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Summary

With this thesis a focus on feminist urban planning is at the centre. Furthermore, it is put in the context of a lacking focus on this approach in Denmark specifically, and in relations to a particular case study in Copenhagen. Therefore, this thesis seeks to explore what the barriers are in implementing a feminist approach to planning and how to actively work within the field in order to break through these barriers. The case study used in this thesis revolves around a project which aims at including girls and women to participate to a greater extent in the public space associated with URBAN13 under the Bispeengbue-highway in Copenhagen. A series of participatory design processes has been the first phase of the project, conducted in the fall of 2020. This thesis builds upon that first phase and moves into the second phase that consist of an online workshop and network building with professional participants in the early spring of 2021. In addition, seeks to use feminist research approaches throughout the report, in order to achieve a truly feasible thesis in feminist urban planning. Therefore, the thesis showcases usages of Feminist Qualitative Methods and examples of Intersectional Theory, Methodology and Writing. In addition, the thesis will only make use of references made by women.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

This thesis research noblest task is to explore and highlight the need for a gendered approach in urban planning. This steams from a conscious choice from me as a soon to be planner, who also happens to be a woman. I feel a responsibility to engage with the field of feminist urban planning, since this has been immensely lacking through my years of education, not by choice but rather because of choices made by institutions. Most of my higher educational years has been spent in Denmark, but with this thesis written at Malmö University, I want to emphasise the lack of focus in feminist planning in a Danish context. This thesis has been built on top of others who came before me, and that sought that it would be possible for women to study and no less write a dissertation about feminist urban planning approaches. In ode to them and women in science in general, I have decided to exclusively refer to other women, which makes for a wonderful list of women in my bibliography. Throughout the thesis you will see pictures of young girls and women, taking space, using space and making space.

Point of departure
In this chapter I wish to start off with my own personal journey into the field of feminist urban planning. Through my education in urban planning, starting at bachelor level and then at master level, I have been schooled to understand the multiple and diverse field that urban planning is. I have learned through an interdisciplinary approach, to examine and understand the complexity of the urban, and the many theoretical approaches to it, combined with a broad knowledge of qualitative methods.

My first introduction to feminist urban planning, however, were through a course in critical urban theory on my master programme where one of the lectures gave a brief overview into the field and its origins. Unfortunately, the lecture was the only one on the subject and it did not get brought up again or before in my 5 years of studying urban planning. Despite being green to the field of feminist urban planning, I did end up writing an essay around the subject for the semester exam in the fall of 2019. Working with the essay and connecting it to a specific urban space in Copenhagen, I realised how limited the field really was in a Danish context. I searched for examples of planners and architects using the approach or suggestions on how to work towards it. But I could not find anything in that regard, at least not from the last couple of decades. I did however come across an observation study of urban space's abilities to promote physical activity and meetings between people, made by The Ministry of City, Housing and Rural from 2011. The purpose of the study was to look at the connection between design, architecture, and planning and how people use the space. In their study they observed three public spaces and found that in relations to gender, only 28% of users staying in the spaces were women and moreover only 15% of people using the urban gym facilities were women (By, Bolig og Landdistrikter, 2011). The study mentions this noticeable difference in the usages of the studied public spaces in relations to gender but does not mention what the effect of this difference might be, both in relation to general health issues and physical activities, moreover gender does not play any other role than a quantitative value in the study.
In my preliminary search and review of both feminist literature and feminist urban planning literature for my thesis, I became intrigued in finding examples of practice and methods from interventions and urban spaces that showed good practices. As well I became intrigued in finding more information on how one was to plan for feminist spaces and how the planning process could look like. When going into working with the object of study Buens Torv and the feminist urban planning approach to the project, it became clear to me that there were no specific examples of a such process in Denmark to follow, nor physical spaces to compare or examine either.

Problem statement
This thesis focal point is to highlight the need for further research, acknowledgement, and engagement with gender in urban planning, through a case study in a Danish context. As well reflections on the role academic institutions play in sustaining a marginalization of gendered perspectives in urban planning and knowledge production, will be made. Further, this research seeks to explore the structural barriers linked to the lack of acknowledgment from policymakers, stakeholders and decisionmakers. Therefore, my empirical work lies in the realm of the planner, in order to understand and analyse the power discourse they hold in the production of urban space.

Research Questions

What are some of the key barriers in implementing a feminist approach to urban planning in Denmark? And what are the ways forward in order to ensure commitments and responsibility to even productions of space?

Empirically the data will consist of qualitative discussions and dialogues with several different professionals from the urban planning and architectural scope in Denmark, in order to examine structural, academic, and legislative barriers connected to the feminist urban planning field.

Previous research

The research focus of this thesis stems from my own personal journey into the field of feminist urban planning and a search for ways to work in this field in a Danish context. My objective was therefore to gain knowledge of the broader field and building on that explore and understand what questions and concepts are needed in
In order to investigate the intersecting field of feminist urban planning and uneven productions of space and the structures within.

In order to start understanding the width of attention that several scholars have paid the, often neglected, focus on gender in theory and practice in shaping cities one must review a multifaceted and substantial literature spanning several decades (Parker, 2016: Simonsen, 2009: Fenster, 2005a, 2005b: Beebeejaun, 2017: Kern, 2020). Throughout the past decades feminist and urban scholars have made contributions to research about gender and the city. Most of these contributions highlights one issue in particular; there is a need for further research, acknowledgement, and examples of feminist urban planning and an engagement with gender – even still requesting that in 2021. When reading through the rich number of articles, books, reports etc. on gender aware urban planning, it becomes very clear that it is not a simple task to translate ideas and ideologies into actual change in the urban setting. Many scholars suggest methods and frameworks, and even organisations like the UN and WHO have checklists, campaigns and agendas targeted gender awareness (UN, 2019: WHO, 2018). Feminist urban planning might seem like a narrow or niche perspective to urbanism, but it builds on broad contributions to feminist, anti-racist, gender, or genus research. In my readings and preliminary work with this thesis, I went through several contributions to this research area, in an attempt to comprehend the bodies of work made by feminist scholars, since this had not been a part of my educational syllabus. There are many ways this thesis could have turned out, many areas that could have been examined in relations to feminist urban planning, but what really struck me was the lack of actual planning examples rooted in feminist theory and foremost I could not find any examples in a Danish context.

Yasminah Beebeejaun describes how the feminist critique of urban theory and planning in the 1970s demonstrate the focus on heteronormative and gendered environments suited for men in urban planning (Beebeejaun, 2017). As a response to these critiques, new explorations towards a equal city emerged and according to Beebeejaun the insights developed at that time shaped, and continue to shape, our understanding of this intersecting field, though many questions still remain underexplored (ibid.). Primarily Beebeejaun, among other scholars, managed to raise the issue of the role of planning in supporting women’s access to the city.

Beebeejaun highlights that even though planning has taken a participatory turn in relations to engaging with citizens, statutory planning processes has a limited influence by different communities within a city (Beebeejaun, 2017). According to Beebeejaun, planning can be understood as a set of “institutional processes that mediates development decisions and is interrelated with policy approaches that articulate visions for future development patterns”. Beebeejaun acknowledges the existing mechanisms that are supposed to take gender and other groups into account but emphasises that there are dangers at play with using gender mainstreaming as a bureaucratic tool distanced from the rights agenda (ibid.). According to Beebeejaun, the integration of gendered perspectives within professional practices remains limited. She points to the continuing binary categorization of men and woman as one of the key barriers in this context (ibid.).
order to eliminate these binary barriers, intersectionality is highlighted as a tool for revealing the complexity of gendered experiences, touching on tensions with race, ethnicity, class, age, or sexuality as well as across place, context and political regimes (Crenshaw, 1991: Beebeejaun, 2017: Parker, 2016).

Brenda Parker emphasises a presence of silence in the research of urban planning, politics, and materialism today (Parker, 2016). Further, she asks for a deeper and more thorough contribution on feminist urban planning that take materialism and differences seriously remains missing according to her (ibid.). Parker suggests that some of the work lies with mainstream urbanists, who, according to her, have yet to draw fully upon insights from a wide range of feminist scholars as well as paying more attention to urban power relations present in each space and society. In her words this is “necessary, alongside and in conversation with other radical, caring, and critical imaginations, in order to comprehend and challenge uneven productions of urban space.” (Parker, 2016, p.1354)

Position in the field

This thesis refers to the views of different scholars within feminist urban planning, but moreover it reflects and are shaped by my own academic, political, and personal opinions. Therefore, I here briefly touch upon positionalities in research, which will be elaborated further in relations to the object of study and my positioning in that, as well as my own positionalities.

