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Abstract

Shared spaces are streets where conventional traffic controls are removed. Typically featuring a level surface, their design attempts to calm traffic, allowing for better integration of pedestrians and cyclists alongside motorists. Shared spaces can improve urban settings by creating places for people, yet public discourse and much of the literature focusses on their effects on vehicle movement and pedestrian safety. Placemaking is a movement which seeks to improve underutilised public spaces in towns and cities into meaningful places which communities take pride in, where there is a sense of ownership and a sense of attachment.

The aim of this thesis was to investigate how placemaking can improve the outcome of shared spaces in town and city centres. Reinstating a sense of place to improve the quality of the public realm has recently been endorsed by planners and urban designers in Adelaide, with the implementation of Adelaide City Council’s Placemaking Strategy. Therefore, the city provided an ideal case study to explore placemaking and its application to shared spaces. Data was acquired through a video survey and design checklist to evaluate the place function of four shared spaces. Despite a range of design features, high numbers of pedestrians and low numbers of motorists, there were few people spending time and partaking in activities in the street spaces. Issues with placemaking were identified through interviews with planning and urban design professionals involved with placemaking in Adelaide. Key challenges included defining the concept and understanding its motivations, and determining the role of government in the process.

A placemaking approach involves a community being in a partnership with a local authority for the design and management of a shared space. Placemaking should continue after the construction of a shared space as a healthy and resilient community will contrive their sense of place in a shared space over time. Temporary projects like art installations or events can be very effective at empowering communities. New Zealand towns and cities with vehicle-dominant streets and unattractive public spaces which lack activity can benefit from these lessons. Strategic planning for placemaking, understanding that the process of placemaking, including finding funding, has a positive outcome for communities, and employing short-term place activation projects which reflect the context of the street will ensure effective shared spaces are created in New Zealand.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Streets are part of the public realm within the built environment. As such, they can be used not only for travelling, but as a place for social interaction. However, for decades, street design has focussed on the requirement to efficiently and safely get motor vehicles from one point to another. Facilitating faster movement of vehicles has involved measures such as the construction of complicated intersections, the widening of carriageways, and the utilising of traffic islands and road markings. Higher speeds have meant that it is necessary to segregate pedestrians from motor vehicles, using footpaths, underpasses and designated pedestrian crossings, for their safety. The transport policies, rules and regulations which have evolved highlight the increased government control over the design of streets and human behaviour within these environments (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b).

Car-oriented transport planning has increased the reliance on motor vehicles which has had well-documented impacts including traffic congestion, health problems due to sedentary lifestyles, increasing emissions of carbon and other pollutants, and social isolation and inequality (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b; South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012). Furthermore, accidents among pedestrians remain a central concern in transport policies. Jane Jacobs (1961) was influential in arguing the negative effects of the car-oriented planning in American cities in the 1950s. Now, movements such as ‘Reclaim the Streets’ and New Urbanism, which have gained popularity in the United Kingdom, Europe, Australasia and North America, highlight growing public dissatisfaction with urban street environments.

The emerging approach to designing streets as ‘shared spaces’ is a reaction to the way they have been designed in the past. Shared spaces (or ‘shared streets’) are streets which typically feature a level surface with limited or no traffic control devices, such as road markings and signs. An example is illustrated in Figure 1. Without a clear indication of how pedestrians, cyclists or vehicles should occupy the space, street users are forced to adapt their behaviour to interact with one another safely. This follows evidence that with a higher perception of risk, people become more aware of their surroundings (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, 2007a; Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a; Kaparias et al., 2012). Additionally, shared spaces may feature street furniture, artwork and vegetation to help to calm the flow of the traffic. This design removes the presumed priority that vehicle users have. The role of the
government in controlling and regulating behaviour is questioned by the concept of shared spaces (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b).

Figure 1: Exhibition Road shared space, London. Source: (People and Places Projects, 2012)

However, shared spaces are criticised for being difficult for people with mobility and visual impairments to navigate (Havik et al., 2012; Imrie, 2012). Because of this, shared spaces may also incorporate a ‘safe space’ (or ‘comfort space’), which is a strip on the sides of the street delineated by textured paving, colour contrasting or street furniture to allow visually-impaired, and other vulnerable pedestrians (such as children and the elderly) to navigate the street and feel safe from vehicles.

The shared space concept is attributed to the Dutch planner De Boer, who, during the late 1960s, had the idea of levelling residential streets to create the impression of a yard (Ben-Joseph, 1995). Called a ‘woonerf’ (‘residential yard’), the design of the street would slow traffic to better allow children to play in the space (Ben-Joseph, 1995). Since then, shared spaces have been a popular design in residential zones around Europe (Ben-Joseph, 1995), including in the United Kingdom where they are called ‘home zones’ (Biddulph, 2010). In more recent years there has been a rise in applications of the concept to streets in town and city centres, including in Australia (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012) and New Zealand (Auckland Council, 2014).
Supporters for shared spaces argue that they result in a safer, more vibrant street environment. The primary result of a shared space is the reduction in the speed and number of vehicles. This helps to create a safer and more welcoming space for pedestrians and cyclists. With the inclusion of good urban design, a shared space can become a place – a destination where people come to, while not restricting the movement function of the street. A shared space can revitalise a street because of improved amenity, more social interaction and activities such as markets and street performances being able to occur. Additionally, businesses benefit as more foot traffic on a street increases retail expenditure there (National Heart Foundation of Australia, 2011).

A successfully vibrant shared space will lead to further benefits. More pedestrians and a range of activities, including night-time activities, can reduce on-street crime. Reducing car dependence has health benefits as people can choose to walk or cycle for a more active lifestyle. Reduced car use also contributes to a decline in carbon emissions and other pollutants. There is evidence of property values increasing due to their location within a higher-quality environment (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, 2007b). Research even shows that where busy intersections have been converted to shared spaces, vehicle congestion has eased and travel times have decreased due to a steady, uninterrupted flow (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a).

1.1 Research Rationale

Shared spaces rely on their function as a place for people, as well as their function as a link for street users to pass through efficiently, to be successful. However, research on shared spaces has predominantly focussed on quantitative analysis of vehicle presence, congestion and pedestrian movement, and qualitative analysis of users’ perceptions of safety and behaviour in selected shared spaces (Reid et al., 2009; Karndacharuk et al., 2013). Furthermore, public discourse has generally been concerned about the effects on vehicle movement and pedestrian safety. Advocators for shared spaces argue that comfort, visual amenity and the reallocation of space to better allow for social interaction and activities will help create a place which people are attracted to spend time in (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b; Reid et al., 2009; Joyce, 2012; Karndacharuk et al., 2013). However, the concept of place is deeper in meaning.
A great place is a space which has a unique identity, is meaningful to the people who use it and provides a sense of belonging (Cresswell, 2004). Placemaking is a movement which seeks to improve public spaces in towns and cities into places. A common analogy is turning a house into a home. Accordingly, placemaking requires the local community to transform a public space into one that they take pride in, where there is a sense of ownership and a sense of attachment (Silberberg et al., 2013). Proponents for placemaking argue that great places in the public realm contribute to the social wellbeing of communities (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987; Silberberg et al., 2013). This thesis will argue that placemaking is a concept which needs to be employed to create shared spaces which successfully act as places for people. The next Section will describe the aim and objectives to follow this argument.

1.2 Research Aim and Objectives

The aim of this thesis is to investigate how placemaking can improve the outcome of shared spaces in town and city centres. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were established:

1. Conduct a literature review to gain an understanding of the concepts of placemaking and shared spaces and their application overseas.
2. Explore placemaking strategies in Adelaide and how they are being undertaken in practice in the design of shared spaces.
3. Identify the issues and challenges for planners, designers and local communities in creating shared spaces as places.
4. Determine the implications for local authorities in New Zealand wishing to create successful shared spaces.

The findings contribute to the literature on shared spaces with a focus on their place function. In doing so, it has relevance for transport planning, urban design and community development. Furthermore, the implications can help local authorities in New Zealand struggling with the application of shared spaces to urban streets, particularly with the intention to create a destination for people. The reason for exploring placemaking in Adelaide will be explained in the following Section.
1.3 Research Context

Adelaide, South Australia, was chosen as a case study to explore the use of a placemaking approach to planning. As the state capital and the most populous city of South Australia, Adelaide is a commercial, retail and entertainment hub, providing employment, civic services and tourism services. Adelaide City Council has recently adopted a placemaking approach for the city’s planning after recognising problems with low quality and underutilised public spaces. The appointment of a placemaking team within the Council, the beginning of placemaking projects in three communities and the establishment of Splash Adelaide, a programme of events to activate public spaces throughout the city, demonstrates fruition of the Council’s Placemaking Strategy (2013b).

Furthermore, converting selected streets into shared spaces is one objective of the Adelaide City Council’s Transport and Movement Strategy (2012a) and gives effect to the vision of a highly connected pedestrian and cycle network and a high-quality, vibrant public domain. Several shared spaces have been created and some existing ones have undergone improvements so far. Therefore, Adelaide is a city whereby placemaking and its application to shared spaces can be explored. Specifically, this thesis will investigate four streets in the city centre, namely Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West, chosen due to the use of a placemaking approach in their development.

Finally, Adelaide is a relatively small city, compared to others overseas and is facing issues common to New Zealand cities, such as traffic congestion and low quality streets. Accordingly, the lessons are applicable to New Zealand cities such as Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.

1.4 Thesis Structure

This introductory Chapter has explained the research background and problem before setting out the aim and objectives of this study. Additionally, the context of Adelaide is briefly described. Chapter Two contains a literature review which will establish the research topic. The research methods, which include both quantitative and qualitative data collection, will be developed in Chapter Three. The two subsequent Chapters will provide more detail on the context of Adelaide and the research sites, and analyse the planning framework in relation to
placemaking and shared spaces. Chapter Six presents the findings from the primary research undertaken in Adelaide. A discussion of these findings in relation to the wider literature follows in Chapter Seven. Finally, Chapter Eight will summarise and conclude the thesis.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This Chapter provides a critical analysis of the literature surrounding placemaking and shared spaces. Understanding this background literature provides a theoretical framework, or perspective, for investigating more specifically how placemaking can be applied to the creation of shared spaces. Therefore, this Chapter will begin with an overview of the more widely understood issue of automobile dependency. Section 2.3 describes movements influencing planning today which seek to improve the urban form and address automobile dependency. These provide the context for the placemaking movement, which will be explained in Section 2.4. Finally, Section 2.5 will analyse in detail the literature on shared spaces.

2.2 Automobile Dependency

Automobile dependency is a concept which has had much attention since the 1970s as concerns about the negative effects of car-oriented urban planning have emerged (Jacobs, 1961; Gakenheimer, 1978; Newman & Kenworthy, 1989). Automobile dependent cities are associated with high levels of per capita vehicle travel, vehicle-oriented planning and reduced transport alternatives (Litman, 1999). Automobile dependency is an outcome of the interdependent relationship between transportation and land use in cities. Giuliano (2004) explains that:

The characteristics of the transportation system determine accessibility, or the ease of moving from one place to another. Accessibility in turn affects the location of activities, or the land use pattern. The location of activities… affects daily activity patterns, which in turn result in travel patterns. These travel patterns… affect the transportation system. (p. 239)

This relationship of the transportation system, shown in Figure 2, is part of the larger urban system which includes people, institutions and infrastructure. Therefore, transportation affects the way people in cities live their lives.
The origins of the ‘automobile city’ are mostly associated with the growth in private vehicle ownership in the United States in the mid-20th Century and a number of other factors. Prior to the 1950s, public transport systems were successfully run in the private domain, and suburbs grew along transportation routes (Frumkin et al., 2004; Schiller et al., 2010). Government policies to improve road infrastructure and promote vehicle ownership began from the 1920s (Frumkin et al., 2004). The uninhibited movement of vehicles allowed suburban growth to occur further away from city cores, and at lower densities (Schiller et al., 2010). In 1934, the Federal Housing Administration was formed and created mortgage policies which enabled more people to own homes in suburbs, and promoted single-family dwellings (Frumkin et al., 2004). From the 1950s, suburban development and the construction of highways rapidly increased, and the zoning policies which separated industrial, commercial, retail and residential activities created a reliance on private vehicles to travel increasingly long distances (Frumkin et al., 2004).

The mutually dependent relationship between land use and transportation is apparent. Car-oriented planning created land use activities dependent on vehicles for their access. As Muller (2004) puts it, “suddenly the automobile was no longer a luxury or a recreational diversion: it

Figure 2: The transportation-land use relationship. Source: (Giuliano, 2004, p. 239)
quickly became a necessity for communicating, shopping, and socializing” (p. 75). Car-oriented planning has had such a significant impact on how people in cities live their lives, Frumkin et al. (2004) argue that “an entire culture grew up around the automobile” (p. 41). This ‘car culture’ which continues to exist today, as explained by Schiller et al. (2010), is reinforced through media, advertising, entertainment, vehicle-dependent tourist activities, and ‘carchitecture’, the ways in which buildings are designed to accommodate cars and show their features to passing motorists. The ‘car culture’ sustains automobile dependency.

While automobile dependency is mostly evident in the United States, Australian cities are also highly automobile dependent (Newman, 1996; Schiller et al., 2010). Additionally, car-oriented planning is now seen as ‘conventional’ in the United Kingdom and Canada (Schiller et al., 2010), and increasingly in Asian (Barter, 2000) and Middle Eastern (Elsheshtawy & Al Bastaki, 2011; Al-Fouzan, 2012) cities. A large proportion of local, state and federal government expenditure is allocated towards the building and operating of highways, and yet traffic congestion continues to be one of the most important issues in cities (Johnston, 2004). Car-oriented planning across the world benefits people who have access to private vehicles by providing unprecedented mobility. It has brought about economic benefits. However, as described above, the land use and transportation relationship affects urban life, and a range of problems are associated with automobile dependency.

2.2.1 Problems with Automobile Dependency in Cities

The primary arguments which defend public policies for car-oriented planning are the stimulation of economic growth, and meeting the preferences of people to travel with convenience, comfort and privacy (Litman, 1999). These benefits are direct and internal to vehicle users, and do not reflect the significance of the negative impacts of car-oriented planning. With an increasing focus on sustainable transport in the literature (Turton & Knowles, 1998; Newman & Kenworthy, 1999; Schiller et al., 2010), the problems with automobile dependency are becoming more apparent. The environmental, economic and social impacts are summarised in Table 1.
Table 1: Problems associated with automobile dependency. Source: (Schiller et al., 2010, p. 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental problems</th>
<th>Economic problems</th>
<th>Social problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High greenhouse gases – global warming</td>
<td>Congestion costs</td>
<td>Loss of street life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photochemical smog</td>
<td>High urban infrastructure costs for sewers, water mains, roads, etc.</td>
<td>Loss of community in neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid rain</td>
<td>Loss of productive rural land</td>
<td>Loss of public safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater stormwater runoff problems</td>
<td>Loss of urban land to pavement</td>
<td>Isolation in remote suburbs with few amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic problems: noise, neighbourhood severance, visual intrusion, physical danger</td>
<td>Economic and human costs of transportation, accident trauma and death</td>
<td>Access problems for those without cars or access to cars and those with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High proportion of city wealth spent on passenger transportation</td>
<td>Anti-social behaviour due to boredom in car-dependent suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public health costs from air and other pollution</td>
<td>Enforced car ownership for lower-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health costs from growing obesity due to sedentary auto lifestyles</td>
<td>Physical and mental health problems related to lack of physical activity in isolated suburbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As displayed in Table 1, the primary environmental problems are the emission of greenhouse gases which contribute to climate change, and the release of pollutants such as carbon monoxide, volatile hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides which create smog. While the construction and maintenance costs are generally overt, there are hidden economic costs such as the loss of productive land. Furthermore, many of the impacts of automobile dependency are interrelated. For example, air pollution has health consequences which are costly for public health systems. Additionally, noise, visual intrusion and danger can affect mental health and cause a loss of street life.
2.2.2 Conventional Street Design

Street design is both a result of and a contributor to automobile dependency. Firstly, traffic congestion is a significant issue faced by governments who have become reliant on the movement of people and goods for economic growth (Johnston, 2004). Traffic engineering has particularly influenced how roads and highways have been constructed to efficiently and safely get motor vehicles from one point to another (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b). The underlying principle for policymakers in achieving this has been traffic segregation. The Buchanan report (Buchanan, 1963) is widely identified as the driver for policies in the United Kingdom to separate motorised vehicles from pedestrians on routes with high volumes of vehicles for pedestrian safety (Ben-Joseph, 1995; Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a; Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b; Shearer, 2011). Traffic management measures for facilitating faster movement of vehicles include the construction of complex intersections, the widening of carriageways and addition of lanes (Turton & Knowles, 1998), and the utilising of traffic islands and road markings. Higher speeds have meant that it is necessary to segregate pedestrians from motor vehicles, using footpaths, underpasses and designated pedestrian crossings, for their safety.

Secondly, as streets have been designed as a result of automobile dependency, they have consequently helped maintain automobile dependency. In cities which have been shaped by car-oriented planning, poor quality pedestrian infrastructure makes it difficult to walk and people must depend on vehicles to get around (Schiller et al., 2010). Figure 3 shows a street designed for vehicles, with a wide carriageway and multiple lanes, large signs which can be seen from a distance and plenty of car parking for adjacent businesses. Additionally, there are no footpaths and few places where pedestrians can cross the street. Such street designs are also found in Australia, contributing to automobile dependency (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012).
2.3 Rethinking the Urban Form

Several theories and movements to address the impacts of automobile dependency have developed over the past few decades. These include Smart Growth, the Compact City and Transit Oriented Development. Smart Growth, or the Compact City as it is known in the British literature, promotes urban intensification by creating limits to urban growth (Jenks et al., 1996; Dieleman & Wegener, 2004). Transit Oriented Development is a model where high-density, mixed-use activities, including residential living, are designed around public transport stations (Cervero & Sullivan, 2012). New Urbanism encompasses these theories and will be discussed in more detail in the following Subsection. More recent notions around Sustainable Urbanism will be discussed in Subsection 2.3.2. These movements focus on urban form, whereas the Reclaiming the Streets movement, described in Subsection 2.3.3, is concerned with rights to the public realm.

2.3.1 New Urbanism

New Urbanism is a movement which began in the 1980s in the United States as a reaction to the prevailing low-density, automobile dependent patterns of urban development (Fulton,
1996), also known as ‘urban sprawl’. It aims to mitigate the environmental, economic and social costs associated with automobile dependency and create sustainable and liveable cities (Fulton, 1996; New Urbanism, 2014). Key principles include walkability, connectivity, mixed land-use, quality architecture and urban design, increased density and the greater use of public transport (New Urbanism, 2014). Accordingly, new urbanism promotes the traditional urban form designed for people rather than for vehicles. New Urbanism also promotes citizen participation and housing affordability (Fulton, 1996). The movement continues to influence urban planning in Australia and New Zealand, highlighted by the formation of the Australian Council for New Urbanism (ANCU, 2014), and the incorporation of New Urbanism principles into the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (Ministry for the Environment, 2005).

Critiques of New Urbanism largely surround the notion of intensification and mixed-use development. For example, Neuman (2005) questions whether high-density neighbourhoods are any more healthy and sustainable than sprawling neighbourhoods due to pollution from overcrowding, and factors other than design which can influence car use, such as specialised employment, unique shopping or weekend travel. Fulford (1996) argues that mixed-use development is unviable as people have negative connotations with living next to industrial facilities, and often industrial and commercial sites require access to important transport routes, like motorways, which are unsuitable in residential areas. Similarly, New Urbanism is seen by some to ignore consumer preferences for private vehicles and suburban living (Ellis, 2002).

### 2.3.2 Sustainable Urbanism

Sustainable Urbanism is a more contemporary movement which has developed in tandem with New Urbanism. Similar movements include the Eco City movement, Resilient Cities and Green Urbanism. Sustainable Urbanism is defined as “walkable and transit-served urbanism integrated with high performance buildings and high-performance infrastructure” with density and human access to nature, or biophilia as its key principles (Farr, 2012, p. 42). More broadly, Haas (2012) argues that it is a framework for architecture, urban planning and urban design with an emphasis on issues of sustainability, resilience, human health and safety, ecosystem dependency, natural resource management, permaculture, green building and eco-tech design, environmental justice, accessibility and mobility and green economic growth. It is about a sustainable urban system rather than design. For example, Farr (2012) states a green
building is not positive for the environment if it is surrounded by a large parking lot. The objectives of shared spaces should be considered in this wider context of sustainable urbanism.

2.3.3 Reclaim the Streets

The Reclaim the Streets movement is generally acknowledged to have begun as an activist movement in London in the mid-1990s. It consisted of a series of street parties which took over particular roads as protests against car-oriented planning (Wall, 1999). However, it shifted its focus towards anti-capitalism (Jordan, 2014). A key aspect of the Reclaim the Streets movement was Lefebvre’s (1991) idea of ‘the right to the city’, an argument against planning measures which restricted the ability to participate in social interaction in public spaces. As Hamilton-Baillie (2008b) explains:

The streets and public spaces that make up the public realm of our cities, towns and villages have always had to serve a multitude of purposes essential to our social, cultural and economic needs. Principally these purposes fall into two broad categories; those associated with movement and transport, and those associated with social exchange and interaction. The balance between these two complementary functions, and the nature, design and use of the public realm, appears to both reflect and determine our social values, and radically affect our activity patterns and behaviour. (p. 131)

Transport policies, rules and regulations highlight the increased government control over the design of streets and human behaviour within these environments (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b).

Proponents of the Reclaim the Streets movement, such as Engwicht (1993, 1999) have proposed innovative ways of transforming city and residential streets into more people-friendly, rather than car-oriented, environments. An example of a project driven by the idea of reclaiming the street is Intersection Repair. This began in Portland, Oregon in 1996 and involved neighbourhood residents painting a large mural across the street and holding street parties with temporary furniture to create a public space (Silberberg et al., 2013; City Repair, 2014). Figure 4 portrays an example of an Intersection Repair undertaken in Davis, California. In addition to promoting people-friendly streets over vehicle dominance, the Reclaim the Streets movement is similar to the Placemaking movement which promotes community-constructed public spaces. Placemaking will be covered in the following section.
2.4 Placemaking

Placemaking is a movement which seeks to improve public spaces in towns and cities by involving the local community in the design, to create places which are welcoming to citizens, facilitate social interaction and are aesthetically pleasing. Project for Public Spaces is an organisation which assists communities with placemaking projects, and initiated the Placemaking Leadership Council which has members worldwide dedicated to best-practice placemaking, including in Adelaide (Project for Public Spaces, 2013). Placemaking is having an impact in cities such as San Francisco, Vancouver, Melbourne, Stockholm and Singapore (Kent, 2014). This Section will address the concept of place before discussing the ideals of placemaking. Finally, Subsection 2.4.3 will explain the main method of evaluating public places.

2.4.1 Place

The concept of ‘place’ is elaborate, and has been explored in many disciplines, including human geography, planning, architecture, philosophy and ecology (Cresswell, 2004). The
simple definition is that places are spaces which people have made meaningful and are attached to (Cresswell, 2004). Agnew (1987) identifies the three fundamental aspects of place as location, locale and sense of place. Location refers to the fact that a place is always located somewhere, although not always geographically. The locale is the material setting or the visual form. Finally, sense of place refers to the subjective and emotional attachment people have to the place. For example, an office in a building is a space. For the person working there, it has a location: the fifth floor of a particular building on the university campus. The office has desks, chairs, books and coffee cups which create the material setting. These factors, along with the work which is undertaken and the people who share the office, help to make the space meaningful to the person, and it is thought of as a place – in this case a place of work.

