe how such spaces work. For that, they talked to wide range of people and did 15-20 stakeholder interviews and nearly 700 interviews with the public.

Means and Tims believe that city emerge from millions of daily interactions between soft and hard factors: employment patterns, the demographic profile of the population, the presence or absence of a university, the quality of public transport, the range of cultural and civic organizations, the quality of the housing stock and so on. Such soft and hard factors create a radical variation in the public character of towns and cities and shape a corresponding variation in quality of life at both the individual and collective level within each place. They wanted to develop an understanding about how these constituent place-based character traits interact and how they might be guided to enhance the quality of life for people living in them.

The research was carried out in three places that are distinctive among each other, but each represents common urban experience with other towns and cities. The places are Cardiff, Preston and Swindon.

##### **Cardiff**

Cardiff has urban regeneration outlook, with its emphasis on culture and designed retail-friendly public space. It experience sudden transformation within short span of time due to the outburst of investment, new employers, competition a booming university. The city former harbor has now hotels, apartments, bars, restaurant and an opera house. This style has been adapted to other part of the city where Marble Square and trendy bar are opening up. However, many people that fall outside the target market of the city's redevelopment strategies are left cold by all the activity going on around them. Those who are not young and affluent feel less is relevant to them and are made to feel more invisible in the public life of the city. In particular, the Somali community of Bute Town feels overlooked, with many other residents regarding the area as a kind of no-man's land sandwiched between the resurgent city center and bay.

##### **Preston**

Preston is old, civic city that is hungry for recognition. It can be characterize with its growing population, mixed economic base, growing university and amicable race relations among a diverse population. Earlier, Preston reflects the Victorian legacy of public improvement through public space. It has landscaped civic



gardens and a collection of market squares in the center, complemented by rolling parkland in the suburbs. Victorian reformers saw such investment as a way to civilize and improve the conditions of the rapidly growing urban working classes. These investments made 150 years ago have served the city well, but there is a current debate going on over what kinds of public spaces might serve it well for the future as well. There are Plans to redevelop the market area and demolish the iconic bus station. However there are lots of controversies going on. The city leader's wants to hurriedly build, expand and rebrand the city that there are chances that the city may lose its traditional Prestonians. Thus there is a clear tension in the public space. Among the many redevelopment Seaside piers, urban parks, promenades and city squares are in the prescription list.

### Swindon

There are no public spaces in Swindon. In history after the war Swindon has the pressure to build houses for slum-cleared Londoners and successively local manufacturing and service sector boom. The town has many road structures like the motorways, roundabouts and bypasses. But, it doesn't have definite public space other than its covered shopping malls and connecting walkways that run through office blocks. Its potential squares are filled with cars while its central library has been relegated to a Portakabin.

However, now the civic leaders of Swindon have begun to realize what the band of committed activist residents have long known—that the town's public spaces matter and they need some attention. Now, it seems the council's main plan is to refit the commercially focused town center to appeal more to the affluent village dwellers.

In Cardiff, Preston and Swindon the researcher asked people questions, listened to them and observed them in order to map and understand the patterns of movement and use that they have of their cities. After that they categories these users into ten types. The categorizations are based on the use of public space and places where they frequent.

No.	Type of Public Space User	Descriptions
1.	Home Birds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Live isolated life, rarely come into contact with public venues or public spaces</li> <li>• Centre their lives on their homes, their work and go out only to do essential tasks</li> <li>• Their significant places are outside their boundary of their hometown and center on pleasant resorts or home of loved ones and family</li> <li>• sometime being Home bird is not choice but a forced decision</li> <li>• For example: some Muslim people express that they did not feel comfortable in alcohol-saturated town centers so</li> </ul>

		avoid going to such places
2.	Mall Walkers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Found in shopping centers, department stores, fast food outlets and bus stops</li> <li>• not necessarily but are usually elderly and females</li> <li>• often travel in pairs or small groups to fight boredom and low self-esteem</li> <li>• For them commercial space is the most comfortable place because it acts as a guardian by providing services (toilets) and protection (from the elements and other people) and because it makes few demands on them</li> </ul>
3.	Hoodsters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• often mums with young children who like to live only within their postcode</li> <li>• usually know their neighbors, safety, and familiarity are a high priority</li> <li>• often have low income or no income at all</li> </ul>
4.	Patriots a. Nostalgic Patriots b. Optimistic Patriots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one who are born and raised in the town</li> <li>• boastful of their town and get very angry if it is criticized</li> <li>• have a strong affiliation to a neighbourhood or series of neighborhoods where they know the streets, corner shops, religious and community centers</li> <li>• two types of patriots: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nostalgic Patriots: older people; tend to be occupied by the past. Often visit heritage events or museums where they can make connections with other people of their similar type</li> <li>b. Optimistic Patriots: younger people often from minority ethnic groups; strong sense of loyalty to districts as well as the whole town. Often work as newsagents, or in takeaways and restaurants</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	Displayers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• public spaces are their theatre</li> <li>• always want to be in town than to be in their home</li> <li>• contains lot of young males including night-time revelers, skateboarders, bladers, joggers and street entertainers and evangelists</li> <li>• tend to have expressive outfit, body language, mobile ringtone that is aimed to attract opposite sex or to impress their friends</li> <li>• bring liveliness to public spaces and leisure venues, but are usually associated with or suspected of breaking the rules, littering, crime and vandalism</li> <li>• can make other people feel unsafe, and can be seen as territorial</li> <li>• problem is not everyone understands their language</li> </ul>
6.	Brand Addicts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• usually regular job holders and live structured highly structured lives</li> <li>• go to cinema, bowling, restaurants, superstores, theme bars and the gym that are connected with the symbol of success- the cool place to be</li> <li>• Concerns are often on venue and thus hardly care for the street name. The spaces that occur in between their</li> </ul>