When working within the spectre and claims of feminism, it is important to reflect on the question of positioning. Kathy Davis (2014) describes how thinking about one’s multiple positionalities as a researcher, in an intersectional way can develop a narrative about how one’s specific location shapes or influences in specific ways, that will be relevant in terms of the conducted research (ibid). Meaning that your thinking, theoretical preferences, intellectual biography among other, affects your position and how you perceive the world around you. These notions can also be related to geographical positions, feelings of safeness, endangered or risks can be directly linked to certain kinds of public spaces (ibid.). So as Davis describes, it is possible to both reflect on one’s social identity markers, as sexual orientation, race, class background, able-bodiedness, national belonging, but one step further is to select some of these narratives and explore how they are linked to one’s research (ibid.).

“The assumption is that your social location will inevitably shape the ways you look at the world, the kinds of questions you ask (as well as the questions you haven’t thought of asking), the kinds of people and events that evoke sympathy and understanding (as well as those that make you feel uncomfortable or evoke avoidance).” (Davis, 2014, p.23).

I recognise that this research reflects knowledge and believes shaped by my institutional, social, cultural, political, geographical, and emotional positions. I wish to perceive these narratives in an intersectional way, by linking my personal point of departure with educational influences together with my positioning in the object of study in a Danish context. My aim is to meaningfully engage methodologically and theoretically with these positionalities throughout my research.
Lastly, I want to elaborate on my role in the case study *Buens Torv* that will be elaborated further in the thesis. I became connected to the project through an internship at COurban Design Collective in the spring of 2020. Thereby I have had the opportunity to work closely with the project and I decided to incorporate it in my thesis not long after getting involved. The research conducted in this thesis can be seen as a parallel process to the object of study, but with some overlaps since I have had the privilege of engaging with the actual project and thereby the outcomes of the project process. Before going into this research, I made an agreement with COurban Design Collective and the other main actors about how this could play a part in the actual implementation and planning process. In terms of the object of study the research I have conducted has and will act as a way of connecting the project to theory and literature that makes for an even stronger project process and hopefully interventions as well. I have had the opportunity to collect rich empirical data through this agreement as well as free realm to step back, observe, research, and analyse without influence from the other actors.
Methodology

I propose, based on Brenda Parkers view on epistemology in feminism and anti-racism, that a situated and relational standpoint benefits from an intersectional epistemology in order to conduct and examine uneven productions of space, in an adequate way. By situating the production of knowledge both in time, space, and power relations, I seek to show how my research is embedded in the given context. But moreover, I seek to position myself and my view, experience, education, and contributions to and in, both the object of study, as well as in the overall reflections on mainstream urbanism.

Parker describes how feminists and anti-racist scholars have critiqued and challenged notions of political scholarship that might (re)produce injustices in representation (Parker, 2016). This, they point out as being related to knowledge production and politics often relying on liberal notions of “a white, male, free subject that are inattentive to everyday and systematic racism” (Parker, 2016). Parker goes on to quote Derickson (2015) in relation to how a lot of critical urban theory influenced by Marxist political economy “has done an inadequate job of reckoning in a meaningful way with how its own theories and knowledge production practices are themselves implicated in cultural marginalization and misrecognition” (Parker, 2016). Parker describes based on Haraway’s view (1988) on knowledge not being value-neutral but embedded in its context of production, as well as reflecting the researcher's position in time, space, body, class, race, and nationality, that many feminist and anti-racist scholars often argue for situated and relational epistemologies. Demanding an engagement in deep empirical work that: “clarify the standpoint from which they are produced; blur binaries; engage and make visible the voices and experiences of historically marginalized; and do not make all-inclusive claims about knowledge, causality, structure, or the world” (Parker, 2016).

Even though feminist scholars historically have challenged notions of inadequate recognitions and representations in theory, resulting in situated relational epistemologies, Parker suggests that in some cases, feminist urban researchers have tended to overemphasize the “situated” and therefore are reluctant to explore broader patterns, structural arguments, and generalizations (Parker, 2016). In this context Parker also highlights the importance of recognizing one’s own privileges as researcher, as well as crediting or including other voices and perspectives in order to avoid making claims that do not match others’ experiences (ibid.).

In an effort to avoid an overemphasized situated position, as Parker describes, I seek to include an intersectional standpoint (epistemology) as well as a relational, in order to map links and gaps across different scales and sites in an attempt to connect urban political structures and the experiences of women and their everyday life.

Methods
Workshop
As part of my research, I conducted a workshop in collaboration with COurban, AIMbyliv and URBAN13. The aim was to open a discussion on gendered notions in relation to urban planning as well as getting the participants to discuss how to work actively with these notions in planning. The workshop was divided in two steps, the first being about feminist urban planning in Denmark in general. The second revolved around the specific case of Buens Torv.

We hoped the workshop process could be beneficial in multiple ways, both for us as main actors and planners as well as for the participants by creating a space for discussion, reflection, and new knowledge, as well as an opportunity to get involved with a network of different people, who shared an interest in feminist urban planning at different scales. The workshop had a structural frame that sought to help the participants get the discussions started, but with room for intervening and collaboration with us as the core actors. The participants extended over different academic backgrounds, professions, and job descriptions, including planners, researchers, urban designers, leaders, assistants, architects, anthropologists, ethnographers, future researcher, students, project managers, program director and consultants in both organization, mobilization, as well as cultural and sports facilities. By inviting people with such a variety of positions, the goal was to create new ideas, get inspired and mostly create a foundation for collaborations between us, in search of a way of working with and comprehend the field of feminist urban planning.

In describing a participatory method like this workshop, I here draw on my epistemology based on situated knowledge and Ragnhild Claesson’s description of her methodology in a research project on narrating cultural heritages in urban planning (2017). Claesson’s point of departure into the research are manifold, but one is an understanding of urban planning as not neutral but consisting of acts that works towards exclusion or inclusion. She refers to Massey’s (2005) argument that “single-directed narratives and processes can work as closures of space, and therefore points to the importance of imagining and narrating space as open, to be able to make relations that are not exclusive or reductive.” (Massey in Claesson, 2017, p. 44). In an effort to open up a new space in established planning practices, Claesson and her colleagues used a participatory workshop format to tentatively elaborate on making narratives and heritages (ibid.).

I argue that the workshop conducted as part of this thesis, can be seen as a process of situating knowledges together across participants – situated both in time and in a specific space as well as by our personal positions in the field. By doing so, one works toward avoiding making elusive context-independent knowledge (2017). When positioning the method of participatory workshops within situated knowledge, I argue that it allows for a deep analysis of both the method itself and the outcome from the workshop. Situating knowledge, according to Claesson, enables us to avoid falling into either a rationalised universalism or a particularistic essentialism, and rather take responsibility in the here and now (ibid.) which I consider to be relevant in order to answer the overall research question of this thesis - How a feminist approach to urban planning can ensure commitment and reasonability to the production of space.
Initially the workshop was supposed to be held in person, in the actual space of 
*Buens Torv*, in the facilities of URBAN13, but due to Covid19 this was not possible. 
Therefore, the setup got changed to an online workshop via the online 
communications platform Zoom and the format was adjusted accordingly.

A big part of the empirical work is based on the feminist urban planning workshop 
held in the beginning of March 2021 online. As mentioned, the goal of the workshop 
process was for it to be beneficial in multiple ways, both for us as main *actors* and 
*planners*, as well as for the participants. We created a space for discussion, 
reflection, and new knowledge building, as well as an opportunity for participants to 
get involved in a network of different people, who share an interest in pushing for a 
feminist urban planning approach at different scales. In total we were 20 people in 
the workshop, including my colleagues from the project and myself. The participants 
were ‘selected’ through me and my colleagues’ networks within the field of planning, 
arquitecture, culture, children and sport, feminism, and others. The invitations were 
sent out with a note that you were welcome to forward the invite towards anyone 
else you might think would be interested, and everyone who signed up could be part 
of the workshop, that made for a good mix of people we already knew and people we 
did not.

My role in the workshop was central, both in terms of planning and constructing it, as 
well as being the key speaker and main facilitator throughout the day. By having a 
pre-existing connection to COurban Design Collective, as my former place of 
internship, I was trusted with this assignment as well as given a lot of freedom to
conduct and decide how the workshop should function as well as the outcomes from it. Therefore, it can be seen as my empirical data-collection that also benefitted the object of study (Buens Torv). The same goes for analysing the outcomes from the workshop. I consider it my analysis of the empirical data, that I had freedom to evaluate and analyse as I saw fit, but with the opportunity for use in the Buens Torv project as well afterwards. There will be times throughout this thesis where I refer to a we and an I, this is mostly a sign of gratitude and respect for my colleagues in the project, but nonetheless this thesis reflects my research, empirical data collection, analysis, and conclusions and are therefore a product of my own work. The object of study act as – an urban planning project that I have conducted research around but also, I have had the opportunity to interact very closely with the project and in certain ways interfered with it. I consider the overall project to be a case study for this thesis, but I do acknowledge that the lines can get blurred when you interact the way I have with this project. My aim has been to research the barriers and ways towards, and in relation to, a feminist planning approach in Denmark, at the same time I have aimed at conducting research that might have the potential to be used actively in the object of study or other places. This can be seen in my analysis as well as conclusion and discussion, where I seek to show how I wish to continue the work with the outcomes from this thesis in the future.

