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1. Abstract

This thesis examines participatory Urban Planning as an emerging application area for Participatory Design. Through testing and analysis traditional methods and concepts from Interaction and Participatory Design demonstrate how Participatory Design can contribute to current practices within participatory Urban Planning. Literature research provides a base on which to analyze the designer's roles acting within Urban Planning. Research findings concerning the redevelopment of the RAW-arena in Berlin suggest the adjustment of traditional Participatory Design operating principles, such as user-centeredness into citizen-centeredness. The Participatory Designer's traditional roles of a facilitator and translator extend by the role of a mediator, advocate, connector and activist when acting in the context of Urban Planning. The research presents a thorough description of the design process, workshops and interventions on-site.

2. Introduction

Participatory Design (PD) as a distinct research discipline and field of design practice has just recently started engaging in Urban Planning (UP) (DiSalvo et al., 2013; Björgvinsson et al., 2010; Ehn et al., 2014; Hilgren et al., 2016). The belief that PD as a discipline has the potential to enhance participatory Urban Planning as it is today, is the driving motivation behind this research.

Initially, PD has developed as part of the “workplace democracy movement” in the 1970s led by the transformation of office spaces due to the introduction of computers (Simonsen & Robertson, 2013). “At the heart of this tradition is an unshakeable commitment to ensuring that those who will use information technologies play a crucial role in their design” (Simonsen & Robertson, 2013 p.2). PD focuses on “the shaping of future situations” (Simonsen & Robertson, 2013) through actively involving all stakeholders in the design process. Subsequently, this approach is expected to help ensure that the results meet the peoples’ needs and are usable and a human-centred design is facilitated.

By focusing on UP as an application area for PD, practicalities change. Bratteteig et al. identify that “in such application areas, the access to use settings and users is different from accessing workers in a workplace and presents new challenges on how to organize and carry out a Participatory Design process” (Bratteteig, et al., 2013 p. 139).

The expansion of application areas for PD indicate the need to re-analyze the Participatory Designer’s (PDr) roles and coherent ability to influence the design process.

For ‘traditional PD’ Sanders & Strappers highlight the shift of the designer’s role as a “translator” to the role of a “facilitator”. A main task becomes the “facilitation” of “people’s expressions of creativity at all levels (Sanders & Strappers, 2012 p.24). The designer’s main task is to ensure the PD team’s ability to participate by giving them the “appropriate tools for expressing themselves” (Sanders & Strappers, 2012). The important role of materiality in such traditional PD process, is suggested a valuable contribution for participatory UP.

Through the analysis and discussion of related work in the field of participatory UP the arising challenges for a PD working on the borderline of design, participation and UP will be discussed more thoroughly. Findings in literature acquire an initial framing and base for the analysis of the designer’s roles within participatory Urban Planning. Finally, these findings
are extended by investigations concerning the on-going process of the re-development of the RAW-arena (RAW) in Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. Research findings suggest an expansion of the PDr’s roles when entering the field of Urban Planning and raise a discussion around the value of the PDr’s mandate and how it influences his roles coherently.

3. Working definitions

In this thesis I distinguish between Participatory Design (PD) and the Participatory Designer (PDr). The Participatory Designer is engaging in a process by consciously enacting the PD methodology (see method section).

When referring to the mere “designer” the role is not clearly divisible and might hold aspects of the roles of the Participatory Designer or the Urban Planner or some other designerly role. In some direct quotes the term co-design occurs. Co-design and Participatory Design are commonly used in similar terms. However, I distinguish between a co-creation and Participatory Design. A co-creation is the product of stakeholders creating together. Within this thesis, I use the term to indicate workshops or citizen participations in which the participants have the option to contribute and create.

4. Research Questions

Research Question one:
How can Participatory Design contribute to Participatory Urban Planning?

Research Question two:
What could be the role of the Participatory Designer in Participatory Urban Planning?
5. Background and related work

5.1 Participation in Urban Development

“The idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you”

(Arnstein, 1969, p. 216)

The necessity of participation in Urban planning becomes evident when looking at the rising population density in cities. Public urban spaces need to be shared amongst a growing number of people and should therefore be designed in a way that ensures their effective and sustainable use. Urban spaces are commonly created for a long-term and permanent use. Their extensive long-term effect and influence on the citizens and the cityscape can only be assessed years later. Accordingly, urban planners have an important role in shaping the future city life which entrusts them extensive responsibilities. Oftentimes, the planning of urban spaces evokes conflicts (Mohring & Wilhelm, 2013) among stakeholders involved.

Indirect participation
Several stakeholders are commonly involved in the urban development process. Those range from different departments within the municipality, the investor, the planners to the future users. The municipality plays a major role and has an extensive degree of control in such processes. The municipality awards the construction rights and is oftentimes also the contracting authority. In representative democracies, the municipality representatives are elected by vote and therefore the municipality engagement can be regarded as an indirect citizen participation. The citizens give mandate to an elected representative to advocate their interests (BauGB § 1, § 2, § 10 German construction law/legal code) (Clarke & Foweraker, 2001).

Direct participation
Direct citizen participation resembles a direct democracy, in which people are empowered to exercise power directly through voting on issues with public implications (Budge, 2001). Jean-Jacques Rousseau regards a direct democracy as the only true democracy, because the delegation of people's power lead to alienation and the risk of losing control over one's representatives (Clarke & Foweraker, 2001).

5.1.1 Participatory Urban Planning – Moderation, Mediation and Participation

Historic overview
Urban Planning as a scholarly discipline developed in the beginning of the 1900s. Patrick Geddes is one of the first advocates of today's understanding of participatory Urban Planning, he requested to move away from an unduly reliance on design and effect and instead focus on considering the surrounding quarter and construct regarding local needs and potentialities (Hall, 2014) (Geddes, 1947). Also, Urban Activist Jane Jacobs is one of the pioneers in the field. She criticizes that urban development does "not respect the needs of most city-dwellers"
in her book "The Death and Life of Great American Cities" published in 1961 (Waal, 2014). With her activism, she contributed to the evolvement of direct citizen participation as in participatory Urban Planning, which has its roots in the 50s and expanded in the late 60s “with the recognition of collaborative citizen participation in decision-making for urban development” (Brody et al., 2003 as cited in Glackin & Dionisio, 2016 p.364).

Notions of participation
In 1969 Shelly Arnstein developed “The ladder of participation”, a typology indicating eight levels of participation. Her intention was to encourage a “more enlightened dialogue” (Arnstein, 1969), by providing a simplification that explains the significant gradations of citizen participation. The model explains types of participation and "non-participation". Early, she identifies the "critical difference between going through the empty ritual of participation and having the real power needed to affect the outcome of the process” (Arnstein, 1969 p.216). While the lower rungs of the ladder indicate top-down decision-making structures1, the upper rungs indicate bottom-up decision-making structure2. Arnstein refers to the intermediate levels of the ladder as "degrees of tokenism" that might allow for the participants to advise but withhold the right to decide (Arnstein, 1969).

Similar, Nobre (1999) established four main degrees of community participation: to inform, to consult, to discuss and to share (Nobre 1999 as cited in Laurini, 2001). Thereby, "lower levels are one-way procedure as they do not necessarily ask for any particular feedback from the community. On the contrary, higher levels of participation require two-way procedures as they imply capturing the public’s reaction and feeding the decision-making process with such data” (Laurini, 2001 p.249). In 2016, “The International Association of Public Participation” defines five distinct levels of engagement: informing, consulting, involving, collaborating and empowering” (Glackin & Dionisio, 2016 p.364).
Despite this extensive discussion around levels of participation, most citizen participation procedures are still conducted to fulfil constitutional regulations (Selle, 2013) comparable to the lower and intermediate rungs of Arnstein's ladder.

Glackin & Dionisio observe that "community and stakeholder participation are considered critical condition for precinct regeneration" (Glackin, 2013; Newton et al., 2012; Dionisio et al., 2015 as cited in Glackin & Dionisio, 2016 p.364). They identify the need for "improved research on methodology, aiming to capture qualitative and 'deep' information on community values and responses" due to the "diversity and complexity of factors influencing community participation" (Glackin & Dionisio, 2016 p.364). Glackin & Dionisio emphasize the need to develop "clear methodological frameworks" (Glackin & Dionisio, 2016 p.364), regarding recent research identifying the need for "better collaboration outcomes" (Brody et al., 2003; Cavaye, 2004; Aulich, 2009; King and Cruickshank, 2012 as cited in Glackin & Dionisio, 2016 p.356).

Additional to their subject areas, today, most Urban Planning offices offer moderation and sometimes mediation as services (Opperman & Langer 2003 as cited in Mohring & Wilhelm, 2013). Moderation and Mediation are both methods for conflict resolution. The stage of the conflict is the determining criteria for choosing one over the other.

**Figure 2: “Konflikt-/Eskalationsstufen” (according to Mohring & Wilhelm, 2013) [conflict- & escalation levels]**

**Figure 3: Common pattern in Urban Planning**

*moderator and urban planner are often the same person*
Even if the increasing relevance of these methods can be understood as symptom of a society that recognizes heterogeneity and understands that agreements are more likely to be obtained through active citizen engagement (Mohring & Wilhelm, 2013), the notion of moderation still does not overcome the intermediate rungs of Arnstein’s ladder.

The need for conflict management indicates it being late for a participation in the sense of PD, which involves users in the planning prior to decision-making (Bratteteig, et al., 2013). The request for “better collaboration outcomes” (Glackin & Dionisio, 2016) is not likely to be served when participation happens in a stage in which decisions were made and conflict resolution is item of agenda.

Klaus Selle professor of Urban Planning at RWTH, Aachen notices that today’s citizen participation is often more concerned with pacification than with true involvement. Selle states that parallel processes are running in the background and decisive resolutions being passed in small circles without considering the citizen participation. Besides, the highly administrative processes, complicates the alignment of the multiple actors. He criticizes a political style that just formally conducts participation to obtain legitimation. Selle coins the term “particitainment” by analogy to “infotainment”. The term “particitainment” indicates the banalization and simulation of public participation evolving in participatory Urban Planning, that is oftentimes just serves for good publicity. Selle criticizes that the success of participation is commonly measured by quantitative resonance (also observed by Arnstein (Arnstein, 1969)) and therefore, current participation procedures often resemble a political staging rather than substantial discourse in the context of a vivid democracy. Consequently, many participation procedures are left without essential influence on urban development which leads to frustration.

This evaluation raises the question on how to design citizen participation to avoid a mere moderation or meditation but nor lead to “particitainment”?

In this thesis, PD is suggested as an approach to offer new perspectives to participatory Urban planning in avoidance of the above elaborated concerns.
5.2. Urban Planning as an emerging application area for PD

“Creativity does not happen inside a person’s head but in the interaction between a person’s thoughts and a socio-cultural context.”

(Csikszentmihalyi, 1996)

This evaluation raises the question on how to design citizen participation to avoid a mere moderation or meditation but neither lead to “particitainment”?