		<p>destinations are perceived as irrelevant and at worst dangerous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mainly meet new people or mix with people at work, but are also happy to mix with other people once inside their chosen venue</li> <li>Some people are obliged to become Brand Addicts. For example some disabled people in wheelchairs are restricted to the mega-sized chain venues, as they tend to be the only places physically accessible to them</li> </ul>
7.	Bright Lights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are usually new comers to the city</li> <li>find many advantages in the city as compared to their rural communities or smaller towns and thus are captivated with the bright lights, facilities, shops and job or cultural opportunities</li> <li>enjoy the increased chance of meeting like-minded people</li> <li>tend to be optimistic about their living place and thinks it is better than where they came from</li> <li>add a lot to a city and its public spaces because they represent the city's attractiveness to newcomers</li> <li>are also more likely to be accepting of disruptive behaviour in public space, and may themselves shift the socially accepted norms of the city</li> </ul>
8.	Hobbyhorses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are those who do not like to follow regular routine jobs; they like doing nonfamily- based activities that is, either pursuing one hobby exclusively or trying their hand at everything</li> <li>can be of any age, ranging from kids to young executives doing a bit of acting on the side, or retired people working their allotment</li> <li>Initially they try their hand on safe activities, such as an evening class, but as soon as they gain confidence they are often quick to organize their own activities and events</li> <li>like to travel in groups and do it for social reasons as much as the hobby itself</li> <li>are comfortable pursuing their hobby with new people, as they know they already share a common interest, and can be very welcoming</li> </ul>
9.	Urban Safarians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>choose different places that are out of track to mix 'rough and ready' with 'glam and shiny'</li> <li>like living in diversity even if they don't have so many friends of different cultural or ethnic backgrounds</li> <li>are usually with money and well-educated</li> <li>taste-bud is eclectic but they tend to have a few favorite places that they think of as their locals even if they are not actually near where they live</li> <li>take pride in knowing their cities and generally want to share their knowledge and their city with other people</li> </ul>
10.	Public Spirits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>read books on benches in parks and gaze at monuments</li> <li>have the ability to be themselves in public and to stand and stare</li> <li>tend to use traditional public spaces such as parks,</li> </ul>

		<p>squares and facilities like libraries and art galleries at max and spend more time in them than most other people do</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are very public spirited and are likely to intervene, or at least want to intervene, to stop anti-social behaviour such as people dropping litter or stealing flowers from parks</li> <li>• show extreme divergence</li> <li>• can either be 'short of money-students, homeless people- and therefore choose the free activities associated with public spaces' or are 'relatively affluent and educated and are looking for something more profound from public space such as an escaping from commercial space'</li> </ul>
--	--	---

**Table 3.2 Type of Public space user**

After the categorization of public space user into ten types the researchers again categories the places where those user usually frequent. They are:

No.	Type of public space user	Spaces and places these people populate
1.	Home Birds	Their own living rooms, kitchens, gardens, and those of their friends and family
2.	Mall Walkers	Bus stops, department store and supermarket coffee shops and markets.
3.	Hoodsters	Local parks, local parade of shops, mosque, church, coffee mornings.
4.	Patriots a. Nostalgic Patriots b. Optimistic Patriots	a. Clubs and hobby groups where they can maintain their interests/profession from the past such as conservative clubs, ex-service men's clubs, railway workers pubs, bingo, tea dances, hospitals, football grounds. b. Neighbourhood places (mosque, school, shops), football grounds, sports facilities.
5.	Displayers	Everywhere, but popular places include streets with clusters of bars, leisure and entertainment districts, park benches, skateparks.
6.	Brand Addicts	Chain pubs, clubs, bars, leisure centers and entertainment districts.
7.	Bright Lights	Bars, clubs, café quarters, regenerated arts districts and quaysides, shopping malls, the landmarks of the city, and transport hubs.
8.	Hobbyhorses	Further education colleges, arts centers, community centers, parks, youth clubs- anywhere with some spare space where they can congregate and practice their chosen hobby.

9.	Urban Safarians	They could turn up anywhere, but generally favor places they can eat, drink or talk. Arts activities and anywhere offering ethnic distinctiveness are popular.
10.	Public Spirits	Parks, squares, galleries, libraries, arts centers, amenity associations (Such as 'friends of the park' societies).

**Table 3.3 Spaces and places public space user populate**

### **Spaces and places the public from Cardiff, Preston and Swindon populates**

After tracking the full diversity of different types of people – from Mall Walkers to Urban Safarians the researcher list down the place these various public space users frequently visit. In each of the places researcher is especially interested in knowing the people’s experience of the place. However, for the ease of study the various study location was further categorized into:

1. Commercial and civic places
  - a. Chapter Arts Centre, Cardiff
  - b. The Car Boot Sale, Preston
  - c. Morrison’s Café, Preston
  - d. Harris Library, Preston
  - e. The University of the Third Age, Swindon
  - f. Asda Wal-Mart, Swindon
  
2. Residential areas and neighbourhood centers
  - a. Bute Town Youth Pavilion, Cardiff
  - b. Llanishen Skatepark, Cardiff
  
3. Green /open spaces:
  - a. Pontcanna Allotments, Cardiff
  - b. Coate Water, Swindon

#### **1. Commercial and civic places**

##### **a. Chapter Arts Centre, Cardiff**

Chapter Arts Centre is a studio, containing various creative activities ranging from working artists and creative industries to after-school math’s and yoga sessions. It is used by various people for various reasons, ranging from home workers using for free wireless internet to meeting point for young moms, community groups, couple meeting point and also Cardiff trendies hanging out spot. The reason this place is popular among such wide range is because of low-

price café / restaurant in day, 'the best bar in Cardiff' at night, which is open almost every day except Christmas and New Year.