As also mentioned, the participants extended over different academic backgrounds, professions, and job descriptions, representing both the public and private sector. By inviting people with such a variety of professions, new ideas, inspiration, and a foundation for collaborations between us, was build. This in the search for ways of working with and comprehend the field of feminist urban planning.

The participants included planners, researchers, urban designers, team leaders, assistants, architects, anthropologists, ethnographers, future researcher, students, project managers, program director and consultants in both organization and mobilization, as well as cultural and sports facility planners, as seen in figure 1. There was a ratio of 90% women attending, and 10% men. This was not intentionally, as this was not a factor considered in the selection of people invited, I will say that it was more random, but it does however express some difference in interest between the genders.

The workshop was mostly held in Danish, but for the sake of this thesis, I have translated the outcomes to English.
Feminist urban planning workshop

Job title / profession
- Future-oriented user/trend researcher for design and innovation.
- Development Consultant - Local and Civil Engineering Fund
- Ethnologist at arki_lab
- Urbanist
- Mobilization consultant
- Anthropologist and advisor in BARK
- Independent organizational consultant
- Urban designer
- Programme Director at Dreamtown
- Architect, Platant
- Project manager, Danish Cultural Institute in India
- Research Assistant / Copenhagen University
- Feminist architect
- Urban Designer at Dreamtown ngo
- Spatial design graduate

Facilitators/actors
- Co-founder and Head of Secretariat Urban13
- Architect and urban developer in AIM-Byliv
- Ethnographer, General Manager of COUrban
- Nordic urban planning graduate and student worker at COUrban

90% Women
10% Men

Figure 1 Feminist Urban Planning Workshop
The workshop had a structural frame that sought to help the participants get the discussions started, but with room for intervening and collaboration with us, the main actors of the project. The participants were firstly introduced to the actors behind the project, the overall aim of the workshop and how the day would be structured. Then the workshop was divided into two thematic parts, the first being about feminist urban planning in Denmark in general, with questions like; From your perspective and background - do you have experience with the feminist urban planning? If so, in what way? Why is a feminist approach to urban space important? And what issues as well as gendered notions about the urban do you encounter in your work and / or private? And lastly, how do we get equal urban spaces on the planning agenda and how do we actively work with it as “City makers”, urbanists, citizens, etc.?

The workshop consisted of 4 breakout rooms with 5 participants in each, one of them being from the project group in each room. These breakout rooms constituted our discussion teams. Then we had a main zoom room where everyone could see and hear each other, this constituted our plenum room where each group summarized and included the others in their discussions - both rooms are visualized in figure 2.

The second part revolved around the specific case of Buens Torv. Here the discussion was directly connected to the object of study and interventions connected to that. Therefore, the participants got introduced to the projects aims and what the planning process had been so far, as well as what we sought to do in the future. Still keeping some structure but making room for the honest opinions of the participants, and for the main actors to listen and keep an open mind.
We asked the participants to reflect on the following questions: How can the interventions and the process of Buens Torv be further optimized to highlight the strengths and the possibilities within feminist urban planning? How to increase the active hours and season of the urban space? What methods and knowledge exist in order to create a more inviting place with art, better wayfinding, increased sense of security, and more intimate spaces? How can Buens Torv be an active player in the work of getting feminist urban planning on the agenda in Denmark as well as being a pioneering project with experiences that future projects can use – help for others with the desire to start projects within feminist urban planning. Here we followed the same structure as in part 1 with the same discussion teams and further elaboration all together in the plenum room, as seen on figure 3.

*Figure 3 Part 2 of Workshop*
After the workshop, all the statements, ideas, conversation topics etc. were gathered into the digital cooperative platform – Miro. Then the results was divided into categories depending on which thematic part of the workshop they belonged to, together with what question they referred to. When looking through the raw and unfiltered outcomes of the workshop, several themes surfaced, and a way of coding the different statements, made by the participants, came to be and from there an analysis started to take form.

Following in the footsteps of Claesson (2017) I shortly after conducting the workshop, reached out to one of the participants for a follow up interview. Based on the information retrieved at the workshop, I realised that there were aspects to dig further into, and I decided on an interview with an Urban and Cultural Planner. By following up with interviews, Claesson retrieves further understandings, information, and insights from participants about the planning issue at hand (ibid.). It makes for further reflections on what were discussed initially at the workshop, and it can make room for clarifications as well as evaluation from participants back to the organizers.

The interview was conducted exclusively for the purpose of my thesis, but moreover, we as a project group, decided that the workshop should be followed by a series of measures in order to create a network or collective with and across participants. The premise of the network was to connect relevant actors with each other and function as a share point of relevant articles, literature, and projects within the feminist urban field. DeVault & Gross (2014) describes interviewing as a powerful tool for feminist researchers, even though the emphasis is on exploring women’s experiences and the context that organize their experiences, I find it relevant to include their perspectives in relation to my methodology.

DeVault & Gross explains how interviewing involves relatively direct exchanges of views and perspectives among participants and can act as an occasion for viewing those exchanges and building new knowledge (2014). By that DeVault & Gross considers interview research as part of a knowledge building tool, that has the opportunity to de- or construct the sustaining of women’s oppression (ibid.). As referred to earlier and supported by DeVault & Gross, feminist research is a process situated in a larger historical context, as goes for knowledge, and is socially organized (ibid.). Therefore DeVault & Gross suggests that social scientists continuously need to evaluate and question the methods used in establishing data and findings (ibid.). By doing so I wish to evaluate not only on the data that came out of the interview and workshop, but also to evaluate the methods used and how they interacted with me as researcher and the participants. I consider this to be relevant in terms of situating the data and what that entails, as well as a way of mapping the relations at place, which corresponds with my theoretical framework.

Lastly, I wish to highlight mapping as a methodological tool, which I will make use of in my analysis in order to examine those complex power relations at play in the planning project related to my object of study. DeVault & Gross considers mapping to be fundamental in any project that seeks to explicate relationships among groups, histories, and contexts (DeVault & Gross, 2014). In that regard I have made use of an online collaborative whiteboard platform called Miro (Miro, 2021). Miro will be
used as a tool for gathering all the different outputs that came from the workshop as well as visualizing the empirical data. Other than being a very valuable tool in a time where physical gatherings where not possible, and thereby eliminating the possibility to collaborate in person with classic workshop tools at hand, it also serves a platform for further work and discussion on the topic – both with participants and actors in the project, and for the purpose of this thesis. Furthermore, I use it when analyzing in order to visualize certain aspects inclusive of mapping one’s privilege based on of Maya Goodwill’s privilege web (2020).

Limitations
I consider the empirical data obtained in this thesis to be adequate, even though it is mainly retrieved through online meetings and interviews due to restrictions related to Covid19. However, some attention on the impact of the pandemic on this thesis, needs to be drawn.

My preliminary thesis work started in the Fall of 2020, while the pandemic was already shaping everybody’s life. Therefore, this thesis sprang out of a restricted time period where it was not considered safe to meet people outside one’s household, and moreover, not more than 5 people in Denmark at the time. A workshop with more than 20 people, who did not necessarily know each other and obviously were not from same households, was not a realistic idea. The set-up of the workshop got changed to an online format and even though there are considerably limitations to not meeting in person, and discussing issues face to face, it did however make room for attendees living in other countries or cities to participate. The same goes for the interview conducted after the workshop, where me and the person interviewed reside in different cities across Denmark, the online format made for a simpler and less time-consuming approach.

Moving on from the limits related to Covid19, this study examine structures in urbanism that might contribute to an uneven production of space and places itself in the view of the planner, whoever they might be. The study is thus consciously *not* examining women’s, and others’, everyday experiences in relation to a specific public space or in broader terms. On the contrary, this study seeks to examine the underlying structures related to barriers and limitations in the implementation of a feminist urban planning approach in a Danish context.

In relation to that, as mentioned in the introduction, this thesis builds on both preliminary observations, surveys and groundwork performed by both the main actors at place, as well as by another master student\(^2\). This work has laid the foundation for my research and made way for a view on structural issues rather than the lived experiences of women and others in and surrounding the specific space of *Buens Torv*. I argue that without this groundwork, it would not have been appropriate for me to examine these structures without exploring and seeking the unique knowledge of the people, who uses the space and- or are affected by it in their everyday life. Together with the previous research mentioned in the introduction, these contributions to the object of study functions as secondary data in this thesis.

\(^2\) Sarah Laustsen Larsen, 2021, Roskilde University
Theory

FPEP framework and theoretical toolkit

I propose that the theoretical frame for this thesis lies within the focus of deeper understandings and contributions to feminist urban planning. I consider my education, and partly my own contribution throughout my schooling, to lay in what Parker describes as mainstream urbanism, this serves as a point of departure into the research carried out in this thesis. Alongside my attention to an imbalance in my education in urban planning and my own contributions, I propose an imbalance in urban planning in general in a Danish context regarding uneven productions of urban space. Therefore, this research has a feminist intersectionality epistemology in the search and examination of uneven productions of urban space.