In their paper ‘Deep engagement’ and urban regeneration: tea, trust, and the quest for co-design at precinct scale’ Glackin & Dionisio recognize the need for new methodologies to enhance urban redevelopment. They identify the need for developing “deep engagement” methodologies which overlap to some extent with design led research methodologies. They highlight the notion of “generative artefacts” in Sanders & Strappers sense (Glackin & Dionisio, 2016).

PD practicalities change when applied to the area of Urban Planning. Bratteteig et al. identify that “in such application areas, the access to use settings and users is different from accessing workers in a workplace and presents new challenges on how to organize and carry out a Participatory Design process” (Bratteteig, et al., 2013 p. 139). A PD process can be guided according to the PD method which refers to a “coherent set of organization principles and general guidelines”. Important, however, is the accurate and careful selection, adaptation and appropriation of these general guidelines according to the specific project and situation at hand (Bratteteig, et al., 2013 p. 118). DiSalvo et al. (2013) emphasize the necessity to refocus towards “fostering creativity” among the extended group of actors in such “spaces other than workspaces” (DiSalvo, et al., 2013 p.192). “What is novel throughout this work is the use of Participatory Design methods to support the process of creative and critical discovery and expression through the arts. In addition, it is important to recognize that these forms of cultural production involve learning and are often politicized acts.” (DiSalvo, et al., 2013 p.192).

A participatory design process often implies aspects of co-creation at some stage. A co-creation holds to actively and co-operatively create. In such a co-creation, the end-users “become acknowledged as co-creators because they are being recognized as experts of their own experience” (Sanders & Strappers, 2012). A co-creation in that sense might result in “better collaboration outcomes” as requested by Glackin & Dionisio (2016) and other scholars. Whereas in traditional PD user-centeredness is the premise in participatory Urban Planning the ‘mere user’ does not exist. The citizen, resident, site-user, site-stakeholder replace the ‘end-user’ of the ‘product’. These actors have a stake in the development and might be, but are not necessarily, users. However, these actors are likely to advocate very different interests. Therefore, the notion of user-centeredness needs to be reconsidered when the PD premise is transferred to participatory Urban Planning. The idea of actively involving representatives of different groups, affected by the future design, remains. The value of such an approach is the creation of “a design that is considered from all different perspectives” (Sanders & Strappers, 2012). PDr’s expect “that users may expand the space of design ideas because their imagination will be based on their experiences, which will be different from the designer’s experience” Cf. e.g. Robinson 1993; Grudin 1994 as cited in Simonsen & Robertson, 2013 p.127). Additionally, Binder (2011) highlights the “importance of making participants’ tacit knowledge”
come into play in the design process, not only their formal and explicit competencies” (Binder (2011) as cited in Brandt, et al., 2013 p.147).

5.3. The role of materiality in co-creation

It is probable that stakeholders with different backgrounds and expertise focus on very different aspects of the future design within a co-creation process. In such situations, it is important to support the communication across different professional languages. Therefore, Glackin & Dionisio stress the importance of generative artefacts, that through clearer visualization allow for well-focused debate (Glackin & Dionisio, 2016). The facilitation of specific design materials enables participants to engage in a “reflective conversation” as coined by Donald Schön (1992) (Schön, 1992). To create such a reflective conversation, Eva Brandt suggests tangible mock-ups, as generative artefacts. She reports that tangible mock-ups have proven to be important elements in co-creation. The physical objects “become ‘things-to-think-with [and] evoked new design considerations just as much as they mediated already finished design work” (Brandt, 2007 p.5). Brandt highlights that the interaction with tangible mock-ups triggers significantly more senses than mock-ups rendered in paper or computer and consequently, evoke more reflections and comments (Brandt, 2007). Here the direct interaction with material objects enable participants to “anchor their reflections” in the mock-up and communicate their specialist concerns more specifically to one another. “In this respect, the mock-ups are inscription devices through which the design evolves” (Brandt, 2007 p. 7).

The materiality of artefacts being used to further the participatory design process has impact on the communication between the participants and therefore ultimately influences the design itself.

In her dissertation “Materials matter in co-designing”, also Mette Agger-Eriksen recognizes the importance of materials in co-creation. She refers to materials as “non-human participants” in the PD process. By building on Susan Leigh Star’s concept of “Boundary Objects” she states that “materialized non-humans might become actors mediating further action and thus leaving traces in the project network” (Agger Eriksen, 2012 p.371). Agger Eriksen’s notion of material is very broad. Physical materials participating in the PD process she indicates as “content materials”. By pointing to Bruno Latour she characterizes ‘content materials’ as ‘delegated play mates,’ as they might participate in collaborative experimentation, exploration and negotiation of issues, expressions and proposals. She determines that “negotiated materialized and rematerialized outputs, often become traces, memories, actors in the aftermath archives of an [co-creation] event” (Agger Eriksen, 2012 p. 335).

In line with the two researchers, materials are identified crucial for a fruitful co-creation. That indicates the PDr’s role of providing appropriate materials and artefacts to facilitate the communication of ideas. Naturally, the PDr does not know how to solve the (design) problem beforehand. Therefore his main challenge persists in engaging in a “reflective conversation” with the problem and to observe the participants’ actions and choices. Correspondingly, he needs to “recognize” the problem and respond to it by pointing towards different possibilities.
Traditionally, the PDr holds the role of a facilitator that contributes “metaphoric appreciation” (Cross, 2006). This term hints to the designer’s professional ability of “reading” the world of goods [and] in translating back from concrete objects to abstract requirements, through their design codes” (Cross, 2006 p.10).

As a facilitator in the co-creation process the designer provides tools and thereby enables participants to express themselves. In line with Cross (2006) stating: “Designers have the ability both to ‘read’ and ‘write’ in this culture: they understand what messages objects communicate, and they can create new objects which embody new messages” (Cross, 2006 p.9), it can be argued that the designer can take various roles within a participatory design process.

When the phase of co-creation commences, the PDr’s main task is to provide the appropriate tools and techniques to support the participants to “learn enough about technical possibilities to develop a technical imagination” (Bratteteig, et al., 2013 p.127-128).

Accordingly, in a traditional PD process, the designer’s role shifts in between being “translator” and being a “facilitator”. The designer’s main task is to ensure the team’s ability to participate by giving them the “appropriate tools for expressing themselves” (Sanders & Strappers, 2012).

**5.4 The traditional role of a Participatory Designer**

Traditionally, the PDr holds the role of a facilitator that contributes “metaphoric appreciation” (Cross, 2006). This term hints to the designer’s professional ability of “reading” the world of goods [and] in translating back from concrete objects to abstract requirements, through their design codes” (Cross, 2006 p.10).

As a facilitator in the co-creation process the designer provides tools and thereby enables participants to express themselves. In line with Cross (2006) stating: “Designers have the ability both to ‘read’ and ‘write’ in this culture: they understand what messages objects communicate, and they can create new objects which embody new messages” (Cross, 2006 p.9), it can be argued that the designer can take various roles within a participatory design process.

When the phase of co-creation commences, the PDr’s main task is to provide the appropriate tools and techniques to support the participants to “learn enough about technical possibilities to develop a technical imagination” (Bratteteig, et al., 2013 p.127-128).

Accordingly, in a traditional PD process, the designer’s role shifts in between being “translator” and being a “facilitator”. The designer’s main task is to ensure the team’s ability to participate by giving them the “appropriate tools for expressing themselves” (Sanders & Strappers, 2012).
5.5 Inspirational roles for a Participatory Designer when engaging in participatory Urban Planning

Urban Planning processes pose a challenge for the PDr to rely on generalized methods, as projects are very place-specific and involve an extensive number of stakeholders. Through related work in the field the roles of the designer/planner are analyzed and compared to the traditional role of a PDr.

5.5.1 Related work: Sweden, Gothenburg – Development of the Harbor area

The following example is a critical reflection of the designer as a participant in a participatory dialogue in the light of political and social structures.

The harbor area in Gothenburg was planned to be re-developed by involving citizens and different experts into the design process. The participants were divided into teams, each consistent of designers, architects and citizens, that followed a certain agenda throughout a six-month process. The design teams had to develop proposals for the future use of the former industrial harbor area in Gothenburg.

Afterwards, the agenda and protocol have been criticized of having biased the design process in a certain direction. Thereby, participants became “collaborateurs” of the higher-level system, as referred to by Palmås and Busch, when instead the original intent was to foster a diverse and democratic PD process. In their reflective investigation on the project "Quasi-Quisling: co-design and the assembly of collaborators" Palmås and Busch state: “Citizens may be invited to participate in so-called democratic processes, but the very set-up of the mechanisms of participation precludes any significant influence. Thus, attempts to engage citizens in politics tend not to politicize the status quo” (Palmås & Busch von, 2015 p.239). Important is that they distinguish between the terms "collaborators", in a positive sense, as equal members of a decision-making process, and "collaborateur", in a negative sense, referring to "unconditional collaboration" which is to collaborate with the enemy (Palmås & Busch von, 2015). The protocol or the agenda of a collaborative (or: co-creation) event were identified to be of great importance as they function as “a subtle form of power”.

Palmås and Busch observed the power of materials as being determinative for “processing the communication of development proposals” (Palmås & Busch von, 2015 p.242). An idea or a vision that was easier visualizable through the materials at hand was advantaged to an idea that was more abstract and thus harder to communicate through visualization. Subsequently, it happened that ideas that were of minor relevance to the participants were brought forward in the design process because they were easier to communicate through the provided channels (determined by agenda and protocol). One medium to present the ideas was a poster, which naturally "foregrounded ideas that could be rendered into visual expressions." Those ideas were generally emphasized, “while more abstract ideas were somewhat sidelined.” (Palmås & Busch von, 2015 p.243).
It is thus likely that ideas that do not fit into the chosen format are treated as incompatible. Ultimately that leads to filtering out voices as incomprehensible due to the protocol under which the design process takes place.

In line with Brandt, Agger Eriksen and others, this case confirms the importance of material artefacts as means for communication in a co-creation. As soon as stakeholders which have different fields of expertise come together and collaborate it is important to establish a common language. Often such a common language can only be created by providing a range of materials through which communication can happen. However, Palmås and Busch highlight that “artefacts may prove influential in the democratic deficit of co-design” (Palmås & Busch von, 2015 p.241). Here a dilemma becomes evident. While materials are of main importance for the communication of ideas and the creation of a common language they might also distort the outcome of the collaborative process. It remains difficult to foresee which materials are suitable throughout a design process because “generative brainstorm session” should be open to all kinds of suggestions and ideas (Palmås & Busch von, 2015) which makes potential outcomes unpredictable.

5.5.2 Related work: Chile, Constitucion – Building Villa Verde

The Chilean Do Tank “Elemental” was commissioned to reconstruct part of the city of Constitución after the big earthquake in 2010. Elemental attempts to engage in a participatory design process to “work closely with the public and end users” as they state on their website (Elemental, 2017).

Elemental’s leading architect Alejandro Aravena invited the future residents to participate in the process and together develop an understanding of the problem situation. As an outcome, the future residents were provided with the basics of a house, which left room for the citizens to expand the house themselves. This resulted in the motivation to finish the house and extend it to meet individual preferences and needs.