The extensiveness of the term is largely debated in the literature. The notions of ownership, connection and belonging are often suggested by the term ‘place’ (Cresswell, 2004). This is highlighted by the way place is used in the non-geographical sense, for example “the place of art in social life, [and] the place of men in society” (Harvey, 1996, p. 208). The individual experience is an important component of place. As Price (2013) explains:

The uniqueness of place is such that no two people will have exactly the same experience of place. Seen as a collectively generated entity, place is frequently portrayed as a weaving together of diverse individual experiences, and as such having a textural dimensionality. (p. 122)

While places are spaces given an identity by people, Sundstrom (2003) argues that individual and collective identities are, in turn, shaped by places in a “looping effect” (p. 90). As such, places are a way of understanding what connections people have with a space and who they may be because of that (Cresswell, 2004). The placemaking movement realises the importance of place for human experience and social interaction.

2.4.2 The Placemaking Movement

Placemaking refers more specifically to creating places in the built environment. From the 1960s, concerns about auto-centric planning and bad public spaces began to emerge, as insights into human-scale movement and social interaction in the built environment were made. Influential works include Lynch’s *The Image of the City* (1960), which presented
empirical research on how individuals navigate the urban landscape, and Jacobs’ *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) which described the interaction between people in her home of Greenwich Village. Jacobs (1961) argues that for pedestrian safety and wellbeing, protection and civic trust comes from other people’s “eyes on the street” (p. 45). These works were fundamental in illustrating the link between the built environment and social wellbeing.

A large body of literature now surrounds the importance of public spaces for social wellbeing, from various disciplines including public health, sociology, and psychology. Well-designed public spaces facilitate social interactions. These interactions can be incidental and brief or intentional and lengthy, and between people who know each other or between strangers (Wolf & Rozance, 2013). Whyte’s (1980) term ‘triangulation’ explains “the process by which some external stimulus provides a linkage between people and prompts strangers to talk to other strangers as if they knew each other” (p. 94). ‘Social friction’ describes the resulting interaction between different groups of people who would not otherwise meet (Silberberg et al., 2013). Additionally, public spaces can allow people to display their culture and identities and subsequently learn awareness of diversity and difference (Worpole & Knox, 2007). These factors help individuals feel accepted by others and builds trust between people in a community, effectively creating a sense of place, which helps build social cohesion and social capital (Wolf & Rozance, 2013). Social capital is explained by Stone and Hughes (2002) as “networks of social relations which are characterised by norms of trust and reciprocity and which lead to outcomes of mutual benefit” (p. 62). Thus, communities benefit from increased social cohesion and capital.

While placemaking is sometimes viewed as an urban design technique to provide works of public art which provide meaning and connection to a site (Fleming, 2007), others reinforce that placemaking is about the involvement of the local community in public space design and management (Project for Public Spaces, 2014b). This follows Jacobs’ (1961) assertion that the real life functioning of city neighbourhoods is understood by the people who live and work there. Similarly, Jacobs and Appleyard (1987) argue:

While we have concentrated on defining physical characteristics of a good city fabric, the process of creating it is crucial...It is through this involvement in the creation and management of their city that citizens are most likely to identify with it and, conversely, to enhance their own sense of identity and control. (p. 120)
Placemaking recognises the benefits to be derived from social cohesion and social capital associated with effective public spaces where people have a sense of place, including improved health and wellbeing, and lower incidence of conflict and crime (Wood & Giles-Corti, 2008).

Silberberg et al. (2013) argue that in addition to the benefits resulting from good places, communities benefit from the process of placemaking, through acts such as advocating for change, questioning regulations, finding funding, and mobilising others to contribute their voices. Consequently, it empowers citizens and builds social capital. Furthermore, the process of placemaking creates a “virtuous cycle” whereby “communities transform places, which in turn transform communities, and so on” (Silberberg et al., 2013, p. 3). This reinforces that placemaking is not only a tool to improve public spaces but an overarching idea to build community capacity.

The form and focus of placemaking projects varies beyond one-off permanent improvements to public spaces. Corona Plaza in Queens, New York was a project undertaken by the Department of Transportation in 2012, where moveable furniture and other temporary features allowed the designers to observe how people used it, for a range of events to be undertaken and for the community to subsequently envision the permanent design of the space (Silberberg et al., 2013). TAXI is an ongoing, developer-led placemaking initiative to regenerate a neighbourhood in Denver, where the developer has built trust with the business community over a decade (Peterson, 2014).

In contrast, some projects are simply to activate a public space to raise awareness of the ability to occupy and benefit from public space, such as ‘21 Balançoires’ (21 Swings) in Montreal, Canada. Illustrated in Figure 5, these swings were installed along a street as public art and each swing plays a recorded tune which creates a song when other people are also swinging (Daily Tous Les Jours, 2014). Called ‘tactical urbanism’, ‘tactical placemaking’ ‘guerrilla urbanism’ or ‘DIY placemaking’ (Pape, 2012), these placemaking initiatives are often undertaken by members of the public without any official permission. One example is yarn bombing, where ‘graffiti knitters’ target features of the urban landscape such as fences and poles and knit artwork onto them (Peterson, 2014). Such initiatives demonstrate how inexpensive, temporary and community-created projects can build a sense of place (Pape, 2012).
Table 2 outlines the key principles of placemaking. In brief, successful placemaking requires the community to adopt the planning, design and management of the public space. Furthermore, short-term, inexpensive and creative installations can be effective, yet placemaking is a long-term process of building community ownership of a place.
Table 2: 11 principles for creating great community places. Source: (Project for Public Spaces, 2014a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The community is the expert</td>
<td>Community members can provide historical perspective, insights into how area functions, understanding of the issues and what is meaningful to people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create a place, not a design</td>
<td>Physical elements should make people feel welcome and comfortable, and should have effective relationships with surrounding activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Look for partners</td>
<td>Partners like local institutions, museums and schools can ensure the success of the place by providing ongoing support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You can see a lot just by observing</td>
<td>Look at how people use public spaces and find out what they like to assess what makes them work or not work. Need to continue to observe after improvement to see how the place evolves in order to manage it over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have a vision</td>
<td>A vision which comes out of the community should highlight what kinds of activities might be happening, that the space should be comfortable and that it should be an important place where people want to be. Additionally, the vision should instil a sense of pride in the people who live and work there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Start with the slogan: lighter, quicker, cheaper</td>
<td>Experiment with short term improvements that can be tested and refined. Seating, outdoor cafes, public art, community gardens and murals are examples which can be completed in a short time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Triangulate</td>
<td>In a public space, the choice and arrangement of different elements in relation to each other can bring people together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. They always say “it can’t be done”</td>
<td>By starting small-scale with the community, small improvements can help overcome obstacles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Form supports function</td>
<td>Input from community and partners about how places function advises what form you need to accomplish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Money is not the issue</td>
<td>Costs should be viewed more broadly and compared with the benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You are never finished</td>
<td>Be open to respond to the needs, opinions and changes of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the key challenges to placemaking is traditional governance models. Local government processes are generally top-down and problem-focused, with layers of regulations which make community-driven placemaking projects difficult to implement (Silberberg et al., 2013). Kent (2014) contends that a place-led governance model is necessary to create successful places throughout a city. Place-led governance involves all government departments to be organised around the goal of creating great places by facilitating and enabling communities to take responsibility and ownership for public spaces (Silberberg et al., 2013).

The placemaking literature focusses on community participation without discussing the complexity of the term ‘community’. It appears that it is used with the common definition, that of “a group of people who share a geographic area and are bound together by common culture, values, race or social class” (Pacione, 2009, p. 376). However, rather than being place-bound, communities can be based on religion, nationalism, ethnicity, lifestyles and gender, allowing people to belong to more than one community (Delanty, 2003). Furthermore, Delanty (2003) asserts that in a globalised world, they can transcend local and national boundaries. Ideas of belonging, identity and political action have shaped the discourse on community (Delanty, 2003). An understanding of this concept will be important in critiquing references to the ‘community’ in Adelaide’s placemaking.

2.4.3 Evaluating Public Places

Project for Public Spaces (2014c) have developed a method for evaluating a public space to determine if it is successful as a place. The Place Diagram, shown in Figure 6, identifies four key qualities of a successful place: “they are accessible; people are engaged in activities there; the space is comfortable and has a good image; and finally, it is a sociable place: one where people meet each other and take people when they come to visit” (Project for Public Spaces, 2014c). These key attributes, shown in the inner ring, are represented by a number of intangible qualities in the middle ring. Quantifiable data can be obtained on the characteristics presented in the outer ring.
Despite developments in the study of place attachment in the field of psychology, the placemaking literature does not provide guidance on evaluating the notions of sense of place or place attachment. Reviewing the literature on place attachment, Lewicka (2011) explains that quantitative indicators of place attachment have included length of residence, neighbourhood ties and scales rating residents’ opinions of aspects such as pride about living in the neighbourhood. Such research methods uncover the strength of emotional bonds with places but do not measure what places mean to people, which Lewicka (2011) states has been sought by qualitative methods, such as interviews and map or photo-based exercises. While these measures of place attachment have largely related to homes and neighbourhoods, similar measures could be applied to public spaces.
2.5 Shared Spaces

A shared space is defined as “a street or place accessible to both pedestrians and vehicles that is designed to enable pedestrians to move more freely by reducing traffic management features that tend to encourage users of vehicles to assume priority” (Reid et al., 2009, p. 1). The shared space concept is attributed to the Dutch planner De Boer, who, during the late 1960s, had the idea of levelling residential streets to create the impression of a yard (Ben-Joseph, 1995). Called a ‘woonerf’ (‘residential yard’), the design of the street would slow traffic to better allow children to play in the space (Ben-Joseph, 1995). Since then, shared spaces have been a popular design in residential zones around Europe (Ben-Joseph, 1995), including in the United Kingdom where they are called ‘home zones’ (Biddulph, 2010) and more increasingly in urban activity centres. Typical features of a shared space include a level surface with no kerbs and no road markings. New Road in Brighton, UK is an ideal example of a shared space, illustrated in Figure 7.
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*Figure 7: New Road shared space, Brighton, UK. Source: (Civic Engineers, 2014)*

This Section will explain the philosophy behind shared spaces, before describing the Link and Place classification, which is a method to select suitable streets to be transformed into shared
spaces, employed by Adelaide City Council. Subsection 2.5.3 will detail the primary objectives for shared spaces and Subsection 2.5.4 will summarise the limitations. Subsection 2.5.5 will outline methods for evaluating shared spaces. Finally, the shared space development in the Fort Street area in Auckland will be presented as a case study in Subsection 2.5.6.

2.5.1 The Philosophy of Shared Space

The philosophy of shared space is based on Adams’ (1995) risk compensation theory. This explains that in a situation perceived as dangerous, a person will act in a less risky manner, whereas in a situation perceived as safe, the person will act in a more risky manner. Hamilton-Baillie (2008b) argues that conventional road safety features such as wide lanes and painted centrelines present motorists with a situation perceived as safe so they drive in a more risky manner. Increasing the perceived risk of being in an accident by creating uncertainty about how to act in a shared space, motorists and other users, including pedestrians, behave in a less risky manner and become more aware of their surroundings.

Shared space reflects a reaction to automobile dependency and the associated street design. Transport policies, rules and regulations which have evolved highlight the increased government control over the design of streets and human behaviour within these environments (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b; Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a). Shared spaces attempt to reinstate the street as part of the public realm, allowing free-flowing movement of all street users by way of natural interactions, rather than regulated behaviour (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b).

2.5.2 Determining Streets for Shared Spaces: The Link and Place Classification

Link and Place is a way to classify urban streets based on their ‘link’ and ‘place’ functions. Jones et al. (2007) argue that the Link and Place classification balances the role of the street as a place – a destination where people spend time taking part in activities, as well as its more conventional role as a link – designed for users to pass through quickly and conveniently. Used by local authorities in Australia, including in Adelaide, the United Kingdom and New Zealand, it offers a method for identifying appropriate streets to be transformed into shared spaces (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012).
To classify all streets in a given urban area, Link and Place involves the use of a 5x5 matrix, shown in Figure 8. Link status is shown on the vertical axis in Roman numerals and place status is shown on the horizontal axis in capital letters. A street is classified according to whether it is a major arterial serving traffic at a national level (I), down to residential streets serving local traffic (V). It is also classified according to its function as a place, from those which are nationally significant and serving people who have travelled from beyond the city, to places where local residents or workers visit. For example, a street classified as III-E is a link to people from around a district, while people who use it as a place are from the immediate locality.

Figure 8: The Link and Place matrix for classifying streets. Source: (Jones & Boujenko, 2009, p. 3)

In undertaking the Link and Place approach, it is necessary to establish how status levels are chosen. Table 3 demonstrates the measures used by Adelaide City Council to determine link and place levels for Adelaide’s streets as part of their Smart Move: Transport and Movement Strategy (2012a). Link status is determined by the catchment from which users are arriving and the volume of vehicles. Similarly, the place status is decided by the average distance travelled to reach the street, indicating the catchment of users, and the number of people staying, which includes activities such as sitting, playing sport and outdoor dining (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012). Jones et al. (2007) suggest that additional factors to determine the place status, such as predominant land use and the cultural or historical significance of buildings fronting the street, should be taken into account.
The general understanding of the Link and Place classification is that streets with lower link statuses and higher place statuses are most suited for transforming into shared spaces (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012). The following Subsection, which discusses the outcomes of shared spaces, presents studies which suggest ideal conditions for shared spaces.
2.5.3 Objectives for Shared Spaces

Shared space is wider in its definition than similar terms like ‘woonerven’, ‘home zones’, ‘levelled streets’, ‘naked streets’, ‘complete streets’, ‘civilised streets’ and ‘living streets’. Hamilton-Baillie (2008a; 2008b) asserts that shared space is an approach to designing streets rather than a set of specific guidelines. Therefore, this Subsection discusses the main purposes of creating shared spaces and some of the design features which can – but are not necessary, for achieving them.

*Reduce Vehicle Dominance*

A reduction in speed is one aspect of reducing vehicle dominance. Through research in the United Kingdom, an operating speed of 32km/h has been identified as the highest appropriate speed for a successful shared space (Reid et al., 2009). To legally enforce low speeds in a shared space, there must be regulation signage stating the speed limit (Joyce, 2012). Generally, speed limits are not signposted because the design of the space should influence driver speed (Joyce, 2012).

The levelling of the street and removal of traffic control devices have alone, in some cases, been attributed to reducing vehicle speeds (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a). Additionally, the presence of pedestrians causes drivers to act more vigilant (Reid et al., 2009). However, it is usually in conjunction with other traffic calming measures that speed is effectively reduced. These measures are categorised by Joyce (2012) as visual narrowing, focal points and edge friction. Visual narrowing can be achieved through reducing the perceived width of the surface available for vehicles by the placing of street furniture and vegetation, and differences in paving. Providing many focal points by way of public art or landscaping creates changes in the environment. Examples of edge friction include shop frontages, tree canopies and banners which cross the width of the road. These measures all help to create a more complex environment for drivers to move through, thereby causing more cautious driving behaviour. Psychological traffic calming has benefits over traditional Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) devices like speed bumps and chicanes because these compromise the pedestrian movement of a street and continue to identify the carriageway as vehicle-only (Joyce, 2012).
The transition from a conventional street to a shared space, or the ‘threshold’, should communicate to drivers that they are entering a different kind of environment. In New Zealand, an NZTA regulation ‘Shared Zone’ sign must be in place (Joyce, 2012). As signage should be kept to a minimum and design aspects should instead influence driver behaviour, a change in the surface material, a reduction in the carriageway width, a raised table, or a combination of these are effective thresholds (Joyce, 2012).

Removing on-street car parks is one way of reducing vehicle dominance within shared spaces. Doing so creates more space to be allocated to pedestrian movement or landscape features (National Heart Foundation of Australia, 2011). Joyce (2012) argues against the complete removal of on-street car parking because it can act as edge friction, obstructing drivers’ views. It can also help to ensure initial support for a shared space from business owners (Shearer, 2011).

Reducing the volume of vehicles may or may not be an objective for the design of a shared space, depending on existing traffic flows. This is because a high volume of vehicles will affect the visual amenity of the street and the ability of pedestrians and cyclists to move about in the space. The volume of vehicles should be characterised by the spread of traffic throughout the day, the dependence on the shared space as a through route, and the availability of alternative routes (Joyce, 2012).

**Ease of Pedestrian Movement**

High numbers of pedestrians are desired in a successful shared space. Adjacent land uses that support social activities, such as cafes, pedestrian amenity and streets on pedestrian desire lines are important for attracting high numbers of pedestrians to shared spaces (Joyce, 2012). Many urban shared spaces in the United Kingdom have resulted in increased pedestrian numbers (Reid *et al.*, 2009). Additionally, Hamilton-Baillie (2008a) describes how intersections in Drachten, the Netherlands which were transformed into shared spaces resulted in increased pedestrian activity.

Pedestrians using a large proportion of the space is also a key objective. Levelling the street and limiting design features which create a demarcation between pedestrians and motorists removes physical and psychological barriers to pedestrian movement. A study of a newly created shared space in Norrköping, Sweden found that despite its 13,000 vehicle movements
per day, most pedestrians took a direct route across the middle of the space by negotiating their way with motorists and cyclists (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a). After trials where traffic signals were turned off in the town of Portishead, UK, Firth (2011) found that most motorists gave way to pedestrians and there were reductions in travel times for pedestrians. Similarly, evaluating pedestrian movements across a shared space in Graz, Austria, Schönauer et al. (2012) observed that pedestrians took more direct paths and there was a higher variety of path choice.

However, across urban shared spaces in the United Kingdom, Reid et al. (2009) found that pedestrians gave way to motorists more often than the other way round. Higher vehicle flows were associated with less likelihood of drivers to give way, whereas higher pedestrian flows were associated with more likelihood to give way. Furthermore, Moody and Melia (2013) question the extent to which pedestrians move freely across shared spaces. Rather, the authors found that in the Elwick Square shared space in Ashford, UK, pedestrians tended to cross at the courtesy crossings. Additionally, most motorists did not give way to pedestrians.

**Improve Safety**

Reducing the number of deaths and injuries on roads is a central concern to transport authorities, as highlighted by government-initiated strategies such as New Zealand’s Safer Journeys 2010-2020 (Ministry of Transport, 2010). Shared spaces purportedly reduce the number and severity of accidents involving cars (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012). Studies of residential shared spaces in Europe, Japan and Israel found that the number of accidents was 20% less than conventionally designed streets (Ben-Joseph, 1995). There were fewer accidents following the removal of traffic control at an intersection in Bristol (Firth, 2011). Several studies also show decreases in the number and severity of accidents (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a; Reid et al., 2009). These reductions are generally attributed to lower vehicle speed and volume.

The available evidence is highly contested due to different designs and contexts of shared space projects. For example, there is some evidence that in shared spaces with volumes of over 14,000 vehicles per day, there are increased accident rates (Reid et al., 2009). Evaluating a selection of English Home Zone initiatives, Biddulph (2010) found that there was no significant reduction of accidents. Gerlach et al. (2009) argue that shared spaces in the
Netherlands which were shown to have fewer accidents, were not accident-prone areas to begin with. Accident reports are not reliable indicators as many accidents, especially between pedestrians and cyclists, are not reported (Methorst et al., 2007), and fewer vulnerable people use shared spaces (Imrie, 2012).

The design of shared spaces attempts to make all street users aware of each other’s presence and intended movements to navigate the space safely. The successful ‘sharing’ of a shared space is largely determined by how safe and confident pedestrians feel to move around and occupy the space freely. This enhances the alertness of drivers and cyclists to look out for one another and pedestrians, further increasing safety (Kaparias et al., 2012). However, the unpredictability created through the design of a shared space tends be a cause of concern for the public who can view them as unsafe, creating mixed perceptions of safety. Research on urban intersections in Europe, particularly the Netherlands, suggests an increase in confidence among drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008a). Some residential shared spaces in the United Kingdom (home zones) feel more safe to residents than others (Clayden et al., 2006; Biddulph, 2010), which indicates that different designs influence user perceptions. This is expanded by Kaparias et al. (2012) who found that pedestrians feel most comfortable in shared spaces where there is low vehicular traffic, high pedestrian traffic, good lighting and areas which vehicles cannot occupy. Their study showed that age and gender influence pedestrians’ perceptions of safety. Men tend to be more comfortable than women in shared spaces, and with increasing age, there tends to be a decrease in comfort. Furthermore, drivers are more cautious in the presence of many pedestrians, particularly children and the elderly.

The reduction of crime is one aspect of improving safety with shared spaces. Research on home zones in the United Kingdom shows some reduction in crime, vandalism and antisocial behaviour and the reduced fear of these activities (Clayden et al., 2006; Biddulph, 2010). Despite the lack of evidence for the ability of shared spaces, especially in urban areas, to reduce crime, the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles, promoted in the field of urban design, are easily applicable (Joyce, 2012). These principles are based on a growing body of literature which claims that aspects of environmental design can be effective at preventing crime (Cozens et al., 2005). Principles include safe movement and connections, surveillance and sightlines, clear layouts, mix of activities, sense of ownership and quality environments and are instilled in government guidelines such as the National Guidelines for
A recurring issue is how people with vision impairments, including low vision and blindness, perceive shared spaces as unsafe (Havik et al., 2012; Imrie, 2012). Many groups representing vision-impaired people have expressed concerns over shared spaces. For example, the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association, UK, campaigned against the proposed design of Exhibition Road in London (Joyce, 2012). Kerbs, building edges, signposts and pedestrian crossings all help vision-impaired people navigate a street, as these defining features are noticeable by guide dogs and people using canes. For vision-impaired people, shared spaces, without these conventional street features, are “disabling by design” (Imrie, 2012, p. 2273). The unpredictable movement and close proximity of vehicles and cyclists can be uncomfortable for vision-impaired people and street furniture and vegetation are sometimes viewed as obstacles (Havik et al., 2012). Initially, shared spaces are unfamiliar, and varying designs among shared spaces affect the ability to learn how to use them (Imrie, 2012). People with reduced hearing, people with mobility impairments and people with learning difficulties may experience these problems (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association, 2006).

Feelings of danger have been great enough to prevent some vision-impaired people from returning to particular shared spaces (Imrie, 2012). There are mixed results of how well measures such as tactile paving and colour contrasting have improved these perceptions of danger and unease (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association, 2006; Childs et al., 2010; Havik et al., 2012; Imrie, 2012). These measures for an inclusive design are discussed in more detail in the next section.

While the theory that shared space design increases user awareness, reducing accident risk, is sound, the evidence is not. Where the design of shared spaces has resulted in slower speeds and fewer vehicles, fewer accidents occur, yet there are still questions over the change in the number of accidents in shared spaces with high volumes of vehicles. User perceptions of safety following the implementation of shared spaces are mixed. The design of shared spaces can contribute to a reduction in crime and the perception of crime. Shared spaces rely on changes in user behaviour, primarily confidence of pedestrians and cyclists to move about freely, and all users, particularly drivers, to be more cautious. However, as Methorst et al. (2007) explain, the design approach assumes that everyone can recognise risk and act
accordingly. It relies on people to have adequate sensory and cognitive perception for visual interaction (Imrie, 2012).

**Inclusive Design**

The shared space approach is a reaction to how streets have conventionally been highly exclusive of pedestrians, people who cannot drive or afford to own a vehicle, and people who choose to use a non-motorised form of transport. As such an inclusive design is an important objective of a shared space. It contrasts with pedestrianisation which prevents public transport, delivery vehicles and sometimes cyclists and other forms of non-motorised transport like skateboarding or rollerblading. In addition to being inclusive of pedestrians through lower vehicle speed and volume, shared spaces attempt to be inclusive of all street users.