### **People's experience of the place**

A diverse community who use Chapter Arts Centre on a daily basis and most people interviewed mentioned that they appreciate the area because of appreciation of diversity that was accompanied by a high level of **tolerance**, including acceptance of types of people who were not tolerated in other parts of the city. The researcher mentioned that, a number of young adults with learning difficulties said that:

*the bar in Art Centre was one of the few bars in Cardiff where they felt comfortable socializing.*

Regular user of Chapter Arts Centre cited the **sociability** of the area. It was considered a place where they can make friends with other visitors something that was unusual in other public spaces. For example, one evening class leader reported that:

*in contrast to the situation after her classes run elsewhere in the city, when people would leave as soon as the class finished, at Chapter she had got to know everyone and most people stayed on after the class to have a coffee and a chat.*

The Art Centre was also able to maintain its **Status and esteem**. It manages to blend its neighbourhood social club role with a culture and consumption trend.

*It is the place to be seen if you are interested in the latest art house film or the month's most fashionable beer.*

### **b. The Car Boot Sale, Preston**

The Car Boot Sale is the covered market in Preston. It is a Victorian cast iron structure. It hosts a market three days a week and a car boot sale two days a week. It is available for use for other community events as well, for example, it has been used as the centerpiece of a Caribbean Carnival, a procession place for the Chinese New Year celebrations, and the finishing line for a marathon. Diverse set of people visit this place ranging from students, elderly to Asian mother. Their activities are also very diverse. Students can be seen flicking through old records; elderly Prestonians chatter in groups; office workers enjoy the theatre of activity; Asian mothers hunt for bargains.

## People's experience of the place

In Car Boot Sale people reported that there was a high **incidence of bumping** into people that they knew and people would stop for a chat. A high proportion also reported that:

*they were comfortable passing the time of day with people they didn't know.*

Regular stall-holders help create **belonging** and people can easily share common interests and passions whether they were there to buy books, antiques or old records.

The car boot sale has an element of surprise since it was different every day depending on what stalls are there and what goods they sell. People liked the sense of exploration, **novelty** and that they might discover something different.

At the car boot sale there are **no fixed roles**, shoppers can also become traders. The sale stalls are always very active, hunting and bartering.

Visitors to the car boot sale enjoyed being able to see other people's belongings and possessions. Seeing other people's things provides them an entrance into other people's lives, which enhance **empathy** among other.

### c. Morrison's Café, Preston

The café is situated inside Morrison's Supermarket on the outskirts of Preston, adjacent to a dockside redevelopment. The café is subsidized because the Supermarket wants to enhance customer's shopping experience rather than make money. Because of the subsidy, many people are using the cafe even if they are not shopping. The good service of the café- inexpensive food, prompt service, and never hurried customer- makes it very successful. The café is a source of pride for the worker at the store and the users sound happy. The cafe has diverse range of users from different parts of Preston.

## People's experience of the place

The user see café as an **escape** for many-from bored children being dragged around the supermarket and parents tired of pushing the trolley, to office workers popping in for a coffee break. The fact that the supermarket allowed people to stay for as long as they wanted added to this feeling of calm and respite.

Morrison's Café is a café of regulars. Many of its users make it part of their weekly routine to stop off for a coffee or a special treat of fish and chips on a Friday. People feel comfortable there and regular customers felt they knew the staff and thus felt welcomed increasing their sense of **belonging**.

#### **d. Harris Library, Preston**

The Harris Library is spread across two floors. On the top floor there are archives and current newspapers, and beneath there is a learning center where visitors can enroll for different courses. On the ground floor is the main library. The library has a variety of books and programs that attract a variety of crowd. People can read newspaper, or books or borrow foreign language section while relaxing on sofas, chairs and stools around the library whereas, children can amuse themselves in the play area.

#### **People's experience of the place**

The library provides a forum for people to learn about their locality, explore their **curiosity**. Beyond the basic displays of local history, the library also hosts information stalls for people to convey aspects of importance in the local community such as one focused on Chinese New Year.

People valued the library as a quiet refuge from the bustle of the city. Many people liked the fact that they knew that other people had come in for the same reason, even if they did not actually talk to them. This has increased their sense of **community**, as being part among the group.

#### **e. The University of the Third Age, Swindon**

Swindon does not have great public or civic spaces. But they have unconventional forms of public spaces like the University of the Third Age. It is the largest network of learning groups for retirees in the country. Slightly guerrilla-like in their operating style, members themselves organize discussion and/or social groups on topics they find interesting to them. Groups can pop up in people's homes, community centers or the spare room of public or private organizations, anywhere with spare space they can occupy.

#### **People's experience of the place**

The rationale behind the University of the Third Age is to share knowledge and learn new things. There is no established curriculum or restriction over topics. Because of that people reported that they had tried things and developed skills in activities that they would never have thought of trying, such as *Tai chi*. People



also reported that they had revised their old skills and become **confident** in using and sharing them with others.