In his TED Talk: “My architectural philosophy? Bring the community into the process” Aravena highlights the design team’s struggles throughout the participatory process that ulti-
mately led to the final design proposals.
Throughout the participatory process the planner’s focus shifted from the construction of the housing to underlying problems that the citizens were facing and that were causing distress. Those problems could only surface through the thorough and direct dialogue with the people. Ultimately, the newly generated insights helped the architects to understand the core of the people’s anger and helped to focus on the broader context.
In the case of rebuilding Constitución this led to the planning of a forest area to create buffer zone for flooding that occurs regularly. Besides, it democratizes the access to the geographical landmark that the citizens most identify with. As a conclusion of the participatory design process the idea was accepted politically and socially (My architectural philosophy? Bring the community into the process, 2015).

Elemantal’s approach to re-constructing parts of the destroyed city of Constitución show a yet successful example of participatory Urban Design. The example depicts the value and potentials of a direct dialogue with the end-users.

Figure 7: up: “Half a good house”, down: “Artificial forest area as buffer for floodings” (My architectural philosophy? Bring the community into the process, 2015)
5.6 Possible roles for a Participatory Designer in the application area of Urban Planning

With the presented examples in mind it is essential to synthesize the core values of the ‘designerly interference’ in the participatory process. When analyzing the designer/architect as an actor in the process of PD the projects highlight a different aspect of the designer’s roles. It is important to note that in both cases the designer/architect does not consciously work in the role of a PD. However, the cases deliver inspirational aspects for adjusting the PD’s role when engage in participatory Urban Planning.

The designer as a mediator in the light of the development of Gothenburg’s harbor area.

The analysis of this case highlights how the political structures within a participatory design process can lead to complications. The emphasized concern are constraints, imposed by protocols or agendas, that lead to the deceptive choice of one idea over the other. To prevent this, the designer needs to take the role of a mediator. As a trained professional, the designer knows how to move, act and expand given frames. The constant re-framing (seeing—moving—seeing) of the problem situation is at the core of the design activity (Schön, 1992). In the case of the redevelopment of the harbor area in Gothenburg, Palmås and Busch identified the problem of an insufficient variation of media for the communication of ideas between the co-design team and the organizers. The designer’s ability to recognize the lack of appropriate tools for expressing ideas and consequently re-frame the situation is a core value of the designerly interference. The designer in the role of a mediator can set up, guide and maintain a fair participatory process.

The designer as an interpreter in the light building Constitución’s Villa Verde

In this case, the focus is set on the outcomes, thus the design itself, created by the designer after having engaged in a participatory process. The idea of building “half-houses” was (future) resident driven. Here, it is important to note, that not the design proposal, thus the idea of building “half-houses” was created by the residents. The design proposal and the final design were developed by the designers. However, participation and the resulting mutual understanding of the given problem situation, were essential for the designer to cultivate the design proposal within the given ‘design space’ and thereby construct a ‘design world’ (Schön 1992). This case depicts the designer in the role of an interpreter of demands and hopes into concrete design proposals. Only through the professional interpretation of these demands and hopes the designer could make way for a socially accepted design and coherent sustainable design.

Figure 9: Inspirational roles of the designer/planner acting in participatory Urban Planning

REDEVELOPMENT OF GOTHENBURG’S HARBOR AREA
THE PARTICIPANT AS MEDIATOR

BUILDING VILLA VERDE
THE PLANNER AS INTERPRETER
Conclusion

It is important to understand that interpretation always also contains the interpreter's individual perception. This leads to the question about the designer's opportunities to contribute with an individual style and a creative signature to the final product of a co-creation. Ehn et al. find that “ordinary people [as opposed to the genius designer] […] as users or consumers, are increasingly seen as potential co-creators” even if “much of the hope associated with design and innovation is certainly directed toward the genius of invention – the creative signature designer and the equally creative and omnipotent entrepreneur turning ideas into successful business” (Ehn, et al., 2014 p.3). This hint to the omnipresent role of the designer as an artist.

Here a tension becomes evident. A key value of co-creation is based upon is the premise that “everyone is creative”. This means that all people, when included in the design process as “experts of their own experience” will have “ideas and can contribute to the design processes that aims to improve their lives as well as the lives of others” (Sanders & Strappers, 2012 p.12).

In consideration of the findings, I suggest that the designer as “artist” must draw back when entering the field of Urban Planning as a PDr. For the genius creative that has the ‘certain feeling’ needed to create aesthetically pleasing and attractive designs and likewise brims of ground-breaking ideas, it can be hard to let the others design. Because “co-designing threatens [not only] the existing power structures by requiring that control be relinquished and be given to potential customers, consumers or end-users” as Sanders & Strappers observe, it also threatens the role of the designer as artistic creator.

In a PD process, the designer as the “artist” might have to step back for a moment and take the role as a “translator”, a “mediator” or a “facilitator”. In this respect, the creation of the PD process might be the actual design.

POSSIBLE ROLES FOR
THE PARTICIPATORY DESIGNER ENGAGING IN URBAN PLANNING

The participatory designer can shift between this different roles.

Figure 10: Suggested roles for the PDr entering Urban Planning

* inspired by Houde & Hill's model
6. Methods

6.1 Research through Design

The design process described in this thesis is inspired by a Research through Design (RtD) approach, which is characterized as a “design practice” with the goal of the designer’s manifestation of “possibilities and problems” through the creation of topical and theoretical design (Gaver, 2012 p. 937). Accordingly, research insights reveal by conducting design activities around the area of interest (Krogh, et al., 2015 p.3). RtD is beneficial for generative research and is a common approach within the field of Interaction Design (Gaver, 2012). As an exploratory approach RtD is suitable for PD.

6.2 Participatory Design

Within the RtD methodological framework Participatory Design has been the guiding method. Bratteteig et al. identify that “The method concept in PD refers to a coherent set of organizing principles and general guidelines for how to carry out a design process from start to finish” (Bratteteig, et al., 2013 p. 118). “Methodological guidelines for Participatory Design often address how to communicate with users, how to investigate and discuss their needs, how to involve them in developing design ideas, and how to iteratively test and redesign a solution together. These are all necessary for users to be able to form and voice their opinions” (Simonsson & Robertson, 2013 p.131).

The adaptation of a “participatory mindset” (Bratteteig, et al., 2013) has essentially influenced the choice of activities and formats furthering the research. Ethnographic research and Infrastructuring are interrelated with PD and have served as starting points for the design process. Both methods were important for the identification of stakeholders.

6.3 Infrastructuring

Throughout the initial phase of the project, the method of infrastructuring was chosen to create an overview of the project, the various stakeholders and their motivations. The concept of “infrastructuring” as in Björgvinsson et al. 2010, (Björgvinsson, et al., 2010) describes “a continuous process of building relations with diverse actors and by a flexible allotment of time and resources” and the “consciously strategy of constantly looking for opportunities” (Hillgren, et al., 2011 p.180-181; Hillgren, et al., 2016). This approach requires long term commitment as it is characterized by an “open-ended design structure without predefined goals or fixed timelines” (Hillgren, et al., 2011 p.180).

6.4 Ethnography

“The particular ethnographic field techniques of in situ observation and interview have been widely adopted and employed in various newer professional design fields that value the inspirational potential of qualitative studies and potential for collaboration, such as interaction design (Löwgren & Stolterman 2004), design thinking (Brown 2009), commercial innovation
(Kelley 2005), service design (Polaine et al 2013), and public sector innovation (Bason 2010)” (Halse & Boffi, 2016 p.89 ff ). For the Designer conducting ethnographic research it is important to get an insight on the use-situation and the setting in which the future design will be implemented. Ethnography can be of supportive in the finding of stakeholders and gaining insights form user perspective which enables “a descriptive and holistic view of activities as they occur in their everyday setting from the point of view of study participants” (Blomberg, et al., 2003 p. 967).

For the research resulting this thesis an initial ethnographic study and extensive field work were essential for understanding the chosen context, in line with Blomberg and Karasti stating: “to understand the world you must encounter it first-hand, gathering information in the settings in which the activities of interest occur” (Blomberg & Karasti, 2013 p.88). The de-

6.5. Design Activities

Design activities to be categorized in workshops and on-site interventions. Those were chosen to generate empirical data on which to base further steps.

Two workshops and two design interventions have been conducted and bridged theory and practice.

6.5.1 Workshops

Workshops are a common activity used in PD. Usually a specific target group is invited to share ideas and build upon these shared ideas. Ideally, participants are provided with materials to physically express their ideas or to easily express them verbally (Bravo, 1993).

In this research workshops were chosen to gather a group of stakeholders and engaging them in one activity and initiate a co-creation.

6.5.2 Design Interventions

Halse & Boffi (2016) describe "design interventions as a form of inquiry" that "supplements existing research methods" and "enable new forms of experience, dialogue and awareness about the problematic to emerge" (Halse & Boffi, 2016 p. 89 ff).

In this context, the concept of "convenience sampling" is important to mention. The interventions were conducted in a setting that did not allow for pre-selection, other than the workshops. "Convenience sampling entails selecting people who are available, meet requirements of the research and are willing to participate” (Blomberg, et al., 2003 p.968).

6.6 Prototyping

Prototyping is an essential activity of practicing interaction design. However, the term is very broad and can be applied in various contexts regarding different activities.

Commonly, “prototypes provide the means for examining design problems and evaluating solution” (Houde & Hill, 1997 p.1). In this context, the essence of a prototype is the representation of a design idea.

"Experience Prototyping" adds the dimension of context and focuses on the “design problem
in terms of designing an integrated experience, rather than one or more specific artefacts” (Buchenau & Suri, 2000 p.425). Buchenau & Suri define “experience prototyping is less a set of techniques, than it is an attitude” that is valuable to create a common vision and “shared experience providing a foundation for a common point of view” (Buchenau & Suri, 2000 p.425). Hillgren et al. suggest exploring “how prototyping can […] [be considered] as ‘agonistic spaces’, where the different stakeholders do not necessarily reach consensus but rather create an arena that reveals dilemmas and makes them more tangible” (Hillgren, et al., 2011 p.179.)

These aspects of prototyping have been valuable in the process of designing activities as well as to explore, explain and test, together with participants, through the research project.

6.7 Lego Serious Play (LSP) method

"Lego Serious Play is a technique which improves group problem solving” (Lego Group, 2017). A series of questions supports the participants to engage deeper and deeper into the subject and embody abstract concepts using storytelling and metaphor, both key elements of play, and thereby "concretizing formal relationships that can otherwise be quite difficult to comprehend", (Lego Group, 2017). The LEGO group states: “[Lego] had been inspiring children to ‘build their dreams’ for decades, so perhaps adults could be asked to build their visions for future strategy” (Lego Group, 2017). “Key elements of the method are Play (learning through exploration and storytelling), Construction (building knowledge by building things), and Imagination (using the participant's creativity)” (LEGO Group, 2012).

