The form and use of everyday streets

Hausleitner, B.; Clossick, Jane; Martire, Agustina

DOI
10.2307/j.ctv32bm0wp.15

Publication date
2023

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Everyday Streets

Part II

The form and use of everyday streets

Birgit Hausleitner, Jane Clossick and Agustina Martire

Everyday streets facilitate various activities and movements, both indoors and outdoors. The second section of this book addresses the following question: *What is the relationship between the urban form of everyday streets and the activities that occur on them?* Each chapter describes this relationship as well as the spatial forms, features and uses that make up everyday streets. In all of the considered cases, ongoing urban transformations underpin the visualised processes, adding a temporal layer. Andre Corboz (1983) calls this a 'palimpsest' – a reflection of the understanding of urban form as a process shaped by its site and social processes and the understanding that, in turn, spatial form builds the conditions for social processes. This section explores the spatial qualities of everyday streets in Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria, India and the UK. This introduction begins with an outline of the key morphological mechanisms that underpin everyday streets. It then outlines the themes addressed by the chapters in this section: walkability and pedestrian prioritisation, the accommodation of social and economic change, urban depth, and site significance.

Research on urban morphology considers there to be three key spatial components in urban form: buildings (and their associated open spaces), plots and streets (Scheer 2016). The street network offers choice of way, differentiates the centrality of a place and constitutes the base from which to understand the relationship between places (Hillier and Hanson 1984), while its centres have a particular kind of spatial configuration (Chiaradia et al. 2009). The plot structure represents the 'distribution of landowners … which act according to different strategies … that, in effect, can lead to a higher diversity' (Marcus 2005). Building types influence the available size and proximity of

occupiable units as well as the availability of and access to open spaces (Berghauser Pont and Haupt 2010). Similarly, building density serves as a proxy for potential access to people and activities.

Meaningful places, such as everyday streets, comprise specific combinations of building types, plots and streets. The relationship between building types, plots and streets and their differentiation into urban types has recently become central in quantitative studies (Berghauser Pont et al. 2017; Fleischmann et al. 2021; Gil et al. 2012) that investigate the extent of whole urban systems with the resolution of the buildings, plots or street segments. Some studies have tied urban form types to specific objectives, such as walkability and pedestrian movement (Berghauser Pont et al. 2019), or micro-business activities (Hausleitner and Berghauser Pont 2017). The results of these typological studies indicate that main streets constitute the most central streets in their neighbourhoods and the primary links between different districts; they generally feature fine-grain parcellation and medium-rise buildings with related open spaces, mostly on the plots' 'back' sides.

A lack of spatial complexity – a lack of rich variety of spaces – may offer fewer opportunities for different types of uses. To understand the relationship between physical characteristics and activities, Anne Moudon Vernez (2019) suggests an 'operational approach, which recognises the nestedness of urban form elements … multi-levelness of urban form parallels that of societal structures'. Thus, we can conclude that spatial design likely needs to produce nested spaces to achieve 'environmental and social complexity' (Habraken 2016). Everyday streets generally feature these nested spaces. The typical form of main streets generates 'the presence of people in public space' (Berghauser Pont et al. 2019) and micro-businesses in ground-floor spaces (Hausleitner and Berghauser Pont 2017). Although main streets are planned in different ways, relatively similar configurations tend to emerge. While such quantitative methods are useful for identifying general trends, more local, fine-grain spatial descriptions are necessary to achieve a full understanding of the relationship between the form and use of everyday streets. The chapters in this section feature such descriptions.

The buildings and public spaces of everyday spaces accommodate necessary, optional and social activities (Gehl 2006). Matthew Carmona refers to them as 'people places … intended to be used by people, usually through spontaneous, everyday and informal use' (Carmona et al. 2010). Uses include necessities like 'going to school or to work,

shopping, waiting for a bus or a person, running errands' (Gehl 2006) and optional activities that 'take place only when exterior conditions are favourable, when weather and place invite them' – things like 'taking a walk to get a breath of fresh air, standing around enjoying life, or sitting and sunbathing' (Gehl 2006). Social activities on streets require the close proximity of people in homes, gardens or balconies, offices or other public spaces. These activities may occur spontaneously, as is often the case with children playing and people chatting – these are what Jan Gehl calls 'passive contacts' (2006).

Walkability is essential to the liveability of everyday streets and important for necessary, optional and social activities. The pedestrian scale, John Friedmann (2010) explains, 'allows people to interact in a variety of mostly unplanned ways, on the street or in business establishments among other spaces of habitual encounter'. The degree to which a street's public space facilitates pedestrian flows influences its uses and street life: 'pedestrian movement is circulation, but also permits economic, social and cultural exchange' (Carmona et al. 2010). Sigrid Kroismayr and Andreas Novy address the question of walkability in their chapter on Vienna, demonstrating that high accessibility for pedestrians facilitates the use of adjacent squares with complementary use programs.