The University of the Third Age is self-created; depending much of its activities equally on the people who attend the groups as on those who run them. Everyone is a participant there and everyone is a learner. There is a strong sense of **mutual support**, with members, for example, encouraging each other to try different activities and see what will work.

#### **f. Asda Wal-Mart, Swindon**

Asda Wal-Mart is the retail shop with a library, cafe and water fountains. The café provides a safe and low-cost treat for low-income couples – young and old alike – and a child friendly retreat for mums and their offspring. It also makes its car park available to community groups. The mart is also actively involved in organizing fêtes, barbeques and fundraising events.

#### **People's experience of the place**

The aromas, the smiling faces at the counter, and unhurried atmosphere all create a relaxing **comfortable** environment for people to take a break.

### **2. Residential areas and neighbourhood centers**

#### **a. Bute Town Youth Pavilion, Cardiff**

Bute Town Youth Pavilion lies between the main city center and the redeveloped bay but for people living outside these two areas feels as outsider. It has some of the highest levels of disadvantage in the city. The outlook of the Pavilion is unattractive made from brick and metal. But there are lots of activities going on around all year through with children and young people aged 8–24. It has various facilities like sports hall, pool room, kitchens, a DJ booth, dark room and computer room. In the day it runs Connexions and other services to help young people over 16 to find employment or education opportunities. From midafternoon until late at the weekends it becomes the social center for the whole neighborhood's youth population of all ethnic backgrounds.

#### **People's experience of the place**

The Pavilion provides a theatre for peer-to-peer **performance**. There is a mix of different kinds of spaces with different kinds of performance going on within them. Some spaces are noisy and very physical where young people hang out and

play table sports, usually with MP3 players streaming into one of their ears. Other spaces offer a quiet space in which to do homework and send emails – often to friends in the same room.

The ratio of adults to teens was low. But there was clear **autonomy** within them. The latter were often organizing and do their own activities. Young people don't get told what to do, but they are given plenty of options.

The Pavilion has a health program that has managed to make exercise and healthy habits for **personal development**. It also has a popular leadership scheme whereby young people can train to become youth leaders.

### **b. Llanishen Skatepark, Cardiff**

The Llanishen Skatepark has a range of ramps thus it is famous among kids from the four schools in the area. These kids tend to come after school and the older ones come later, some staying after dark when it is not too cold. There is an intricate etiquette of who gets what space on which ramp and when, as the boarders, bladers and bikers weave around each other. There tends to be a strict gender division: boys skate, girls chat and pretend they are not watching the boys.

#### **People's experience of the place**

Among all the popular space mentioned the Skatepark is foremost space mentioned by the user to **perform** for their mates and the opposite sex. For example, a number of the skaters said:

*We go home when the girls go home, as there is no longer a point to be there if the girls are not there.*

The Skatepark provides **autonomy** where skaters and observers can hang out with little interference from anyone else, particularly adults. However Adults who do not disrupt the rules are unwelcome.

### **3. Green /open spaces**

#### **a. Pontcanna Allotments, Cardiff**

The allotments lie in between the busy Western Avenue and Pontcanna Fields. There are total of 35 allotments that are mostly used by retired men during the week but at weekends and during the long summer evenings these retired men's are joined by their children and grandchildren. Also, in recent years there has

been increasing number of young foodies and green lifestyles joining the allotments. Part of the allotment is used for community project that works with local residents to grow food. This group consists of diverse group of people including children, youths in hoodies, and Asian parents in their traditional dress.

### **People's experience of the place**

The allotment provides **companionship** to many of the plot holders. Some have had a plot for a decade or more, thus valuing it as very precious. Due to the allotment Different generations also get chance to come together and share time and enhance their hobby.

**Learning** at every level is a daily activity at the allotment; including neighboring plot holders trading tips, old people teaching newcomers, students from the nearby college conducting permaculture experiments, and children finding about nature and where food comes from.

### **b. Coate Water, Swindon**

Coate Water is a country park where the town joins its rural fringe. Many of the rural dwellers prefer the managed countryside of Coate Water to that of the surrounding Wiltshire wilds. The dweller come to walk dogs, picnic, feed the swans, play crazy golf, go fishing, gaze at the lake, ride bikes, ride horses and admire the miniature railway. The park also creates the space to host a range of different activities in close proximity to one another, but care has been maintained that one person's enjoyment of the space does not inhibits another's freedom to use space.

### **People's experience of the place**

For many people, Coate Water is where they can enjoy beauty, get their daily fix of nature and they love the beautiful diversity of the park, which includes a nature reserve. Most users like to balance a **sense of escape** with **proximity** to other people and therefore **safety**.

The park hosts many **playful activities** that different groups of people can easily join and leave.

- **Keywords for vitality:** tolerance, sociability, status, esteem, encounter, belonging, novelty, no fix role, empathy, escape, curiosity, community, confidence, support, comfort, performance, autonomy, personal development, companionship, learning, proximity, safety

## **Conclusion**

The case studies are chosen on the basis of ethnic diversity in the location and the locational choice of the researcher. Each of the researchers chooses the location in term of the public spaces the city can offer. While in the first three cases, city was chosen that has varieties of public and /or shared spaces within the city itself; but in the last case (case 4) the researcher choose three different cities that has different meaning of public spaces to its resident. And the residents were allowed to choose the place they consider going frequently even if it was not 100% public.