A ‘comfort space’, ‘safe space’ or ‘safe zone’ is one way in which to address people who feel vulnerable sharing the street with vehicles. A comfort space is an area adjacent to the building line, where the footpath would be on a conventional street, which is unable to be entered by vehicles. Street furniture and landscaping can be used to act as a barrier to vehicles (Joyce, 2012), as shown in Figure 9. The inclusion of these in shared spaces is derived from concerns from people who do not feel comfortable being in the presence of vehicles, particularly people with disabilities (Reid et al., 2009). However, as Havik et al. (2012) note, it is important that “they still facilitate a sharing of the larger part of the street area by users who feel comfortable to do so” (p. 144).
Figure 9: Comfort space on New Road, Brighton. Source: (Joyce, 2012, p. 13)

However, the comfort space needs to be indicated by a surface which is detectable by vision-impaired people, but is not an obstacle for mobility-impaired people (Childs et al., 2010). A surface which is too rough or has a significant height difference can be difficult for people in wheelchairs and people with walking problems to pass over. A study undertaken by University College London explored the detectability of a range of surfaces by vision-impaired people and the impacts on mobility-impaired people (Childs et al., 2010). Surfaces included sloped kerbs at different heights, blister paving, corduroy paving and guidance paving. An agreed solution which emerged is an 800mm wide corduroy strip located adjacent to a 230mm drainage channel which provides a contrasting colour from the surrounding paving (Joyce, 2012). An example of this type of navigational strip is illustrated in Figure 10.
Figure 10: 800mm wide corduroy paving strip located adjacent to a 230mm drainage channel on Exhibition Road, London. Source: (Freeman, 2014)

While the provision of parking is largely discouraged in shared space designs, some parking may be appropriate, particularly for mobility-impaired people (Joyce, 2012). This is because people with mobility impairments often depend on the use of a private vehicle or a taxi with a hoist to enable them to participate in everyday activities (Department of Building and Housing & Barrier Free New Zealand Trust, 2008). Accessible parking spaces are enabling for people with a wide range of mobility impairments, including chronic illnesses, brain injuries and intellectual disabilities, not just people who rely on wheelchairs (Tait, 2014). Loading to service properties in shared spaces is usually allowed but not explicitly provided for, and does not seem to create any significant effects (Joyce, 2012). Accessible parking and loading zones for trade and delivery vehicles should be considered for a more inclusive design.

Cycling is acknowledged to be a healthy and environmentally-friendly alternative to driving, and as such, should be encouraged by the design of shared spaces. In the Netherlands, there is increased conflict between cyclists and pedestrians (Gerlach et al., 2009), presumably due to high numbers of cyclists. Schemes in the United Kingdom show an increase of cyclists with a reduction in vehicles (Reid et al., 2009). Therefore, vehicle volume needs to be considered for
the successful inclusion of cyclists in a shared space. Where high numbers of cyclists are present, comfort spaces may reduce conflict with pedestrians. Joyce (2012) suggests that connectivity to surrounding cycle networks and the provision of cycle parking should be considered. Finally, cyclists may be concerned about the street surface and other design features, as highlighted by concerns in Shrewsbury, UK about the granite paving being uncomfortable and slippery for cyclists (Reid et al., 2009).

Economic Regeneration

A study commissioned by the Heart Foundation South Australia (2011) found that there is more retail expenditure in streets which are pedestrian and cycle friendly due to higher numbers of pedestrians and longer staying times. A large proportion of shoppers tend to be local residents and workers, and the need for car parking for people travelling from further afield is largely overestimated by retailers. Additionally, in pedestrian and cycle friendly streets, pedestrians and cyclists spend more per month than motorists.

Studies in London show that high quality streets attract higher retail rental values and increase the values of nearby residential property, compared to poor quality streets (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, 2007b; National Heart Foundation of Australia, 2011). The characteristics which make these streets high quality include ease of pedestrian movement, low vehicle speeds, levelled surfaces, high-quality materials, and a sense of security.

The reduction, or even complete removal, of car parking in shared spaces can lead to economic benefits. This is because the large amount of space required for both off-street parking lots and on-street kerbside parking has high opportunity costs. Space used for on-street parking, can be better used as bus lanes, cycle parking or additional footpath width (National Heart Foundation of Australia, 2011). Such measures further increase pedestrian and cycle activity and enhance the quality of the street, which as shown above, increases retail expenditure and property values. Off-street parking uses space which could otherwise be used for retail or commercial buildings. Off-street car parking is often not economically viable because it incurs high construction costs which are passed on to the consumer, it generally gathers lower revenue than other land uses, and is even shown to devalue the land (Leung, 2013). A shared space which is pedestrian and cycle friendly reduces the requirement for
businesses and other adjacent land uses to have off-street parking. Therefore, there is no cost to local authorities, developers, residents and business owners of providing parking in a shared space and more land can be better invested in.

Indirect and long-term economic benefits can be reaped from improved public health (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, 2007b; South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012). Shared spaces which facilitate and encourage walking and cycling can reduce levels of driving, increasing physical activity and reducing pollution, which are highlighted in Section 2.2 as problems associated with automobile dependency. Furthermore, long-term economic benefits to society can be gained from reduced levels of crime and damage.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the cost of constructing a shared space to determine whether it has provided a net economic benefit. The cost is affected by the extent a street is changed, the materials used and the on-going maintenance costs, however, higher spending does not necessarily result in a more successful shared space (Biddulph, 2010). Ben-Joseph (1995) explains that paving is more expensive than asphalt, the conventional road surface material, but longer-lasting. Thus, he suggests that constructing shared spaces is cheaper than conventional streets. Research comparing construction costs to the economic benefits discussed above is insufficient as many occur over a long time and are not measurable.

**Enhance Amenity and Sense of Place**

Enhancing amenity and creating a sense of place are primary objectives of shared spaces. Shared space, for Hamilton-Baillie (2008b), is an opportunity to improve the quality of the public realm, and subsequently improve public health. Improving the amenity of a shared space is subjective and difficult to measure, but is largely related to reducing vehicle dominance, including good quality materials in the design, and providing street furniture, art and landscaping to create a more pleasant environment (Joyce, 2012).

There are aspects of shared spaces which can contribute to enhancing amenity and creating a sense of place. A level surface allows for a more flexible space, which can be used for events like street markets (Joyce, 2012). Additionally, as design regulations, such as specific carriageway and footpath widths, road markings and the provision of car parking, are
removed, there are more opportunities to reflect local identity through creative design (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012).

People generally view shared spaces as improvements of the street environment. This is evident among residents in home zones in the United Kingdom (Clayden *et al.*, 2006; Biddulph, 2010), and users of shared spaces in activity areas in the Netherlands and Sweden (Reid *et al.*, 2009). Research on several UK shared space schemes found that:

Many pedestrian respondents raised the issue of improved visual amenity without prompting. They referred to, for example, the “feel and look of new surface materials”, “lights in the seating” (where a lighting scheme was part of the design), “wider, open space”, “pleasant atmosphere” etc. (Reid *et al.*, 2009, p. 20)

The design of shared spaces can enhance the visual amenity of the street environment which all users enjoy. While the shared space literature attributes attractiveness to sense of place, Section 2.4 shows that placemaking is more complex and requires healthy communities to contrive public spaces into places where they have a sense of belonging and which help to identify them. Hence, the purpose of this thesis is to explore how placemaking can be better achieved for shared spaces.

2.5.4 Limitations

There are several limitations to the creation of successful shared spaces. Hamilton-Baillie (2008b) states that the major limitation is the lack of connection between urban designers and transport engineers or planners. Their functions are often separated, and with no collaboration, the full range of objectives for shared spaces may not be met (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b). In addition to misunderstandings among the professionals, the public often has an attitude of “scepticism and ambivalence about the often counter-intuitive outcomes of shared space” (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b, p. 138). This can make it difficult for public involvement in the planning process. Issues around safety and liability for local authorities can also present a barrier to shared space implementation (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012). Finally, uncertainty around the planning process and the required standards and approvals to be met is a limitation, as discussed further in Chapter Five.
2.5.5 Case Study: Fort Street Area, Auckland, New Zealand

As Subsection 2.5.3 has provided evidence from overseas examples for the desired outcomes of shared spaces, the Fort Street area in Auckland provides an ideal case study. It is a recent example of a shared space within an urban setting in New Zealand. This case study is in reference to a report prepared for the Auckland Council (Auckland Transport & Ascari Partners, 2012) which evaluates the first stage of the upgrade, completed in September 2011. This stage involved the construction of three shared spaces, Jean Batten Place, Fort Lane and Fort Street between Queen and Commerce streets. Evaluations of the next two stages, which involved the creation of a shared space on Fort Street between Gore Street and Customs Street East and several other street upgrades in the area, completed in 2013, have not yet been done. Figure 11 displays Fort Street before and after the upgrade.

Prior to 2011, despite being set in the middle of the central business district (CBD) near restaurants, shops and facilities, the area was perceived as rundown and neglected. It was identified in 2008 by Auckland City Council (now Auckland Council) under the Auckland’s CBD: Into the Future strategy as having potential to become a more attractive and people-friendly street environment. The Fort Street area upgrade was implemented with the objectives of:

- Creating areas that are attractive to pedestrians.
- Providing high-quality streetscapes where people can visit, spend time and shop.
- Establishing distinct destinations that offer diverse street activities.
- Building better pedestrian environments.
- Reducing vehicles and slowing vehicle speeds.
- Improving safety (traffic and personal).
- Improving economic performance.

These shared spaces were designed with a level paved surface and no traffic control devices, except for the regulatory ‘shared zone’ signs at the entry and exit points. They feature a 1.8m accessible zone along the length of the street adjacent to the building edge, defined by tactile paving. This is a space free from vehicles, street furniture and vegetation to allow for easier and safer movement for people with visual and mobility impairments. They also feature an
activity zone, which is an area designated for fixed activities, outdoor dining, trees, street furniture and parking for loading vehicles. Loading is only allowed between 6am and 11am.

Figure 11: Fort Street from Queen Street looking east, before (above) and after (below) shared space upgrade. Source: (Skyscraper City, 2012)

User perceptions and data on pedestrian and vehicle numbers before and after the upgrade revealed successful results. Pedestrian numbers increased and most users perceived the new shared spaces as more attractive, easier to walk around in and safer spaces in which to spend
time. A large proportion of drivers (41%) did not feel comfortable sharing the space with pedestrians. This is an intended outcome as uncertainty should create more cautious driver behaviour and slower speeds. There has been an increase in the number of permits issued for outdoor dining areas and for events, indicating greater activity occurring. Vehicle numbers have decreased and speeds are slower, particularly in peak pedestrian times. No reports of accidents were recorded in the assessed period after construction. Initial data shows an increase in consumer spending in the area. Moreover, business and property owners generally value being adjacent to a shared space. However, the report explains that it is too early to determine economic performance from changes in building vacancies and rents.

2.5.6 Evaluating Shared Spaces

Studies of shared spaces have tended to focus on evaluating particular elements, such as pedestrian movement, and in specific sites, as shown in Subsection 2.5.3. Yet there is little guidance on evaluating the performance of shared spaces more generally. This Subsection describes two standardised methods to evaluate shared spaces.

Andrews (2009 as cited in South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012) suggests a scoring system for rating the extent to which a street, or proposed design, is shared (Table 4). This system contains a selection of design criteria which are given are number of points. A shared space can be assessed in terms of the total number of points received. While it can be used to determine ease of pedestrian movement and the presence of design elements which enhance amenity, it does not evaluate the participation in staying activities or social interaction.

By contrast, Karndacharuk et al. (2013) propose the use of a performance evaluation framework which captures the success of a shared space for meeting the objectives of placemaking, a pedestrian focus, vehicle behaviour change, economic impetus and safety for all users. To evaluate a shared space, quantitative data and qualitative data is gathered. Quantitative data is collected on key performance indicators of these objectives. These indicators and the methods for measuring them are summarised in Table 5.
Table 4: Scoring system for establishing the extent to which a street, or proposed design, is shared. Source: (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012, p. A27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absence of kerbs or Low kerbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absence of demarcation (other than kerbs, eg. stormwater gully)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No contrasting surface colours or Subtle contrasting surface colours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Presence of cafes or stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Presence of benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greenery/landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Street art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absence of formal crossing points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absence of road markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absence of traffic lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absence of bollards or Few bollards only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Absence of any guard railing/pedestrian fencing/planters to delineate road users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Free standing lamps (rather than to delineate road users)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High pedestrian flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low vehicular flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Quantitative key performance indicators of shared spaces. Source: (Karndacharuk et al., 2013, p. 56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking</td>
<td>Pedestrian occupancy ratio</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Video survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User dwell time</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>Video survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian focus</td>
<td>Pedestrian density</td>
<td>p/m²</td>
<td>Video survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian trajectory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Video survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle behaviour change</td>
<td>Motor vehicle speed</td>
<td>km/h</td>
<td>Traffic counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor vehicle volume</td>
<td>veh/h</td>
<td>Traffic counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impetus</td>
<td>Active frontage</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User accessing adjacent land use</td>
<td>ped/h/m</td>
<td>Video survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for all users</td>
<td>User conflict</td>
<td># of conflicts</td>
<td>Video survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reported crash history</td>
<td># of crashes</td>
<td>CAS database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative data is collected by gaining shared space user perceptions on whether a shared space meets the objectives. An on-street survey seeks to measure participants’ opinion towards the following five statements:

1. ‘I like spending time in this street.’
2. ‘I can freely move around on the street.’
3. ‘Driver behaviour is appropriate in this street.’
4. ‘This street complements the economic activity.’
5. ‘I feel safe and secure in this street.’

Participants rate these statements using a 6-point Likert rating scale, ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. This framework can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of shared spaces in meeting a wider range of objectives.

The quantitative measures give an indication of the extent to which a shared space is pedestrian-friendly and the extent to which people are spending time in the space. The opinion of street users on how much they like spending time in the street can portray the enjoyment of a space but not attachment, sense of belonging and how users identify the space, which are more fundamental characteristics of a place.

2.6 Conclusion

This Chapter has provided an in-depth analysis and critique of the literature on shared spaces to establish the research problem. Shared spaces provide an opportunity to create a place, in addition to having a movement function, yet shared space research does not adequately cover the concept of place. Therefore, there is a gap in the literature on how a placemaking approach can be applied to improve the function of a shared space as a place. The Literature Review has explored international literature on placemaking to establish the current understanding of this planning approach. Additionally, this Literature Review has examined the background issues relating to placemaking and shared spaces, which has formed a theoretical framework for this thesis. Finally, this Chapter has helped to develop the thesis’ primary data collection methods, which will be explained in the following Chapter.
Chapter 3: Research Methods

3.1 Introduction

To investigate how placemaking can improve the outcome of shared spaces in urban areas, this study used a mixed methods research approach. This Chapter will expand on the research approach and explain why Adelaide was chosen as a case study. It will then develop the research approach to describe the secondary research undertaken and the methods of primary data collection, transformation and analysis. It will also examine the limitations of these research methods.

3.1.1 Research Approach

A mixed methods research approach seeks both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data was collected through a street video survey and a street design checklist. Qualitative data was collected through key informant interviews with a range of key informants with knowledge on placemaking and shared spaces in Adelaide. Quantitative and qualitative data collection methods have their own advantages. For example, the provision of precise, numerical data for quantitative research, and the provision of contextual and in-depth information of phenomena with qualitative research (Henn et al., 2005). Triangulation was employed, which combines findings from both of these methods to generate synergies in the results (Fielding & Fielding, 2008), which can increase their validity (Henn et al., 2005). This is because the use of several research methods can allow the researcher to gather larger amounts of data to increase knowledge, to be thorough in addressing all aspects of the topic, and to overcome the deficiencies of single-method studies (Sarantakos, 2005).

The research design was based around a case study approach. Case studies allow the researcher to explore particular locations in depth (Sarantakos, 2005). Adelaide provided an ideal case study to investigate how shared spaces can be improved with placemaking for several reasons. Adelaide City Council has recently endorsed a placemaking approach to improve underutilised and deteriorated public spaces in the city, with the appointment of a placemaking team, the beginning of placemaking projects in three communities and the establishment of Splash Adelaide, a programme of events to activate public spaces throughout
the city. As discussed in more detail in Chapter Five, the Council has also produced strategic plans for creating better streets for people, including the use of shared spaces.

Furthermore, there are several existing shared spaces in Adelaide which have been improved, and some which have been newly created, with a placemaking approach. Four streets, namely Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West were investigated in more detail with a street video survey and a street design checklist. The primary reasons for examining these streets were their location in an inner-city setting and the use of a placemaking approach in their development. Leigh Street underwent an upgrade in 2012, while Peel and Bank Street received improvements in 2013. The Hindley Street West redevelopment was completed in June 2014. Additionally, information on placemaking and the creation of shared spaces in the ongoing redevelopment of Bowden was provided by one interview participant. The examining of this site was undertaken as it demonstrated how placemaking and shared spaces are being applied in a state-led project outside of the City of Adelaide. Chapter Four presents more detailed contextual information about these sites.

A city where a placemaking approach to planning has been endorsed and used with the development of shared spaces was necessary to explore the thesis topic. Adelaide is a relatively small city, compared to others overseas, and is facing issues common to New Zealand cities, such as traffic congestion and low quality street environments. Accordingly, the lessons are applicable to New Zealand cities such as Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. Therefore, the use of Adelaide as a case study was suitable.

3.2 Secondary Research

3.2.1 Literature Review

A literature review is an important component of projects and theses. As a preliminary step in a research project, it provides an overview of the current body of literature surrounding the research question (Knopf, 2006). Consequently, the researcher is able to create a theoretical framework and develop methods to investigate the research question effectively (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). Furthermore, the literature review enables the researcher to evaluate and compare the study’s findings with the current body of knowledge (Knopf, 2006). The literature review provided in Chapter Two critiqued the existing literature surrounding
placemaking and shared spaces. It identified key themes to better understand the context of the research, and helped to develop primary data collection methods.

3.2.2 Analysis of Planning Framework

An analysis of the planning framework was undertaken as part of secondary data collection and is provided in Chapter Five. This sought to provide a strategic planning and regulatory context for exploring placemaking and shared spaces in Adelaide. Documents included national and state strategic plans and guidance documents, and the City of Adelaide strategic plans and its development plan. By analysing the policies and rules under the planning system, an understanding of the potential opportunities for and barriers against the implementation of placemaking and shared space projects in Adelaide can be made. While it is specific to the case study location, understanding the links between Adelaide’s planning framework and the projects undertaken has implications for elsewhere.

3.3 Primary Research: Street Video Survey

3.3.1 Data Collection

A street video survey was undertaken on four streets to obtain empirical data about how people use them. This follows research by Karndacharuk et al. (2013), Moody and Melia (2013) and Schönauer et al. (2012) who all used video observation to capture information on volume and movement of street users. This method was applied to Bank Street, Peel Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West. The video camera was placed at one spot on each street, selected to best capture the movement and interaction of street users. Recording took place at each street for ten minutes during the following time periods on a weekday:

- 8am-9am (before work),
- 10.30am-11.30am (mid-morning),
- 12.30pm-1.30pm (lunchtime),
- 2.30pm-3.30pm (mid-afternoon),
- 5pm-6pm (after work),

and on the weekend between 10am-11am and between 2pm-3pm. Video recording gathered quantitative data, specifically the number of pedestrians, motorists, cyclists, motorcyclists and
other modes of transport, and the number of people accessing adjacent buildings. Data was also collected on people spending time on the street rather than simply walking through.

The time periods, particularly on weekdays, were chosen as they have different characteristics. For example, before and after work, pedestrians tend to be walking directly to their workplaces, whereas between these time periods, people tend to use streets for other purposes, such as shopping or purchasing food or beverages, which may facilitate further activities other than movement. Ten minutes was seen as a suitable sample of those time periods, for two reasons. Firstly, modes of public transport in the vicinity arrive every three to four minutes. A shorter time period may be influenced by a higher number of pedestrians due to arriving public transport, whereas a ten minute time period allows for two or three fluctuations to be evened out. Secondly, within a ten minute time period, a variety of lengths of stays can be accounted for, specifically less than five minutes, five minutes to ten minutes and over ten minutes.

3.3.2 Data Transformation

A series of criteria were counted for each video clip. These were the total number of pedestrians, motorists, cyclists, motorcyclists and people taking other modes of transport. Additionally, the number of people accessing adjacent buildings, the number of people staying for two to five minutes and for more than five minutes was counted. This method is displayed in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(time period)</th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. motorists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. cyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. accessing adjacent building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. ped staying 2-5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. ped staying more than 5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several factors influenced the counting of these indicators. People on the streets for work purposes, such as road workers, painters and window washers were not counted as
pedestrians. The counting of motorists involved counting those that passed through the street, those that arrived and parked their vehicle, and those that departed from their parked vehicle during the ten minute period. Vehicles which were parked the entire duration of the video were not counted. The number of people accessing adjacent buildings included those already identified as motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists or other mode of transport but excluded workers loading or unloading a vehicle. Finally, the time spent staying in the street was measured within the 10 minute period. This means no assumptions were made about the time spent staying before or after the 10 minute period.

3.3.3 Data Analysis

The aim of this method was to determine how people use the streets at various times of the day. Therefore, the data was presented in graphs to illustrate for each street, the number of pedestrians, motorists, cyclists, motorcyclists, people using another mode of transport, people accessing adjacent buildings and people staying for more than two minutes during the specified time periods. This allowed for comparisons to be made with individual activities across the time periods and between different activities in specific time periods. Furthermore, it allowed for relationships to be identified between how people use the street and the design characteristics of that street, for example people staying for more than two minutes and whether there is appropriate seating.

3.3.4 Limitations

Video surveying was limited to daylight hours. Therefore, a major limitation of this method was not capturing street scenes at night time, particularly on Friday and Saturday nights when many people are visiting restaurants and bars in the area. It was decided that the researcher’s presence with a video camera on the street among people in various states of intoxication may affect the normal movement and interactions of those people in that time period.

Furthermore, this research was undertaken in June. The combination of frequent outdoor events and warmer weather outside of winter was acknowledged to result in higher numbers of pedestrians participating in a wider range of activities on Adelaide streets. Street video surveying in winter would not have captured this potential difference.
The placement of the video camera did not fully capture each street in its entirety. Video footage was taken from one spot on each street, at street level. Caution was taken to place the video camera where there were no obstructions and as much of the streetscape could be recorded as possible. However, at street level, with the camera facing down the length of the street, pedestrian movement and interaction is difficult to see beyond approximately 50 metres. Either the amalgamation of footage from several locations on each street, or video recording from above the street, such as from an adjacent building, would ensure the entire streetscape is captured.

The placement of the video camera also restricted the ability to capture the spatial distribution, or density, of pedestrians and the paths they took across the space, which Karndacharuk et al. (2013), Moody and Melia (2013) and Schönauer et al. (2012) achieved through filming from above the street. This informed those authors of changes in pedestrian movement following the transformation of a street into a shared space.

### 3.4 Primary Research: Design Evaluation Checklist

#### 3.4.1 Data Collection

A checklist based on the place evaluation tool of Project for Public Spaces (2014c) and the shared space evaluation tool proposed by Andrews (2009 as cited in South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012), was applied to the four streets. This checklist (Appendix C) evaluated specific design criteria to indicate the extent of sharedness, access and linkages, comfort and image, uses and activities, and sociability of each street. Undertaken once for each street, this was an efficient tool to evaluate the design characteristics of these shared spaces.

#### 3.4.2 Data Analysis

The checklist table was merged to contain the data from all four streets. Ticks and crosses, which identified whether that criteria was met or not, were colour coded for more efficient analysis. This design evaluation checklist allowed comparison of design elements to be made across all four streets. Furthermore, it allowed connections to be made with the video survey and with qualitative information gathered in the key informant interviews.
3.4.3 Limitations

While this method sought to evaluate how design elements were used in an objective manner, some elements were subjective, for example, if the space feels safe. This had the potential for biased results, depending on the researcher’s opinion. To alleviate this problem, the author looked for consistent features to base decisions on.