According to Brenda Parker, and as mentioned earlier, a deeper and more thorough contribution to feminist urban planning that take materialism and differences seriously remains missing (Parker, 2016). As described in the introduction chapter, Parker emphasises that some of the reason for this lies within mainstream urbanists, who, according to her, have yet to draw fully upon insights from a wide range of feminist scholars, as well as paying more attention to urban power relations present in space and society. In her words this is “necessary, alongside and in conversation with other radical, caring, and critical imaginations, in order to comprehend and challenge uneven productions of urban space.” (Parker, 2016, p.1337).

Parker (2016) suggests that the problems with uneven productions of space, the way they are build, governed, studied and represented, is haunted by issues with privilege, patriarchy and positivism. As well as pointing to an attention need towards racial inequalities and violences in cities and urban politics. By focussing on how urban space is continuously produced in a mainstream and inequal context, Parker draws attention towards a gap in research and societal structures that needs more attention.

Parker describes that feminist scholars have critiqued the inadequate way many critical urban theorists, mainly white, male scholars influenced by Marxist political economy, have produced practices, theories and knowledge that are implicated in cultural marginalization and misrecognition (Parker, 2016). Therefore, feminist and anti-racist scholars have made diverse contributions that put gendered and intersectional violences and inequalities at the forefront and challenges those notions of urbanism (ibid.). In these contributions, situated knowledge plays a central role in engaging in deep with empirical data and make experiences of marginalized people visible. These notions of urbanism on the other hand, do not make all-inclusive claims about knowledge according to Parker. But Parker emphasizes that even within feminist scholars, a silence and imbalances occurs and remains a work in progress. Parker suggests that this gap (silences) comes from not only methodological and empirical practises in urban research, but also from the systematic and uneven practices in society in a broader generalized and structural
way (ibid.). Parker therefore suggests a specific attention to gendered and intersectional power relations.

Through the usages of an approach called Feminist Partial Political Economy of Place or FPEP, Parker has made connections between daily life experiences, gendered governance practices, urban development projects and discourses about what cities should consist of and for whom (Parker, 2016). The approach draws on a variety of literature that culminates in four critical dimensions:

“(1) Attention to gendered, raced, and intersectional power relations and structures, including affinities and alliances; (2) Reliance on partial, place based, materialist approaches to research that attend to power in knowledge production; (3) Emphasis on feminist concepts of relationality to examine connections among sites, scales, and subjects and to emphasize ‘life’ and possibility; (4) The use of theoretical toolkits (Wrights 2006) to observe, interpret and challenge material-discursive power relations in complex ways.” (Parker, 2016, p.1338).

According to Parker, FPEP engages with the tensions mentioned earlier and aspires to be reflexive, critical, and paying special attention to qualitative research. The approach challenges silences, shows specific practices and opportunities for interventions as well as engaging with a theoretical toolkit, that serves as a way of observing, interpret and challenge power relations (ibid.). Connected to that Parker describes that a FPEP framework suggests multiple feminist lenses and techniques, including: "studying the body as a site of resistance to urban politics; probing gendered, raced, and neoliberal discourses in cities; and studying marginalized women’s everyday lives as a lens into the state and structures of power." (Parker, 2016, p.1339). Parker elaborates that by using the framework of FPEP one advances the use of a theoretical toolkit, which draws upon complementary epistemological traditions and methods in order to produce sharper, fuller observations and explanations (ibid.). By doing so, Parker describes, one moves away from a singular theoretical approach and towards a “hybrid” approach that considers underlying “(…) gendered, raced, and other power-exerting behaviors, biases and patterns” (ibid.) that might otherwise be hidden or underestimated.

Parker concludes that there are productive and provocative bodies of research on urban politics and planning, but still there is an imbalance present that creates silences. She calls for further feminist, anti-racist, intersectional critical contributions to research, and thereby a move away from or development in mainstream urbanism in order to comprehend and challenge uneven productions of urban space (Parker, 2016). Thus, a framework of multiple techniques of observation, analysis, interpretation, and communication is useful to engage and challenge mainstream urbanism.

The FPEP framework and theoretical toolkit will be applied in order to observe and articulate my research and substantiate my analysis, by implementing the use of several theories and theoretical views I wish to examine both underlying and visible themes and structures that occur when looking into feminist urban planning related to a Danish urban context.
Intersectionality

Cities as interrelated dynamic fragments where different relations such as social structures, racial, gender and class relations are linked together with notions of power demonstrates the core visions of intersectionality in feminism. This approach however is, according to Irene Molina, often neglected in the research and practises of urban and spatial planning that affects the build environment (Molina, 2017). She argues that policies and studies way to often focuses on numbers and abstract images of planning targets, and therefore neglect people, their bodies, needs and feelings. Thus, disregarding the temporal dimension of human behaviour and forces a more static view of space and place and an understanding of cities as separate parts (ibid.).

The theory of intersectionality originates from civil rights activist Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) as a way of illustrating how race and gender are difficult to separate, and that discriminations often occurs based on both (Molina, 2017). Over the years the theory has developed and been used in different contexts, and by different scholars in different ways. One orientation within intersectionality focuses on revealing and destabilizing systems of sexism, racism and class oppression of capitalism and the power structures that go with that (ibid.). According to Molina, intersectionality contains political potential that challenges those power structures, who affects everyday life for everyone by revealing intersections between power structures and the role they play in formations of power (ibid.). By using an intersectional approach, one gains a holistic understanding of issues, struggles and problems related to feminism as well as insights on “resistances and activisms as a response to structures and mechanisms of oppression” (Molina, 2017, p. 97).

Intersectionality is widely used by feminist researchers of all kinds, Molina therefore seeks to connect it specifically to spatial discussions, in order to map landscapes of power and the ways in which the dimensions of power interact with space and time (ibid.). “(…) time and space are contingent in the sense that they act as contexts: everything happens at some time and at some place. But more than that, time and space are constitutive for all power relations. Time and space, history and geography are always present in the articulation of power relations, though in highly particular ways.” (Molina, 2017, p. 98)

Lacey et al. describes the intersectional approach to contrast with gender mainstreaming by allowing for context-specific policies and planning that reflect the nature and multiple identities of women (Lacey et al., 2012). According to Lacey et al., intersectionality challenges beliefs about cities being the same for men and women, and that women’s experiences of a city is the same for all – singular. This makes for a recognition and visibility of the differences among women and their experiences, and thus do not diminishes the way woman often are marginalized (ibid.).

“Rather than assuming that women are marginalized solely because of gender inequality and in relation to inequality with men, intersectionality broadens the lens to include how differences among women influence how women experience cities in
Intersectionality encourages and demands a focus on diversity, in particular women’s diverse experiences. This supports the way we examine those experiences and ask the appropriate questions along with their relationships to the city socially and spatially (Lacey et al., 2012).

The paradox of feminist praxis.

Elsa Koleth & Cristina Temenos describes the enactment of transnational feminist praxis as a political act, whether it being through academia or policy making, which according to them requires a critical iterative process where methodologies and political commitment are evaluated or revised in order to ensure that women are heard (Koleth & Temenos, 2021). “The discursive cultures, epistemic vernaculars, and performative strategies deployed in such settings are in turn revealing of the tensions emanating from the fraught histories of these institutions and ongoing struggles over the terms of recognition in both policy and academic contexts.” (Koleth & Temenos, 2021, p.9). It is especially in the containment of gender in policy and academia, that Koleth & Temenos sees the ongoing challenge of constitutive roles based on normative patriarchal views in the urban within institutional settings. This Koleth et al. depicts as a way of occluding the lifeworld’s of women (ibid.).

Koleth & Temenos argues, based on experiences, that policy and academic contexts paradoxically can sustain a marginalization of gendered perspectives through discursive and performative strategies at place, used for the purpose of bringing gender into urban planning and knowledge production - mainstreaming (Koleth & Temenos, 2021). They further argue that these unsustainable strategies used to bring gender into urban knowledge production, operates because of prevailing unviable landscapes of power in urban development and scholarship (ibid.) Therefore Koleth & Temenos suggests a “recognition of the necessity of wading into the mire of those contradictions as part of a reflexive feminist praxis” (Koleth & Temenos, 2021, p.9). If not, scholars and urbanists alike miss out on more than half the story, by not placing women’s experiences at the centre of urban understandings, which Koleth & Temenos describes as essential for a sustainable urban change (ibid.).

“If acceptance of the inherently compromised natures of policy and academic forums is a condition for engagement in these spheres, the privilege of inclusion must enlist a concomitant responsibility to ongoing scrutiny of and contention with the discursive and embodied limits they signal and the contradictions inherent in performances of inclusivity.” (Koleth & Temenos, 2021, p. 9)

Put into Parkers framework, more precisely the second dimension related to Reliance on partial, place based, materialist approaches to research that attend to power in knowledge production, I propose the use of Koleth & Temenos reflections on gender mainstreaming and feminist praxis. This I suggest in order to analyse and
challenge complex power structures in and beyond a specific place, while reflecting on uneven contributions to knowledge production and policy making.