## Discussion

Cases in previous chapter illustrate the use of public space by various people. Even though each research has different objectives and were taken were from different locations, but each represents the issue of vitality of public space in its own specific way. Three cases are from United Kingdom and one is from the Netherlands. While the locations are diverse they bear similarity in term of their association of their study in ethnic diversity and varieties of public spaces each city consist: streets, markets, parks and neighbourhood spaces.

### 4.1 The meaning of public space to different people

Case 1 provides the information about the way people perceive public spaces in their surroundings. It is known from the case that when places are predominantly used by particular ethnic group then they are usually labeled. Such places tend to have strong characteristic in term of architecture and sometimes by the way ethnic people dress. The people who appreciate the place and fall within that characteristic have positive perception of the place. The place is a comfortable place for them where they can regularly meet their friends and acquaintances despite their lack of knowledge of local language. As Dines et al. (2006) mentioned endurance affects the use of public space. Since people continually use the place it helps to form an individual sense of community which is perceived as a basis for establishing closer ties. The example can be seen from Newham which was often called 'Asian Street' or 'Little India' because of the high concentration of Asian owned store, restaurants and Asian population the older Asian people feel comfortable living in Green Street even though they do not know English language. It was noticed that at places like that people who fall outside of those characteristics and who do not belong to such community usually have negative image of the place. They detach themselves physically and socially from the place and usually avoid going to such places. However, the younger Asian generation did not show much affinity to Green Street. For them Green Street is dirty and messy and only have functional meaning with Green Street.

When we look at the role of public space from convivial space perspective the above case can be better understood. As already mentioned in the second chapter, the success of a place is not only determined by physical settings but also by how much a person can experience from their everyday setting (Cattell et al., 2008). Such experiences enhance people's subjectivity of a place thus building people's attachment or non-attachments to the place. In case of Green Street,

Newham the people who falls within the predominant characteristic of a place and appreciate the place has developed immense place attachment with the street while for others the immense attachment of others was the case to develop non-attachment with the same place.

But Queens Market also from Newham was not ethnically labeled even though this place was labeled as multicultural and multilingual by many. It was because in Queens Market there were no groups that were dominant over others. Queens Market was a place of encounter and interaction not only between people of particular ethnicity but also between different ethnicities and nationalities. It was democratic shared space because it was freely accessible to everyone, open, non-discriminatory (Peters and Haan, 2010).

In the case of Parks in Newham, they were not perceived as the domain of any one ethnic group. Although Parks were very popular among Asian to play cricket and used for community events such as 'Pakistani Sports Day' but it was not described as Asian parks. Indeed during weekend it was a mixed space. It is because the parks were not characterized by ethnic facilities, unlike Green Street. It was seen more as a place of retreat for public welfare. Thus, people tend to perceive parks only in terms of range of activities.

In Newham, it was noticed that when the locals were asked to describe their surroundings, social and functional elements of public spaces get more attention than the physical dimension. It explains that the perception of space is widely dependent according to different age factor, status, gender and generation.

Case 2 talks about the contested definition of public space and regard the 'publicness' of the public places as 'conditional and contingent'. It says that although much talked about the democratic nature of public space, public spaces are usually not democratic. Children, young and older people, and marginalized groups are usually excluded in public space by providing limited facilities for them to enjoy the place to the fullest. Sometime certain people are made out of place and/or make them feel out of place due to the general expectation of others or by management; the inclusivity of public space can be questioned. Like for example, the young people from other neighborhood hanging around Fairford Leys and Walton Court were often seen as problem in shopping street. The researchers from the case suggest that the generational difference can be the cause of fear, distrust and misunderstanding between young and old people. The researchers suggest further that prohibiting young people in public space is not a solution to the problem rather a better solution can be that wider range of people are educated about social interactions in public spaces.

It is stated in chapter 2 that the encouragement or discouragement of diversity in public places is strongly influenced by the emphasis put forwarded on management and design. Jacobs (1992) also mentioned that the usefulness and quality of public space can differ drastically by design alteration. If design is used to obtain the 'publicness' of public space then the design should follow what

Thwaites (2001) mentioned, the designer or managers should know what experience matter to people and how it can be interpreted in design, only than the design contributes to the inclusivity of public space.

The case also mentioned that age, status, sometimes gender and time of the day influence the appreciative use of public spaces. The researchers believe that the way public spaces are designed and managed, influence whether or not the public presence of diversity is desired.

Case 3 is about the social and functional elements of public spaces but it also focuses on the quality of public spaces. The researcher believe that there are different ways that people are attracted to spaces, and space affects how people feel and what they do (p.14).

Like the Queens Market from case 1, Kanaalstraat was busy, thriving, and in many cases anonymous leading to more inter-ethnic encounters. It was indeed an inclusive and democratic place for all but the researchers of the case mentioned that such encounters do not motivate for more enduring inter-ethnic contacts. In such places ethnicity were only tolerated. Even if the recent inhabitants celebrate diversity and the liveliness of the neighborhood, they have their social networks mainly outside the neighborhood. It may be because such encounter leads towards the appreciation of diversity but it does not take step forward to more meaningful relationship as mentioned by Gehl (1987).

Bankaplein Park was like a home ground for familiar people; and was less inclusive to the outsider. As mentioned in chapter 2, being comfortable and feeling safe are among the essential elements that have direct relation on place satisfaction (Charkhchian and Daneshpour, 2009). But Bankaplein was used more by multi ethnic young children where encounters happen spontaneously. It shows that if the user can see some practical affordances like, the simple presence of playing opportunities, it can bring people together. The playground also has different identity; although it was not as vibrant space as Kanaalstrat but it was space of temporary escape and cultural self-identity.