3.5 Primary Research: Key Informant Interviews

3.5.1 Data Collection

Key informant interviews were carried out to gather qualitative information relating to placemaking and shared spaces in Adelaide. Interviews are useful as they allow the researcher to gather data which other methods are unable to derive effectively, and they provide insights into differing or similar opinions among informants (Dunn, 2000). Furthermore, interviews offer the opportunity for the researcher to clarify information with the interviewee (Thomas, 2003). Therefore, the purpose of the key informant interviews was to explore aspects of the research topic such as problems with the application of placemaking in Adelaide and contextual information which influences the effectiveness of shared spaces in the city. One participant provided ancillary information on the Bowden redevelopment which informed the researcher about the inclusion of shared spaces using a placemaking approach in a state-led, mostly residential development outside of the City of Adelaide.

The type of interview used was the semi-structured interview. Dunn (2000) states that a semi-structured interview is organised around flexible questioning. The nature of the interview allows particular ideas and themes to be explored and developed depending on the knowledge of the interviewee (Mason, 2004). For Mason (2004), it is advantageous over a more standardised and structured approach which may not divulge events and experiences that are important from the interviewees' point of view or that are relevant to the research but have not been anticipated. Additionally, it permits the researcher to redirect the conversation if it moves too far from the research topic (Dunn, 2000). The list of key informants who participated in the interviews is provided in Table 7 below. These were individual interviews except for one interview with three participants and another with two participants. The list of questions which shaped the course of the interviews is located in Appendix D.
### Table 7: List of key informants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking Facilitators (x2)</td>
<td>Adelaide City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner 1</td>
<td>Government of South Australia DPTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Lecturer</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>University of South Australia and the Melbourne Street Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Renewal SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner 2</td>
<td>City of Onkaparinga Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Representatives (x2)</td>
<td>Adelaide East End Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking Consultant</td>
<td>Landscape architecture and urban design practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.5.2 Ethical Considerations

Ethical consideration was required for the key informant interviews. It is imperative that research is conducted in an ethical manner, particularly when involving human participants. For ethically sound research, the researcher should do no harm, seek voluntary involvement, maintain the anonymity of participants, avoid deception and examine and report honestly (Davidson & Tolich, 2003). This will achieve valid results in a way which does not compromise the researcher or the community in which the research is conducted in.

Ethical approval was gained from the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee prior to the fieldwork commencing in Adelaide. Participants of interviews were given an information sheet which explains the aims and objectives of the project (Appendix A). Additionally, participants were asked to sign a consent form before interviews began (Appendix B). These documents advised that there was no obligation to answer all questions and that it was possible to withdraw from an interview at any time. Furthermore, they explained that participants will remain anonymous in the written thesis, unless they ask to be named and that audio recordings of interviews will be made if permitted. An opportunity to verbally discuss the information sheet and consent form was given for any clarification needed. This process ensured that participants were aware of the purpose of the research, that their involvement was voluntary and that they would not be disadvantaged in any way.
3.5.3 Data Analysis

Coding was used to interpret the qualitative data from the key informant interviews. This is a technique for analysing data from interviews which are recorded and subsequently transcribed. Coding involves categorising and sorting data into key themes which helps the researcher to interpret the findings (Dunn, 2000; Lockyer, 2004). The researcher can identify conceptual patterns and conclusions can then be made (Sarantakos, 2005).

3.5.4 Limitations

The main limitation of the key informant interviews was the absence of business owners and residents on the four streets. It was particularly difficult to establish relationships with these important stakeholders to organise interviews. This may be attributed to ‘planning fatigue’, which explains how communities can lose interest in planning projects after a large amount of consultation (Burks, 2013). In the case of the four streets, business owners and residents are subject to continuing consultation about the rejuvenation projects occurring there. This was overcome to some extent by interviewing professionals involved with these projects, who provided what they knew about business owners and residents.

3.6 Conclusion

This thesis employed a mixed methods research approach that combined quantitative data from a street video survey and design checklist with qualitative data collected through interviews with key informants. The street video survey and the design checklist evaluated the use of placemaking principles on four shared spaces in the Adelaide CBD, while professionals and community representatives gave insights into the placemaking approach to planning and the opportunities and barriers for its use in Adelaide. This Chapter has explained the data collection, data analysis and limitations of the primary research methods. Adelaide’s context will be expanded on in the following Chapter.
Chapter 4: Context

4.1 Introduction

Shared spaces are usually created on urban streets which are specifically chosen due to their location and surrounding land uses. Meanwhile, placemaking principles are generally applied to improve public spaces in developed areas. Therefore, to investigate the use of placemaking and its application to shared spaces in Adelaide, it is necessary to understand the geographic context of the city and metropolitan area. Transport and population characteristics in Greater Adelaide are also pertinent to understanding the context for shared spaces and placemaking in Adelaide City. This is because the city centre is the major employment and shopping hub for the greater metropolitan area. This Chapter will first describe these aspects, and then move on to characterise the research sites more specifically.

4.2 Adelaide

4.2.1 Geography and Land Use

Adelaide is the state capital and most populous city of South Australia. Metropolitan Adelaide lies on the Adelaide Plains between the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Gulf St Vincent, and extends from Gawler in the north to Willunga in the South, as shown in Figure 12. Adelaide City is also highlighted. Adelaide City refers to the city centre, the suburb of North Adelaide and the parklands, administered by the Adelaide City Council.

Adelaide City is noted as one of the best planned cities in the world (Gehl Architects, 2011). This is attributed to the city’s grid layout, which contains six public squares, and parklands which surround the entire city. It is made up of the ‘square mile’ on the south of the River Torrens and North Adelaide on the north side. Planned by Colonel William Light in 1837, it is recognised as a major influence on the Garden City planning movement, and is now listed as a National Heritage Place (Department of the Environment, 2008). Its grid layout gave rise to a hierarchy of streets, with streets in the east-west direction being intersected by several major roads running the north-south direction. Streets in the east-west direction are also intersected by many laneways in the north-south direction. Figure 13 illustrates this distinct city form.
Despite this legacy, in their *Public Spaces and Public Life Study*, Gehl Architects (2011) found that Adelaide has a lack of street diversity, underutilised laneways and heavy traffic volumes contributing to low quality street environments and public spaces. This has also been caused by the prioritisation of vehicular traffic in the design of roads and extensive off-street car parking (Adelaide City Council, 2012a). Furthermore, the expansion of the suburbs and high levels of through traffic has led to low numbers of people spending time in the city (Adelaide City Council, 2012a). A major challenge for the Adelaide City Council is maintaining the city form and its heritage buildings while improving the quality of street environments (Adelaide City Council, 2014a). Strategies to address this challenge, including the use of placemaking and the creation of shared spaces, will be explained in Chapter Five.
Adelaide City incorporates some mixed land use. However, most of the city has distinct geographical areas which are characterised by a predominant land use. Figure 14 illustrates the predominant land uses in the city. A large stock of heritage buildings has influenced land use and remains a significant characteristic of the city (5000+, 2012).
The central business district (CBD) extends from the geographical centre of the city around Victoria Square to North Terrace and incorporates Hindley Street on the west and Rundle
Mall on the east. This area is made up of commercial and retail activities. The cultural precinct is located between the CBD and the River Torrens to the north, and contains University of Adelaide and University of South Australia campuses, Parliament House and other cultural buildings such as the Museum of South Australia, the State Library of South Australia and the Adelaide Convention Centre. The mixed-use areas on the east and west edges of the CBD contain some residential, commercial, retail and light industrial activities. Finally, North Adelaide and the southern half of the ‘square mile’ are predominantly residential.

Adelaide has been ranked as the fifth most liveable city in the world, according to the Economist Intelligence Unit’s *Global Liveability Ranking and Report August 2014*, which bases its rankings on criteria such as availability of goods and services, personal safety and effective infrastructure (Wilson, 2014). It has also been ranked as the most liveable city in Australia based on the cost of living, affordable housing and being a clean and well-maintained city, yet was ranked low in terms of having a vibrant cultural and entertainment scene (Holderhead, 2013). Without a highly vibrant cultural and entertainment scene, Gehl Architects (2011) recognised that there are low numbers of people in the city in the evenings and on the weekends. This has prompted the Adelaide City Council to develop strategies to improve vibrancy, explained further in Chapter Five.

The location of Adelaide City in relation to the greater metropolitan area and its urban form provide some context to the opportunities for and barriers against shared space and placemaking projects. The transport system is also important to examine as it influences how people move around Adelaide in relation to particular land uses.

### 4.2.2 Transport

There are approximately 229,000 daily visitors to Adelaide City for all purposes (Adelaide City Council, 2013a). The primary mode of transport to Adelaide City is the car. This is evident by the accessibility to the city facilitated by expressways and arterial roads from all directions. However, walking, cycling and public transport are increasingly being chosen as modes of travel (Adelaide City Council, 2012a). This reflects recent efforts to encourage walking and cycling with the creation of wide footpaths and several cycle lanes (Adelaide
City Council, 2012a), following suggestions that public transport was underdeveloped and pedestrian and cycling infrastructure was insufficient (Gehl Architects, 2011).

Public transport in Adelaide includes metropolitan trains, buses and one tram line. Trains predominantly service the northern and southern suburbs with Adelaide City (Adelaide Metro, 2014), arriving and departing from the railway station located adjacent to North Terrace. An extensive bus service operates across the entire metropolitan area, connecting to Adelaide City mostly along North Terrace and Currie Street in the east-west direction and King William Street in the north-south direction (Adelaide Metro, 2014). The O-Bahn is a bus rapid transit connecting the city with the north-eastern suburbs (Adelaide Metro, 2014). Finally, the tram runs from the coastal suburb of Glenelg, located to the south-west of the city, through the city centre and on to the Adelaide Entertainment Centre just north of the city (Adelaide Metro, 2014). Figure 15 is a diagram of the existing and proposed tram and rail links, and shows the location of the railway station as well as the major streets serviced by the bus network.

The combination of land use and transport are generally acknowledged to affect how people live their lives. This information is necessary to plan successful placemaking and shared space projects. Moreover, there needs to be consideration of how many people live, work or participate in other activities in Adelaide City and how this will change against the backdrop of the greater metropolitan area in the future.
Figure 15: Existing and proposed tram and rail links, and location of primary bus routes in Adelaide City. Adapted from: (Adelaide City Council, 2012a)
4.2.3 Population Characteristics

The population of Greater Adelaide is approximately 1.29 million (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014), while Adelaide City, including North Adelaide has a population of about 20,000 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013). Overall, Greater Adelaide is experiencing steady population growth (Government of South Australia, 2010). The largest and fastest growth is occurring in the far-northern suburbs, yet Adelaide City is also experiencing fast population growth (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014). The population of Adelaide City is projected to reach almost 39,000 by 2036 (Adelaide City Council, 2014b).

Alongside the growing residential population of Adelaide City, there are changes in the types of visitors to the city from the metropolitan area on a daily basis. Students and overnight visitors have had the largest increases from the period 2002-2011 and make up 86,700 and 7,600 daily visitors to the city respectively (Adelaide City Council, 2012a). This is contrasted with 118,200 people who visit the city daily for employment (Adelaide City Council, 2012a).

Population growth will have implications for land use and transport in the future. Furthermore, this section shows that people are present in Adelaide City for different reasons, with a large proportion visiting from the metropolitan area.

4.3 Research Site Characteristics

The following section describes the locations and characteristics of the research sites. Peel Street, Bank Street and Leigh Street are streets running in the north to south direction within the CBD, while Hindley Street West runs in the east-west direction. As explained in Chapter 3, these streets were investigated by way of a design checklist and video survey. Figure 16 identifies the location of these streets. Additionally, the ongoing redevelopment of Bowden was used as a research site and was subject to site observations and a key informant interview. The following paragraphs are based on site visits and information provided in the Bank Street and Leigh Street progress and evaluation reports (Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure, 2013b, a).
Figure 16: Map of Bank, Peel and Leigh Streets, and Hindley Street West. Also shows location of Adelaide Oval. Adapted from: (Google Maps, 2014)

4.3.1 Peel Street, Bank Street and Leigh Street

Peel Street is to the east of Leigh Street and also connects Hindley Street and Currie Street, displayed in Figure 16. Accordingly, it is of the same length, approximately 140 metres. However, it is narrower than Leigh Street with a width of about 10 metres. Peel Street is signed as a shared zone and consists of a single surface which is part paved, part bitumen. It is one-way for vehicular traffic to travel in the south to north direction from Currie Street to Hindley Street.

Bank Street connects Hindley Street and North Terrace, and is shown in Figure 16. It is approximately 130 metres in length with a width of about 14 metres. The street consists of a 6 metre wide carriageway with a bitumen surface, and footpaths measuring 4.2 metres and 3.5
metres wide on the eastern and western sides of the roadway respectively. The street is one-
way for vehicular traffic travelling in the north to south direction from North Terrace to
Hindley Street, and a contra-flow cycle lane allows cyclists to also travel in the opposite
direction. Bank Street is not labelled as a shared zone, rather it has a 10km/h speed limit.

Leigh Street connects Hindley Street and Currie Street, shown in Figure 16. It is
approximately 140 metres in length with a width of about 12 metres. The street is configured
with a middle section which is completely paved over and is closed off to vehicular traffic. At
either end there is a part paved, part bitumen carriageway allowing vehicles to enter the street
to access an on-street, full-time loading zone with three parking bays. In these sections, a kerb
separates the carriageway from a 2.5 metre paved footpath. Leigh Street is legally a shared
zone.

4.3.2 Hindley Street West

Hindley Street West refers to the section of Hindley Street between Morphett Street and West
Terrace. The section between Register Street and Liverpool Street has recently been upgraded
to a shared space, and is highlighted in Figure 16. It is approximately 130 metres long and 16
metres wide. It is a single, paved surface, with a narrow two-way carriageway running down
the middle. Low-lying plants, small trees, lamp posts and several bollards provide a
demarcation between the carriageway and area suitable for pedestrians. Protuberances, a
raised table and pedestrian crossings are present at each end. Hindley Street West is not
legally signed as a shared zone.

4.3.3 Bowden

Bowden is a 16.3 hectare site situated on the north-west edge of Adelaide City’s parklands,
shown in Figure 17, and was chosen by the South Australian State Government for
redevelopment into a mixed-use area (Bowden: Life More Interesting, 2014). At the time
research was undertaken, the first stage of development was almost complete, including
several streets and some residential buildings. Construction will continue for the next 10-12
years. In addition to accommodating 3500 residents, the development will include commercial
and retail activities (Bowden: Life More Interesting, 2014). Factors used to promote the
development include its close proximity to Adelaide’s CBD, its variety of transport options,
walkable and vibrant streets and a focus on placemaking and sustainability (Urban Renewal Authority, 2014). Therefore, it makes an ideal study for investigating new and ongoing initiatives for placemaking and shared spaces.

![Map showing location of the Bowden site. Adapted from: (Google Maps, 2014)](image)

**Figure 17:** Map showing location of the Bowden site. Adapted from: (Google Maps, 2014)

### 4.4 Conclusion

This Chapter has described Adelaide’s land use, transport and population characteristics which provides context to the research. Additionally, it has highlighted the issues which have led to low quality street environments. Finally, the research sites were located and their characteristics were explained. Despite issues with underutilised public space, high volumes of traffic, poor pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and a general lack of vibrancy, the city has auspicious features for improvement. These include the parklands, the historic building
stock, the mixed land uses, provision of public transport, increasing visitor numbers and increasing numbers of pedestrians and cyclists. Chapter 5 will elaborate on the strategies being undertaken by the State Government and Adelaide City Council to address these, including the use of placemaking and the creation of shared spaces.
Chapter 5: Analysis of Planning Framework

5.1 Introduction

An urban street environment includes the frontages of adjacent buildings, or other land uses, as well as the space between them. The space between buildings is typically made up of the road carriageway and the footpath, and is public land vested to the relevant authority, while adjacent land is privately owned. To explore shared spaces and the use of placemaking in Adelaide, it is necessary to consider the planning framework – the legal processes for which they can be created, and how the design of streets, and the form and design of adjacent land is controlled.

Firstly, for a new road to be created, usually with the development of land, the road is assessed by the local council under the Development Act 1993 against the provisions of a development plan, against the Road Traffic Act 1961, and against road design regulations and standards. More commonly, the upgrade of an existing public road in South Australia can be undertaken by local councils under the Local Government Act 1999 (Section 212), as long as it complies with the Road Traffic Act 1961 and associated regulations and standards. Adelaide City Council is the local government authority for Adelaide City and North Adelaide, bounded by the Adelaide Parklands.

This Chapter will analyse the extent to which strategic directions and guidance documents promote the development of shared spaces and the use of placemaking in Adelaide. Additionally, it will examine the regulatory requirements for the creation of shared spaces, specifically the road design standards and guides. An understanding of the planning framework and the process for which local councils can create shared spaces sheds light on the barriers of undertaking such projects, the responsibilities of all authorities involved, and their directions for the future. This begins with the understanding that towns and cities in Australia are influenced by planning requirements at the national and state government levels as well as the local government level. Therefore, the first part of this Chapter will briefly analyse planning documents at the national and state level before examining the relevant local level plans. Figure 18 illustrates the planning framework relating to shared spaces and placemaking in Adelaide.
### National Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Cities, Our Future: National Urban Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Places for People: An Urban Design Protocol for Australian Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Level: South Australia Strategic Plan 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Level: South Australia Strategic Plan 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (under the Development Act 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat Well Be Active Strategy for South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy by Design SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets for People: Compendium for South Australian Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Zero Together: South Australia’s Road Safety Strategy 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City Level: City of Adelaide Strategic Plan 2012-2016 (under the Local Government Act 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Level: City of Adelaide Strategic Plan 2012-2016 (under the Local Government Act 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide (City) Development Plan (under the Development Act 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide: One City, Many Places Spatial Vision 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Adelaide Placemaking Strategy 2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Adelaide Smart Move: Transport and Movement Strategy 2012-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Diagram showing the planning framework for shared spaces and placemaking in Adelaide and South Australia.

### 5.2 National and State Level

A large and varied planning framework in Australia guides the implementation of plans and consequently development at the district or city level. While planning legislation and regulations are administered by state governments, the Australian Government provides guidance on matters which have national significance. This section examines three national documents, namely the *National Urban Policy*, the *Urban Design Protocol* and the *National Road Safety Strategy*.

Furthermore, numerous state strategies influence Adelaide City Council’s plans. These are the *30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide*, the *Eat Well Be Active Strategy for South Australia 2011-2016* and *Towards Zero Together: South Australia’s Road Safety Strategy 2020*. Additionally, two guidance documents, *Healthy by Design SA* and *Streets for People: Compendium for South Australian Practice*, promote the inclusion of shared space and placemaking provisions in Adelaide City’s plans. This Section will explain the national and state planning framework and highlight its significance for strategic and regulatory planning in Adelaide City.
5.2.1 National Guidance

Our Cities, Our Future: A National Urban Policy for a productive, sustainable and liveable future (2011) establishes the Australian Government’s objectives and directions for its cities. Several objectives relate to the provision of shared spaces. These are to integrate land use and infrastructure (Objective 2), improve accessibility and reduce dependence on private vehicles (Objective 10) and to support community wellbeing (Objective 11). One way to achieve Objective 11 is to improve the quality of the public domain. Methods to achieve these objectives include encouraging “the development of urban areas that promote healthy lifestyles through cycling and walking networks, recreation facilities and high quality public spaces” (p. 64) and supporting community wellbeing with a national urban design protocol for high quality public domains.

Creating Places for People: An Urban Design Protocol for Australian Cities (2011) recognises the importance of high quality urban design in cities and that there are challenges with the planning, design and management of the built environment. Appropriately, it provides a set of principles for best practice urban design intended to guide urban design professionals and decision-makers. These address three broad aspects of good urban design. Firstly, a place should be productive and sustainable, achieved with the principles of enhancing, connecting, diversity and enduring. Secondly, urban design should focus on liveability by being comfortable, vibrant, safe and walkable. Finally, there must be leadership and governance by working within the context of the place, by engaging, by fostering excellence and by considering custodianship. This protocol promotes and facilitates good urban design to be addressed in local plans.

The National Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020 (2010) uses a ‘Safe System’ approach which is “a holistic view of the road transport system and the interactions among roads and roadsides, travel speeds, vehicles and road users”, inclusive of all groups using the road system (p. 33). It focusses on four key areas, namely safe roads, safe speeds, safe vehicles and safe people. Despite recognising that the design of roads and the adjacent land uses can influence safety, the strategy does not provide guidance on the use of shared spaces.
5.2.2 State Strategic Plans

The 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (2010) is one volume of the Planning Strategy for the state of South Australia, which is mandatory under the Development Act 1993. The purpose of the Planning Strategy is to set out the state government’s directions on land use and development, with regard to population growth and demographic changes, supply of land for housing and employment, and a range of other factors. The 30 Year Plan sets a growth target of 27,300 people and 15,040 dwellings for Adelaide City. Additionally, the city is identified as the most significant hub of the region. Accordingly, a series of policies are assigned to it. The policies for increasing density and revitalising public space set the context for more specific directions and policies taken at the local level, which will be described in Section 5.3.

The Eat Well Be Active Strategy for South Australia 2011-2016 (2011) highlights the significant role that land use planning and the built environment have in enabling a physically active and sociable lifestyle to be convenient and enjoyable. It states that the South Australia Department of Health will support the implementation of pedestrian and cycling-friendly streets. Furthermore, the Department of Health will contribute to the development and review of national and physical activity policies and legislation. This is expanded on by the actions of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI), which include considering the links between infrastructure and active transport, supporting the development of walkable neighbourhoods and ensuring high-quality design of the public realm. In achieving these actions Eat Well Be Active established the development of the Healthy by Design SA guide and the Streets for People compendium.

Healthy by Design SA (2012) is a guiding document to assist urban designers, planners and policy makers at the state and local level “to design healthy urban environments that enable people to make healthy lifestyle choices and, in particular, to incorporate incidental physical activity – such as walking and cycling for transport and recreation – into their daily routine”. (p. 6). This document provides objectives and design guidelines for a range of areas requiring improvements, including streets. Specifically, it portrays the importance of pedestrian-friendly streets for making communities more vibrant and healthy. While it does not explicitly provide for shared spaces, its objectives and guidance for creating attractive, welcoming and safe speed street environments relate to the reasons for implementing shared spaces.
Streets for People (2012) is a compilation of knowledge on street designs which promote cycling and walking, which follows the key principles outlined in the national urban design protocol Creating Places for People. Specifically, it identifies that the current guidelines for ‘Shared Zones’, as they are legally described in South Australia, are “very prescriptive and limiting, and require specific project by project approval by the Minister for Transport through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure as well as Council approval” (p. 10). This has caused uncertainty around the creation of shared spaces, designed according to international best practice, in South Australia. Therefore, the compendium draws on international literature and national case studies to provide best practice guidelines for shared spaces and other low-speed street designs, and explains the planning approval process and liability issues in South Australia. This document should provide adequate guidance for Adelaide City Council to create shared spaces.

Towards Zero Together: South Australia’s Road Safety Strategy 2020 (2011) is consistent with the National Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020, and also identifies and discusses areas of particular importance to South Australia. In addressing the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, it states that they will be better promoted, and in some instances in urban areas, these modes should be given priority over motorised traffic when designing the road network. Low-speed environments are highlighted as imperative for achieving this. The provision of shared spaces could meet these objectives. However, as they are not explicitly acknowledged in this strategy, appropriate changes to legislation and regulation to better allow for shared spaces may not occur.