Additionally, using the hands to build 3D-models of pieces of knowledge, ideas and feelings "opens up a new path for free, creative and expressive thinking” (Gauntlett, 2007, p. 130), through “building on the complex interplay between the hands and the brain (Kristiansen & Hansen, 2009). "By utilizing visual, auditory and kinesthetic skills, the method requires participants to learn and listen, and it provides all participants with a voice” (Lego Group, 2017).

The method was applied to create the phenomenon of the "Magic Circle". The Magic Circle signifies "the boundary between the ordinary world and the game world" (Bogost, 2016 p.109).

6.8 Persona method

“Personas are fictional profiles, often developed as a way of representing a particular group based on their shared interest” (Stickdorn & Schneider, 2014 p. ). The Persona method is commonly used to develop a product according to user needs to create a user-centered design. Often personas are introduced as a design tool to avoid including “real” users or stakeholders in the design process (Blomquist & Arvola, 2002).

This method was used in a workshop setting.
6.9. Design Process

The design process of this thesis resembles the Double Diamond model that maps the divergent and convergent stages of a design process (Design Council, 2007). Underneath the phases of this thesis’ design project are mapped in a model. The colors correspond to the phases depicted in the Double Diamond model.

Figure 11.1: Double Diamond Model

Figure 11.2: Research structure & methods of this thesis’ design project's process
7. Design project part 1: Exploration

The RAW-arena (RAW) in Berlin Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg provides a specific context in which I anchor the investigations guiding the thesis. RAW is subject of a re-development process that initiated in 2014. I was drawn to the project, through a personal relation within the landscape architecture office Atelier Loidl. Accordingly, I could develop a collaboration throughout my research. The engagement in this project was based on my motivation for testing and extending my knowledge within a specific and existing context in the field of PD and participatory Urban Planning.

7.1 The development of the RAW arena – Berlin, Germany

The RAW arena (Reichsbahnausbesserungswerk) is a former industrial area in which trains of the Reichsbahn and later Deutsche Bahn were being repaired and maintained. The territory is situated in Berlin’s neighborhood Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg close to the Warschauer Brücke, one of the city’s main arteries. Soon after the German Reunion the territory was gradually disused. The empty buildings of the territory were partly occupied by artists. Since 1999 the cultural association RAW-Tempel officially leases several buildings for intercultural projects. Today, the main part of the arena is rented out to different culture and sport facilities as well as concert halls, live music clubs, night clubs, cafes, bars and restaurants. The borough assembly Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg decided in 2014 that the RAW arena should remain a public, cultural and recreational area that should be developed in compatibility with the surrounding residential areas.

In 2015, the real estate group Kurth bought a major part of the RAW arena and initiated a process for development.

Several dialogue procedures between various stakeholder groups have been left without success. The situation has escalated to the extent that internal stakeholders organize to redeem the space from the investor.
The research started with an undetermined “Design Space”\(^1\) as the initial motivation was mainly context driven. The design process can thus be described as exploratory, as in line Bo Westerlund, 2009 \((\text{Westerlund}, 2009)\). Thereby, I provided room for the discovery of ideas and serendipity. An initial ethnographic study and infrastructuring have enabled to steadily narrowing down and defining the design space. With increased knowledge, my endeavors became more experimental and specific.

Through infrastructuring I created an overview of the project, the various stakeholders and their motivations. I could develop an understanding of the current situation and general problem setting, by mapping the findings.

---

\(^1\) The design space is understood as all the possible design proposals that would be regarded as meaningful to use by some people in relevant contexts.
I distinguished the stakeholders in two distinct groups, external stakeholders and internal stakeholders. “External stakeholders” encompasses the actors involved in the constructional redeveloping of RAW. These stakeholders are commissioned to work with the site and have a temporary relation with the RAW. The “internal stakeholders” encompass the actors on-site. Those stakeholders are geographically bound to RAW and are therefore directly affected by the development. The internal stakeholders’ business is not related to the re-development process but they are experts of site-specific conditions and current usage.

I identified possible collaborations and formulated a potential benefit for my contribution as a PDr.

7.2.1 External Stakeholders

A first personal meeting with the landscape architects Loidl in March 2017 provided extended information on the current state of the development process. Besides, I tried to contact the architecture and urban planning office Jahn, Mack & Partner for detailed information on the format and progression of the previous participation process. I contacted the office several times without reaction. Atelier Loidl was willing to meet again for an interview on their previous experience with citizen participation in Urban Planning.

For more information see Appendix A.

Interviewing Atelier Loidl – Martin Schmitz and Bernd Joosten (Expert Interviews)

Martin Schmitz is Loidl’s planner responsible for the RAW project. Bernd Joosten comments from the perspective of an urban planner that has been involved in the lengthy citizen dialogue concerning the development of Berlin’s Gleisdreieck Park.

“Major changes in the cityscape cannot be based on the “wishes” of laymen.” - Schmitz

“If I ask people what they would like, they will tell me that they like Japanese Blossom Gardens.” - Joosten

The planners doubted a laymen’s capability of developing the necessary foresight and expertise needed when developing a city. The constant conflict between the stakeholders was perceived as a burden and counterproductive towards innovative Urban Planning. The planners highlighted the problem of general’ or “unqualified” wishes and “endless discussions without results” emerging in citizen participation. This indicates the problem of an inappropriate communication basis between the stakeholders with opposing interests and might present the main reason for unsuccessful participation. Consequently, we identified the format as a crucial factor for the quality of participation.

---

1 referring to ideas or wishes that are naturally considered by the urban planners when designing a new urban space
2 referring to unrealistic and unreflected wishes or demands uttered by citizens
Findings

Through discussing previous formats, we encountered the term “thinking with the pen”, which provided a shared basis for communication between our fields. I suggested to try “together thinking with the pen” as I expected this to enable participants and planners to more effectively work together in a co-creation and foster an environment for mutual learning and understanding which might finally result in a broadly accepted design proposal.

The interview that turned into an intense discussion, led to the first design opening: Exploring the notion of “together thinking with the pen”.

For more information see Appendix A.

7.2.2 Internal Stakeholders

Through fieldwork and online investigations, I approached internal stakeholders, among which representatives of the socio-cultural organizations as well as site-users. An initially positive attitude towards my interest could not be furthered into a working collaboration. Additionally, some stakeholders of the socio-cultural organizations, perceived my investigation concerning their matters as “annoying” and considered me an unwelcome guest, and “intruder” in their sphere. Further approaches form my side have not been answered and therefore no further collaboration could be built. It became apparent that I was discerned an “intruder” and potential collaborator with opponents.

For more information see Appendix A

Findings

A possible reason for the refusal to collaborate could be a misconception of my interest and motivation as a self-enabled actor in the context, not representing any official instance. It remains open if my student status was beneficial to foster an understanding for my motivation to act in the context. The difficulty of approaching important stakeholders could have been caused by the lack of a formal mandate. The value of a formal mandate and the coherent level of influence of a PDr acting in the context of Urban Planning has continued to be central to my research.

7.3 Observation through Field Work

The RAW-arena’s reputation has decreased over the years and has been topic in Berlin’s local news for criminality, party excesses and the clash between user-groups.

To familiarize with the context, the site and its users, I conducted an intense initial field work. Throughout the spring of 2017 I explored the territory throughout different times of the day and different days of the week. Through active involvement in the “life on-site” I experienced several situations and could develop a “feeling” for the place. I did spontaneous semi-structured interviews with several users.

For more information see Appendix B
Design Opening

With an explorative mind-set, I could be open to serendipity. This is how an installation attracted my attention, however, only after the third time of visiting the site. The "Wunschbaum" [tree of wishes] is a hand-crafted, extemporary metal construct situated close to the entrance of one of the buildings. A couple of gift packages with wishes for the future of RAW are attached. A small note with instruction on how to contribute a wish can be found close to the “tree”.

This approach seemed to be an attempt of the territory’s internal stakeholders to offers a public and inclusive option to participate in the discussion about the future of RAW. Yet, users passing by did not seem to be overly interested in the tree, the tree does not emit any “call for action” to participate. The attached wishes were few and of very general nature. The idea, however, was inspirational and led to a first design opening: The creation of an enhanced “Wunschbaum”, one that activates more users to contribute and additionally offers alternative
ways of contributing. Thereby, I could build upon an already existing idea and increase the chance of its acceptance by the stakeholders.

Figure 17: "Wunschbaum" (tree of wishes)
8. Design Project part 2: Creation

8.1 Ideating & Exploring

Based on the ethnographic study and the infrastructuring I identified two design openings and as well explored possibilities to act and contribute within these emerging design spaces. Through the expert interviews with Atelier Loidl it became apparent that the format of the citizen participation poses the main problem of the procedure’s efficiency. The setting of a workshop in which stakeholders of one project gather, was found to be necessary to maintain. However, I identified the need for an exploration around more suitable workshop formats. The idea of “Together thinking with the pen” guided the exploration around suitable materials and workshop exercises.

An enhanced “Wunschbaum” became the second design opening. I explored alternative ways of inviting users to contribute their ideas and opinions around the future of RAW to the “Wunschbaum”.

8.2 “Together thinking with the pen” – workshop

Positioning the workshop

By conducting the workshop, I explored if my knowledge and experience with PD can have an influence on the planners’ attitude towards participation and if they would accept a different approach to the common participatory process in Urban Planning. In this case, my role was one of an advocate of my specialist field.

As a reaction to my findings from the expert interviews, I wanted to introduce a participatory format in which “together thinking with the pen” becomes possible, effective and beneficial. “Thinking with the pen” can be understood as “exploring with material” while doing. I expected this notion to be suitable to develop a better understanding among stakeholders and their goals, similar to Eva Brandt’s tangible mock-ups. Exploring together by using material for demonstration, I assumed that the participants could learn from each other’s experience and expertise, this required a method that enables a more abstract communication through material than with the tangible mock-ups. Subsequently, I hoped to create a creative collaboration that results in an enhanced participatory design between stakeholders in Urban Planning. The redevelopment process of the RAW-arena was taken as the project case for the workshop. As previous citizen participation had already taken place, the workshop had to be constructed according to the current circumstances, a clash of interests and opinions.

I decided to take an explorative approach and to postpone discussions about concrete design proposals and instead I suggested a workshop procedure aiming at mutual learning through addressing the stakeholders’ professional and tacit knowledge concerning the mutual project. Focusing on tacit knowledge was expected fostering an understanding for each other’s efforts and experience as well as concerns within the project rather than leading to “endless discussions with no solutions” and the proposal of concrete and “unqualified” wishes.

I expect this approach to serve as a source of inspiration for the planner rather than a collective creating of concrete proposals. Creating a concrete construction plan should remain the planner’s task and expertise, as was also the case in Elemental’s project in Chile. Hence, the
workshop’s focus was set on creating and exploring – together – each other’s opinions, views and understandings of the given situation and collectively re-built them. I expected this to result in an enhanced communication.

Workshop aim
The primary aim of the workshop was the exploration of “together thinking with the pen” among stakeholders with different professional backgrounds to foster an environment for mutual learning. Secondary aim, was the alignment of the stakeholder’s actions within a shared project (RAW in this case) by sharing their thoughts, knowledge and concerns around one topic.