It is also found from the research that there is a direct relationship between people endurance to a place and people's reflection towards diversity of encounters and contacts in public space. It is known from Lombok that the resident with longer history built up extensive neighborhood networks that cross ethnic boundaries. For both natives as well as non-natives who have lived already for many years in Lombok, Lombok is an important place for their social network.

From the case it was noticed that, people were aware of multiculturalism in Kanaalstraat and to a lesser extend around the playground. Inter-ethnic social interactions occur in the place. But beside this two places in other spaces even when people were aware of multiculturalism, they avoid, or simply are not inclined to social encounters. The inhabitants do have private bonds, like friendships and more structural contacts with people living in the same

neighborhood, however, these bonds mostly occur between people from same ethnic background and, perhaps even more important, class. Thus, in case of Lombok it can be said that the appreciative use of public spaces was dependent upon: size. And in case of neighborhood residential space the vitality also depends upon the length of stay of the resident.

The fourth case argues that the vitality of public space is not determined by the ownership status, physical design or aesthetic consideration but it is determined by whether public spaces are actively used and shared by different individuals and groups. The researchers mentioned that only by understanding the people's diverse values, motivations and needs the city planners can determine which place should be shared or negotiated among different users. From the case it is known that public space is not only the regular places public often visit but it can also be privately own property; Like the Asda Wal-Mart in Swindon; Harris Library in Preston etcetera. The case teaches that the 'publicness' of space is not determined by ownership status, physical design or aesthetic appearance. Instead, a much better guide to check its 'publicness' is check whether it is actively used and shared by different individuals and groups. Because, the 'publicness' of a space is composed of the active participation, everyday use and experiences that people are able to create within it. However, the researchers did not hurriedly conclude that the groups are divided in term of ethnicity; rather, they divide public space user into ten types according to the resources, social norms and individual values.

From the cases in the previous chapter it can be acknowledge that everyday social life of public space user are not only present in traditional public spaces like the streets, parks but also in the non-traditional quasi-public spaces like the markets, shopping streets. These quasi-public spaces get the most positive appreciation by public because it provides possibility for interaction among diverse people. This can be verified from case 1 and case 4; People were more innovative in using space. They were seen using unconventional spaces like the market's wide aisles and unused spaces between stalls where they can linger and talk to other people. Interaction happened in markets usually does not cause tensions to the inhabitants. Residential streets were also mentioned as an important setting for multicultural exchanges. Equally, parks fulfilled the general acclamation. Even though the park was used some times by particular ethnic groups that obsolete other user, like Pakistani New year festival in Newham, but it was not claimed by locals as ethnic dominance place. Rather, such events were seen as an opportunity to foster stronger ties between people from same ethnicity.

Even though all the four cases talked about the diversity in public spaces they also mentioned various factors that tend to hinder the vitality of such spaces.



Some researchers mentioned lack of local languages as a problem while for some researchers public space not being inclusive was a major problem. I believe mostly in diverse society that has multiethnic influences, prejudices and suspicions towards different ethnic groups hinder interaction. It may be the results of little knowledge about each other culture. Therefore, it is necessary to know what the problems are that can hinder the interaction between the diverse ethnic groups. Hudson et al. (2007), Cattell et al., (2008) and Dines et al., (2006) points out certain factors that inhibits social cohesion. They are:

#### **4.2 Problems in multicultural neighbourhood**

Mostly in multicultural society, prejudices and suspicions towards different ethnic groups may be the results of little knowledge about their cultures. Public space is now of central political importance to questions of sustainable, equitable and enriching urban life (Worpole and Greenhalgh, 1996 in Shaftoe, 2008, p.12). For example; the presence of small park may be valued positively by one particular group while for different other groups it may be a place to avoid and the reason cannot be related to its physical quality (Andini, 2010). Therefore, it is necessary to know what the problems are that can hinder the interaction between the diverse ethnic groups. Hudson et al. (2007), Cattell et al. (2008) and Dines et al. (2006) points out certain factors that inhibits social cohesion. They are:

Hudson et at. (2007) emphasize on the **knowledge of local language**. She explains that lack of knowledge of local language and the inability to understand different ethnic languages is one of the prime reasons for less interaction. When people fail to understand spoken languages it is commonly signaled as a potential barrier to social interaction.

**Facilities** like sitting space, playground, and definite gathering spot serve as important elements to enhance cohesion. Cattell et al. (2008) mentioned that such facilities give purpose to a space (p. 553) since lack of such facilities can sometimes limit the quality of people's encounters (p. 554). This can be better understood from Dines et al. (2006) example. The researchers explained that in one of the neighborhood in their study location, the lack of proper gathering space caused that youth gather in street corner and in telephone booth and their chatting, loitering was often seen as disturbance by many people. Many people, mostly the old, have problems with such disruptive behavior of the young.

Lack of facilities also impedes strong friendship. Regular encounter with people may create weak ties where people can start formal greetings but the presence of facilities enhances such weak ties into stronger ties. Dines et al. (2006) further explains that an Indian women who was enthusiastic to make strong friendship with her frequent meeting friend in her local shopping street was frustrated that

her fleeting exchange could never turned into meaningful encounters because of the absence of sitting space such as café.