5.3 City Level

At the district level, visionary documents support the City of Adelaide Strategic Plan 2012-2016. This is an overarching management plan required under the Local Government Act 1999 and sets broad visions for all aspects of the city. Furthermore, it establishes the need for more detailed strategies into various aspects, such as placemaking, spatial planning and transport planning and appropriate amendments to the regulatory Development Plan. This Section will analyse these more in-depth plans, specifically the City of Adelaide Placemaking Strategy 2013-2015, the Adelaide: One City, Many Places Spatial Vision 2014, the City of Adelaide Smart Move: Transport and Movement Strategy 2012-2022, and the Adelaide (City) Development Plan.
5.3.1 City of Adelaide Placemaking Strategy 2013-2015

The *Placemaking Strategy* (2013b) emphasises the City of Adelaide’s commitment to placemaking. It does this by stating the aspiration for the city: “ultimately it’s about creating places for all types of people; places that are vibrant and boast a strong sense of community ownership that are sustained by the strong place attachment of place users” (p. 5). Adelaide City Council identifies three key outcomes for achieving this: empowered communities and strong partnerships; unique districts and places; and best practice organisation through better governance. Furthermore, the document provides methods for implementing the strategy, called ‘centrepiece initiatives’. These are that firstly, the Council will co-create, with community representatives, district plans for three districts within the city which incorporate placemaking. Secondly, a series of ‘place pilots’ will test placemaking on particular streets, one being Hindley Street West which is a research site for this study. Finally, the Council will appoint ‘place facilitators’ to areas of the city to act as a single point of contact for precinct and resident groups. At the time of research, these initiatives were underway.

This strategy is significant for this thesis as it shows that Adelaide City Council is taking a placemaking approach to planning which is consistent with best practice identified in the Literature Review. It also shows that Adelaide City Council is being proactive in undertaking placemaking activities to improve the public realm within the city. Furthermore, the strategy influenced the creation of the *One City, Many Places Spatial Vision*, which will be examined in the next section.

5.3.2 Adelaide: One City, Many Places Spatial Vision 2014

The *Adelaide: One City, Many Places Spatial Vision* (2014a) is a spatial plan of Adelaide’s land use and the built form for the next 10 years. The *Spatial Vision* is integrated with the *City of Adelaide Smart Move: Transport and Movement Strategy 2012-2022* which provides the desired transport and movement outcomes for the city. Together, these documents are a ‘structure plan’, which is required under the *30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide*. Its purpose is to outline the priorities of the city for more efficient planning. The *Spatial Vision* refines the objectives of the *30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide*. 
The central aim of the Spatial Vision is reflected in the title ‘One City, Many Places’. Having many unique and distinct places which define Adelaide’s overall image is desired. Appropriately, reference is made to placemaking:

Placemaking is both an overarching idea and a hands on tool for improving a neighbourhood, city or region. It’s a process and a philosophy, a multifaceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces. Put simply it involves looking at, listening to and asking questions of the people who live, work and play in a place to discover their needs and aspirations. The information is then used to create a common vision for the place. (p. 13)

This has helped to create a vision for the entire city. This includes that:

Enhanced infrastructure and continuing housing developments reinforce the City’s enviable reputation as an accessible, healthy, affordable and vibrant place… The pedestrian-friendly streets can be walked along safely any time, day and night… The City’s squares, terraces and laneways are alive with people of all ages. Public art and live music enliven the streets, side by side with an exciting array of outdoor dining venues and small bars. (p. 16)

Additionally, it provides visions for the different zones within the city, highlighting where land use activities will occur and the associated built form. For example, the main streets of the Central Activity Centre will be:

Important shopping, hospitality and gathering places during the day and evening that form a vital part of the City’s identity… The Main Streets provide a comfortable pedestrian environment with intimately scaled built form – including heritage buildings – and a rich visual texture. (p. 18)

These visions show how the city will be shaped by a placemaking planning approach. This is significant because One City, Many Places will influence changes to the Adelaide (City) Development Plan to be more aligned with its visions. Therefore, placemaking principles will be effectively applied to all future development.

5.3.3 City of Adelaide Smart Move: Transport and Movement Strategy 2012-2022

The Smart Move: Transport and Movement Strategy (2012a) has been developed in accordance with the City of Adelaide Strategic Plan 2012-2016 for creating an accessible city. Additionally, it responds to the population growth predictions laid out in the 30 Year Plan for
Greater Adelaide to assert the Adelaide City Council’s direction for transport within the city. Its key priority is to create a people-friendly city by improving conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and those using public transport.

The strategy sets out a number of desired outcomes the Council wishes to achieve. These include easy walking, safe cycling, calm traffic and great streets. In more detail, great streets are sought where: “everyone can participate equally in City life; streets invite people to stay and enjoy their surroundings; there is a distinct sense of place through high-quality streets and public spaces; [and] environmental qualities are embraced through street design” (p. 5). One strategy for achieving this is to “redesign selected streets as shared street environments” (Strategy 8.5.2). Smart Move states that priority will be given to the laneways and side streets that connect key destinations and public transport stops. The Link and Place matrix, described in Chapter 2, was also applied to identify streets with low traffic volumes but high place functions to be given priority for creating shared spaces.

Additionally, Smart Move provides strategies for activating streets. These include to “introduce effective small-scale activation measures” (Strategy 8.2.2) and “develop streets that encourage community involvement” (Strategy 8.3). The document then describes examples of how this can be achieved.

The Smart Move strategy explains that the Adelaide City Council intends on creating more shared spaces and identifies appropriate streets where transformations should be made. Furthermore, the strategy’s focus on activating streets and re-allocating street space in favour of pedestrians strongly portrays a placemaking approach to transport planning and the design of public space in the city.

5.3.4 Adelaide (City) Development Plan

Local area development plans are required under Section 23 of the Development Act 1993. They contain objectives, principles and policies (or rules) to guide land-use development in the area covered by the development plan. Development is defined in Section 4 of the Act and includes building work, a change in the use of land and the division of an allotment. It also includes “the construction or alteration (except by the Crown, a council or other public authority…) of a road, street or thoroughfare on land (including excavation or other
preliminary or associated work)”. Therefore, development plans do not apply to the transformation of a street into a shared space undertaken by a local authority. The development plan must be consistent with the planning strategy for South Australia under Section 30 of the Act.

All development requires the lodgement of an application for development approval to the local council. This can be granted once planning consent is given after assessing the application against the development plan regarding matters such as the change in activity, building location, height and bulk, the provision of open space, appearance, and access and movement. Development approval may also require land division consent for the amalgamation or creation of new allotments, or building consent which shows that any construction is compliant with the Building Code of Australia or the South Australian Housing Code.

While works undertaken by the Adelaide City Council to change the design or layout of a street is not regulated by the development plan framework, there are a number of provisions in the Adelaide (City) Development Plan which influence the creation of shared spaces in the city. These relate to development abutting streets.

The general provisions promote the use of placemaking and shared spaces around the city. For example, Principle 83 states that development should promote the safety and security of people in the public realm by designing for “natural surveillance”. Also, Principle 170 states that:

The height, scale and massing of buildings should reinforce:
(b) a comfortable proportion of human scale at street level by:
   (i) building ground level to the street frontage where zero set-backs prevail;
   (ii) breaking up the building facade into distinct elements;
   (iii) incorporating art work and wall and window detailing; and
   (iv) including attractive planting, seating and pedestrian shelter.

Similarly, Principle 184 states that “building facades fronting street frontages, access ways, driveways or public spaces should be composed with an appropriate scale, rhythm and proportion which responds to the use of the building, the desired character of the locality and the modelling and proportions of adjacent buildings”. One design technique to meet this principle is “incorporating architectural features which give human scale to the design of the
building at street level such as entrance porches, awnings and colonnades” (184.1-g). Finally, Principle 222 states that:

Development fronting public spaces should be of a high standard of design and should reinforce the distinctive urban character of the City by (c) defining the major streets as important linear public spaces which display a formal townscape character.

These show the range of aspects of development control which the plan addresses for the whole of Adelaide which could enhance shared spaces with placemaking principles.

A number of provisions for the Capital City Zone are also significant. The shared spaces which were examined for this thesis exist in this zone. Principle 7 states that “buildings should present an attractive pedestrian-oriented frontage that adds interest and vitality to City streets and laneways”. Principle 13 is that “buildings, advertisements, site landscaping, street planting and paving should have an integrated, coordinated appearance and should enhance the urban environment”.

The provisions of the Adelaide (City) Development Plan reinforce the need of buildings to be designed in a way to enhance the urban streetscape and provide a pedestrian-friendly environment. As such, they support the creation of shared spaces in Adelaide.

5.4 Design Standards and Guidelines

There are a number of Australian guidelines and standards which seek to create consistent, safe and appropriate road designs. Streets for People (2012) acknowledges that these can create confusion with the creation of shared spaces and other low-speed street environments. Thus, this Section will explain the role of the relevant guidelines and standards and their implications for shared spaces in Adelaide.

A ‘shared zone’ is a legal traffic control device in South Australia. The Design Guidelines for Shared Zones in South Australia (2010) state that shared zones have a speed limit of 10km/h, and it provides guidance mostly for their application to residential streets. Additionally, they require approval by the DPTI, as well as local council approval.
There are no provisions which apply to shared spaces which are not legally defined as ‘shared zones’. Shared spaces offer more flexibility in their design to shared zones, but may still require some traffic control devices. The Road Traffic Act 1961 states that the removal or installation of traffic control devices requires approval from the Minister for Transport or a delegated authority. Commonly used traffic control devices such as slow points, contrasting pavements and humps are approved to be used by local councils. However, others must be given approval to by the DPTI.

All traffic control devices must conform with the Code of Technical Requirements as laid out in the Manual of Legal Responsibilities and Technical Requirements for Traffic Control Devices (2012), the Australian Standards and the Austroads Guides. Relevant Austroads Guides are the Guide to Traffic Management (2008c), the Guide to Road Design (2008a) and the Guide to Road Safety (2008b). Traffic control devices which do not conform to these require special approval from the DPTI. Finally, a Traffic Impact Statement is needed to identify the traffic management and road safety impacts of any proposed device.

A key issue is that these requirements are prescriptive and the guidance offered is not appropriate for low-speed environments. The requirement to adhere to the regulations for traffic control devices may affect the ability to allocate space for placemaking activities, align the street and incorporate particular materials in the most effective way for a shared space.

### 5.5 Conclusion

A clear theme permeates through the planning framework, which is the need to create pedestrian-friendly streets and public spaces which are safe and comfortable. This, it is suggested, will contribute to physical health and a sense of community. These follow arguments under the New Urbanism and Sustainable Urbanism ideologies to address the adverse effects of automobile dependence on cities.

This Chapter has portrayed how the creation of shared spaces and the use of placemaking are currently dealt with in Adelaide and how they will be dealt with in the future. Guidance at the national and state levels has influenced the development of plans for Adelaide City. The Development Plan controls land use adjacent to streets in a way which will enhance shared spaces. Furthermore, there is state level guidance, through the Streets for People (2012)
compendium to help Adelaide City Council implement shared spaces. Adelaide City Council’s explicit placemaking approach to planning is sufficient for incorporating placemaking into the design of shared spaces. However, road design standards and guidelines manage the use of traffic control devices and intend to provide consistent road designs across South Australia. This could reduce the effectiveness of shared space designs and the ability to create individual and unique streets. In presenting the findings from the primary research in Adelaide, the following Chapter will portray outcomes of Adelaide’s strategic direction.
Chapter 6: Findings

6.1 Introduction

This Chapter will describe the findings from the primary research undertaken in Adelaide. In doing so, it addresses objective two of this thesis, which is to explore placemaking and shared spaces in Adelaide. Additionally, it reveals issues and challenges with using a placemaking approach for the creation of shared spaces, which is objective three of this thesis. The first Section will explain the analysis of the street video survey and Section 6.3 will cover the findings from the street design checklist. These portray the place characteristics of Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West. Finally, Section 6.4 will describe the findings produced from the key informant interviews to determine issues and challenges with placemaking.

6.2 Street Video Survey

The analysis of the video survey indicates varying uses among Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West. This video survey was undertaken by placing a video camera at one spot on each street and recording the movement and activities of street users for ten minutes during selected time periods across the day. This Section will elucidate the key findings from the video survey for each street, and then collate the findings, providing comparisons between the streets. Bar graphs at the beginning of each Subsection present the findings for each street. The raw data is located in Appendix E. The bar graphs display the frequency counts for street users in each time period, categorised as the following: pedestrians, motorists, cyclists, motorcyclists and people undertaking other modes of transport. They also display the number of these street users who accessed adjacent buildings. Finally, they show the number of these street users who stayed in the street space for longer than two minutes.
6.2.1 Peel Street

Figure 19: User characteristics of Peel Street. Results are from ten-minute samples of the time periods.

Figure 19 shows that there were more pedestrians than any other street user in Peel Street across all time periods. The number of pedestrians peaked in the 5-6pm time period on a weekday, and the next highest count of pedestrians was in the 8-9am time period, corresponding with before and after-work movements. The rest of the weekday time periods experienced steady numbers of pedestrians. Finally, pedestrian counts were the lowest on the weekend.

The number of motorists was steady across all time periods, including on the weekend. By contrast, there was a very small amount of cyclists and motorcyclists observed. One person using a skateboard was recorded on Peel Street in the 2-3pm weekend time period.

Street users who accessed adjacent buildings were highest in the 10.30-11.30am and 12.30-1.30pm weekday time periods. Only one person accessed a building from Peel Street in the 2-
3pm weekend time period. There were fairly consistent numbers of people staying in the space for more than two minutes over all weekday time periods except between 5-6pm. One example of this is shown in Figure 20. No one was observed to stay for longer than two minutes in the weekend time periods.

Figure 20: A mix of street users on Peel Street during the 2.30-3.30pm weekday time period, including two people who smoked a cigarette and talked for more than two minutes.
6.2.2 Bank Street

![User Characteristics of Bank Street](image)

**Figure 21: User characteristics of Bank Street. Results are from ten-minute samples of the time periods.**

Similar to Peel Street, more pedestrians were present than any other street user in Bank Street in all time periods, seen in Figure 21. The highest count of pedestrians was in the 5-6pm weekday time period, with fluctuating counts in the other time periods. Pedestrian numbers on the weekend were similar to the weekday time periods.

The number of motorists was also steady across all time periods, with the two highest counts being in the 8-9am and 10.30-11.30am weekday time periods. Motorists were fewest in the 2-3pm weekday time period. Cyclists were observed in the 12.30-1.30pm, 2.30-3.30pm and 5-6pm weekday time periods and in the 2-3pm weekend time period. Some cyclists used the contra-flow cycle lane, shown in Figure 22. Two cyclists observed in the 12.30-1.30pm time period walked their bicycles along the footpath, rather than riding them. Two people in this same time period used mobility scooters. One street user rode a push scooter in the 2.30-3.30pm weekday time period. No motorcyclists used Bank Street in any of the time periods.
Figure 22: A cyclist using the contra-flow cycle lane on Bank Street during the 2-3pm weekend time period.

Very few street users accessed adjacent buildings in both the weekday and morning time periods. The highest number was observed in the 12.30-1.30pm weekday time period. Finally, several street users were seen staying for longer than two minutes in each time period except the 10.30-11.30am time period. Most of these people were sitting in the parklets at the southern end of Bank Street.
6.2.3 Leigh Street

As displayed in Figure 23, Leigh Street had highly fluctuating pedestrian numbers across all time periods. While it peaked in the 5-6pm weekday period at 397 pedestrians, only 70 were observed in the 10-11am weekend time period. An example of pedestrian movement is captured in Figure 24. The ten minute sample periods captured few vehicle movements, which were all motorists involved with unloading goods for adjacent businesses.
Cyclists used Leigh Street in all time periods except between 10-11am on the weekend. The number of cyclists ranged from one to four altogether. One street user rode a skateboard in the 12.30pm-1.30pm weekday time period. Additionally, one motorcyclist was recorded using the street in the 8-9am weekday period.

Few street users accessed adjacent buildings in the weekend time periods compared to the weekday time periods. The highest number of people in this category was in the 8-9am weekday period, followed by the 12.30-1.30pm period. Several street users stayed for more than two minutes in all time periods except for the 8-9am and 10.30-11.30am weekday periods.
6.2.4 Hindley Street West

Figure 25: User characteristics of Hindley Street West. Results are from ten-minute samples of the time periods.

Shown in Figure 25, more motorists than pedestrians were observed in the 8-9am and 10.30-11.30am weekday time periods. Pedestrian numbers were highest in the 12.30-1.30pm weekday time period, followed by the 2.30-3.30pm and 5-6pm time periods. The number of motorists was relatively high across all time periods, with the least recorded in the 12.30-1.30pm weekday period. Figure 26 illustrates the movement of motorists in both directions.
While cyclists used Hindley Street West in all weekday time periods, they were not observed on the weekend. One motorcyclist was observed in each of the 8-9am, 12.30-1.30pm and 2.30-3.30pm weekday time periods. Furthermore, one skateboarder was observed in the 12.30-1.30pm time period and one in the 2.30-3.30pm time period.

Overall, more street users accessed adjacent buildings in the weekday time periods than the weekend time periods. The highest number was 49 in the 12.30-1.30pm time period. Finally, very few people stayed for more than two minutes in the Hindley Street West shared space. Specifically, there was four and two in the 10.30-11.30am and 12.30-1.30pm weekday periods respectively.

6.2.5 Collation of Findings

Peel Street, Bank Street and Leigh Street had higher numbers of pedestrians than any other mode of transport across all time periods. Hindley Street West differed as motorists outnumbered pedestrians in two time periods. Furthermore, the highest numbers of pedestrians were observed for Peel, Bank and Leigh Streets in the 5-6pm weekday time period, whereas for Hindley Street West it was during 12.30-1.30pm. Fewer pedestrians were observed in the weekend time periods than the weekday periods in all streets except Bank.
Street. Overall, Peel Street had the least pedestrians, while Leigh and Bank Streets had the most at 1175 and 1163 respectively.

Hindley Street West had relatively high numbers of motorists across all time periods, with the highest in the 8-9am weekday period. At 128 motorists, this contrasted notably with the 12.30-1.30pm weekday time period when only 29 motorists were observed. Motorist characteristics for Peel Street and Bank Street were similar to each other, with numbers low and consistent across all time periods. Leigh Street had the least amount of motorists overall.

Cyclists were present on all four streets, and travelled in both directions. However, compared to pedestrian and motorist numbers, their numbers were very low. Moreover, cyclists were not observed in every time period for all of the streets. Bank Street and Leigh Street had the most cyclists overall with 13 each, while Peel Street had the least with only four.

Very few motorcyclists were observed on Peel Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West, and no motorcyclists were seen on Bank Street. They were also not observed in the weekend time periods on Leigh Street and Hindley Street West. Other modes of transport included mobility scooters, a push scooter and skateboards. These street users were present in very low numbers on all four streets.

Street users who accessed adjacent buildings were observed across all time periods on the four streets. However, these numbers fluctuated and were lowest in the weekend time periods, and tended to be highest during the middle weekday periods. Bank Street had the least amount of street users accessing adjacent buildings compared to pedestrian counts.

On Peel Street, people who stayed for more than two minutes in the space were observed in all weekday time periods excluding the 5-6pm period. More people in this category were recorded on Peel Street than the other streets. The only time period when people staying longer than two minutes were observed on Bank Street was between 10.30-11.30am on the weekday. On Hindley Street West, people in this category were observed only in the 10.30-11.30am and 12.30-1.30pm weekday time periods. Across all streets, this number ranged from zero to five.
In general, there were fewer street users on the weekend than the weekday time periods for all streets. There were very few street users staying for more than two minutes in the street spaces, and few people who accessed adjacent buildings. Rather, the majority of people were moving through the streets. While the predominant travel mode was on foot, people using a range of other modes of transport were observed. The street video survey captured the characteristics of users on the four streets. The following Section will examine the findings from the design checklist which was also applied to these streets.

**6.3 Street Design Checklist**

As explained in Chapter Three, the street design checklist sought to evaluate the design features of the selected streets to determine their place function. Table 8 presents a summary of the findings from the street design checklist. Overall, the streets performed well against the checklist, with most of the characteristics present. However, many elements were utilised in different ways among the streets. This Section will interpret and explain the prominent findings for each street and then collate the findings, providing comparisons between the streets. Accompanying contextual information on the streets is found in Chapter Four.

Table 8: Design elements of Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared space: To what extent is the space shared?</th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of kerbs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kerbs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of bollards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few bollards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of any guard railing/pedestrian fencing/planters to delineate road users</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contrasting surface colours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some contrasting surface colours</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of formal crossing points</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of road markings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of traffic lights</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High pedestrian flow</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians present right across the space</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vehicular flow</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles give way to pedestrians</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of parking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some parking (eg. disabled, loading)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Access and Linkages: Can people easily access the shared space?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space is visible from the outside</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrances are welcoming</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between the space and the adjacent buildings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space functions for people with special needs</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of transportation options available to reach the place</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comfort and Image: Is the space comfortable and attractive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately placed street furniture (enough seats, choice of places to sit)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space is clean and free of litter</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of greenery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of street art/sculptures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The space feels safe</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-surveillance from surrounding areas and pedestrian traffic</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of vandalism and anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good building conditions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses and Activities: Is there evidence of activity in the space?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variety of ages of people using the space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of activities are occurring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of unused space</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of cafes or stalls</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use of buildings</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of unoccupied buildings</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sociability: Does the space foster social interaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are meeting others in the space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of people in groups</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People interacting with strangers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.1 Peel Street

Peel Street contained most of the design characteristics which are common to shared spaces. The exceptions were the concrete pillars in the north end of the street and the metal bollards which were present through the whole street, as shown in Figure 27. These appeared to both prevent parking in some areas, and guide the flow of the traffic. Apart from the concrete pillars which provided a small ‘safe zone’ for pedestrians, the bollards were not apparently placed to guide pedestrian activity, as some were located very close to buildings.
While the space was visible from adjacent Hindley Street and Currie Street, the entrances were not particularly welcoming. There was paving at the entrances to provide a visual cue that the street is different to the adjacent streets, however, the buildings at the entrances at the south end had inactive frontages. A novel feature at this entrance was a sign containing all the businesses which are present on Peel Street. The south entrance is illustrated in Figure 28. Furthermore, there was a lack of connections between the space and the surrounding buildings due to largely inactive building frontages along the length of the street, visible in Figure 27. These elements lowered Peel Street’s score in the access and linkages category.
Apart from some outdoor tables and chairs belonging to one cafe, there was no street furniture on Peel Street. There was an absence of vegetation. Finally, except for one piece of street art up high on a building in the middle of the street, there was no street art or sculptures present. Apparent self-surveillance and the absence of vandalism and anti-social behaviour helped to maintain a reasonable score in the comfort and image category.

6.3.2 Bank Street

As shown in Figure 29, the carriageway of Bank Street is delineated from the footpath by kerbs. This contrasts with the other streets which have level surfaces. Some painted lines were present to indicate areas of no parking and to highlight a contra-flow cycle lane. Figure 29 also illustrates the blue street graphic which is present across the carriageway in the middle section of Bank Street at its intersection with Woodsons Lane. This is a contrasting surface colour, however, its purpose is to portray a pedestrian-friendly space rather than delineate pedestrians from motorists. Finally, under the shared space category, pedestrians were not
present across the space, but rather tended to adhere to the footpaths on either side of the street.

Figure 29: Street graphic in middle of Bank Street and curving of carriageway to assist pedestrians crossing and slow vehicular traffic. Delineated contra-flow cycle lane runs in the south-north direction. Partly visible is a large mural on the building on the corner of Woodsons Lane.

The entrance to Bank Street from North Terrace was welcoming with active street frontages and cycle parking. Additionally, this entrance featured a raised carriageway which acts to slow vehicles entering Bank Street, as shown in Figure 30. Notably, the contra-flow cycle lane, seen in Figures 29 and 30, allows cycling in both directions. These features were significant for Bank Street in the access and linkages category.
Figure 30: Parklets at north end of Bank Street. Raised table at the entrance from North Terrace is also shown, as well as the contra-flow cycle lane.

The parklets were a unique feature of Bank Street. Six of these were present at the northern end, and nine at the southern end. Pictured in Figure 30, they are temporary structures which extend into on-street car parks and provide seating and planter boxes where trees have been planted, effectively greening the street. Furthermore, they help connect the street space with the adjacent buildings, as visitors to the numerous eateries can sit and consume their food in the parklets. The parklets and associated characteristics gave rise to a high score in both the access and linkages, and comfort and image categories.