Relational space

Molina highlights how feminist sociologists, philosophers, anthropologists, and architects have introduced the discussion of space from a relational intersectional perspective (Molina, 2017). By recognising that space interferes with the social structures in cities, we move away from an understanding of cities as separate parts and instead embraces an understanding of them being dynamically interrelated (ibid.). Molina argues that without a relational intersectional perspective, cities can be seen as; the separation of people from the built environment in research, the separation of work from residence in urban planning practices, (...) this type of research seldom links to the wider power relations hidden behind social structures, including racial, gender and class relations.” (Molina, 2017, p. 97). Molina goes on to say that both studies and policy documents that affect the built environment, needs to move away from being about numbers and abstract images of the planning target – towards a temporal dimension of human behaviour, by focusing on people and their bodies, experiences of life, feelings, and needs (ibid.).

Parker elaborates relational research “that maps links across different sites and scales to recognize difference, human life, common oppressions, and opportunities for activist interventions” (Parker, 2016, p. 1340) as contrasts with much urban political research, which she describes as often privileges the study of markets, elites and a narrowly construed state (ibid.). This Parker terms as a failing to connect urban political research with bodies, households, and everyday life as well as ignoring gendered, raced, and sexualized dimensions and therefore suggests a focus on relational research(ibid.).

“Relational research helps one explore how gender inequalities are both locally and globally constructed, how racialized experiences might be connected across space, how hybrid hegemonies and agencies are intertwined in shaping institutions and life experiences in various locations (...) relationality as a concept reminds us of the connected nature of the human and non-human, and of places, practices, and power.” (Parker, 2016, p.1349)

Urbanists working with relationality uses it for multiscalar analysis of various phenomena, rather than a fixed geography, cities can be seen as assemblages through the lens of relationality (Parker, 2016). Assemblages meaning; “as unbounded sites and processes organized with and through broader social and political practices and institutions, and as sites of broader subject formation.” (Parker, 2016, p.1350). By using a relational approach to urban research, one might examine phenomena and social relations surrounding cities and urban politics (ibid.).
CHAPTER 4
Buens Torv, URBAN13 and Bispeengbuen

*Buens Torv* is an urban development project placed under the Bispeengbue on the border between Frederiksberg / Nørrebro in Copenhagen. The project was initiated by COurban Design Collective, URBAN13 and AIM-Byliv, who across professions, disciplines and involvement have joined forces in exploring feminist architecture and equality in public space. URBAN 13 has developed the large scale temporary urban space over the last two years and the area hosts a shared office space, The Garage – a culture house and event space, a new diner, and sports fields for street sport (URBAN13, 2021). The project is a non-profit project and has therefore sought and received financial support from the Tuborg Foundation, Frederiksbergs Kommune and the Frederiksberg Foundation for materials, involvement of users, and project management in connection with the establishment of the urban space. The administrative structure of the project can be seen as a bottom-up grassroot origination, where likeminded initiators are structuring, planning and to some extent building and constructing the urban space.

**URBAN 13** is a socioeconomic local initiative, supported by Frederiksberg Fonden, that supports the growth segment in Greater Copenhagen and creates local communities that seeks to make positive effect and difference in the neighbourhood under Bispeengbuen. URBAN13 has created a place and office for creative and social entrepreneurs and urban planners to change the identity of Bispeengbuen (URBAN13, 2021). **COurban** is a design collective based in Copenhagen with their office in URBAN 13. Their work involves consultation and providing tools that promote co-creation and democratic urban design for both private and public clients with projects ranging from co-created playground designs, research on senior friendly urban design and pollution and kids in the city of Copenhagen (COurban, 2021). The core of their work is social planning, democratic and healthy urban design and planning and participation processes and involvement. **AIM-Byliv** consist of Asal Mohtashami, who are an architect MAA and urban planner with a focus on concept development, project management and strategic planning. Asal focuses on involvement in the process and development of urban spaces, participation processes and architecture.

*Picture 2* socio-spatial mapping
In a socio-spatial mapping and survey conducted in 2019 and 2020, COurban found that only 15% of people spending time in the public spaces under the bridge were women and girls, and they were always accompanied by at least one other person. However, the number of women and girls passing by the area is approximately 50% (COurban, 2021). Through the preliminary work with the project a online survey showed that women to a much higher extent than men, feel unsafe in the area, and that respondents experience that it is difficult to orient themselves in the area (ibid.).

The project has varied aims and goals at different scales, mainly in connection to the different actors involved and the diverse usage of the space today, as well as the visions for the future:

One is to develop and test innovative methods and involvement processes, within a knowledge perspective that in a Danish context is relatively unexplored. In this regard the project seeks to have the urban space as focal point for further research and explorations of feminist urban planning. In addition, the project seeks to create fertile ground for others to use insights, experiences, and evaluations from the project. This is sought in the form of a transparent and broad dissemination, that can contribute to a greater understanding of the work on gender equality in a Danish context. In addition to attempting to unpack and explore the field of feminist architecture in Denmark through workshops and dialogue with other actors in the field.

Another goal is that the area will attract a greater diversity of activities and people, and that more women and girls will spend time in the space and use it as a natural part of their everyday life, and not only in connection with special events. This through three physical measures, which aim is to introduce qualities and activities that attract as well as increase women's active participation in city life. These three interventions are based on reviews of existing knowledge and literature on the matter, and quality checked by young girls and women with connection to the area in different ways.

A third goal is for the project to have a strong focus on creating synergy and coherence between the various initiatives, that are already existing under the Bispeengbue, as well as devising solutions that have both a social, economic, and physical imprint on the local society. In addition to frame the ‘square’ – the area between the office and the Garage, create a better flow of pedestrian traffic, more intimate gathering areas, more greenery and art to invite for lingering.
The history and the space today

Bispeengbuen is a 6-lane motorway on the border between Copenhagen and Frederiksberg municipalities. In 1972 it was completed and has since then been widely discussed among citizens, politicians, and opinion leaders. At the moment there is a lot of debate going on about whether or not it should be demolished and proposals for alternatives are being prepared, but nothing has been determined yet (URBAN13, 2021). The municipalities of Copenhagen and Frederiksberg were in 2017 looking for a private actor who could develop the area over a five-year period. By the end of 2017, URBAN 13 were winners of the tender and the project was to transform the place into a cultural, social, and creative urban space. The Frederiksberg Foundation and since Realdania and Lokale- & Anlægsfonden joined as partners in the project (ibid.).

Today the area under Bispeengbuen mostly goes by the name URBAN 13, which consist of a cultural and creative urban space with a whole container city of both entrepreneurial offices, food stall, small workshops, street sports courts and a culture house that are both a concert venue, cinema, theatre, and community centre (URBAN13, 2021). Beneath, the area under Bispeengbuen is depicted from 2017.
Fast forward to today:
In order to answer some of the goals mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, three physical interventions came to be in the preliminary stage. They consist of a wayfinding intervention, art installations, and a new semi-public indoor space – the greenhouse. Here you can see the overall development plan for the area. The plan is to start implementing these interventions in the Summer 2021.

*Figure 4 Development plan*
Wayfinding - The initiative is thought to be implemented out towards Nordre Fasanvej, where most people move past according to our registrations.

It is here the work of inviting people into the space begins and we want to create an eye-catcher that arouses people's curiosity and interest. Through painting pavement in different colors and patterns, the goal is both to strengthen the spatial graphics, as well as the visual character of the urban space. Furthermore, the wayfinding should also help to make visible and communicate what the existing possibilities in URBAN 13 are.

In connection with the wayfinding the goal is to involve young girls with connection to the area to give input to design, as well as take part in the physical implementation in the urban space. Furthermore, the visual links are suppose to be established, so that the outdoor area reflects the rest of the urban space, both in color and in decor.

The pictures on the left showcases sketches we made in the preliminary part of the project, in order to start imagining the wayfinding and how it could incorporate the whole area.