The chosen method
Lego Serious Play (LSP) was considered a suitable method to use for the workshop. Lego as a toy is broadly familiar and immediately invites to play. Besides, Lego enables to quickly build abstract 3D models that are easily recognizable and adjustable. Besides, the tangibility of Lego makes it a nice material through which to explain and demonstrate. The playful character of this method was expected to immerse the participants in building rather than discussing.

Testing
In preparation for the workshop I tested the method with a changing set of questions and as well participants. The specific context in which the workshop was supposed to take place, presented a difficulty in testing the method with participants not familiar with the project. Nevertheless, the tests provided valuable insights in how to use the method and on enabling a notion of “Together thinking with the pen”. Further information on the test settings can be found in the appendix.

For more information see Appendix C
Sampling:
The initial motivation was to conduct the workshop among the stakeholders concerned with the redevelopment of the RAW-arena, to have one shared project and several different stakes, opinions and interests. Besides, it would have been interesting to compare outcomes of this workshop to the workshop previously conducted by Office Jahn, Mack & Partner. However, due to legal issues only “test” stakeholders and the planners could participate. The workshop tasks had to be adjusted accordingly.

Setting
The workshop took place in the office of Atelier Loidl in Berlin Kreuzberg. Seven participants were invited of which four attended. Two of the participants were the planners that had been interviewed previously. The other two participants had a different professional background and were strange to the context of the RAW redevelopment. They however, represent citizens and were frequent users of RAW.

The workshop took place around a big table and the participants were seated around one end. A pile of pre-selected Lego bricks was placed on the table's center. Additionally, white paper was covering the table top to enable participants to extent their models with drawings.

Procedure
The participants received 8 tasks to successively conduct through building Lego models. The first task was intended to be an “ice breaker” and transfer the participants into a playful mindset. The following tasks addressed personal experiences as well as professional knowledge and expertise. Gradually, an increased abstraction in thinking and an interaction between the participants was required. After each round of building the participants were asked to explain their model, color and shape choices. After two hours, the workshop ended and I asked the participants to elaborate on their experiences and insights. I placed special emphasis on the planners’ stance towards this method and procedure within a citizen participation in an Urban Planning context.

For more information see Appendix C
Findings

Prior to the first task, participants started playing with the Lego bricks. That created the "Magic Circle" around them, as a safe space. The most important finding was the positive atmosphere that developed throughout the workshop and the openness and ease with which the participants engaged in the given tasks. Several times, participants asked for extended time to elaborate on details of their models.

In the collaborative tasks participants were expected to build while listening to their partner’s explanation, however, all participants first listened and then start building. Withal, participants listened very carefully to be able to build their partner’s knowledge. In some cases, one of the partners adjusted the suggested model, however in all cases the model was accepted and appreciated. Overall the participants were positively surprised by their partner’s take on the knowledge they shared.

Throughout the task in which the participants were supposed to build a concern or conflict situation regarding their work, they often suggested a solution within the model. Therefore, the actual adjustment of the models by the other participants, as was expected, was hard to evoke.

Participants that prior to the workshop had mentioned time concerns, seemed to have forgotten about them by the end of the workshop and kept engaging after the official end of the workshop.

Figure 19: Workshop “Together thinking with the pen” at Atelier Loidl - participants while engaging with the tasks
Evaluation

All participants stated that the workshop was fun. Even though the participants did not know each other before, they were willing to share private experiences, knowledge and concerns with each other and were able to quickly learn and understand the others’ perspective and professional knowledge. Besides, they could help each other express their concerns. One participant stated that she values the aspect that through building with Lego bricks she literally “handles” [German: befassen/behandeln] the other participants concern and worry. That provided deep insight and empathy.

Participants stated that it would be very interesting to try out this workshop among stakeholders of a shared project as they expected that looking at the different perspectives within one project would have evoked additional interesting insights.

The participants understood, that this approach was not meant to create concrete design proposals but rather create and experience that could eventually change the stakeholders attitude towards and understanding for each other. This might later translate into mutually accepted design proposals.

A great success was that the planners found the method and approach suitable for the context of citizen participation in Urban Planning projects. It became apparent that the planners that had previously been skeptical had opened towards this approach and understood that some aspects of participation could provide valuable for their work.

8.2.1 Persona workshop

Based on the pervious user-study, I developed Personas representing the stakeholders that I had initially intended to take part in the workshop with Atelier Loidl.

Setting

The workshop took place around a table outside in a café, four participants took part, one of which a planner that also participated in the previous workshop, the other three participants were occasional users of the RAW-arena. The Lego bricks were placed on the table in between the participants.

Procedure

After a brief introduction and explanation of the Personas method, each participant received a sheet with details of one persona. After some time to familiarize with the respective personas, the participants were asked to introduce themselves to the group.

The participants had to do three tasks. This time all tasks were directed towards the RAW-arena. The tasks addressed information that could be assessed through the Personas. The participants had to introduce their models and start a discussion around them. After half an hour, the building part of the workshop ended and participants were asked to share their opinion while acting from a persona’s perspective. Afterwards, the use of such an approach in the given context was discussed.
Workshop aim

The introduction of personas aimed at creating a workshop setting in which stakeholders must switch perspectives and discuss from a stance that might not be their own, like in a role-play. Thereby, I hoped to provoke an understanding for one another's situation and the context in which each stakeholder acts.

Findings

The participants quickly managed to identify with their persona and started discussing as if from a personal point of view. It turned out that the Lego models were less important than in the previous workshop and participants discussion was more important than building. However, the Lego models were referred to occasionally for demonstration.

Evaluation

Generally, working with personas facilitated the participants' involvement with the different stakeholder groups of the project. The participants could develop an understanding for each other's situation by demonstrating their point of view through the Lego models. However, it was not possible to create a similar deep level of engagement and immersion as in the previous workshop.

Together we identified that the approach of working with personas could be valuable for the preparation of a workshop in which opposing stakeholders meet and discuss their concerns. For more information see Appendix D

8.3 Wunschbaum [three of wishes]

Positioning the “Wunschbaum- intervention”

During my explorations on RAW I discovered the "Wunschbaum” and decided to build upon the idea of letting users contribute their ideas for the future of RAW and displaying them around the construct. I decided to develop a concept to vitalize the "Wunschbaum".
Ideation

I identified that the call-for-action in form of a small note attached to a flowerpot close to the construct, hardly invited to participate. Additionally, the question of “What do you wish on the RAW”, was exactly what had been previously criticized by the planners for leading to general and “unqualified” wishes. Therefore, I started ideating on the different questions, that could deliver interesting user-insights and opinions. I tried to think of a way to make the tree more attractive and recognizable as a tree with which one can engage. I decided to develop an open concept that could be adjusted and appropriated by the internal stakeholders and initiators of the current “Wunschbaum”. As an occasion for the intervention I proposed the Open Day on May 14th, that had been organized to celebrate RAW’s 150 years’ existence. I expected many visitors to come and assumed the situation to be advantageous to dedicate the new tree by creating an action around it.

Concept

The proposed concept suggested to give the tree, a spring look, by attaching big leaves to the metal construct. The idea was to write question on plastic leaves cut from a plastic table cloth, to resist rain and wind. Those questions should be answered by visitors. One proposal was to use the letters “R”, “A” and “W” to trigger words that deduce a “new” meaning for the arena’s name. This proposal was thought to be playful, guiding and open enough at the same time, to inspired the participants.

I developed a low-fi prototype to communicate the idea. This suggestion including pictures of the prototype were sent to one of the on-site stakeholders and organizer of the Open Day. I did not receive a reaction to the proposal. Consequently, I decided to tweak the concept.
Concept tweak
The concept, as it was proposed could not be realized without the stakeholder’s agreement. Therefore, I adjusted the concept to the new situation. I maintained the idea but decided to intervene on a smaller scale and use note cards instead of leaves. On the Open Day, I approached visitors on the territory and asked them to fill in the note cards, that I handed out.

Findings
Even with a tweaked concept, it was harder than expected to conduct the intervention without the affiliation of on-site stakeholders. However, reactions were positive and all visitors I approached were willing to participate. Additionally, the cards served as a conversation starter around the recent development and history of the territory.

Evaluation
Generally, I belief that the concept could have provided interesting insights if it could have been conducted on a larger scale. For that, I would have needed the agreement and support of the on-site stakeholders in charge of the tree. An action, as planned, would have probably attracted more participants and led to extended discussion around the topic. Even the small intervention with the note cards showed that RAW’s visitors are open and welcoming to engage in playful interventions and are willing to contribute their opinion and ideas.
For more information see Appendix D

8.3.1 LSP – intervention on-site

Additional to the note-card intervention, I decided to conduct an intervention on-site using the Lego Serious Play method. This suggested to expand the Wunschbaum by offering material to the user to express their perspectives on the RAW’s future. This time I focused on using the LSP methods to provoke “storytelling”.

Setting
Compared to the workshop, this time, no arranged setting was organized and With a box of Lego bricks and some previously sorted questions, I approached users at the RAW-arena.

Procedure
I approached visitors that seemed to be resting and asked them to take part in a brief experiment concerning the RAW. My initial question concerned their experience or a feeling that they associate with the territory. In a second question, I asked them to remodel their construction according to what they consider an improved situation or alternatively what they thought the territory would look like in 50 years. Subsequently, the participants were asked to explain their models.
Aim
The aim of the intervention was to get an insight on the user-perspective. I wanted to engage
them in an activity and provoke a reflection on their experience through material.

Findings
Most participants shared very concrete experiences instead of building a more abstract gen-
eral feeling. Some participants named concrete examples of other public spaces which in their
opinion would improve the RAW-arena. They focused on special aspects which delivered con-
crete examples on their perception of good public spaces.

Evaluation
The intervention led to discussions about the RAW-arena and similar places. However, it did
not deliver as interesting insights as the previous workshop. This might be related to the set-
ing. The intervention style did not allow for participants to build upon each other’s proposals.
Using the method of LSP for a brief intervention created concrete proposals for changing the
place which might however lack reflection. This reminds of the previously criticized question
“What do you wish” that according to the planners leads to “unqualified” and general pro-
posals.
Besides, through convenience sampling, I was not able not to approach a sufficient variety of
users.
9. Reflection & Discussion

In this research, I have explored how Participatory Design can contribute to participatory Urban Planning and how it changes the traditional role of the Participatory Designer. Findings obtained through literature research and my own investigation in the field as manifested in the previous chapter are my contribution to the subject area of Interaction and Participatory Design.

The course of this research was significantly influenced by opportunities and constraints that occurred throughout investigations. Different points are worth being discussed and analyzed.

9.1 Materiality and user-centerdness

Materiality and user-centerdness are two important qualities throughout this thesis.

Regarding the first research question, "How can Participatory Design contribute to participatory Urban Planning?" it is important to highlight these qualities as they are native to the fields of Interaction & Participatory Design. Therefore, they are a first attempt to answer the question. PD as a subfield of Interaction Design offers a variety of methods and approaches that are not common in participatory UP and present suitable supplements to enhance current formats of citizen participation.