A variety of activities were being undertaken by street users at the time of evaluation. These included walking, unloading, sitting, smoking and eating. With takeaway outlets, cafes, student accommodation, short-term visitor accommodation, retail and commercial offices, Bank Street comprises of mixed-use buildings. These influenced Bank Street’s score in the uses and activities category.
6.3.3 Leigh Street

A few bollards were present on Leigh Street in the middle section. Shown in Figure 31, retractable bollards permit some vehicle access along the middle section of the street, while the permanent green bollards act somewhat as a demarcation between the carriageway and footpath. There was no use of contrasting colours and road markings to delineate road users. However, at the each end of the street, there were low kerbs which delineate vehicle passage from pedestrians. Loading zones were also at these ends. Figure 32 illustrates this.

Figure 31: Middle of Leigh Street looking south towards Currie Street. Retractable bollards and permanent green bollards are present in this section. This photo also illustrates the vegetation, outdoor furniture and building facades.
Leigh Street satisfied all of the characteristics in the access and linkages category. Firstly, it was very visible from the adjacent streets. The entrances were welcoming and featured lamp posts with signs which provide information on the history of the street, visible in Figure 33. These complement the Edwardian and Victorian architecture of the buildings which characterise the street, which influenced the comfort and image category. Furthermore, many building entrances create good connections with the street space.

Fixed furniture and cafe seating were present in Leigh Street. This can be seen in Figures 31 and 32. Large trees and planter boxes were prominent design features. Moreover, there were two large murals painted on the sides of buildings in the middle section of the street, however, there were no sculptures or artwork at the street level.

The activities recorded as being undertaken at the time of evaluation were walking, sitting, unloading, eating and smoking. There was a high presence of cafes, restaurants and bars among other land uses like retail and commercial offices. Finally, there appeared to be an absence of unused space.
6.3.4 Hindley Street West

The Hindley Street West shared space had a level paved surface. Several design elements provided some demarcation between vehicular traffic and pedestrians, namely bollards, trees, street lights, planter beds and contrasting surface colours, as illustrated in Figures 34 and 35. Formal pedestrian crossings on a raised table were at each end of the shared space, shown in Figure 35. Despite the high vehicular flow, there were instances of motorists giving way to pedestrians on pedestrian crossings and at other points along the street.
Figure 34: The middle of Hindley Street West looking towards West Terrace. Bollards, trees, street lights and contrasting surface colours delineate road users.

Figure 35: Entrance of Hindley Street West at Register Street. Low-lying vegetation and street furniture is visible. A pedestrian crossing is also evident.
The entrances were welcoming with the widening of the footpath and narrowing of the vehicle carriageway. Figure 36 shows the traffic island and protuberances which help to slow down motorists and indicate the change in street environment. There were mostly inactive building frontages and only several key entrances to adjacent buildings, primarily university buildings. Therefore, the space overall did not have good connections with the buildings.

Figure 36: Entrance of Hindley Street West shared space at Liverpool Street. Traffic islands and protuberances direct and slow vehicle traffic before entering the shared space.

Several fixed seats were present along Hindley Street West, however, there was no outdoor cafe seating present. Trees and planter beds, as well as a small grass patch, visible in Figure 34, provided adequate greening of the space. Similar to the other streets, there was some large artwork on buildings but no sculptures or pieces of art in the street space itself.

The author observed a lack of activities being undertaken by street users. There appeared to be a substantial amount of unused space. Finally, several unoccupied buildings were present. Consequently, Hindley Street West scored low in the ‘activity and uses’ category.
6.3.5 Collation of Findings

There were variations among the streets with the design characteristics typical of shared spaces. Only two of the streets had complete level surfaces, and three of the streets had bollards. All streets had some form of demarcation between the carriageway and pedestrian areas, by way of a combination of kerbs, bollards, vegetation, contrasting surface colours or road markings. No traffic lights were present on all of the streets. Except for Hindley Street West, the streets had high pedestrian volumes and low vehicle volumes. The author observed pedestrians across all of the street space in Peel Street and Leigh Street, but not in Bank Street and Hindley Street West where pedestrians walked along the edges of the street. Bank Street was the only street where motorists did not appear to give way to pedestrians.

All spaces were clearly visible from the surrounding streets, although Peel Street did not have a welcoming entrance due to inactive building frontages. All streets had design elements to assist people with disabilities, for example kerb ramps on Bank and Leigh Streets, and tactile paving on Hindley Street West. Also a key aspect for access and linkages was the variety of transportation options available to reach all of the four streets. Currie Street and North Terrace are part of key bus routes, while the railway station is across North Terrace opposite the entrance of Bank Street. Additionally, the tram service runs along North Terrace. Figure 37 displays these locations. Finally, the encouragement of cycling, and the ability of some motorised vehicular traffic to access these streets means a range of public and private transport options are available to reach all the streets.

Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West scored highly in the comfort and image category. All streets were clean and free of litter and felt safe due to apparent self-surveillance from surrounding areas and pedestrian traffic, and the absence of vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Moreover, the buildings lacked evidence of deterioration and so were described as being in good condition.
The author did not observe people of various ages using the streets. Rather, it appeared that most people were working-age adults on Peel, Bank and Leigh Streets. An additional age group of young adults was present on Hindley Street West, likely due to its location next to University of South Australia buildings. While there was some variety of activities occurring on Bank and Leigh Streets, there was a lack of people undertaking activities other than walking on Peel Street and Hindley Street West. All streets featured cafes and mixed-use buildings. Contrasting with the other streets, Hindley Street West had some unused space and some unoccupied buildings which hindered its score against the uses and activities category.

Leigh Street scored the highest in the sociability category, while Bank Street scored the lowest. There was a presence of people in groups on Peel Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West but not on Bank Street. Finally, the author did not observe people meeting others or interacting with strangers on Peel Street, Bank Street and Hindley Street West. However, it was observed on Leigh Street.

Overall, all streets scored highly in the access and linkages category and the comfort and image category. However, they were least effective in the sociability category. The following Section will build upon the findings from the street video survey and evaluation checklist by depicting the key findings from the interviews.
6.4 Key Informant Interviews

There was some diversity in the backgrounds and occupations of the professionals and community representatives interviewed which gave rise to differing insights into the topics of placemaking and shared spaces. The analysis of these interviews revealed twelve prevailing themes. These were governance, place activation, community capacity, sustainability and resilience, State Government involvement, trialling, contestation, the meaning of placemaking, city living, people-friendly streets, economic cost, and user perceptions. This Section will elaborate on the insights presented by the participants under those key themes.

6.4.1 Governance

Governance was one of the predominant themes over all interviews, commented on by nine out of the eleven participants. Firstly, conventional planning processes were argued to hinder community-driven projects. As Placemaking Facilitator 2 put it:

It’s one of those things we are dealing with at the moment. I guess there are a lot of barriers in a traditional council model to just allowing people to go forth and do what they want to do in a space, whether it be (sic) planning or city design or permits or building compliance or there are a lot of aspects.

The Placemaking Consultant also criticised conventional council processes, saying that they “have very rigid structures and are quite inflexible”.

Placemaking Facilitator 1 had another way of explaining how the conventional governance model was problematic for community involvement:

It’s just as difficult to be working in the community in this way because they’re used to working with us in a particular fashion. Quite often it’s a parent-child relationship, we’ve got the money, we’ve got the rules, we can tell you where to put your toy box and where you can’t take your dolls and all that kind of thing. So they’re not used to being in a position where they have the ability to affect change in areas.

As a consequence of this, Placemaking Facilitator 1 argued that the culture and attitudes of communities make it difficult to engage them in a productive manner. The Placemaking Consultant reiterated that:
Councils have a community engagement plan all ‘we know how to speak to communities’. You call a meeting in council or a hall and you have three or four members of council administration and the elected members there and you set up an agenda on a PowerPoint and you’re all very professional and no wonder they’re not interested.

However, several participants expressed that the governance model of authorities is changing in a positive direction. For example, Placemaking Facilitator 1 said simply: “we don’t go ‘no’ first off, we go ‘how can we make this happen?’” Planner 2 elaborated by saying:

If you walk through the door and ask ‘oh can I put some seats and chairs and tables out in a car park?’ no doubt if you asked five years ago the answer in local government would be ‘no you can’t do that, you need a permit, it’s not safe’. The culture is changing to say – a culture of trying to say ‘well let’s see if we can make it happen and support you’. So we are definitely trying to cut through some of the red tape. But to be honest I think when placemaking works the best is when the community walks through the door and says ‘can we do this?’ and we can say ‘yes’ rather than us going out to the community and trying to sell them on the idea. So it’s finding that balance which is the challenge.

Several key informants attributed a positive change in the City of Adelaide to the current leadership. The University Lecturer stated that “it really only starts with Stephen Yarwood as the Lord Mayor”, while Placemaking Facilitator 1 extended this further: “there’s really great leadership in this area, and there are people in the organisation who have a vision about how it can work and that ranges all the way up to the CEO and the Lord Mayor”. Furthermore, the Placemaking Consultant explained about his field of work: “we are sort of one mind of how it should work, as is the CEO of Adelaide, and I think there is a growing awareness through the organisation of the Place Leaders Association of what true placemaking really comprises of”.

The role of the placemaking team in Adelaide City Council is an integral part of the new governance model which is promoting placemaking in Adelaide. Placemaking Facilitator 2 explained that their team provides advice to members of the public who wish to develop something or create an event, and that:

It’s not just the placemaking team that will do the placemaking, it’s the entire organisation… At the same time that we’re working out in the community, encouraging people to change their space or you know, initiate an idea, we’re also working internally to change the processes to allow that to happen on a regular basis.
For the Placemaking Coordinator, “everyone is involved in making it a great place, everyone’s got to do their part. You can’t be fighting; you’ve got to be thinking ‘how do we as a council add value?’” Furthermore, the Placemaking Consultant believed that the Adelaide City Council had “hit the nail on the head as they’ve stepped back and said ‘we will enable and not do’”.

The Community Representatives were happy with the relationship between the Adelaide East End Coordination Group and the Adelaide City Council. As Community Representative 1 put it:

It’s healthy, it’s good. I can ring up anyone from the CEO to any of the coordinators to general managers about issues that our councillor is working with. We’ve got regular conversation and communication. The congruity is open between our councillor and our precinct group. Obviously our councillor is our flagman at the Council. But then Council engages in their staff to do projects, consultations, try things, up or down, left or right and from time to time we get involved with those… There’s just the spirit of engagement, it’s an open door policy.

Community Representative 2 added that “it’s really important that we do have the ability to speak to the Council and have a healthy discussion with them and they’re not against that…it’s not only a healthy relationship, it’s a vital one”.

6.4.2 Place Activation

The place activation theme refers to either temporary events or specific design features to activate spaces. This theme was also discussed by nine of the eleven participants. However, it was not discussed by those participants to the same extent as the governance theme.

The Research Fellow commented that place activation is about realising what people are interested in. This participant argued that “there’s got to be something for people to go there for”, and gave playgrounds, Linear Park and the botanic gardens as examples of interesting places in Adelaide. Additionally, Community Representative 2 made the point that “there needs to be a reason for people to use [a] space”.

The Project Manager specified many place activation initiatives at Bowden. There, “the idea is to really create the sense that this is an alive and happening place and that it’s always
happening”. Some of these initiatives included a chess table, table tennis table, an amphitheatre and a barbeque area in Kevin Taylor Park, a meeting place on every street, and “artwork embedded into the public realm”. These are illustrated in Figures 38-41. The Project Manager asserted that “the quality of the finishes and the street furniture is also a lot higher and the quality of the planting [and] the amount of the planting in the street is really important as well for placemaking”. Furthermore, this informant described some of the place activation events which were planned for upcoming months at Bowden, including street parades which involve the children from the Bowden Circus School, and ‘Fork on the Road’ where mobile food vendors gather for a day-long food festival.

Figure 38: Kevin Taylor Park showing a chess table on the right and a table tennis table behind it.
Figure 39: The amphitheatre and barbeque area in Kevin Taylor Park.

Figure 40: A meeting point on Gibson Street, Bowden.
The Community Representatives discussed place activation in the Adelaide East End. Community Representative 1 believed that visual design elements are important for the community: “the visual is a big thing, you know, facing all the elements that we do with rubbish bins, possible buskers all over the place, homeless people sitting on every street corner, graffiti, stickers and newspapers, advertising. All that kind of stuff is very much controlled”. Community Representative 2 noted that the recent street upgrade of Rundle Street, which widened the footpaths and included new seating and planting, had improved the feel of the street and brought more people to the area. Simultaneously,

You’re starting to see international brands coming to certain areas of the street, and what they bring with them is more people, more expensive shop fits, a better quality of presentation... There’s (sic) some fancy shop fits going on across the road at the moment and that sort of contributes to the kind of clientele that is attracted here as well which is a bit more of a sophisticated end of this street.

Both adjacent land uses and the street itself were attributed to placemaking in the East End. The Community Representatives also mentioned place activation events in this area, specifically Christmas music performances, the ‘Summer Fridays’ street festival, and ‘Bikes and Baristas’, a street event celebrating both coffee and cycling.

Several informants talked about place activation projects involving physical design elements around Adelaide. Placemaking Facilitator 2 described the success of ‘the Spheres’ sculpture in Rundle Mall, more commonly known as ‘the Mall’s Balls’ where “people were so attached to this weird sculpture but it’s because they have stories attached to that. Maybe they met
someone there for the first time, or ‘where should we meet?’ ‘Let’s meet by the Mall’s Balls’ kind of thing’. Similarly, the bronze pig sculptures nearby were also thought to be successful as “there are always tourists and kids climbing over those things and that adds to that place, that environment”. The University Lecturer used the examples of the Frome Road cycleway and the upgrade of Hurtle Square as place activation projects.

Place activation events around Adelaide were raised in several interviews. Placemaking Facilitator 1 described the event called ‘Park(ing) Day’, where “it gets people thinking about how you can use space differently and you go and put your couple of bucks in the meter and as an individual you own that [on-street car parking] space for a couple of hours and you can do anything with it” such as “a three or four-bay micro cinema, or a sand pit, or you might have a two-bay croquet game”. Additionally, Planner 1 told of a recent film night on a temporary outdoor screen in Peel Street.

Planner 2 remarked that while large place activation projects have been successful in Adelaide City, there is a challenge with creating projects on a different scale for smaller town centres. It is a challenge because “we don’t have 40,000 people a day walking through some of our spaces so it means that we can pick up some things that are working well but we have to really adapt them to a different environment”. Several ideas were presented in addressing this challenge, including an adaptation of the parklet and the use of technology to contribute to place activation.

The Placemaking Consultant highlighted that there is a difference between place activation and placemaking. This informant believed that there was a risk that councils would view place activation as placemaking, emphasising that “place activation isn’t placemaking but it has an important role to play in raising awareness”. Furthermore, “place activations have a role in the larger placemaking strategy”.

6.4.3 Community Capacity

Seven key informants alluded to the ideas of community capacity, engagement or involvement. They were also heavily focussed on by these informants. This Subsection covers the findings for this theme, which were often linked to the meaning of placemaking theme.
The benefits of engaging communities for placemaking were mentioned by three informants. For Community Representative 1:

When you do get out of your office and you are in this end of town, just the community that has built up in this place, like you know, almost every shop that you can see we know the owner of and the businesses are quite familiar with each other and there’s a fair bit of camaraderie to a certain extent. I think that’s good for friendships but it’s also good for business and like, sharing skills and sharing opportunities amongst each other.

The Project Manager explained the benefits for the planning and designing of Bowden: “we get feedback and input from the local community into the designs that we are to do and they have been very supportive and in fact have turned into advocates of the project for us”. Furthermore, Planner 1 remarked how the owners of businesses on Peel and Bank Streets had begun cooperating with one another since the placemaking projects began. One example was how the responsibilities for cleaning parklets on Bank Street were shared between businesses.

Conversely, several participants highlighted challenges with engaging the community to undertake placemaking initiatives. The Research Fellow described in detail the challenges for the Melbourne Street placemaking project. While the Adelaide City Council was involving the Melbourne Street Association in a co-designing process, this association did not truly represent the range of people who use Melbourne Street. In the Research Fellow’s words, it had “no legitimacy”. Planner 2 compared the difficulty of engaging some communities in larger centres over smaller, residential areas as “it’s easier for them to feel a sense of ownership”. Additionally, this informant commented that while some communities were excited during the initial consultation stage for various projects, “maintaining that interest over a long project is hard”.

One participant contended that a major component of placemaking is the building of community capacity. The Placemaking Consultant believed that: “it goes back to that model of the Roman Forum where the people of Rome had the opportunity to occupy and adapt a space in a way in which it suited their day to day lives and day to day activities and I think that’s what we are seeing here”. This participant explained that: “the communities of our cities need more than, you know, generous, well-intentioned hand-outs. [They] actually need to be encouraged and supported to develop capacity themselves to deliver. Then we are talking about actual placemaking”. Furthermore, the Placemaking Consultant was concerned
about authorities not recognising the importance of communities for placemaking: “if we continue with the top-down approach we will lose sight of what’s the most important placemaking asset which is the community”.

6.4.4 Sustainability and Resilience

Sustainability or resilience was referred to by six interview participants. It was talked about in different ways. Firstly, Planner 1 stated that the parklets on Bank Street:

Have to be robust, have to survive in a tough environment in terms of its kind of a red light district in terms of a lot of late night patrols and stuff like that, they had to be built on a gradient and they had to be safe, they had to be wheelchair accessible you know they had to be able to, couldn’t burn them, you know all those sorts of things.

This highlights the need for the material elements of placemaking projects to be resilient.

Secondly, placemaking can include designs which promote sustainability. For example, the Project Manager argued that the pedestrian-friendly streets and cycle stands at Bowden are “important for a sustainability point of view”. Figure 42 illustrates these cycle stands which are found on many of the streets in the Bowden redevelopment area.

However, most of the comments related to the need for placemaking itself to be resilient and sustainable. Community Representative 2 made the point that “the city grows [and] the city changes and if you can’t change those things and adapt then you fall behind”. Planner 2 expressed a concern with the current placemaking initiatives in Adelaide: “I guess the question with Splash Adelaide [is]: if the [Adelaide] City Council stepped away from it tomorrow, how much of what they created would continue?” The Placemaking Consultant argued that placemaking offers a way of building community resilience: “what I’m seeing now, the intuitive councils are seeing placemaking more than like I said physical embellishments or a series of pop-up events, but actually a longer term strategy to build resilience around a partnership through community empowerment”. Finally, the Research Fellow contemplated this aspect: “make it be more productive…how can a community be more productive?”
6.4.5 State Government Involvement

Six of the key informants associated the State Government with placemaking and shared space projects. Several informants revealed that the upgrade of Bank, Peel and Leigh Streets are part of the State Government strategic direction for Adelaide. The University Lecturer stated: “the State Government recognises Adelaide City as being of strategic importance to the state so they will put a lot of money – and they have put a lot of money into the city”. Furthermore, the Placemaking Coordinator, Planner 1, and the University Lecturer all linked the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval to the State Government’s decision to upgrade Bank, Peel and Leigh Streets. However, this was a concern for the Placemaking Consultant: “I would question the State Government’s approach to a vibrant city when to me it’s a short term you know, fix”.

Some comments were made about the relationship between the State Government and Adelaide City Council. For example, the University Lecturer said: “I don’t know to what extent the City Council have talked to the State Government to say this is what we need. I sense it’s more a top-down approach, but the interesting thing is that Adelaide City Council
needs the State Government to do all these projects to make their placemaking strategy successful”. The Placemaking Coordinator believed that this involvement was beneficial.

There has been a large amount of State Government involvement in the Bowden redevelopment. The Project Manager believed this was important:

We’ve got particular objectives for this project around placemaking and social outcomes, environmental outcomes and economic outcomes that a private sector developer wouldn’t be able to deliver because of the economic stakes don’t stack up for a developer. So we have put a lot of money into it.

6.4.6 Trialling

Five out of the eleven participants discussed the importance of trialling placemaking projects. The Placemaking Consultant explained: “what I think councils need to realise is that there is no failure in that exercise. Just because the outcome isn’t want you expected it to be, [it] doesn’t mean it’s failed because if it has raised awareness and people are participating then it’s working”. The Placemaking Coordinator and Planner 2 made similar comments about the need to trial things to see if they work or not.

The Bank Street parklets were built as temporary structures to trial them. Planner 1 described them: “I imagine the parklets will go elsewhere. They’re very much I guess, built with that in mind. They’re very much built like your furniture that you can take apart and move them elsewhere either together or as separate things”. As stated in Subsection 6.4.2, Planner 2 considered trialling a parklet in the City of Onkaparinga as a place activation project.

Splash Adelaide is a series of place activation projects which happen in the city every year. Placemaking Facilitator 2 pointed out that this programme has initiated many placemaking experiments. Furthermore, this informant mentioned that the food truck programme began as a trial and has become very successful.

6.4.7 Contestation

Four informants described issues of contestation relating to shared space projects in Adelaide. The University Lecturer commented about the public discourse:
Yeah it is polarised. There are very strong very active bicycle user groups that are quite vocal but then there are also the motorists, or people that, you know, that don’t cycle, probably don’t get it [the cycle lane]. To them it’s just an inconvenience, they don’t see why it’s being done. They go along Frome Road and say ‘well I didn’t see any cyclists there, waste of money, pull it up’. And also there’s (sic) the motoring lobbies, they’re not the ones who seem to be problematical. It’s more sort of – it’s more mainstream public opinion that seems to be inconvenienced. They more like don’t like change. We had the same experience when the trams were introduced. We also have a very one-eyed press here which doesn’t give a balanced appraisal of issues.

Other comments were made about compliance with road design standards and rules. Planner 1 highlighted how there is often confusion with shared spaces: “what I’ve found often is no one is sure whose got permission to try some of these new things whether it’s you know, state government or whether its local government or where legally they can do it or not”. This informant also described how there was contention between the designers and planners involved with the Bank Street Demonstration Project and the transport department (DPTI) about the parklets. The issue was that the designers and planners wanted stairs out of the parklets onto the carriageway to allow pedestrians to cross the street, rather than the parklets acting as a barrier, however, this was viewed by the transport department as unsafe. Additionally, Planner 1 told of the street graphic on Bank Street:

It was whether or not – see that’s obviously not a pedestrian crossing but it’s more a pedestrian design point and whether or not that was going to be something that vehicles understood, whether it would also mean where pedestrians would think of looking right to see cyclists go the opposite way to the traffic or not.

Similarly, the Project Manager disclosed that the shared space design at Bowden was contentious with the Council (the City of Charles Sturt) and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. Furthermore, this informant stated: “now that the roads have been built the Council is dealing with some liability issues. There’s (sic) been two claims for damage to cars as a result of the trees in the middle”.

Within a council there can be contestation over the design of shared spaces. Planner 2 had experienced this issue:

We have – I think they call them shared zones where they require approval from our transport department and it takes six months to get approval and then you end up with all these signs down the street going ‘shared zones’ and we’re like well it’s not worth it, we just put a kerb in, pave the road and you don’t have to go through that whole
process. But the second you take the kerb away and try and make it all one level you end up with a sign every five metres warning people that this is a shared zone and I don’t think that’s the right answer.

The findings highlighted contestation about shared spaces from the public, between authorities and within authorities.

6.4.8 The Meaning of Placemaking

Four out of the eleven interview participants discussed what placemaking means. Planner 2 acknowledged that the City of Onkaparinga Council was still trying to comprehend what placemaking means and entails. This participant noted “we have had about three months trying to agree internally about what placemaking even means, and I will say one definition and someone else thinks it’s different so even getting on the same page about what is placemaking has been a real challenge…it means something different to different people”. The Placemaking Consultant had a similar opinion about other local authorities:

I’ve probably worked with about anywhere between eight to ten local authorities in South Australia and I guess a few in Victoria and with each one you would go to them and ask them what placemaking means and you’d get a definition from every one. And you would ask ‘who are the placemakers in your organisation?’ and you would get the response that ‘it’s our landscape design team’ or ‘it’s our economic development team’ or ‘our community development team’. And then you ask them ‘do you have a placemaking strategy?’ and you look at it and sort of think ‘yeah, that’s really not a placemaking strategy. So I think a lot of councils… are grappling with what placemaking means.