**Crime and Nuisance** is one of the central concerns for many people in term of cohesion. Fear of crime influences the social relationships in the local area. It affects people of all age groups, gender and ethnicity since their use of the local area is determined by a sense of safety. Much concern is raised about crime, regarding drug, gun and gang crime. Crime and nuisance in the locality makes people feel unsafe when walking around such area and thus they either tend to avoid or change their daily route (Hudson et at., 2007). These people develop sense of isolation soon when they are affected.

Social cohesion is also sometimes hinder because of **religion and cultural norms**. Diverse groups in the cities associate themselves with different ethnic backgrounds, religion and different cultural practices. Hudson et al., (2007) provides a clear explanation of the case. The researchers said some strict Muslim cannot eat food with their neighbors because they are not sure if the food prepared is halal or not. Hudson et al. adds further that the **tradition**, family structure may also discourage interaction. The researchers argue that some ethnic group may have more affinity to family ties and that they may be more family oriented then other ethnic groups.

Hudson et al. (2007, p. 30) believes that **lack of willingness to interact** and limited inter-ethnic social interaction can have negative consequences because when tension develop, it is unlikely that there will be enough trust to communicate for dissipating inter-ethnic issues. Lack of pious attention for people from different ethnic backgrounds to have contact between each other often results in lack of willingness for inter-ethnic groups to interact. The researchers explain further, even though these groups go well together during short fleeting and when they cross path but there is a huge tension in the use of shared space, like the public space, because of differences in lifestyle or material opportunities. To explain the case the researchers gave the example as, due to, limited employment opportunities in work people tend to work very hard to showcase their efficiencies. But the situation prevents interactions in the workplace. Hudson et al. (2007) emphasized that there is often a lack of willingness to interact in situation where long standing residents placed an onus on newcomers to mix more with the existing population. Sometimes this is also marked with racism and distaste for interacting with newcomers.

In term of **small social network**, Dines et al., (2006) mentioned that it is usually women that are more restricted than men. It can be either in their activities, with daily lives revolving around taking children to and from school, visiting parks,

shopping for food, and visiting locally based family or friends. However, she does not limit this to only women. She adds further, people also limit their network with their own busyness by avoiding going to mosque (gathering spot), stop and chat to people in the park or go to some classes and language problem limit interaction (p. 20).

**Ignorance or misunderstanding about cultural traditions**, lack of knowledge and understanding of people from different ethnic backgrounds, resulting from limited interaction foster intolerance and fuel racism (Hudson et al., 2007). Misunderstanding about different ethnic culture has high tendency to invite conflict among each other since 'one person's idea of healthy ethnic relations might be someone else's experience of hell' (Dines et al., 2006, p. 24). Although young people have more ethnically mixed social networks and positive attitudes towards diversity, but when disputes breaks between young people, it took usually take racialised forms (Hudson et al., 2007, p 46). It is because of their limited understanding about each other cultural traditions.

**Sense of 'racialised resentment'** termed by Hudson et al. (2007) refer to the way everyday neighborhood grievances were manifested in negative attitudes among residents towards racial minorities. In places of racial resentment some overt signs of racial stereotyping and intolerance such as, verbal abuse and aggression, emerged in everyday neighborhood life (Hudson et al., 2007, p. 27). It should be noticed that, where people experienced racism and prejudice it have major impact on the physical and mental health of the victim (Dines et al., 2006) p. 30); leading the victim to withdraw themselves from spaces fearing of these incidents happening again to them. These hamper the possibility of establishing loose ties with local people. Therefore, this racism can increase sense of isolation (Dines et al., 2006). Racial difference has an enduring significance in terms of differential life chances (Hudson et al., 2007, p. 29). Racial and ethnic differences can be noticed more prominent during access to employment opportunities. The racism limits the job opportunities. It suggests that, despite widespread social interaction, there are persistent forms of discrimination that emphasize the continuing significance of racial difference for life chances (Hudson et al., 2007).

Spaces are mostly regulated by **unofficial rules** that are established and enforced by long-term residents (Dines et al., 2006, p. 25). These unwritten rules and social norms not only served to maintain a sense of order but are often used to legitimate prejudices against certain groups on cultural rather than racial grounds. It is also common to see that people living in diversity sometimes distinguish particular ethnic groups as the source of problems, while expressing positive attitudes towards other ethnic groups (Maria Hudson, 2007), p. 42). The society also punishes those who consciously or unconsciously break rules; leading people to be disliked and sometimes harassed (Dines et al., 2006), p. 25).

It is therefore extremely important to look for these above mentioned factors so that proper community cohesion can be established. Hudson et al. (2007) assumes that 'neighborhood' and 'community' coincides and are thus often talked interchangeably. She believes community cohesion can be best achieved when practiced at small scale **neighborhood level**. I also share same sentiment and thus, believe that public spaces especially in neighborhood scale is the best place to practice cohesion since it is a place where the social reality of a multicultural society is more visible (Peters and Haan, 2010). In public space people coincide and practice democratic life.

### **Conclusion**

It should also be, however, noted that all the featured quality of public space may not contributes to the success of public space but as its proportion increases it contributes to better functioning of space. Successful public space grow organically through accumulations, adaptations and additions (Shaftoe, 2008). These spaces add richness to the city as a learning environment and give hope to the cultural understanding (Carr et al., 1992, p. 10). Thus, it can be said that the quality of public spaces can be measured by the number of people visiting. If there are many people then it is successful because successful places always has people in it (Whyte, 1980).

# 5.

## Conclusion

The research question 'Does people ethnicity play a role in determining the vitality of public space' presented after the theoretical exploration of the thesis is answered by looking through various cases from United Kingdom and the Netherlands. The important findings from the cases were discussed so that the research objective of the thesis is met.