However, a first challenge for PD contributing to participatory UP is to invite the urban planners to consider these methods. Firstly, that might imply to generally open them to acknowledge possible benefits of citizen participation for their own work. An essential part of the work done throughout this research was to convince stakeholders (in this case the planners) to take part in the workshop. Introducing tangible materials into the co-creation (the workshop) has proven to be important to engage stakeholders and impact their perspective. The affordance of the Lego bricks animated participants to engage. But even more importantly, the active engagement with the material enabled the participants reflect on their models and change them together. That indicated the beginning of a "partnership" between the stakeholders and related to the upper level rungs of Arnstein’s ladder.

The positive reaction of the planners show that Interaction and PD methods have the potential to add value to their work.

Trained designers are experts of the material world, they know how to read, write and translate the world of goods (Cross, 2006). The choice of material and the way it is used to convey messages is of major importance. The PD must be aware of these choices and adapt them according to the situation.

To prevent a situation as presented in the example of redeveloping Gothenburg’s harbour area, it is important that the PD, as a trained professional, organizes the co-creation event (note: Plamås and Bush were participants and not organizers) because only then he/she has the ability to choose appropriate materials. Currently, that is not common practice in participatory Urban Planning.

The second challenge for PD is an internal analysis; also, PD must adjust when entering participatory UP. The notion of user-centerdness has great potential the context but must be re-
defined with respect to the citizen replacing the ‘mere’ user.

The persona workshop has shown that participants in a co-creation can consider and adopt different perspectives through role play when the right method is provided. Thus, example indicated another method, common in Interaction and PD practice, that has the potential to enhance participatory Urban planning when slightly adjusted.

9.2 Roles and Infrastructuring

Regarding the second research question “What could be the role of the Participatory Designer in participatory Urban Planning?” it is important to highlight the PDr’s changing role and the value of a formal mandate. The question of role was a starting point for investigations, the value of mandate was a finding throughout research.

I had to take additional roles when entering the field of Urban planning as a PDr. I denote them advocate, connector and activist.

In the role of an advocate I had to “advocate” my subject area, PD and IxD, to stakeholders strange to this area. In the role of a connector, I had to connect different stakeholders through infrastructuring. The role of an Activist resulted from working without a mandate. As an activist, I repeatedly tried to approach stakeholders and interfere on the site. Previously, I mention that some internal stakeholders regarded me as an ‘unwelcome guest’ intruding a sphere. I did not include that role in the model as it has a very negative connotation. The activist that keeps engaging represents this characteristic.

The necessity to take this role was also implied by the lack of a formal mandate. I identified that it can constitute a problem to represent a higher instance because you might be collaborating with the opponent. However, when not representing anybody, it is hard for stakeholders to understand your motivation to engage with their concerns. To influence a process in such a situation, you must be an activist.
Throughout the research I realized how much the lack of mandate influence my ability to operate in the chosen context. And how it impacted my roles. The collaboration with Loidl was initiated through a personal relation to one of the planners. Still it took almost two months to build the collaboration to a degree in which the planners agreed to participate in a workshop. Here it becomes apparent how important the additional roles, presented in the second triangle, become when "nobody wants to work with you", when you are lacking a formal mandate but want to engage in a professional setting, particularly in subject area, strange to your own. The role of mandate leads to the practice of infrastructuring which I identified as highly valuable in this context. However, in an Urban Planning setting it is complicated due the underlying politicized processes and administrative structures. Stakeholders have their constraints and restrictions due to contracts and working collaborations. Those cannot just be bypassed and need to be consider when the PDr engages as a new actor and as a connector.

Hillgren at al. emphasize that infrastructuring is an efficient method for building long-term relationships. Also, Bjerkens an Bratteteig highlight "In any design process designers need to develop a relationship with the client so that they are trusted – and so that their envisioning of the future is trusted. Building trust includes several processes. Many of them have to do with getting to know and respect each other across differences in position, perspective, knowledge and skills" (Bjerknes and Bratteteig 1988a). Otherwise, Glackin & Dionisio stress, "there is the likelihood that residents may not understand or trust the process and retreat to a reactive and antagonistic position" (Glackin & Dionisio, 2016). This might have happened between me and the internal stakeholders.

Conclusively, it also raises the question if it is beneficial to engage in such a project for the short term of 10 weeks. When the PDr represents an organization that demonstrates long-term engagement this might be different. Operating as a private actor without a formal mandate in such a setting is however complicated as mandate equals trust and without it, the designer needs to build up this trust and that requires time.

This leads to the further discussion about methodological constraints regarding this research project.

9.3 Methodological constraints

RtD and PD are very process oriented methods and the constitution of a 'final product' takes a long time. Much of the work is internal knowledge contribution through description of experiences in the field.

Besides, the exploratory approach suggested by RtD might cause a lack of understanding in non-design led disciplines regarding stakeholders that are often 'non-designers'. Subsequently, working with external stakeholder requires a lot of advocating of the field and the RtD method for it to be accepted as a valuable contribution. Often external stakeholders expect the designer to come in with an initial idea, rather than building an idea together.

Regarding my research project, it was problematic to approach stakeholders and build a working collaboration without having a clear intention or concrete design proposal. Much of that might be caused by the lack of mandate and the short-term investment in the project. That also indicates the limits of the infrastructuring method that is barely practicable
Further opportunities imply a continuation of the started projects and working collaborations in the context of RAW. How can the PD do further influence the process? A possible continuation could comprise the testing of more facilitation methods with the planners and ideally also involve other RAW stakeholders. Alternatively, the same facilitation methods could be tested among other stakeholders of a shared project in the field of participatory Urban Planning. Besides, PD should continue advocating the value of its contribution to participatory Urban Planning.

9.4 Further Opportunities

Further opportunities imply a continuation of the started projects and working collaborations in the context of RAW. How can the PD further influence the process? A possible continuation could comprise the testing of more facilitation methods with the planners and ideally also involve other RAW stakeholders. Alternatively, the same facilitation methods could be tested among other stakeholders of a shared project in the field of participatory Urban Planning. Besides, PD should continue advocating the value of its contribution to participatory Urban Planning.

in short-time projects.
The PD can easily be deemed an all-rounder with no special competence. Personally, I find that a dilemma within the practice of PD.
10. Conclusion

Participatory Design has just recently started entering the area of participatory Urban Planning. Therefore, the analysis of modus operandi is important and advocating is needed.

Participatory Design can contribute by introducing traditional methods and concepts such as user-centeredness and the knowledge of communicating through prototyping with various materials. Those must be thoroughly adjusted to the context and situation at hand when applied in participatory Urban Planning. Adjustment concerns re-evaluating user-centeredness in respect to the citizen replacing the 'mere' user and the careful selection of materials to enhance but not govern the co-creation and PD process.

The roles of the Participatory Designer entering participatory Urban Planning vary and must be adjusted according to the situation. Traditionally, the PDr works in the role as facilitator or translator. Planners working in the field of participatory UP often take the role of moderation and interpretation. By introducing the PDr as an additional actor, traditional roles should be carefully adjusted and additional roles should be considered.

I suggest adding the roles of mediator and in special circumstances also the roles of advocate, communicator and activist. The role of translation and interpretation must be handled with care to avoid bias.

The PDr as a trained and interdisciplinary actor can detect when to shift between these suggested roles concerning the situation.

Respecting these adjustments of the traditional PD practise, PD has a great potential of enhancing participatory Urban Planning.
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APPENDIX A – INFRASTRUCTURING

EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

Jahn, Mack & Partner – architects, urban planners and mediators

The office Jahn, Mack & Partner was identified as an important stakeholder from which to retain information on the previous participation process. The office represents the direct connection between the planning process and the participants in this case the on-site stakeholders. Subsequently, Jahn, Mack & Partner are actors with a formal mandate for facilitating the participation process. The office was contacted through email and telephone to retain further information on the current state of the dialogue procedure as well as on the further development of the first workshop’s results [1. Nutzerwerkstatt]. Besides, I tried to initiate a meeting to discuss a possible collaboration and get additional information on the format of the participatory dialogue that had taken place previously [1. Nutzerwerkstatt]. However, the stakeholder did not react upon the request.

Due to the stakeholder’s official mandate and resulting legitimacy to operate in the context, I could have had direct impact on the format of the participatory procedure in the case of the RAW arena. To work with this stakeholder would have been a valuable chance for to enter the participatory process in the designated sector.

Atelier Loidl

A first personal meeting with the landscape architects Loidl in March 2017 provided extended information on the current state of the development process. In January 2017, Loidl, in collaboration with the architects Holzer-Kobler, was commissioned by the Kurth group to develop plans for the RAW-territory. In the meeting Loidl granted an overview of the constructional situation and the political structures regarding the RAW arena’s re-development. The planners knew about the previous process and of the dialogue procedure, however, their work was not based on the previous plan suggested by the office Jahn, Mack & Partners. Martin Schmitz, Loidl’s planner in charge of the RAW development, believes that the previous plans were not sufficient, he refers to them as “stuck” and not “leading anywhere”. According to Schmitz the investor commissioned Holzer Kobler and Loidl as external architects and planners to create plans that explore “new” and “fresh” possibilities not affected by any legacy issues. Schmitz refers to it being a problem when the responsible planner is also in charge of the citizen participation. Accordingly, the planner is biased and not able to maintain a neutral perspective on either side. Schmitz’s observation is interesting regarding the fact that diverse architecture and urban planning offices also offer mediation and moderation as a distinct discipline.

Schmitz explains that Loidl’s approach to developing the arena is mainly based on references, examples of other urban development projects within a similar context and scale. The planners’ main effort is placed on the analysis of constructional facts and possibilities. While the integration of current on-site constructions, the neighbouring architecture and the cityscape
play major roles, the current usage of the to-be-developed area seems to have secondary importance.

Interview Loidl

In a second interview Loidl’s planners Martin Schmitz and Bernd Joosten elaborate on their general stance of participation in urban planning projects. Joosten comments from the perspective of an urban planner that has been involved in a lengthy citizen dialogue. He has represented the planners throughout the extensive citizen dialogue accompanying the development of Berlin’s Gleisdreieck Park.

While acknowledging the importance of human- and user-centred design in public spaces, both planners remain sceptical regarding citizen participation in urban planning projects. The planners recognize the possible benefit of including future users in the design process but stress that the “participation has to be done right”. The format is thus being recognized as a crucial factor for the quality of participation. Asking people directly for their wishes and preferences will produce general answers and nothing interesting will emerge, according to Schmitz. Here he refers to such outcomes as “shared safety and responsibility” and “improved trash management” as produced in the previous workshop [1.Nuterwerkstatt]. The planners doubt a laymen’s capability of developing the necessary foresight and expertise needed when developing a city.