The meaning of placemaking was explained to Placemaking Facilitator 1 by another person as:

[It is about] the way that you turn a house into a home… if you look at the elements that make you comfortable, like having a host, having someone who’s welcoming you into that space and that can be, that could be a retailer or a neighbour or it could be a big buffy dog that’s always happy to see people walking past and you know a variety of things to stimulate the senses, so you’ve got scent, you’ve got sound, you’ve got visual stuff going on, somewhere where you feel comfortable putting your feet up on the furniture.

This participant then asserted that “sense of place” and “place attachment” are central concepts to placemaking.
When discussing the meaning of placemaking, participants made links to the ‘community’ with words like ‘ownership’ and ‘pride’. For example, the Placemaking Consultant stated that placemaking involves “building the confidence and capacity of the community to drive these new visions of place ownership”. Planner 2 reiterated that

It should be the community saying ‘this is acceptable’, so building a sense of pride to care... it’s so much bigger than just planning, it’s that community ownership again. How do you build that sense of community pride where someone will actually say ‘hang on a second, I’m not prepared to accept this boring whatever out the front anymore’?

Moreover, Planner 2 believed that by “building healthy communities... it will come naturally”.

The final aspect of participants’ discussions on the meaning of placemaking was the contestation of the role of government. The Placemaking Coordinator discussed the upgrade to Rundle Mall which was being undertaken by the Adelaide City Council:

They’ve got trees and benches but they’re trying to make it quite clean so effectively it’s a canvas for the community to come in and do what they do best and showcase and set up business and complement the businesses that are there. Rather than fill it up with everything it’s sort of allowing people to do stuff in it and I think that’s part of you know a good street... as a council to provide a bit of a canvas for things I suppose. That’s what we should be doing more, provided there’s (sic) opportunities for private businesses who front onto it, the community to do stuff in that, we facilitate that but also the design allows that as well.

Placemaking Facilitator 1 added that: “[there is] really a fundamental shift of attitude that you need for these placemaking things to work, to get away from the parent-child stuff and actually we become allies and friends rather than an opponent”. Moreover, the Placemaking Consultant highlighted that “we need to move into a place-shaping environment where we, you know, we go from a ‘we do’ to a ‘we enable’ body and that the language we are using, talking with the community goes from consulting and you know, engaging to actually empowering”. These comments also relate to the governance theme.

6.4.9 City Living

Three participants referred to ‘city living’ or ‘liveable cities’. The University Lecturer suggested that “a lot of the placemaking, I guess, is tied in with the idea of the city living -
make the city nice for people that live in the city”. This reference to ‘city living’ was made several more times, with an explanation that Adelaide is expecting population growth within the city, leading to higher density living. The Research Fellow raised the concern residents have about this in the Melbourne Street area of North Adelaide: “there’s also a lot of concern from the locals that the character of that area might change significantly if there’s… a relaxation of the height levels… there’s the concern about overshadowing, the parcels of land are quite small to do anything big”.

Placemaking is being incorporated into local councils’ strategic plans alongside the concept of liveable and connected cities. Planner 2 explained that for the City of Onkaparinga:

We have five goals and the first one of which is to create a liveable, connected city and writing a placemaking strategy is one of our goals to achieve that… So I really work under this environment of creating active diverse destinations. We want our centres to be active hubs for shopping, business, compact housing, pedestrian and cyclists can move around, all the typical you know, placemaking, shared street stuff.

The idea of ‘city living’ was tied to people-friendly streets. The findings on this theme will be described in the following Section.

6.4.10 People-Friendly Streets

Three key informants linked the ideas of placemaking and shared spaces to people-friendly streets. For example, the University Lecturer raised the issue about shared spaces in Adelaide:

[They] won’t solve the problem, you know, of so many people bringing their cars into the city. There’s something like 80,000 long term parking spaces which basically means that if you want to bring your car into the city you can. Whereas there’s (sic) a lot of cities around the world where you, if you don’t have parking there’s no point bringing your car in.

This participant highlighted the importance of reducing vehicle dominance in creating successful pedestrian-friendly environments. By contrast, Planner 2 was concerned about the creation of shared spaces in less busy centres outside of Adelaide City: “I think it’s about understanding how we can make it more pleasant for pedestrians but at the same time, respecting that cars still are important activators, I don’t think they get enough respect to be honest”.
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In creating vibrant, people-friendly streets, the Project Manager described the street designs at Bowden:

A design speed of 25-30 kilometres per hour shared street with central trees if we can get them in locations throughout the rest of the development and you know, no upright kerbs to encourage that sense that this is a shared zone. We’ve got, the other important element of this project is that it’s a mixed use project where you’ve got residential above retail or commercial development so there’s more likelihood that people are going to be able to walk to shopping and to work and basically reduce the amount of car usage throughout the whole project.

The central trees, shown in Figure 43, were believed to slow down vehicular traffic to help with the overall goal of a pedestrian-friendly street environment.

Figure 43: Shared space design at Bowden, showing central tree to slow traffic.

6.4.11 Economic Cost

Only two interview participants referred to the economic cost of placemaking. Planner 2 argued that it is an issue for local councils undertaking projects: “how do we pay for it, you know like if we want to upgrade our streets to have trees, shelter, good lighting, public art, no one would argue that’s not right but it comes at a huge cost”. Furthermore, Planner 1 mentioned:

Yeah some of the things can be expensive if you need lots of permits and stuff like that so if you’re going to do street closure and it costs like 700 dollars per night then it can be quite an expensive undertaking. So one of the things State Government is looking at
is how to make it easier for developers and others to actually do things like cut some of the red tape and try to make it a much easier process so the status quo is not sort of the fall-back position I guess.

Briefly touched on by only two participants, economic cost was one of the least predominant themes.

6.4.12 User Perceptions

Two participants remarked on street user perceptions. In reference to the parklets on Bank Street, Placemaking Facilitator 2 stated: “I’ve sort of heard mixed reports on how well that’s working but I couldn’t honestly tell you. I don’t know enough about it but I think some businesses are doing really well and looking after [them] but some others aren’t”. About Leigh Street, Planner 1 said:

I think about 90 percent of people out of about 400 people involved in the survey actually really supported it. Mixed views from the traders, I think only 75 percent of traders, about 15 of them supported it and it depends what sort of business you are, obviously if you are a cafe or whatever then it’s fantastic. But if you’re a business with drop-offs and pick-ups it’s more challenging. I would say that you’d never get 100 percent for any sort of project like that.

Alongside economic cost, user perceptions were a minor theme of the interview findings.

6.4.13 Summary

This Section recounted the findings from the key informant interviews according to the twelve themes which characterised them. Not only does it provide the variety of insights into the topics of shared spaces and placemaking, but it shows the prevalence of the themes. Additionally, it highlights their relationships where applicable.

6.5 Conclusion

This Chapter has displayed the results of the research undertaken in Adelaide. The findings from the street video survey and the design checklist demonstrate the place characteristics of four shared spaces in Adelaide. There was evidence of some placemaking design principles being incorporated and a range of transport modes being supported. However, the findings
showed that few people were spending time and partaking in activities in the street spaces. The findings from the key informant interviews were presented under twelve themes. Interview participants highlighted how a placemaking approach to planning was being undertaken in Adelaide, describing governance, including local and state government direction, and some of the projects which have resulted from this. Moreover, participants interpreted the meaning of placemaking and discussed issues and challenges for its use. Challenges surrounded the need to undertake “true placemaking” and understanding the role of authorities in this. The next Chapter will discuss these findings to elaborate on the use of placemaking in Adelaide and the implications for improving shared spaces.
Chapter 7: Discussion

7.1 Introduction

Designing streets as shared spaces provides opportunities to create people-oriented places in our urban centres. The previous Chapter presented the findings from research undertaken in Adelaide to investigate how the concept of placemaking has been applied both widely to public space rejuvenation, and more specifically to shared spaces. This Chapter will discuss those findings in relation to the academic literature. Adelaide’s placemaking approach will be analysed in Section 7.2, followed by the key challenges for placemaking in Section 7.3. Finally, Section 7.4 will resolve how placemaking can improve the outcome of shared spaces in urban areas and Section 7.5 will discuss the implications for local authorities in New Zealand.

7.2 Placemaking in Adelaide

This Section elaborates on the use of a placemaking approach to planning in Adelaide. Specifically, it will discuss the place characteristics of the four shared space research sites. It will also consider other placemaking projects around Adelaide and the role of the Placemaking Team in the Adelaide City Council.

7.2.1 Shared Space Research Sites

One interview participant, the Placemaking Consultant, argued that the best way to understand how people use a space is to observe and analyse their actions. This view is alike with those of Jan Gehl and Jane Jacobs. Therefore, the street video survey and design checklist was a way of exploring the ‘place’ function of shared spaces in Adelaide City.

Advocates of shared spaces argue that they can be destinations which attract people to take part in activities and spend time (Jones et al., 2007; Karndacharuk et al., 2013). They should be a “lively… environment” (Karndacharuk et al., 2013, p. 56) and “promote… informal, spontaneous activities” (Hamilton-Baillie, 2008b, p. 133). Similar to the study of Elliot Street, Lorne Street and Fort Street in Auckland by Karndacharuk et al. (2013), the evaluation of
shared spaces in Adelaide included measuring the number of users staying in the area, users’ time spent in the area and the types of activities occurring. Along with the key design attributes of a successful place which were evaluated against a checklist, the extent to which the shared spaces acted as destinations and lively environments was determined.

The designs of Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West attempt to create better conditions for pedestrians by using shared space principles. However, there are various combinations of the use of kerbs, bollards and other types of deliniation between street users on all streets which is contrary to the ‘ideal’ shared space – that which has no demarcation, like Fort Street in Auckland, or New Road in Brighton, UK. The assertions by Hamilton-Baillie (2008a; 2008b) and Joyce (2012) that shared space is an approach to designing streets, not a specific street design, highlight that varying uses of such design elements can be appropriate in the context of the street. On some of the streets, the use of bollards seems unnecessary and unsightly, for example on Peel Street, seen in Figure 44. Here, the bollards have been installed to protect people using outdoor cafe furniture from vehicles, which Planner 2 explained is often required as part of outdoor dining policies of councils.

![Figure 44: Bollards protecting outdoor dining area on Peel Street.](image-url)
The use of road markings and kerbs on Bank Street are also contrary to the ‘ideal’ shared space as they provide a demarcation between pedestrians and motorists. However, the parklets, contra-flow cycle lane and the street graphic portray reclamation of the street space for the use of pedestrians rather than motorists. The parklets use space which previously was designated for car parking, while the cycle lane provides extra space for cyclists to travel in both directions. Furthermore, the street graphic indicates a crossing point where pedestrians are able to cross the street free from the confines of a traditional pedestrian crossing. These design elements, displayed in Figure 45, influence sharing of Bank Street between the different users, hence it is a shared space.

Figure 45: Bank Street from the corner of Woodsons Lane, showing the parklets, contra-flow cycle lane and street graphic.

The shared space characteristics of the streets affect the way people move through them. As explained in Chapter Two, the levelling of the street surface and the removal of road markings decreases vehicle speed and helps create a more pedestrian-friendly environment. Peel, Bank and Leigh Streets’ high numbers of pedestrians and low numbers of motorists, observed with both the design checklist and the video survey, indicate that their designs support pedestrian movement and reduce vehicle dominance. Tracing of pedestrian trajectories, as undertaken by Karndacharuk et al. (2013), Moody and Melia (2013) and Schönauer et al. (2012) would have further indicated ease of pedestrian movement on all of the streets but was unable to be
undertaken due to video camera positioning. Such evidence would strengthen the observations made with the design checklist.

For Project for Public Spaces (2014c), a successful place should be easily accessible with connections to a variety of buildings and spaces nearby and further afield. Peel, Bank and Leigh Streets are key north-south links between the railway station and a range of civic buildings, and the main commercial area of Adelaide. With a variety of public transport options available at their ends, they are subsequently major pedestrian corridors. This is evident from the findings which showed high pedestrian numbers on these three streets, particularly in the 5-6pm time period.

All four streets had notable design elements contributing to their comfort and image, and also helped distinguish them as unique places, which is an important part of placemaking (Project for Public Spaces, 2014c). For example, the entrance signs for Leigh and Peel Streets help make their entrances welcoming and aid their comfort and image. Furthermore, the large mural and street graphic help to activate Bank Street.

Project for Public Spaces (2014c) argues that a place should offer reasons for people to visit by containing a variety of uses and activities. Despite pedestrian-friendly street environments, good accessibility and good comfort and image, the findings showed that few people were spending time and partaking in activities in the street spaces. Firstly, mixed-use of buildings and the presence of cafes on the four streets indicated a variety of uses for these streets. Supporting this, the video survey found evidence of people accessing adjacent buildings from the street space across all weekday time periods. However, the number of people accessing adjacent buildings on the weekend was much lower. It is uncertain whether the many businesses which were closed on the weekend was a cause or effect of this. Furthermore, the lack of activities evident in the four street spaces was reinforced by very few numbers of people staying in these streets.

Secondly, low levels of activity on Peel Street and Hindley Street West can be attributed to inactive building frontages. On Peel Street, shown in Figure 46, this was a significant factor hindering its connections with buildings and its image. While Karndacharuk et al. (2013) use active building frontage as a measure for economic impetus, Gehl (2010) emphasises the need for buildings to have detailed and interesting frontages at the pedestrian scale to promote
walkability. Furthermore, building facades which have a high degree of individuality and offer a sense of rhythm and unity to the observer help to create a sense of place, attract people to the area, promote walking and can help reduce vandalism (South Australian Active Living Coalition, 2012).

**Figure 46:** Inactive building frontages in the middle of Peel Street looking north towards Hindley Street.

Design elements which promote social interaction are central for placemaking. As Wolf and Rozance (2013) explain, social interaction, even casual exchanges, helps individuals feel accepted by others and builds trust between people in a community, which helps connections to be made with a place. In Figure 47, people are visible sitting and interacting in the parklets which characterise Bank Street. Yet few instances of social interaction were observed across the four streets. Figure 48 shows a well-designed public seating area on Hindley Street West which allows large groups of people to sit down and promotes social interaction, but is devoid of people. While this seems largely associated with the lack activities which draw people to stay in the street rather than just move through it, triangulation features which bring people together, an idea popularised by Whyte (1980), are lacking. As acknowledged in Chapter 3, the observations of low levels of activity and social interaction on the four streets may have been related to the winter weather. Several interview participants highlighted a number of
outdoor street events which occur in the summer on Peel and Leigh Streets which increase activity and social interaction.

Figure 47: Examples of social interaction in the parklets on the northern end of Bank Street.

Figure 48: Public seating area on Hindley Street West.
7.2.2 Placemaking Projects

A range of other placemaking and place activation projects were either observed during field research or referred to by interview participants. Beyond the four shared spaces, these projects demonstrate the use of a placemaking for public spaces in Adelaide. One example is George Street, off Hindley Street West, which underwent a temporary place activation project in January, 2014. Completed in conjunction with the University of South Australia as part of Adelaide City Council’s Splash Adelaide initiative, street painting and the addition of furniture adds colour and vibrancy to the street (University of South Australia, 2014). This is illustrated in Figure 49.

![Figure 49: Street painting and furniture on temporarily-closed George Street, off Hindley Street West.](image)

Events mentioned by interview participants, such as ‘Fork on the Road’ and ‘Park(ing) Day’, have been part of the Splash Adelaide programme, which was initiated by the Adelaide City Council to trial projects and events to activate the city’s underutilised public spaces (Splash Adelaide, 2014b). Other Splash Adelaide events have included night markets, a wine festival and ‘Out of the Zoo’, a day when some animals from Adelaide Zoo were brought into the city (Splash Adelaide, 2014a). Place activation projects like these are ideal examples of the ‘lighter, quicker, cheaper’ projects advocated for by Project for Public Spaces (2014a) which
have a high impact of transforming public spaces and they raise awareness on what could be further done to improve a public space.

Street art has been embraced in Adelaide as a way of increasing the attractiveness of laneways. Public art can create a sense of place by reflecting the meaning of a public space and the connections people have with it (Fleming, 2007). In the example shown in Figure 50, Adelaide City Council funded a piece of artwork on Blyth Street, a laneway parallel with Bank Street. An information sign explains that this series of black and white prints on seven light boxes which line the street was the work of two Adelaide artists. This accompanies the street art painted on the building walls. Public art is embraced by the Council and while it is not an outcome of their Placemaking Strategy (2013b), it is identified as an important and related activity. The example shown portrays how street art can be successful at enhancing the visual design of a street and provide something unique. A unique feature helps establish the identity of a space, which contributes to the notion of a place (Cresswell, 2004).

Figure 50: Street art on Blyth Street.

The Bowden redevelopment had many examples of novel, inexpensive features which help to identify places in its public realm. One example, shown in Figure 51, is a cycle maintenance
station and a swingball game on Fifth Street. Another is a book library converted from an old Coca Cola fridge, located on a porch of a house on Gibson Street, pictured in Figure 52. The Project Manager explained that “the idea is that people come here and just borrow a book and put it back or they can keep it if they want. People donate books that they don’t need anymore, they just come here and people can sit in the chairs and read a book or take it home or whatever”. This idea has been undertaken in other cities around the world, such as New York City (Melville House, 2012) and Paris (Beekmans, 2012). Figure 53 illustrates artwork on temporary bollards which line a vacant site on Sixth Street. In addition to the examples provided in the previous Chapter, these demonstrate place activation features which have been implemented by Renewal SA, an authority under the South Australian Government managing the redevelopment. Otherwise known as ‘tactical urbanism’ these types of place activation measures are effective at promoting awareness about the social function of public space among the community and with policy makers (Silberberg et al., 2013).

Figure 51: Reallocation of street space on Fifth Street, Bowden to include cafe seating, a cycle repair station (blue post in centre) and a swingball game (on the green turf to the right).
Figure 52: Book library converted from old Coca Cola fridge on Gibson Street, Bowden.

Figure 53: Artwork on temporary bollards on Sixth Street, Bowden.
7.2.3 Adelaide City Council

Silberberg et al. (2013) argue that a place-led governance model is necessary for enabling placemaking projects to be community-driven and free from unnecessary regulation. A key finding of the research was that Adelaide City Council and their Placemaking Team are providing appropriate governance for placemaking in the city. Several interview participants confirmed that a place-led governance model, advocated for by Kent (2014), had been implemented. This supports the *Placemaking Strategy (2013b)* which highlights the Council’s commitment to placemaking and their direction for its implementation. The CEO of the Council and Lord Mayor of Adelaide seem to have provided the leadership to drive this change.

The Placemaking Team plays a specific role of being a contact for members of the public who wish to undertake a temporary place activation project and to resolve administration issues for these. Additionally, Placemaking Facilitator 2 explained that they “mentor” and “encourage” communities to change their public spaces. With backgrounds in fields such as community development and festival management, they have suitable knowledge and experience in what placemaking entails. This has an advantage over conventional governance models which may have placemaking being under the role of the urban design or parks and recreation team, where staff may not have suitable knowledge and experience.

7.3 Challenges with Placemaking

The research found a number of challenges with placemaking, in relation to both Adelaide’s placemaking approach and undertaking placemaking initiatives more generally. This Section will discuss the key challenges of understanding what placemaking means, and understanding the motivations for placemaking and the role of government in the process.

7.3.1 Defining Placemaking

A key challenge for local authorities identified by the interview participants was defining and understanding placemaking. Some of them took this as a cue to explain their understanding of the concept, for example the Placemaking Consultant, who said
I think most of the good places that work successfully as well is (sic) where there has been a sense of community participation and a sense of ownership of place and that’s been allowed to flourish and flourished over many years and not just merely a contrived exercise by Council to try and make place. I don’t think you can make place. I think place evolves.

Placemaking is the process of building healthy communities. Enabling communities to take control of the planning, design and management of public spaces is shown by Silberberg et al. (2013) to build positive connections and trust between community members. Places are more than the physical design of a public space. As Cresswell (2004) explains, places are meaningful to people, and people have a sense of ownership of them and belonging in them. They are contrived by the people who use them, and a healthy community will help create a sense of place.

Key informants highlighted the need for placemaking to be a resilient and sustainable process. A particular issue is that while local authorities can implement a series of successful place activation projects in a public space, if they stop, due to a change of priorities for example, that public space may lose its destination status and uniqueness. The point of placemaking is to encourage the community to take responsibility for placemaking in their public spaces. This can be achieved by building community resilience.

One research participant, the Placemaking Consultant argued that many local authorities in South Australia and the State Government do not understand what placemaking fully entails. Issues with disengagement among practitioners who should be involved with placemaking (Silberberg et al., 2013) and articles like Project for Public Spaces’ What is Placemaking? (2014b) suggest that defining and understanding the concept of placemaking is a major challenge faced by local authorities elsewhere which hinders its success. However, communities may also misunderstand it. Without accurately defining placemaking, the cycle of communities shaping places and being shaped by places (Silberberg et al., 2013) will not be achieved. This cycle is illustrated in Figure 54.
7.3.2 Understanding the Motivations for Placemaking and the Role of Government

At its core, placemaking is part of a broader contemporary reaction to public space deterioration and underutilisation. Chapter Two has shown that similar movements concerned with the deterioration of public spaces include new urbanism, sustainable urbanism and the ‘reclaim the streets’ movement. References by the key informants to vibrancy, city living and people-friendly streets are in line with ideas from these movements. Additionally, the planning framework for Adelaide highlights national, state and city concerns with creating a more liveable environment. However, the Placemaking Consultant suggested that placemaking is often used to improve main streets for the purpose of benefiting retail activity. It is important to look beyond benefiting retail businesses or other particular groups and understand that placemaking seeks to improve the cities and towns that people live in. Furthermore, Planner 2’s insistence that placemaking projects need to adapted to local contexts stresses that while overarching motivations of creating vibrant and liveable environments are important, there may be a range of circumstances in the local context which need to be understood.

Another key motivation for placemaking, not highlighted by any of the key informants, is reclaiming the ‘right to the city’. Harvey (2008) argues that:

The right to the city is far more than the individual liberty to access urban resources: it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city. It is, moreover, a common rather than an individual right since this transformation inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization. The freedom to make and remake our cities and ourselves is, I want to argue, one of the most precious yet most neglected of our human rights. (p. 23)
The public realm plays an important role in affecting social values, activity and behaviour. Placemaking recognises this and attempts to resolve the top-down management of public space, typical of conventional governance models.

A major challenge for local authorities is to understand their role in placemaking. The Placemaking Consultant conveyed that “the mechanisms of placemaking need to be really clear and understood and really it needs to be driven by the community for the community”. Several key informants alluded to conventional governance models hindering this, creating a “parent-child relationship”. This has made it difficult to engage communities like that of Melbourne Street, where the majority of the community seems disinterested in working alongside the Adelaide City Council. Rather, local authorities and communities should be “allies and friends” to bring about successful outcomes. Silberberg et al. (2013) argue that understanding their role in placemaking is a challenge faced by local authorities in the United States, due to a misunderstanding of what placemaking really means. However, key informants claimed that local authorities were often hesitant to rethink their role to better enable bottom-up placemaking, despite that being crucial to its success. This suggests that it is not necessarily a misunderstanding of what placemaking entails but rather, a purposeful decision to not change and instead to stick with what is known.