*Picture 5 Wayfinding Rendering*
The focus of the *Greenhouse* is to create a green, safe and cozy space that invites to informal encounters and makes room for communities. The vision is that the indoor room should be able to be open during the day and invite people to use it for various everyday activities, while at the same time being able to respond to the need of the initiators already present in the area. In addition, there should be opportunities for the Greenhouse to be able to be rented cheaply by neighbors and local communities for various social events.
The focus of *Buens Bygalleri* is to invite interaction, sensory experiences, commitment, and reflection, as is known from art centers, museums and galleries. The passage should, with its changing exhibitions, be changeable and dynamic over time. In addition to the connection with the rest of Buens Torv, Buens Bygalleri aims to: support a wide range of art forms, including duration, expression (sound and light included) and target groups, support the art's growth layer environment, ensure a dynamic platform for contemporary art with temporary works by high artistic quality. Presenting art in various heights; under Bispeengbuen's ceiling, on the sides of URBAN13's built facades, on the bridge pillars and on Buen's paving stones, support URBAN13's overall visions; the creation of a laboratory for the small with the big ideas and a unifying and safe place in the city.
CHAPTER 5
Analysis

This chapter seeks to give a profound and detailed representation of the results and outcomes from the research. It does so by presenting the empirical data in a descriptive yet processed manner, and then intertwines with an analytical approach that aligns with my theoretical framework. In the chapter, there are several figures and pictures introduced, these are implemented and developed for the purpose of simplifying the exploration of the empirical work.

Firstly, the statements referring to notions of gender in the urban were coded, this made for an overview of different opinions, reflections, and views. By placing them together, separate from the overall questions, it showed that some notions reoccurred or that certain themes got repeated. In figure 4, you can see different variations of statements, coded as notions related to gender in the urban.

![Figure 5: Notions Related to Gender](image)

*Figure 5: Notions Related to Gender*
Four overall themes were then concretized in order to analyse further, they are equally important and should not be understood hierarchical. They are as following and can be seen in the figure below: 1) Feminist urban planning benefits everyone - not just girls and women 2) Girls and women experience safety differently than boys and men in the city 3) Girls and women are not sufficiently involved or visible in urban planning processes 4) Girls and women are less physically active in public spaces.

Furthermore, some subthemes came to be, referring to each overall theme: 1) A public place that is experienced as safe by girls and women is often experienced as even more safe for men. 2) The design of urban space is very important for girls' and women's experience of security and safety; Activities plays a big role in girls' and women's experience of an urban space. 3) The urban space today does not speak to
the target group - there is a lack of activities for them. 4) There is a lack of places where girls and women can easily be part of physical and social activities.

The next step of analysing the data, was to intertwine or relate the themes to interventions and actions suggested by the participants, in order to work towards the aim of each given theme and in correspondence with the projects overall aims, this is visualized in figure 6,7,8,9. Lastly the overall themes are depicted in figure 10. The themes will be referred to in the next parts.
Figure 9 Theme 4

3. Girls and women are not sufficiently involved or visible in urban planning processes.

   - Strategically involve users in the selection and production of art for the area.
   - Strategy to market the site to the target audience through S6Me, networking, and physically in the urban space.
   - Strategy for involving decision-makers e.g. municipality, foundations and other sponsors.

4. Girls and women are less physically active in public spaces.

   - Get help from girl ambassadors to generate ideas and plan "Girl Days" with new activities.
   - Process for finding girl ambassadors among the local girls in Street Society.
   - New activities like dance, in the Street Society.

Figure 10 Theme 3
Figure 11 All Themes
Interview

Urbanistas was started by Anne Nielsen, who graduated from the School of Architecture and Roskilde University. Anne is a trained Urban and Cultural Planner and has experience with urban development and involvement processes from the municipal world and from various organizations (personal communication, April 16, 2021). Our informal interview was held online the 16th of April 2021 through zoom.
FPEP Analysis

Through working with *Buens Torv* as a case study for this thesis, I tried to connect the readings I went through with the actual project to see how the different approaches or methods would fit. This made for the realisation that this could escalate to several different levels and scales of analysis and that I would benefit from a framework both regarding theory and applying it in the analysis. Therefore, I chose to draw on Brenda Parker’s FPEP approach, and the analysis chapter will loosely follow the same structure as the theory chapter.

In an attempt to produce more robust, inclusive, and explanatory urban research, as suggested by Brenda Parker (2016), through her FPEP approach, I proposed that the theoretical frame for this thesis lay within the focus of deeper understandings and contributions to feminist urban planning in an effort to research imbalance in urban planning in a Danish context regarding what I call uneven productions of urban space.

As mentioned earlier in this thesis, I consider my education, and partly my own contribution throughout my schooling, to lay in what Parker (2016) describes as mainstream urbanism. Mainstream urbanisms are lacking a deeper understanding of materialism and differences, and the power structures within, which are necessary in eliminating uneven productions of urban space (ibid.). In an attempt to challenge mainstream urbanism this research builds on a feminist intersectional epistemology where cities and people should be understood as interrelated dynamic fragments of social structures such as racial, gender and class relations intertwined with notions of power. Something that several scholars has highlighting as missing in the field of urban and spatial planning today (Molina, 2017: Parker, 2016: Beebeejaun, 2017).

In order to discuss mainstream urbanism, I have decided to situate myself and my academic background, as well as this research in an effort to write intersectional and think about my own identity markers and the context of which they are placed. If one seeks to truly examine the production of unevenness and the inadequate job critical urban theorists has done in recognizing this, engaging with empirical work that clarify the standpoint from which they are produced without making all-inclusive claims are necessary. This thesis focal point is to highlight the need for further research, acknowledgement, and engagement with gender in urban planning in a Danish context, together with emphasizing the structural barriers linked to this lack of understandings. Therefore, my empirical work lies in the realm of the planner, in order to understand and analyse the power discourse they hold in the production of urban space.

Intersectional analysis

In the introduction chapter I described how I recognise that this research reflects knowledge and believes shaped by my institutional, social, cultural, political, geographical, and emotional positions. By going into thinking intersectional I came to that recognition, and I here want to dig a bit deeper. As Davis mentions: “One of the
ways to start thinking intersectionally is to begin with your own multiple positionings as a researcher in terms of gender, class, ethnic, sexual and other social identities” (Davis, 2014, p.22). I therefore started with an intersectional understanding of myself and my position in this research, and in the project of *Buens Torv*, by critically analysing positionalities.

**Positioning/situating myself**

I started by linking Davis’ strategy of thinking intersectional together with Maya Goodwill’s privilege web (2020). The web is explained as following: “Which parts of my identity give me privilege? The identities in the inner circle are privileged, whereas the identities in the outer circle are more oppressed (this can vary depending on geographic context and other factors)” (Goodwill, 2020, p.15). Privilege in this context should be understood as a type of power, reflecting social beneficial relations, at the expense of other social groups (ibid.). The reason for implementing in this regard, is that identity categories do not exit detachedly, on the contrary, they are intersectional and therefore linked.

![Privilege Web](image)

*Figure 12 Privilege Web*

The yellow circles refer to my own privilege. According to the web I belong to the inner privilege circle in 11 of the 13 identities. The only two things that makes me a
slightly more oppressed person, than not at all, are my class and gender. Again, this is according to this web here, it could have been modified to a Scandinavian context or even Danish, in that regard I assume the class sections might also have an identity marker called upper middleclass, if so I would place myself there based on my academic background and possible future income. That means that it is only my gender that sets me apart from the most privileged according to this web. For the purpose of the context that the case study is placed in, Denmark, Language would be Danish instead of English as seen on the web, but I do believe that being fluent in English is also a privilege.

By looking through one’s privilege according to identities, in my case mostly all of them, one can think about what they mean in terms of advantages, both experienced in the daily life, or more relevant for the purpose of this research, what biases do you bring into a planning project as a result to your privilege. This might very well influence, impact and affect the planning process and design. Aside from merely highlighting my privilege and listing my identities, which could consist of even more, I wish to develop a narrative about how my specific location shapes or influences me in regard to my research, in accordance with Davis’ perspectives on situating one’s self (2014).

Davis (2014) proposes that a more intersectional strategy for situating oneself, rather than simply listing identities, is to develop a narrative about how one’s specific location or position shapes or influences you. For the purpose of amplifying usage of intersectional analysis in urban studies, and for the sake of this thesis I again use myself as object of study.

Through the web of privilege, I concluded that I had mostly identities that fits in inner circle of the web. A way of looking further is to pay attention to boundaries within the contexts of identities or as Goodwill puts it, what kind of advantage do I have in relation to others, completely unearned and at the expense of others (Goodwill, 2020). Considering that I am a native Danish speaker living in Denmark, I am white, able-bodied, upper-middle class, a Danish citizen with European origin, young adult cis-women, I have many advantages. This means that I often have more room to do something or influence an outcome or others around me. Advantages or privilege are structures of power. According to Goodwill, that could mean that I might get taken more seriously when I have health issues or at a job interview, I might seem more professional. Because of my able-body I do not have to constantly think ahead in terms of accessibility in different settings (ibid.). The only place where I might experience forms of oppression, is through my identified gender. And in terms of actions, I feel aware of my gender often and in different settings, and I do believe that I worry about my safety in a degree that cis men do not.

“These types of advantages are something that everyone should have access to, and those with privilege can actively work to extend them to those with without privilege by using the influence (or power!) that they have as a result of their social identity.” (Goodwill, 2020, p.14).