“Major changes in the cityscape cannot be based on the “wishes” of laymen.” - Schmitz

“If I ask people what they would like, they will tell me that they like Japanese Blossom Gardens.” - Joosten

In line with Schmitz, Joosten argues that in such discussions either general [meaning that those issues are naturally considered when planning new urban spaces] or unrealistic and “unqualified” wishes and demands emerge. However, he is more generous towards participation of elected representatives, such as borough delegates, that he regards as sufficient “indirect people’s participation”. Additionally, elected delegates, Joosten believes, represent a greater diversity of people than what he calls the “usual suspects”. The groups that actively participate in the dialogue and that have very specific demands are often very similar minded and homogeneous. His sceptical opinion towards citizen involvement does thus not only derive form the quality of participation but is also due to the lack of diversity of the citizen represented. Joosten observes “those actively participating are often leftist middle aged people that are activists for nature protection and conservation”.

“Thereby these people forget that the undeveloped, urban wasteland is only accessible for few privileged and denies access to most of Berlin’s citizen.” - Joosten

Additionally, Joosten points out the difficulty of the pressure of participating. Providing citizens with the chance to contribute will also pressure them to embrace it.

“People just say something for the sake of participating, because that’s what they came for.” - Joosten

Subsequently, Joosten regards direct citizen participation as a burden rather than a chance. A direct citizen participation might advantage a very homogeneous group of few active citizens whereas an indirect citizen participation through elected delegates might lead to general suggestions, as the delegate is a representative of many. While this might be sufficient for the guarantee of a general human-centred design, it does not embrace the chance to profit from the experience of the everyday user as “expert of their own experience” and thus enhance a user-centred design. For that cause, a more direct involvement of the future user seems beneficial.

How can the direct citizen participation however be designed more fruitful?
The participation meetings that Joosten has been part of have taken place according to a strict agenda of matters that were to be orally discussed around a table. Joosten mentions Loidl’s guiding principle of “Thinking with the pen” [“Mit dem Stift denken”]. Loidl’s planners always “think alone with the pen”, that is an established rule that has been followed since the founding of the atelier. The results are then being discussed within the teams or likewise in the participation meetings. These discussions then however, can only take place orally. “Discussing with the pen” or more accurately “Thinking with the pen together” has never been an option and stands in strong contrast to the planners’ conviction. Joosten is sceptical of the idea of trying to “think together with the pen” but considers it interesting.

**USER STUDIES**

RAW Kultur L – solidary development community:

RAW//cc e.V. + Suppe & Mucke e.V. – Socio & Soup Culture

Beamtenwohnhaus – studios & workshops

Skatehalle Berlin – skateboard indoors hall

1. Berliner Skateboardverein e.V. – skateboard association

Haus 23 – studios, workshops and media production
Drop In e.V. – political & intercultural education

Der Kegel – boulder hall

Freiluftkino Insel – open air cinema

Ambulatorium Veranstaltungsort, Theater/ Zirkus – event venue, theatre & circus

Bar Zum schmutzigen Hobby – queer neighbourhood pub

Stoff- und Gerätelager – music & dance

Vuesch e.V. – artistic practice

Zirkus Zack – childrens circus courses

Crack Bellmer – concert venue

Emma Pea – vegan streetfood restaurant

Cassiopeia Club – bar & table football association

Astra Kulturhaus – night club and concert venue

Urban Spree – artistic space with galleries, workshops, concert venue and biergarten

Suicide Circus – night club

Haubentaucher – garden lounge, bar, event location

User interviews:

The interviews were taken on the RAW arena on Saturday the 15th and Easter Sunday the 16th April from 5 pm until 1am. Throughout the afternoon until night the territory got steadily more crowded. Many of the visitors were tourists around the age of 20 years, often in small groups. Some of the afternoon visitors were families with young children. Many of those were interested in the skate hall Five-O which has an international reputation. The semi-structured interviews were taken to gain an understanding of the users’ intentions on the territory as well as how they got to know of the place and how they experience it. In total 11 interviews were taken throughout the night.

Gaya, 20 years old: Tourist visiting a friend

Simon, 23 years old: Resident using the skating facilities
Sanne, 21 years old: Tourist from the Netherlands

Ana, 28 years old: Tourist from Brasil about Party life

Group 20 -23 years old: Tourists from Baden-Württemberg

Kathy, 27 years old: Day visitor from Berlin Charlottenburg, occasional comes for clubbing

Stefan, 31: Founder of Tuneup

Peter, 42: Resident waiting for his kids at Vuesch

Ella, 30: Former Club employee at Suicide Circus

Miriam, 25: Bar keeper at Urban Spree club

Julia and friends: Organizers of RAW//cc organisation and Kultur L

Katrin: Owner of Schädlich&Schädlich Design studio and member of Kultur L organisation
USER MAP

COMMERCIAL USE
- CLUB & BAR OWNERS/EMPLOYEES
- VISITORS
- PARTY GUESTS
- TOURISTS
- DESIGNER

SOCIO-CULTURAL USE
- ATHLETES
- COURSE/FACILITY USER
- GALLERY OWNERS
- ARTISTS
- DESIGNER
- RESIDENTS

PETTY CRIMINALS

USAGE “KULTUR L”

RAW//cc e.V. - Suppe & Mucke e.V.
Für die Kunst // Für den Kiez, (Saxie-) Kultur, SoupKultur

Verwaltungsgebäude
- 30 Projekte: Ateliers und Werkstätten

Beamtenwohnhaus – 30 Projekte: Ateliers und Werkstätten

Skatehalle Berlin
Einzige Indoortrainingsstätte in Berlin: Kurse & Schulklassen

1. Berliner Skateboardverein e.V.
- 250 Mitglieder

Haus 23
Atelier, Werkstatt, Medienproduktion

Drop In e.V.
politische & interkulturelle Bildung

DER KEGEL
- 40.000 Besucher/Jahr

Freiluftkino Insel
- 8.000 Besucher/Saison

Ambulatorium Veranstaltungsort, Theater / Zirkus

Verwaltungsgebäude
- 30 Projekte: Ateliers und Werkstätten

Bar Zum schmutzigen Hobby
queere Kiizkneipe

Stoff- und Gerätefager
- 10 Projekte: Musik & Bewegung

Vuesch e.V.
- 300 Mitglieder

Zirkus Zick - 280 Kinder und Jugendliche in den Karsen

Crack Bullmer
16 Arbeitsplätze, 9 Nationen

Emma Paa
Vegan Streetfoodkombüse

Cassiopeia Club
53 Arbeitsplätze, Kickerverein mit 121 Mitgliedern

retrieved from PDF “presentation Kultur L”
Aquarelle: Franziska Bosse
Illustration und Layout: schaedlichdesign@gmail.com
APPENDIX B – FIELD WORK

OBSERVATIONS

Initial impression:

The RAW arena is situated in the middle of residential houses in an area with playgrounds, squares, cafes and restaurants. However, drug dealing and homeless also belong to the immediate scenery surrounding the territory. The arena can be entered through two main entrances. Coming from the train and underground station Warschauerstraße, the slightly lowered RAW arena strikes with its old industrial character, colourful graffiti walls and improvised outdoors facilities. Scattered dilapidated buildings accommodate night clubs, bars, cafes a beer garden and a boulder and skater hall. Some of the buildings are not accessible and it remains hard to identify their usage. During day time the outdoors territory is mostly empty. Inside children are training with their circus groups, musicians are practising and parents are waiting. The boulder place and skater hall are being used throughout the day until late at night. On weekend nights, the entire arena fills up with party guests. Many visitors are tourists around the age of 20 to 25 years moving in small groups. The atmosphere turns "wild" and boisterous and can even extend to violence.
APPENDIX C – WORKSHOP 1

“TOGETHER THINKING WITH THE PEN”

The workshop was tested with classmates. Through testing influence the final structure for the tasks. For testing purposes I changed the tasks and asked my classmates to elaborate on the work concerning their thesis.

Invitation to the workshop

Eineladung zum Workshop “Zusammen mit dem Stift Denken”


In dem Workshop sollen verschiedene Interessengruppen eines gemeinsamen Projektes zusammenkommen und sich von gegenseitigen Sichtweisen, Erfahrungen und Interessen inspirieren lassen.

Wir werden die Methode „Lego Serious Play“ verwenden um uns über den bisherigen Entwicklungsprozess des RAW-Geländes auszutauschen.


Der Workshop wird am Donnerstag den 11.05.2017 im Atelier Loidl, am Tempelhofer Berg 6 in 10965 Berlin stattfinden.

Uhrzeit: 17:00 – 19:00

Ich freue mich auf dein Kommen,
Hannah

Welcome and introduction

Introduction to the workshop

In a talk with the Landscape Architecture Studio Loidl a few weeks ago we discussed formats of citizen participation in Urban Planning projects. A mutual insight: The format in which participation takes place is significant for the quality of the output.

In this workshop, we are exploring an alternative format for participation.

The method we are going to use in this workshop derives from the concept “Thinking with the pen”. With the method “Lego Serious Play” we try to create a format that allows
to “think together with the pen”. The pen can be understood as the material, Lego in this case, with which to think, that means explore. And this is going to happen together.

We are going to build individual models and discuss them afterwards. The metaphorical translation of experiences and feelings is crucial.

After the practical part, we are going to discuss if it could be beneficial to approach participation in urban planning in such a format. Besides I will ask you if and in how far the experience has influenced you individually.

**How could further steps look like?**

- Can the planner translate his insights in concrete design proposals?
- Can the “other” stakeholders/participants understand the planner’s design proposals?
- Can the “other” stakeholders better express their ambitions and preferences?
- Can the users develop a better sense for the plan-situation and the planner for the use-situation?
- Could this approach contribute to a conflict mitigation?

**Workshop tasks**

1. **A + B**: Please build a duck. *(1-2 min)*
2. **A + B**: Rebuild the duck into your last week. *(3 min)* EXPLAIN
3. **A**: Rebuild the last week into your last efforts in respect to the RAW-arena. / How do you see your work regarding the RAW-territory in the model of your last week? Add if you haven't considered it. EXPLAIN
   **B**: A main aspect of what you have done/ worked on last week.
4. **A**: Build a model that explains what makes the RAW-arena special for you. EXPLAIN
5. **B**: What do you like about that work? What do you think is special about your work?
6. **A**: Prepare 3-5 sentences explaining a main aspect of your work/ knowledge regarding the RAW-arena.
   **B**: Prepare 3-5 explaining a main aspect of your work.
7. **A + B**: Explain this aspect to your partner. Your partner builds what you are explaining in lego, sentence for sentence.
8. **A + B**: Your partner explains the model.
9. **A + B**: This happens for everybody on the table.
10. A: Build a conflict situation regarding to the RAW-arena that is happening right now or has happened in the past.

B: Build a conflict situation regarding your work.

11. A + B: Your partner explains the model that you have built. And the other way around.

12. A + B: Rebuild your model on how this situation would look like without the conflict. What would you wish to happen for the situation to resolve?

*Einführung in den Workshop*

Erst einmal, vielen Dank dafür, dass ihr euch die Zeit genommen habt. Das hilft mir wirklich sehr für meine These.