7.4 Placemaking for Shared Spaces

The fundamental idea of a shared space is that it becomes a place as well as a link. Yet there is a risk that focussing on the movement functions without an understanding of what creating a sense of place entails may result in underutilised shared spaces. Reduced vehicle dominance and a more pedestrian-friendly street can be achieved through various psychological traffic calming design measures which are applied to shared spaces (Joyce, 2012). Despite the physical characteristics which improve safety and enhance the amenity of a shared space, without proper placemaking, people may not view it as a place to spend time and have pride in. Examples like Intersection Repair in Portland (City Repair, 2014), where local communities have taken ownership of intersections, painting the street surfaces and activating the space with stalls and events demonstrate how streets can become successful places. For a shared space to be a great place, it requires the community to take ownership of it and shape it themselves. This Section will discuss how placemaking can be applied to shared spaces.
The upgrade of an existing street into a shared space is, in most cases, undertaken by local authorities. A placemaking approach to creating a shared space requires finding a balance between the responsibilities of local authorities for undertaking the physical construction of the street and the community taking responsibility for designing and managing the resulting space. This is because local authorities may be bound by regulations and standards which determine aspects of road design such as the use of signs, road markings, lane widths and traffic calming measures. For example, as explained in Chapter Five, the Adelaide City Council administers public roads in Adelaide City and can transform a street into a shared space, yet is bound by standards relating to the use of traffic control devices and the need to get approval from the Minister for Transport. Regulations and standards are applied for the purpose of road safety and provide consistent designs across a region or country. However, the need to adhere to road design regulations and standards may restrict unique design features and limit space for place activation activities, removing the ability for a community to shape a shared space into a place. The placemaking process gives local authorities the opportunity to work alongside communities to overcome the barrier which road design regulations and standards present in designing a shared space into a place.

Placemaking is a long-term process of building partnerships with communities and empowering them to undertake changes to the public realm. However, there needs to be an understanding of who the community is. While Adelaide City Council and the State Government have attempted to build partnerships with business owners on Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West, and local community representatives, there may be other communities who use these streets. For example, Planner 2 explained that many people come from outside of suburban Adelaide into the city for events on the weekend, and may spend time in these streets. The Link and Place tool for classifying streets, created by Jones et al. (2007) provides a way of understanding where visitors to the street come from. Therefore, the community who will take ownership of a street and transform it into a place could be broader than local residents or business owners, and may be a mixture of workers or visitors from different parts of a city. The community may even be thought of as the residents of an entire city. Furthermore, other types of communities can view a shared space as a place and should be taken into consideration, such as an ethnic or religious community, or one based on lifestyle. The ‘Bikes and Baristas’ event held in the Adelaide East End is an example of a community based on common interests coming together. Engaging the community is an
integral part of placemaking, therefore, it is necessary to understand who the community is when placemaking for a shared space.

The research has shown that there are numerous physical design elements which can contribute to a shared space being a successful place, such as signs with information about the space, public art, vegetation and seating. Social interaction in shared spaces can be facilitated through ‘triangulation’ – the choice and arrangement of physical elements in relation to each other (Whyte, 1980). Physical features like these can enhance the amenity of a street and contribute to a high quality public realm. Placemaking Facilitator 1’s comparison that a place is like a home, where people feel comfortable and recognise smells and noises, highlights that there are factors beyond the visual elements of a space that can contribute to its sense of place. There are several ways in which smells and noises could be incorporated into a shared space. Flowers among street vegetation and food businesses in adjacent buildings may produce particular smells. Furthermore, there are sounds such as that of seagulls, heard in coastal streets, which help create a recognisable place.

A shared space may not be a successful place directly after its construction. The TAXI placemaking initiative in Denver demonstrates how a strong sense of place is built over time through building relationships and trust among the community, rather than focussing on physical features (Silberberg et al., 2013; Peterson, 2014). Therefore, placemaking needs to continue after the completion of a shared space. Accordingly, placemaking should be a larger strategy of community development which goes beyond the objective of a successful shared space.

‘Lighter, quicker, cheaper’ is an important principle of placemaking. Many ‘tactical urbanism’ initiatives would be appropriate in shared spaces, where, similar to the case of Bowden, the local authority can implement them. They are ideal for temporarily activating a public space and reinforcing that these spaces are for the community to utilise and enjoy. Furthermore, they allow communities and local authorities to envisage what could be achieved with the space over the long-term.

A key finding of the research was that placemaking should be conducted by the community. Therefore, the design of a shared space should be adaptable to enable members of the public to continue to shape the street over time. Being adaptable may mean having space for a
variety of events, like outdoor movie nights and performances, having surfaces which are suitable for artwork, and having moveable furniture. Creative and original ideas which come from the community, like ‘21 Balançoires’ (21 Swings) in Montreal, Canada, or even Placemaking Facilitator 1’s suggestion of beehives in car parks, demonstrate how communities can shape a space themselves and give meaning to it. However, it requires local authorities to think about how to enable them rather than rejecting them.

Finally, there is also value in ‘guerrilla placemaking’, where unconventional initiatives are undertaken without any official permission, as they are low-cost and can make a strong statement about the function of a public space. Being receptive of such measures in a shared space can facilitate successful placemaking because they demonstrate a true form of a member of the public shaping a space. Incremental, small-scale measures undertaken by the community will further help define the street as a place. As the idea of a shared space is to create a street which is intentionally deregulated, it provides an opportunity for creative, original and unconventional placemaking initiatives.

7.5 Implications for Local Authorities in New Zealand

Several shared spaces have been constructed in New Zealand towns and cities in recent years (Shearer, 2011). Auckland Council has plans to transform more inner-city streets into shared spaces following the success of the Fort Street area (Auckland Council, 2014). Furthermore, the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan: An Accessible City (2013) states that some shared spaces will be created in Christchurch’s core to improve walkability (p. 8). These suggest that shared spaces will continue to be created in New Zealand towns and cities. The findings of the research, particularly the challenges with placemaking, have implications for local authorities in New Zealand which intend on improving urban streets into pedestrian-friendly, attractive environments.

Firstly, strategic plans to transform public spaces and streets in a town or city into more vibrant, people-friendly places will help New Zealand local authorities determine objectives and methods for achieving these. The Link and Place tool should be used to determine the streets which are most ideal to transform into shared spaces. Additionally, creating a strategic plan which includes visions about placemaking will help authorities define what placemaking means for them, which has been shown to be a significant challenge.
Funding is often considered a major barrier to undertaking public projects. There are substantial costs associated with transforming a street into a shared space. For example, the Fort Street area upgrade in Auckland cost approximately $23 million (Auckland Transport & Ascari Partners, 2012). Yet, as revealed in the Literature Review, shared spaces can result in economic benefits for businesses and landowners such as higher retail expenditure and higher property values, as well as indirect, long-term benefits reaped from improved public health. The costs of constructing a shared space need to be considered against the wide range of benefits to be derived over the longer-term. Moreover, Silberberg et al. (2013) have shown how local authorities and communities can overcome the issue of funding with partnerships with businesses, organisations and institutions which will benefit from successful public places. It is also important for local authorities to understand that the process of finding funding will have positive outcomes for the community as it requires interaction among people and the building of relationships, which will strengthen the sense of community. Therefore, funding should not be viewed as a barrier, but as an integral and beneficial component of the placemaking process. This is imperative in New Zealand where local government expenditure is tightly controlled.

The importance of temporary place activation projects need to be realised. Local authorities in New Zealand should look to international examples of ‘lighter, quicker, cheaper’ projects, in addition to those undertaken in Adelaide, for ideas. However, they need to be reflective of the context to be meaningful to the community using a shared space. For example, while an event similar to Adelaide’s ‘Bikes and Baristas’ could work in Wellington, where there is an existing cafe culture and a strong cycling community, it may not work in a smaller town without these. Alternatively, initiatives like Bowden’s Coca Cola fridge book library, and Bank Street’s pavement graphic could easily be applied to a shared space in a smaller town. Requiring few resources and being quick to implement, they are influential in reinforcing that spaces are for people to use and enjoy. Furthermore, they allow communities and local authorities to envisage what could be achieved with the space over the long-term. This is important in New Zealand where the public and the local authorities may be reluctant of unconventional placemaking initiatives.

Finally, there are compelling benefits for New Zealand local authorities in adopting a placemaking approach for shared spaces. While the Fort Street area in Auckland has been successful at demonstrating in a New Zealand setting the benefits of shared spaces,
particularly a reduction in the volume and speed of vehicles, improved safety, increased activity and a more attractive street for pedestrians, other benefits can be reaped by effective placemaking. For example, a place where people feel comfortable spending time in and interacting with people contributes to their wellbeing. Additionally, public places which the community has pride in will remain well looked after, therefore incurring fewer costs to maintain it. Yet, placemaking should be viewed as a long-term strategy of community development The Adelaide City Council’s approach to building partnerships with communities and empowering them to undertake changes to the public realm demonstrates what placemaking entails. A similar approach should be taken by New Zealand local authorities and would dovetail with existing strategies of community planning. In this way, a shared space will be only one of many placemaking projects. A predominant benefit of placemaking is the gain in social cohesion and capital in a community. New Zealand towns and cities are not in absence of issues like automobile dependency, deteriorated public spaces and fragmented communities, thus there is evident value in placemaking and shared spaces.

7.6 Conclusion

Shared spaces in Adelaide incorporate a variety of physical design elements that contribute to their attraction as places for people. All four streets were unique in their designs and did not conform exactly to the designs of international shared space examples, but followed the philosophy that shared space is an approach to create more people-friendly streets where motorists are more attentive. This Chapter also discussed other examples of placemaking in Adelaide which demonstrate a range of ways to activate public spaces. Furthermore, Adelaide City Council is argued to have an effective placemaking approach due to the implementation of their Placemaking Strategy (2013b).

Section 7.3 discerned the challenges with placemaking in general. The leading challenges include understanding the concept in its entirety and the motivations behind it, and realising the role of government in the process. Emphasised by the research participants, these challenges are mostly consistent with those presented in the placemaking literature. These challenges can hinder the ability to achieve effective and sustainable placemaking.
This Chapter has then ascertained the use of placemaking for shared spaces. A placemaking approach to creating a shared space involves local authorities encouraging and facilitating the community to take responsibility for the design and management of the street. There are a range of short-term place activation projects which can be applied to shared spaces as part of a greater strategy of community development. Subsequently, placemaking should continue after the construction of a shared space as a healthy and resilient community will contrive their sense of place in a shared space over time. In light of this discussion, the next Chapter will draw conclusions for this thesis.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

Shared spaces are becoming a popular way of improving street environments in town and city centres following their transformation from conventionally-designed streets across Europe, North America and Australia and New Zealand. Offering a way to address the problems of automobile dependency in towns and cities, their use has been attributed to reducing vehicle speed and volume, easing pedestrian movement, improving safety, being inclusive in their design, having economic benefits for adjacent land uses and enhancing amenity. Accordingly, they offer a way for a street to become a place – a destination where people spend time taking part in activities, as well as its more conventional role as a link – designed for users to pass through quickly and conveniently.

The concept of a ‘place’ refers to a space which has a unique identity, is meaningful to the people who use it and provides a sense of belonging. Placemaking is a movement which seeks to improve underutilised public spaces in towns and cities into places, due to their benefits for communities. A placemaking approach to improving public spaces is one that requires the people who use them – the community, to plan, design and manage them. In this way, spaces become meaningful places which communities take pride in, where there is a sense of ownership and a sense of attachment. Placemaking has recently been endorsed by planners and urban designers in Adelaide with the implementation of strategic plans to improve the quality of the public realm. With this in mind, this thesis sought to investigate how placemaking can improve the outcome of shared spaces in town and city centres, ensuring that they become successful places. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were devised:

1. Conduct a literature review to gain an understanding of the concepts of placemaking and shared spaces and their application overseas.
2. Explore placemaking strategies in Adelaide and how they are being undertaken in practice in the design of shared spaces.
3. Identify the issues and challenges for planners, designers and local communities in creating shared spaces as places.
4. Determine the implications for local authorities in New Zealand wishing to create successful shared spaces.
Chapter Two presented a review of the literature relating to shared spaces and placemaking, beginning with an overview of automobile dependency, followed by movements which advocate for improving the quality of street environments and walkability, particularly New Urbanism, Sustainable Urbanism and Reclaim the Streets. Moreover, the Literature Review detailed the placemaking movement and shared spaces. Fulfilling Objective One, this Chapter formed a theoretical framework for this thesis.

Objectives Two and Three were met by conducting a document analysis to explore placemaking and shared space strategies promoted within Adelaide’s planning framework, which formed Chapter Five, and a mixed methods research methodology to collect primary data in Adelaide. This mixed methods research methodology consisted of a video survey, design evaluation checklist and key informant interviews. The video survey and design evaluation checklist produced quantitative data on four shared spaces in Adelaide City, namely Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West, which enabled an evaluation of the ‘place’ function of these streets. Key informant interviews produced qualitative data, specifically expert opinions on issues and challenges with placemaking and its use for shared spaces.

Chapters Six and Seven presented and discussed the findings of the research. The shared spaces in Adelaide incorporate a variety of physical design elements that contribute to their attraction as places for people. These included street art, level surfaces, vegetation, street furniture, good accessibility, active building frontages and the presence of eateries. Despite high numbers of pedestrians and low numbers of motorists, indicating pedestrian-friendly street designs, there were various amounts of people accessing adjacent buildings, and few people spending time and partaking in activities in the street spaces. Therefore, the evaluation of Peel Street, Bank Street, Leigh Street and Hindley Street West revealed that these streets are used more as links than places. Additional examples of placemaking such as ‘Splash Adelaide’ events and the redevelopment of the Bowden industrial site were examined to further the exploration of placemaking in Adelaide. Adelaide City Council’s place-led governance model is argued to be integral to placemaking.

The key challenges with placemaking are defining the concept and understanding its motivations, and determining the role of government in the process. These challenges are interrelated, as without properly understanding what placemaking entails and its overall
purpose, it is also difficult to understand the role of a local authority to enable successful placemaking. Therefore, by addressing these challenges, communities, with the support of local authorities, can better achieve effective and sustainable placemaking.

The function of a shared space as a place can be improved by determining the community who will use a shared space, building relationships among them and empowering them to take responsibility for transforming the space into something that represents them. Placemaking should continue after the construction of a shared space as a healthy and resilient community will contrive their sense of place in a shared space over time. In the short-term, place activation can be very effective at empowering communities and there are a range of initiatives which could be applied to shared spaces. Moreover, the implications for local authorities in New Zealand are that strategic planning for placemaking would help overcome barriers of uncertainty with the concept, economic costs should be viewed against the social benefits, the process of finding funding is a positive component of placemaking, and short-term place activation projects should reflect the context of the street.

This thesis addresses several wider debates identified in the international literature. Firstly, effective shared spaces begin to resolve automobile dependency in cities by providing walkable street environments in town and city centres, thus reducing the need to drive and reducing the effects of car use. Creating more attractive and vibrant public spaces is a primary objective of contemporary urban design and planning. It is also congruous with ideas around intensifying and repopulating town and city centres. Furthermore, placemaking for shared spaces offers a way for the public to recognise the role the public realm plays in affecting social values, activity and behaviour and subsequently reclaim it from overregulation and privatisation.

Finally, this research contributes to the literature on both shared spaces and placemaking as it explored the topic in the context of Adelaide. Additionally, this thesis provides an overlooked connection between the two concepts, as it argues that placemaking is fundamental for a shared space which acts successfully as both a link and a place. Furthermore, it has practical implications for local authorities in New Zealand, by discussing measures which can be undertaken to apply placemaking to shared spaces.
8.1 Limitations of Research and Future Research

In evaluating the shared space research sites, individuals’ attachment to the streets, their sense of belonging and the extent of community pride of the streets were not evaluated beyond suggestions by key informants that people seemed to like them and business owners were cooperating more. Similarly, the Project Manager described how the community at Bowden is proud of the place, however, this was also unsubstantiated. Not undertaking a qualitative study involving community members was a limitation because these notions are important in distinguishing a place from a space. Such a study can be achieved through qualitative methods like those described by Lewicka (2011) and would foster an understanding of place attachment to a shared space.

This thesis explored the application of placemaking to shared spaces in Adelaide by evaluating them in a single point of time. This was a limitation because placemaking is a long-term process which can involve changes in the physical design and use of spaces. A longitudinal study would be beneficial for determining how effective placemaking has been in a shared space over a longer period of time.

A key issue which arose during the research was that placemaking can be interpreted in different ways and should be applied differently depending on the context, for example whether it is a highly-populated urban setting or a small, low-populated town. This study was limited to one case study, Adelaide, due to the scale and timeframe of the exercise. Therefore, it produced knowledge about placemaking in one city. A comparison study would uncover differences in placemaking challenges for towns and cities of different sizes, urban forms, transport systems and cultures. Consequently, a better understanding of the way in which placemaking can be applied to shared spaces in different contexts could be developed.

Finally, the concept of place-led governance was argued to be constituent of effective placemaking. This study only briefly discussed Adelaide City Council’s place-led governance model. More detailed research into place-led governance would validate the benefits for placemaking over conventional governance models and identify measures for local authorities to achieve it. Furthermore, despite the similarities with collaborative planning and community planning approaches, research into this planning approach, which involves all government
departments being organised around the goal of creating great places, would fill an evident gap in the literature.

8.2 Concluding Comments

This thesis has demonstrated that placemaking is necessary for shared spaces in town and city centres to become distinct destinations which people have pride in, are comfortable and facilitate social interaction and activity. As such, they promote public health and social wellbeing of people living in urban environments, a central goal for planners and urban designers. Finally, they put the public back into the public realm.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Information Sheet for Participants

Placemaking and Shared Spaces in Adelaide
INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the aim of the project?
This project is to fulfil part of the requirements of Ethan Archer’s Master of Planning qualification at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. The aim of the project is to investigate how placemaking principles can improve the outcome of shared spaces in urban areas. A shared space is a street design which intends to create a place for people to visit and spend time in, as well as allowing the movement of vehicles like a conventional street. Placemaking is a recent movement which seeks to improve public spaces by involving the local community in the design.

What types of participants are being sought?
A range of participants are being sought for inclusion in this study. In particular, participants with knowledge on and involvement in placemaking and shared space projects will be sought. Additionally, representatives of local communities involved with these projects will be sought.

Participants will initially be contacted via email or telephone. Subsequent participants will be identified and contacted through initial participants. There is no limit on number of participants, but all those who contribute must be at least 18 years of age.
What will participants be asked to do?
Should you agree to take part in this project you will be asked to answer questions based on your knowledge and experience in the planning processes or your involvement in the selected projects. The questions will be open ended and should not take more than one hour. The researcher will do his best to ensure that you are not uncomfortable. If at any time you do feel uncomfortable during the interview and do not wish to take part in the project, you may do so without any disadvantage.

What data or information will be collected and what use will be made of it?
The data collected will focus on the planning and design processes of placemaking and shared space projects in Adelaide. The data will take the form of notes taken during the interview and an audio recording if permitted.

This research involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions that will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions which will be used. In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

The information gathered will be used in the writing of the final Master’s thesis and only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to it prior to the printing of the thesis.

The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library, Dunedin, New Zealand. Every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity. You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the project should you wish.

The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisors will have access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except, as required by the University’s research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

Reasonable precautions will be taken to protect and destroy data gathered by email. The security of electronically transmitted information cannot be guaranteed. Caution is advised in the electronic transmission of sensitive material.

Can participants change their mind and withdraw from the project?
You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.
What if participants have any questions?
If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

Ethan Archer
Department of Geography
University Telephone Number: +64 3 479 4216
Email: arcet439@student.otago.ac.nz

OR

Claire Freeman
Department of Geography
University Telephone Number: +64 3 479 8762
Email: cf@geography.otago.ac.nz

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph +64 3 479 8256 or email gary.witte@otago.ac.nz). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix B: Consent Form for Participants

Placemaking and Shared Spaces in Adelaide
CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the information sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. Personal identifying information which is audio recorded will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;

4. This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes the idea of placemaking and how it is used to design shared spaces. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.

5. The researcher will endeavour to ensure that I am not uncomfortable, but if at any time I do feel uncomfortable and wish to not take part in the project, I know that I may do so without any disadvantage to myself of any kind.

6. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity should I choose to remain anonymous.

7. I grant/do not grant my permission to allow the researchers to record my interview.

8. I grant/do not grant permission to allow the researchers to use my identity.

I agree to take part in this project.

............................................................................  ........................................
(Signature of participant)  (Date)

............................................................................
(Printed Name)

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee.
### Appendix C: Street Design Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared space: To what extent is the space shared?</th>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of kerbs OR low kerbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of bollards OR few bollards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of any guard railing/pedestrian fencing/planters to delineate road users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contrasting surface colours OR some contrasting surface colours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of formal crossing points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of road markings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of traffic lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High pedestrian flow AND pedestrians present right across the space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vehicular flow AND vehicles give way to pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of parking OR some parking (disabled, loading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access and linkages: Can people easily access the shared space?</th>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space is visible from the outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrances are welcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between the space and the adjacent buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space functions for people with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of transportation options available to reach the place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort and Image: Is the space comfortable and attractive?</th>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Street name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately placed street furniture (enough seats, choice of places to sit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space is clean and free of litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of greenery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of street art/sculptures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The space feels safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-surveillance from surrounding areas and pedestrian traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of vandalism and anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good building conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Uses and Activities: Is there evidence of activity in the space?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variety of ages of people using the space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of activities are occurring AND number of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of unused space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of cafes or stalls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use of buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of unoccupied buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sociability: Does the space foster social interaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are meeting others in the space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of people in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People interacting with strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Interview Questions

This list guided the questions asked in interviews.

Questions for planners, urban designers and other professionals:

1) What is your role/job description?
2) Describe your role/involvement in placemaking or shared space projects.
3) What were the key considerations for this project?
4) Who were the key stakeholders and what was their involvement in the planning and design phases of the project?
5) What were the issues and challenges for the project in terms of the planning and design phases?
6) Have the outcomes been successful?
7) Are there any ways the design and outcome could have been improved?

Questions for local community representatives:

1) How were the community involved in the design of a placemaking or shared space project?
2) What were the key considerations for this project?
3) What were the issues and challenges for the project in terms of the planning and design phases?
4) How did members of the community interact with one another, with professionals and the local authority during the planning and design phase to influence the outcome of the project?
5) Have the outcomes been successful?
6) What has the community learnt through this process?
7) Are there any ways the design and outcome could have been improved?
## Appendix E: Street Video Raw Data

### Weekday 8-9am (10 min period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. pedestrians</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. vehicles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. cyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. motorcyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. accessing adjacent building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time 2-5 mins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time more than 5 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.30-11.30am (10 min period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. pedestrians</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. vehicles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. cyclists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. motorcyclists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. accessing adjacent building</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time 2-5 mins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time more than 5 mins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12.30-1.30pm (10 min period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. pedestrians</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. vehicles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. cyclists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. motorcyclists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. accessing adjacent building</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time 2-5 mins</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time more than 5 mins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.30-3.30pm (10 min period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. pedestrians</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. vehicles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. cyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. motorcyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. accessing adjacent building</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time 2-5 mins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Ped stay time more than 5 mins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5-6pm (10 min period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. pedestrians</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. vehicles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. cyclists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. motorcyclists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peel St</td>
<td>Bank St</td>
<td>Leigh St</td>
<td>Hindley St West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. pedestrians</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. vehicles</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. cyclists</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. motorcyclists</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. other</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. accessing adjacent building</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Ped stay time 2-5 mins</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Ped stay time more than 5 mins</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weekend 10-11am (10 min period)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. pedestrians</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. vehicles</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. cyclists</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. motorcyclists</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. other</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. accessing adjacent building</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Ped stay time 2-5 mins</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Ped stay time more than 5 mins</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2-3pm (10 min period)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peel St</th>
<th>Bank St</th>
<th>Leigh St</th>
<th>Hindley St West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. pedestrians</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. vehicles</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. cyclists</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. motorcyclists</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. other</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. accessing adjacent building</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Ped stay time 2-5 mins</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Ped stay time more than 5 mins</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>