It is known from the cases that 'diversity' is necessary for the vitality of public space. Diversity is valued that is shared by positive experience and appreciation of public space. It is because of 'diversity' that various public space user have different usage of the space, they assign different meaning to the place and go to public space for variety of reasons. Also due to 'diversity' public space user have multiple options. There are hundred reasons to visit public space and hundred reasons to visit it again and again. 'Diversity' helps to create a setting that is new everyday so that people can always have curiosity to explore again and again.

During theoretical exploration it is noticed that there are many discussion going on in public space domain about ethnicity. When looked about the issue in the case study it is noticed that ethnicity does play a role in public space use especially at places where particular ethnic character dominates. Moreover, in public space people with different ethnic backgrounds lives together in residential areas and increasingly, although not equally, participate at all level of social and economic life. This means that public space serves as a platform to bring diverse people together to force them to encounter each other, increase curiosity, learn their differences, and increase their tolerance. But it was also noticed that it is not only ethnicity that determines the vitality of public space. Age, gender, perception of being safe, status, facility, and accessibility etcetera were among many factors that determine the vitality of public space.

When considering mostly the social factors the 'publicness' of public space greatly determine the vitality of public space. 'Publicness' simply mean the inclusivity of people in public space. A place that is inclusive to people from all age group, gender and status that are mostly children, old people, homeless, disabled etcetera. Only if public space is designed considering 'publicness' into account than it will increase diversity.

However, public space user should be aware that they are also one of the prominent actors of public space and that they are the one who determine the vitality of public space. Therefore, all the public space user should have an active

role. By only appreciating diversity but not working towards its achievement as in case of Lombok will only leads towards vitality for fleeting time. To maintain the vitality of public space, the public space user should be the one who should consider taking a step forward and initiate interaction between diverse ranges of people. Only if one initiates there will be few others to respond. By initiating interaction loose tie cab be maintained between diverse people and it is up to them to whether or take their friendship to more meaningful level or leave it as it is.

## Reference

- AMIN, A. 2002. Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity. *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 959-980.
- CARR, S., FRANCIS, M. and RIVLIN, L. G. (1992) *Public space, Cambridge series in environment and behavior*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CATTELL, V., DINES, N., GESLER, W. & CURTIS, S. 2008. Mingling, observing, and lingering: Everyday public spaces and their implications for well-being and social relations. *Health & Place*, 14, 544-561.
- CHARKHCHIAN, M. & DANESHPOUR, S. A. 2009. INTERACTIONS AMONG DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS OF A RESPONSIVE PUBLIC SPACE: CASE STUDY IN IRAN. *Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies*, 21, 14-36.
- de HAAN, H. J. (2008) 'Social interaction and neighbourhood control: the significance of walking and narratives', 73-96.
- DEMPSEY, N. (2008) *Quality of the Built Environment in Urban Neighbourhoods*, [online], available: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a902461253&fulltext=713240928#references> [accessed 26-04-2011].
- DEMPSEY, N. 2009. Are good-quality environments socially cohesive?
- DINES, N., CATTELL, V., GESLER, W. & CURTIS, S. 2006. Public space and well-being. *Public spaces and social relations in East London* Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- GEHL, J. 1987. *Life between buildings : using public space*, New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- HAAN DE, H. 2009. Space, Place and Society. *Lecture 6*. Wageningen: Wageningen University.
- HESTER, R. T. 2006. *Design for Ecological Democracy*, Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- JACOBS, J. 1992. The uses of neighbourhood parks. *The death and life of great American cities*. Vintage.
- KOROSEC - SERFATY, P. 1982. *The main square : functions and daily uses of Stortorget in Malmoe*, Lund, [Lunds Universitet].
- MANZI, T., LUCAS, K., JONES, T. L. & ALLEN, J. 2010. *Social sustainability in urban areas communities, connectivity and the urban fabric* [Online]. London; Washington DC: Earthscan. Available: <http://public.eblib.com/EBLPublic/PublicView.do?ptiID=517193>.
- MARIA HUDSON, J. P., KATHRYN RAY AND HELEN BARNES. 2007. Social cohesion in diverse communities. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation* [Online]. Available: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/social-cohesion-diverse-communities>.
- MEANS, M. & TIMS, C. 2005. *People Make Places: growing the public life of cities*, United Kingdom, © Demos.
- PETERS, K. & HAAN, H. D. 2010. Everyday spaces of inter-ethnic interaction: The meaning of urban public spaces in the Netherlands.
- RÍMANOVÁ, M. 2010. *RE-search: towards socially attractive city squares : comparative case study of two main squares in cities of Cieszyn (Poland) and eský T&#283;&#353;ín (Czech Republic)*. Master, Wageningen University.

- SHAFTOE, H. 2008. *Convivial urban spaces: creating public urban places*, London, Earthscan.
- STATISTICS CANADA HOUSING, F. A. S. S. 2003. Ethnic Diversity Survey: portrait of a multicultural society. *In: INDUSTRY, M. O. (ed.)*. Ottawa: Authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada.
- VAN MELIK, R. 2008. *Changing public space: The recent redevelopment of Dutch city squares*. PhD, Utrecht University.
- WHYTE, W. H. 1980. *The social life of small urban spaces*, New York, Project for Public Spaces.
- WORPOLE, K. & KNOX, K. 2007. The social value of public spaces. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation* [Online]. Available: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/social-value-public-spaces>.