Ich studiere IxD an der Malmö University. In IxD designen wir normalerweise Produkte, die meist eine technische Komponente haben. Dabei ist unsere höchste Prämisse die Produkte nutzerfreundlich zu entwickeln. Oft geht es da um das User-Interface aber auch um die Hardware. Z.b. iPhone. Das nennen wir user-centered design.

Im Teilbereich Participatory Design geht das Ganze dann soweit, dass nicht nur der Prototype von einem Produkt getestet und angepasst wird, sondern, dass man mit den „Usern“ gemeinsam überlegt, was eigentlich gebraucht wird. Also was ihr Arbeitsleben besser machen könnte.

Ganz wichtig ist, dass man gemeinsam mit den Participants etwas exploriert und eventuell sogar kreiert. Das nennen wir „Co-Creation“ Design und man könnte auch sagen “Zusammen mit dem Stift Denken”
Some of the participants statements

“If you have to build the problem of your partner you have to listen better to be able to do that.”

“It’s interesting to integrate your own perspective into the problem of the other person.”

“Everybody focuses on other aspects.”

“Through building I realize my own problem better.”

“It’s representational but still abstract.”

“Start thinking from the result and reconstruct the way there.”
Develop the territory according to his visions for the future of the Urban Planning. He loves his Bezirksverordnetenversammlung and is proud to be able to leave a mark in the cityscape.

Sebastian, 35 years old, Urban Planner from Cologne, Berlin - Friedrichshein.

OPINION
-Visits Sunday's fleetmarket sometimes
-In charge of developing the territory

CONCERN
-Does not want the territory to turn into a face-less, gentrified area
-Feels that KulturL's efforts are not being considered by the investors

EFFORT/KNOWLEDGE
-Good collaboration with architects and investor
-Integration into environment

NAME PERSONA - INTERVIEWED

RESIDENT
Regina, 42 years old, Pharmacy assistant, Berlin - Friedrichshein.

INTEREST
-Being able to let her kids walk home alone from school
-A safer neighborhood without petty criminals

CONCERN
-The RAW is a negatively influencing the entire neighborhood
-The neighborhood is not safe anymore due to the RAW territory

EFFORT/KNOWLEDGE
-Engages actively in several initiatives for conservation
-Advocates the KulturL's interests

NAME PERSONA - INTERVIEWED

Sandra, 31 years old, Social Worker, Berlin- Friedrichshein with a Design Studio on-site.

OPINION
-Was an interior of the RAW territory
-One of the most popular places in Berlin
-One of the last places of its kind in Berlin

CONCERN
-Does not want the RAW to turn into a face-less, gentrified area
-Does not want the area to stay a party and tourist hub

EFFORT/KNOWLEDGE
-Processes the area by contributing with high-end facilities
-Worries about development of "socio-cultural ghetto" in the area

NAME PERSONA - INTERVIEWED

APPENDIX D – WORKSHOP 2

PERSONA WORKSHOP
**PERSONA - THE URBAN PLANNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>Urban Planner</td>
<td>Berlin - Mitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old</td>
<td></td>
<td>(from Cologne)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sebastian is an Urban Planner, he works in the field for seven years already. He is very talented and has strong visions on the future of Urban Planning. He loves his new home city Berlin and is proud to be able to leave a mark in the city scape.

**RELATION TO RAW**
- In charge of developing the territory
- Visits Sunday’s fleetmarket sometimes

**OPINION**
- Tourist hub
- Run down
- Undeveloped but has a lot of potential to be turned into an interesting place
- Can only improve

**EFFORT/ KNOWLEDGE**
- Segmentation is important
- Integration into environment
- Good collaboration with architects and investor

**CONCERN**
- Doesn't know if his plans can be realized due to conflict with on-site stakeholders
- On-site stakeholders are generally against development, therefore he prefers to not include them at all
- Feels guilty because he cannot please everybody
- Wonders how he should include people in the planning if they don't even know important basic of Urban Development

**INTEREST**
- Develop the territory according to his visions for urban spaces and for the city
- Creating a space accessible to many user-groups

*Inspired by sources:*

*Interviews*
*Book: “To whom belongs the Gleisdreieck”*
Sandra is a socially engaged young woman. She believes that the RAW’s true DNA, is an open and inclusive space for socio-culture. She puts her heart and soul into the protection of conservation of the socio-cultural use. She spends almost everyday on the site and enjoys using the variety of offers in her spare time.

Inspirer by sources:
https://akademie-im-bwh.de
https://rawcc.org/
http://raw-kultur-l.de
interviews on-site

NAME
Sandra

AGE
31 years old

PROFESSION
Graphic Designer

PLACE
Berlin- Friedrichshein

RELATION TO RAW
• Works on the territory
• Makes use of socio-cultural offer, (concerts, bars, facilities)

OPINION
• “A village within the city”
• One of the last places of its kind in Berlin
• One of the most popular places in Berlin
• Need to claim back the space which gets ever more defaced by tourists

INTEREST
• Wants to maintain the territory as a center for socio-culture and art
• Owns a Design Studio on-site
• Is active in setting up the “Akademie im Beamtenwohnhaus”, an association offering artistic courses facilitated by the artists of RAW
• Is actively involved in establishing the “KulturL” (a solidarity development community of the on-site stakeholders)
• Strongly supports the KulturL’s goal*, the long-term protection of the socio-culture on the territory, by redeeming the land and facilities used by KulturL’s members

EFFORT/KNOWLEDGE
• Advocates the KulturL’s interests
• Knows all actors involved and knows how to reach them
• Knows about the actor’s expertise and potentialities
• Engages actively in several initiatives for conservation

CONCERN
• Feels that KulturL’s efforts are not being considered by the investor’s plans
• Regards socio-cultural usage as RAW’s DNA and character and fears its loss
• Does not want the RAW to turn into a face-less, gentrified tourist center
• Worries about development of “socio-cultural ghetto” in between the new buildings and facilities on the territory

*Erwerb der Gebäude und Flächen des Soziokulturellen L in Zusammenarbeit mit der Stiftung trias: Kauf der Gebäude und Flächen durch die Stiftung trias. Übernahme, Verwaltung und Bewirtschaftung der Gebäude und Flächen durch die Genossenschaft RAW KulturL im Rahmen eines Erbbauvertrags mit der Stiftung trias (beinhaltet die Übernahme bestehender Mietverträge)
PERSONA - ON-SITE STAKEHOLDER / CLUB & BAR OWNER

NAME  AGE  PROFESSION  PLACE
Dennis  37 years old  Club owner & Entrepreneur  Berlin - Mitte

Three years ago Dennis could finally fulfill his dream of being the club manager of his own club. He is not in particular fan of the RAW-territory but sees potential in the area’s and neighborhood’s development.

RELATION TO RAW
- works on the territory
- otherwise barely visits the area

OPINION
- The territory has a lot of potential due to the old industrial charm and cultural heritage, street art and gastronomy
- But it is not being used to its full potential yet
- Needs better offer and more commercial use

EFFORT/ KNOWLEDGE
- Development of area by contributing with high-end club culture
- Providing day-time offers (yoga, swimming, etc.)

CONCERN
- Loses customers because of territory’s bad reputation and petty criminality
- Wants place to turn hipper, feels he works in contrary direction to socio-cultural organizations

INTEREST
- Development, renovation and revitalization of area
- Enhanced day-time use, diversified usage and user-groups
- Create a flair similar to Art District Miami and Meat Packing New York

Inspired by sources:
meeting/ email contact
interviews on-site
PERSONA - RESIDENT

NAME  AGE  PROFESSION  PLACE
Regina  42 years old  Pharmacy assistant  Berlin - Friedrichshein

Regina used to love her neighborhood but is very concerned about its recent development. She fears to walk by the area after dawn and would never let her kids (age 12 and 15) walk there alone, not even at day-time. She appreciates the RAW’s cultural offer and thinks about joining a painting class together with her daughter.

RELATION TO RAW
• Lives in the neighborhood
• Visits Sunday’s fleet market

OPINION
• The neighborhood is not safe anymore due to the RAW territory
• The situation needs to change. Too many tourists, especially at night
• Beliefs that tourists attract the drug dealers that make the area unsafe.
• The RAW is a negatively influencing the entire neighborhood

EFFORT/ KNOWLEDGE
• Development of area by contributing with high-end club culture
• Providing day-time offers (yoga, swimming, etc.)
• Supporting the open Petition Germany initiative for “Konsequente Bekämpfung des Drogenhandels rund um das RAW-Gelände in Berlin-Friedrichshein” (combat of drug dealing around the RAW-arena)

CONCERN
• Wants to be part of the dialogue procedure but feels not included
• Process takes too long

INTEREST
• A safer neighborhood without petty criminals
• Being able to let her kids walk home alone from school
• Spare time activities for kids on the territory
• Being part of citizen dialogue and have a saying about future plans

Inspired by sources:
http://raw-online.berlin
http://dieanrainer.de
http://www.berlin.de/ba-friedrichshain-kreuzberg/politik-und-verwaltung/ Bezirksverordnetenversammlung/online/to010.asp?SILFDNR=8301
PERSONA - RESIDENT

NAME  AGE  PROFESSION  PLACE
Peter  65 years old  Retired teacher  Berlin - Friedrichshein

Peter has lived all his life in Friedrichshein. He has seen the RAW changing over the years. The recent worries him. For that reason he became active in the neighborhood association. He wants to keep his Kiez livable.

RELATION TO RAW
- Lives in the neighborhood since his birth
- Is active in the neighborhood association

OPINION
- The situation needs to change
- The area developed into a touristy, faceless and polluted law-less hub
- Used to be a beautiful place and needs to be protected and cared for

INTEREST
- Noise abatement
- Combat of drug dealing
- Better trash management

EFFORT/KNOWLEDGE
- Active member of “Die Anrainer”, an organization of residents
- Supporting the open Petition Germany initiative for “Konsequente Bekämpfung des Drogenhandels rund um das RAW-Gelände in Berlin-Friedrichshein” (combat of drug dealing around the RAW-arena)

CONCERN
- Is very skeptical about the realization concerning the noise abatement
- Does not want the territory to stay a party and tourist area

Inspired by sources:
http://raw-online.berlin
http://dieanrainer.de
http://www.berlin.de/ba-friedrichshain-kreuzberg/politik-und-verwaltung/bezirksverordnetenversammlung/online/to010.asp?SILFDNR=8301
Isabell comes for the weekend to Berlin. She has heard about the RAW as being “the place” to party in Berlin. She likes the loud music, the atmosphere and just wants to enjoy the night. She does not care much about the rest.

**RELATION TO RAW**
- Came here because of friend’s recommendation
- Only there for one night

**OPINION**
- Fun place
- Typical Berlin and crazy
- You can do whatever you want
- Always something fun going on

**INTREST**
- Having a good night
- Check out several night clubs and pubs in one night
- Buying cheap weed

**EFFORT/KNOWLEDGE**
- ---

**CONCERN**
- Wants RAW to stay a party area

**Inspired by sources:**

*Interviews on-site*
*Interviews with friends*
APPENDIX D – INTERVENTION 2

WUNSCHBAUM NOTE CARDS