According to Goodwill, designers are able to influence desired outcomes to a large extend, therefore we need to be aware of our own privilege and be sensitive towards
how oppression might function in a given setting, thereby we can make informed decisions and avoid reproducing inequities and patters of oppression (Goodwill, 2020)

Gender in urban research

Elsa Koleth & Cristina Temenos strongly emphasizes the necessity for feminist researchers and urban scholars to wade into the mire of the contradicting perspectives that policy and academia encompasses (Koleth & Temenos, 2021). These observations are built on their experiences in the field, and from their work with a project that aims to bring academic research on communities and women’s organizations into dialogue with policy makers and policy-making processes (ibid.).

With this they seek to reflect on the impossibilities and contradictions of gender mainstreaming, that in their eyes reveals an ongoing challenge: “(...) of highlighting the constitutive role of gender in the urban within institutional and disciplinary settings built on normatively patriarchal foundations which occlude the lifeworlds of women.” (Koleth & Temenos, 2021, p.9). This they highlight despite agreeing that there has been much discussion about the need for increasing the connection between research and policy.

From the many insights gathered through the empirical data, some pointed to impossibilities and contradictions as well. Among other statements about this issue, some pointed to how planning for movement and activities in the urban has failed to incorporate the needs and view of women and girls in these interventions. Meaning, that many of the participant in the workshop had either noticed, experienced, or worked with interventions like urban gyms, skater ramps or parkour venues that fails to attract young girls or women. The misconception that something that might benefit physical health automatically must be good for every single person, is problematic. Especially as, according to the participants, many architects and urban planners has incorporated these kinds of interventions in a wide range of urban developments. This made for selecting both themes 3 and 4 seen in figure 6: 3) Girls and women are not sufficiently involved or visible in urban planning processes and 4) Girls and women are less physically active in public spaces. This is paradoxical in the way that cities, like Copenhagen, are planned for ‘all’, in the sense that the public sphere should be open and available for everyone, but activities like these are unintentionally targeted towards a certain user group. This is not something that gets acknowledged per say but it is paradoxical, since there is many obstacles and problems when targeting something towards girls or women, this are not easily obtained. Many of the participants in the workshop emphasised that it would be better to move away from planning in public places being available for everyone or a public space for ‘all’. Instead, many pointed out that it would be much more beneficial to have certain places that are mainly targeted towards certain groups, like young girls or other identities. By doing so, it would not only invite those groups to spend time there, but it would also make visible the need for such interventions. This is something that many pointed out in workshop, visibility. Visible women’s day activities, or girls football tournaments, or reserving certain areas just for women or girls, mostly for making visible the comprehensive need there is for the involvement of women and girls. In addition, someone mentioned that if this did not happen, it
could be very hard to get statistics about the importance, since women and girls are simply not represented thoroughly enough in statistic about usage. In respond to these views, we selected subthemes as well: 3) *The urban space today does not speak to the target group - there is a lack of activities for them.* 4) *There is a lack of places where girls and women can easily be part of physical and social activities.*

In addition to the themes mentioned here, theme nr. 1 should be included here as well: 1) *Feminist urban planning benefits everyone – not just girls and women.* And the following subtheme: 1) *A public place that is experienced as safe by girls and women is often experienced as even more safe for men.* This theme implies that you can, and should perhaps, prioritise making public spaces that are targeted girls and women, and by doing so you will automatically plan for humans in general, simply put.

"The discursive cultures, epistemic vernaculars, and performative strategies deployed in such settings are in turn revealing of the tensions emanating from the fraught histories of these institutions and ongoing struggles over the terms of recognition in both policy and academic contexts." (Koleth & Temenos, 2021).

It is especially in the containment of *gender* in policy and academia, that Koleth & Temenos sees the ongoing challenge of constitutive roles based on normative patriarchal views in the urban within institutional settings. This Koleth et al. depicts as a way of occluding the lifeworld’s of women (ibid.).
In conversation with Urban and Cultural Planner Anne Nielsen from Urbanistas, I asked if she thought her colleagues and partners in the field knew about feminist urban planning, and her answer was a definitive no (personal communication, April 16, 2021). She mentions that as she recalls they have never discussed or talked about it either, instead they have talked about health and movement in the urban in more general terms and not in relation to gender. When asked if she thinks it is a field that students from the architectural programmes knows about, her answer once more is no.

She recalls talking with fellow students at her programme that were Swedish about it, and through them she gained insights on gendered topics but other than that she never got any introductions to gender and the build environment through her education, Anne holds a bachelor’s in architecture and a master’s in cultural and urban planning (A. Nielsen, personal communication, April 16, 2021).

I proceeded to ask her what she thought it meant, or if she thought it had any consequences that students were not introduced to this aspect. To that she replied that she had often reflected on how the school of architecture lacked a basis introduction to social sciences in order to comprehend social aspects in the build environment. When reflection even more on the matter, Anne mentions that she would have appreciated a thorough exploration of planning in praxis in her studies, both on bachelors- and master level. She elaborates that the concepts of social sciences in urban planning can sometimes be abstract or intangible, and that there is a lack of examples of good and bad practises of actual planning, and insights in the parameters that affect it (A. Nielsen, personal communication, April 16, 2021).

Anne Nielsen explains how she got introduced to the field of feminist urban planning, by more or less randomly attending an inspirational presentation at a former job she had (A. Nielsen, personal communication, April 16, 2021).
She then came back to the approach two years later when starting her own urban planning consulting firm, where she pitched the concept to a municipality in Denmark – Vejle. Here she presented the idea, that Vejle municipality could become a pioneer municipality in Denmark by planning gender-aware urban spaces. The idea was generally welcomed, and it sounded like something they could be interested in, unfortunately the response she got was also that the person she talked to would pass it on to a colleague who the again passed it over to another and so on. This she describes as common with municipalities, especially because within the municipality it is difficult to figure where to place a planning proposal like this. Someone told her that it might fit within the technology and environment department, another said that it might be better if placed with the department of children and youth, or maybe it should go to the culture, activities, and sports department (ibid.). In the end she got the feeling that if she would find someone in a department who might saw it as fitting within their frame of work or budget, then perhaps it could get carried out but this seemed very unlikely. Anne elaborates that she thinks it is a really hard task to pitch a feminist approach to planning in municipalities in Denmark, if there is not sufficient support from within the municipality.

She suggests however that it might make sense to pitch these ideas to different local associations instead, they might find it easier to implement certain aspects of feminist approaches in their settings. She mentions sports clubs, different activity associations as examples. These kinds of place might not be able to affect the overall planning in a municipality, but they could push the agenda by making the issue visible, like mentioned earlier in regard to the suggestions from participants in the workshop.

I followed this up with a question about why Anne thinks there are these barriers with getting municipalities to act on proposals like she pitched. To that she says that she thinks it has to do with the departments not being sure where to place such projects. Like mentioned before, the idea got allocated again and again, and it seems difficult for them to place it precisely, especially when dealing with smaller municipalities that does not necessarily have a planning department. Therefore Anne suggests that the solution might be political support in order for it to be prioritized and placed at a department that can act on the ideas (A. Nielsen, personal communication, April 16, 2021).
Relational space

In order to answer how a feminist approach to urban planning can ensure even productions of space, one needs not only to look at the potential the approach contains but also look at the consequences of not implementing a such approach to planning. With this research I have sought out to explore the structural barriers linked to a lack of acknowledgment from policymakers, stakeholders and decisionmakers in relation to gendered notions in the planning field. According to Molina a neglection of this could result in a separation of people from the built environment, separation of work from residence and so on, instead of having a temporal dimension of human behaviour, their life's, bodies, experiences, feelings, and needs (Molina, 2017).

From the empirical data I have gathered planners, architects and others working in the field of urbanism, often feel inadequate in securing spaces that are truly inclusive and that represent the people affected by it, especially in what I would consider the intersectional aspects. In this regard it makes sense to highlight that several of the informants acknowledges that their academic backgrounds did not prepare them to consider intersectional relational perspectives in planning for urban planning and development. This could mean that without structural understandings of links, identities, and assemblages in cities, research might fall short in recognizing gendered issues related to the urban.

In Brenda Parkers FPEP framework she emphasises how relationality can be a strategy for recognizing the politics of location and power of agency, applied to subjects, sites and scales selected for an analysis in an FPEP approach (Parker, 2016). Through the lens of relationality one can explore how gender inequalities are both locally and globally constructed, and highlight how humans, places, practices, and power are all connected.

If one seeks to research marginalized women and their everyday life, questions about policies, power, and institutions, Like Koleth and Temenos phrases it: the enactment of feminist praxis is a political act, will undeniably occur. In order to understand and try to answer these questions, relationality can provide insights to the relations between sites, scales, humans and political structures, among other aspects. By mapping out relations, one can reveal the alignment of actions in one place with relevance to elsewhere, and by that percept the links and structures that forms everyday life (Parker, 2016).