The importance of prioritising pedestrians to boost the liveability of streets has been highlighted by researchers for decades, but the need for more walkable public spaces was amplified by the Covid-19 pandemic. Vikas Mehta (2013) identifies three factors that determine the degree to which a street is a sociable space: social (places that have special meanings for the community), behavioural (land uses and their mix) and physical (form and space characteristics). The chapters by Matthew Carmona on London high streets and Deepti Adlakha on Chennai's Pondy Bazaar describe the effect of recent pedestrianisation efforts. Adlakha looks specifically at short-term, low-cost, citizen-led interventions, which are commonly referred to as tactical urbanism (Lydon and Garcia 2015). Carmona prioritises the improvement of the pedestrian experience through adequate space for pedestrian movement and activities in the hierarchy of interventions for street space enhancements. This section's chapters address the behavioural and physical aspects of streets as social spaces and discuss how to develop them into meaningful places for the local community.

The unique morphology of everyday streets can facilitate social and economic change. Urban environments and urban life evolve over time, and the physical elements of urban form change at varying

speeds. For example, the evolution of street networks occurs over long periods of times, while individual buildings evolve at a far faster pace (Scheer 2006). Importantly, however, the aforementioned form types (Berghauser Pont et al. 2019; Hausleitner and Berghauser Pont 2017) are resistant to sudden major shifts, slowing the physical effect of incremental changes in social processes. Research on the resilience of urban form has shown that streets 'have a stabilizing effect and constrain the reconfiguration of smaller-scale morphological elements' (Romice et al. 2020). Although buildings show 'limited capacity to generate systemic change', Romice et al. (2020) explain that in 'special circumstances bottom-up processes can trigger wide-ranging transformations'. John Friedmann (2010) described such bottom-up actions as inherent to 'lived-in' spaces through which 'actual physical and social spaces [are] … transformed … through the simple fact of being lived in … as newcomers arrive, old residents depart'. In her chapter on Naples, Orfina Fatigato describes how building transformations can be seen in the appropriation of different types of spaces, with voids filled with new community functions. In other words, social changes occupy the existing fabric in new ways. Another example of such 'bottom-up' change is shown in Birgit Hausleitner and Mae-Ling Stuyt's chapter on Amsterdam, which describes the transformations inside buildings that allow businesses that require more space to fit into relatively small shops by combining two or more units.

Small-scale adaptation between uses and spatial form mainly occurs in what Philippe Panerai (2005) calls the 'urban leeway' – the zone between the building and the street where either the public or the private can expand. This zone often shows differences in use at different times of the day or on different days of the week. Such informal shifts in use are facilitated by the permeability of the boundaries between spaces, which are 'simultaneously means of separation and communication' (Madanipour 2003). Orfina Fatigato, in her chapter on Naples, refers to this as the 'porosity' of spaces, related to the definitions of Paola Viganò (2006) and Sophie Wolfrum (2018). John Habraken (2016) 'territorialises' this zone, embedding it in the logic of Anne Vernez Moudon's concept of nestedness: 'A territory resides in a larger one and may contain smaller ones … the control of access that comes with a territory means that what reaches the boarder's room must first cross boundaries of larger fields.' The sequence of spaces between public and private areas produces what John Habraken (1998) calls 'territorial depth', Machiel van Dorst (2006) calls 'privacy zoning' and Jane Clossick (2017) calls 'urban depth' – a relational spatial concept

that differentiates spaces by their degree of accessibility. These zones of varying degrees of depth facilitate different uses, not only in buildings and transition zones but also in nested public spaces. Hausleitner and Stuyt note that, in Amsterdam, these territories operate at building, block and neighbourhood scale levels, offering many places with a variety of uses on everyday streets and their hinterland. For Carmona, the everyday street functions best in London when uses cross the street threshold, flowing between inside and outside.

Finally, site matters. Kahn and Burns (2021) elaborate on three bounded domains that frame every site: a distinct climatic region, the material expression embedded in local building traditions (influenced by climate and geomorphology) and a sphere of cultural practices. The coherent spatial design of sites, which comprises these three domains, contributes to the identity of a place. Maria Luna Nobile's chapter on Kiruna is the most interesting in this respect, as it describes the relocation of an entire Arctic city and reflects on what this relocation means for the city's everyday streets. Birgit Hausleitner and Mae-Ling Stuyt's chapter on Amsterdam elaborates on landscape and water engineering as a prerequisite for a settlement and, in turn, for everyday streets.

The chapters in this section also focus on the overarching theme of this book: inclusiveness. Each chapter describes an everyday street with a morphology and range of uses that include broad sections of society. For Fatigato, the *vicoli* of Naples constitute a place for both traditional residents and new tourists, though spatial conflict may emerge between them as ground-floor residential units transform into Airbnbs. For Hausleitner and Stuyt, the diversity of Amsterdam streets accommodates everyday uses that the city needs, including those of large-scale industry. For Adlahka and Carmona, prioritising pedestrians allows their needs to be included in streets' primary functions. Nobile assesses the translation of identity and the inclusion of the Sámi people and new residents in the relocated streets of Kiruna. Finally, for Kroismayr and Novy, the provision of a walkable foundational economy facilitates the inclusion of a wide range of socioeconomic groups in Vienna.

Bibliography

Berghauser Pont, Meta and Per Haupt. 2010. *Spacematrix: Space, density and urban form*. Rotterdam: NAI.

Berghauser Pont, Meta, Gianna Stavroulaki, Jorge Gil, Lars Marcus, Miguel Serra, Birgit Hausleitner, Jesper Olsson, Eshan Abshirini and Ashley Dhanani. 2017. 'Quantitative Comparison of Cities: Distribution of street and building types based on density and centrality measures'. *Proceedings, 11th International Space Syntax Symposium*.

Berghauser Pont, Meta, Gianna Stavroulaki and Lars Marcus. 2019. 'Development of Urban Types Based on Network Centrality, Built Density and their Impact on Pedestrian Movement', *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 46(8): 1549–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808319852632.

Carmona, Matthew, Steve Tiesdell, Tim Heath and Tanner Oc. 2010. *Public Places Urban Spaces: The dimensions of urban design*. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

Chiaradia, Alain, Bill Hillier, Christian Schwander and Martin Wedderburn. 2009. 'Spatial Centrality, Economic Vitality/Viability. Compositional and spatial effects in Greater London'. *Proceedings, 7th International Space Syntax Symposium*.

Clossick, Jane. 2017. 'The Depth Structure of a London High Street: A study in urban order'. PhD thesis, London Metropolitan University.

Corboz, Andre. 1983. 'The Land as Palimpsest', *Diogenes* 31(121): 12–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/039219218303112102.

Fleischmann, Martin, Alessandra Feliciotti, Ombretta Romice and Sergio Porta. 2021. 'Methodological Foundation of a Numerical Taxonomy of Urban Form', *Environment and Planning B: Urban analytics and city science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/23998083211059835.

Friedmann, John. 2010. 'Place and Place-Making in Cities: A global perspective', *Planning Theory and Practice* 11(2): 149–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649351003759573.

Gehl, Jan. 2006. *Life Between Buildings*. 6th ed. København: Danish Architectural Press.

Gil, Jorge, José Beirão, Nuno Montenegro and Jose Duarte. 2012. 'On the Discovery of Urban Typologies: Data mining the many dimensions of urban form', *Urban Morphology* 16(1): 27–40. Accessed 1 November 2022. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256895610.

Habraken, John. 1998. *The Structure of the Ordinary: Form and control in the built environment*, edited by J. Teicher. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habraken, John. 2016. 'Cultivating Complexity: The need for a shift in cognition'. In *Complexity, Cognition, Urban Planning and Design*, edited by J. Portugali and E. Stolk, 55–74. Berlin: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32653-5_4.

Hausleitner, Birgit and Meta Berghauser Pont. 2017. 'Development of a Configurational Typology for Micro-Businesses Integrating Geometric and Configurational Variables'. *Proceedings, 11th International Space Syntax Symposium*.

Kahn, Andrea and Carol Burns. 2021. *Site Matters: Strategies for uncertainty through planning and design*. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

Lydon, Mike and Anthony Garcia. 2015. *Tactical Urbanism: Short-term action for long-term change*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Madanipour, Ali. 2003. *Public and Private Spaces of the City*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203402856.

Marcus, Lars. 2005. Plot Syntax: A configurational approach to urban diversity. *Proccedings, 5th International Space Syntax Symposium*.

Mehta, Vikas. 2013. *The Street: A quintessential social public space.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Moudon Vernez, Anne. 2019. 'Introducing Supergrids, Superblocks, Areas, Networks, and Levels to Urban Morphological Analyses', *International Journal of Architecture & Planning* 7: 1–14.

Panerai, Philippe. 2005. 'The Scale of the Urban Block'. In *Atlas of the Dutch Urban Block*, edited by S. Komossa, H. Meyer, N. Jutten and S. Thomaes, 10–14. Bussum: Toth.

Scheer, Brenda. 2016. 'The Epistemology of Urban Morphology', *Urban Morphology* 20(1): 5–17.

van Dorst, Machiel. 2006. 'Sustainable Liveability: Privacy zoning as a physical condition for social sustainability'. In *Environment, Health and Sustainable Development*, edited by A. Abdel-Hadi, M.K. Tolba and S. Soliman, 1–10. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Viganò, Paola. 2006. 'The Porous City: Prototypes of idiorrhythmical conglomerates'. In *Comment vivre ensemble: Prototypes of idiorrhythmical conglomerates and shared spaces*, edited by Pellegrini Viganò. Rome: Officina Edizioni.

Wolfrum, Sophie (ed.), Heiner Stengel, Florian Kurbasik, Norbert Kling, Sofia Dona, Imke Mumm and Christian Zöhrer. 2018. *Porous City. From metaphor to urban agenda*. Basel: Birkhäuser.