Based on the statements from the workshop participants, including my own experiences with the field, there is a tendency in planning to have a narrow or over-situated focus on scale. Meaning that a lot of urban planning happens in single scale and fixed geographies where emphasis is on developing an area, park, neighbourhood etc. Without connecting it to a city wide or multiscale structure of analysing. According to Parker and Molina, cities should be understood as dynamic interrelated assemblages of sites, processes, practices, politics, institutions, and social structures (Parker, 2016: Molina, 2017). By using a relational approach to urban planning and research, one has the opportunity to understand phenomena and social relations that are coherent with- and beyond the build environment.
Seen through the lens of the case study Buens Torv, relationality could be said to be constrained by larger structural power relation affecting the project at several scales. By policies, municipality plans, economy, stakeholders and bigger political visions for the area and the highway bridge on top.

URBAN13 is placed on the border between Nørrebro and Frederiksberg, which means that it is connected to Copenhagen Municipality and Frederiksberg Municipality, that is in itself a peculiar situation that might create tensions between the too, in addition, it requires great ingenuity on the part of the actors at URBAN13 in terms of negotiations. When creating a space out of nothing, on a parking lot under a highway bridge, it becomes very important to understand some of the relationalities such a space encompasses. Meaning, that even though it might at first not seem as if there are certain relations at place, other than parking for car users, it can enclose many different relations from different groups of people. That could be beer drinkers having a ‘roof’ to sit under sheltered from bad weather, it might a place for meeting up with your friends and play load music from a speaker, it might be a shortcut for people in the nearby areas or maybe dogwalkers enjoy going through it in order to stay away from the fast-moving cars on the roads. The list could go on, but the emphasis remains on understanding and respect the different relations that people might have to the space, and how to best implement and respect those relations.

Even though the area today has undergone development to some degree, it respects the rough interior of the area, and you can still find parking here, but it has undeniably created new relations and assemblages of relation no less. Both by creating room for other groups of people to participate in activities but also across former relations to the site and new relations to the site. In observations of the area today and in conversations with the stakeholders behind URBAN13, the former users of the place as found a way of still incorporating it into their everyday life, and simply pushed out or displaced. Therefore, the place can be said to contain a varied and diverse group of users, but with room for inviting in a more equally diverse gendered group.

Through the use of the theoretical toolkit presented in this thesis, I came to different realisations regarding uneven productions of space and barriers that come with trying to implement a feminist approach to planning. By using an approach that builds on having a toolbox filled with different theories and methods, one can better understand cities structures and relations, as well as make way for even productions of space by exposing the possibilities for interventions. An interdisciplinary view on planning processes and engagement with space, can be said to be beneficial for other areas of knowledge production as well, it does not have to be separate fields with associated theories. Further it encompasses and match the intertwined and tangled ways cities operates, as fluent and everchanging spheres of power, humans, and sites.

With the use of an FPEP toolbox approach it has become clear to me that it is important that research should not get to narrow when it comes to urban planning, there is huge potential in thinking across and in relation with different approaches to planning. If one wishes to, as I have tried to highlight through my own work with this
thesis, to examine space with such a framework it can make way for more sustainable and inclusive approaches to urban planning. By using a toolbox of theories and methods, one can work towards fruitful processes for planning and furthermore intersectional understandings of cities. In Denmark there seems to be a lack of a feminist approach to urban planning, based on my empirical data there is a willingness to do so but certain barriers and struggles makes it difficult and causes problems. These barriers revolve around a misconception of the term feminism, a lack of knowledge and research in Danish contexts, political support and case examples of feminist urban planning. The latter could, based on the empirical data, affect the others by showcasing good practises and thereby demonstration the potential, success, and benefits from a feminist approach to urban planning. This could influence or even persuade fonds, municipalities, policymakers, stakeholders, and others to invest and prioritise such an approach. Data and science have a strong effect in this regard as well, it is very common for decisionmakers to get influenced by data and science, it is therefore very important that urban sciences uphold its responsibility to educate, produce and research on feminist urban planning. Something that the empirical data points to as lacking in Denmark.
CHAPTER 6
Conclusion and Discussion

What are some of the key barriers in implementing a feminist approach to urban planning in Denmark? And what are the ways forward in order to ensure commitments and responsibility to even productions of space?

Some of the key barriers with implementing a feminist approach to planning in Denmark is a general misconception, or misunderstanding even, of what the feminist approach can contribute with and what the benefits of such an approach are. The same goes for how to implement the approach, especially since there is a lack of examples and cases to learn from in Denmark, as well as a lack of knowledge, acknowledgment and data in both academia, politics and among planners and architects regarding feminist urban planning. A way of working forward and towards a feminist approach is to implement toolboxes both as used in this thesis – a theoretical toolbox, but also through tools that help planners engage, react, and understand women’s usage of urban spaces and construct processes that respects them and their unique knowledge. By working with toolboxes, the potential in thinking across and in relation with different approaches to planning are revealed as well as opportunities for intersectional understandings of cities.

The research interests of this paper came from my own personal journey into the field of feminist urban planning and a search for ways to work in the field in a Danish context. Therefore, the objective is to gain knowledge of the field as a broad but moreover what questions and concepts are needed in order to investigate the uneven productions of space and the structures within. Empirically the data consist of qualitative discussions and dialogues with several different professionals from the urban planning and architectural scope in Denmark, in order to examine structural, academic, and legislative barriers connected to the feminist urban planning field.

Through the preliminary work with this thesis, it became clear to me that there is discussion about gender within the urban research field. But it is not something that one can easily assess, or furthermore implement in actual planning processes and practises. According to several scholars including those chosen for this specific thesis, there are no copy-paste model for doing so in a thoroughly manner. Some of this has in my opinion to do with the scales and sites that the academic research holds, in the sense that it is often anchored to specific situated locations that are not easily transferable to others. This is based on my own experiences and observations with the case study Buens Torv where the actors sought to create a more inclusive urban space towards women but lacked actual examples and methods to engage in such a project. Most of the research and literature, if not all, collected for the foundation of the project are from other countries than Denmark. This means that one must modify and change aspects in terms of getting it to fit the context. It is not uncommon to do so when planning, but in this regard, it can create boundaries for the project being realised and, in the end, successful in its vision to be truly inclusive. Because it makes for difficult explanations and elaborations on why this approach are valuable for a planning process, that the planners need to go through whenever they encounter involved actors, stakeholders, politicians etc. since
they cannot easily refer to examples from science that speaks for itself. Again, this builds on my own experience and observations from working with the case. In this I observed many confrontations with such barriers, both in terms of seeking funding or getting building permits or even showcasing the project as feminist in general.

This could mean that a lot of the research done on methodological ways to implement a feminist praxis in urban planning, are not assessable for actors or stakeholders who wishes to apply such an approach. Further, if the academic research does not showcase examples of, and ways to, concretely implement those methods, it can for some planners and grassroots organizations be a difficult task to persuade or encourage policymakers, developers, investors, municipalities or funds to engage with the field of feminist urban planning. This was a real concern from many of the participants in the workshop, since they had the will to start implementing feminist approaches in their work, but they feared that it would not get financial or political backing from policymakers.

This I argue aligns with what Koleth & Temenos (2021) explains as feminist praxis, whether it being through academic research or policymaking, is a political act which needs involvement with an ongoing iterative process of critically scrutinizing or methodologies and the alignment of our political commitments with our scholarly practice. We have to be able to recognize the ways that planning processes, as well as in academia, may fall short of commitments and responsibility to ensure even productions of space that builds on true experiences of women and people in general. I think that Koleth & Temenos explains very well, that there is a need to increase the connection between research and policy, and even though there has been much discussion on this topic, there are still a large gap between the two (2021).

"As the global community proceeds with the implementation of the SDGs through emergent challenges posed by crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, bringing women’s experience from the periphery to the center of our understanding of contemporary urbanization continues to be essential to sustainable urban change, and without such understandings, scholars and urbanists alike miss out on more than half the story." (Koleth & Temenos, 2021, p.9)

By analysing my empirical data through several theories instead of focusing mainly on one, I have come to find that there are deep connections between these approaches, and it benefits a complex and manifold field that is feminist urban research. Some might assume that feminist urban planning is a branch of urban science, but I do not recommend approaching it that way, since feminism, and even more directly put women, are not simply a branch within humankind, citizens, or users for that matter. Feminism and women in urban science represent holistic understandings of the urban as a web of relations and if gendered notions are not incorporated in matters of urban space, the maintaining and oppression against half the populations continuous. This does not correspond with what I, through my education and my experiences in the planning field, understand as urbanism and urban planning. I would say that the field of urban sciences are built on an ideology that represent democratic and sustainable visions for humans living together in cities, with concepts and ideas of build environment as plannable in correlation with
human needs. If half of those human needs are not meet, then I would not consider it democratic or sustainable, but rather very discriminating.

Design proposal – further work in feminist urban planning

Through this thesis work, and in order to get started with feminist urban planning approach to Buens Torv I started collecting concepts, idea and methods for how one could better conceptualise this rather complex field. This came out of so many of the participants in the workshop stating that they would not know where to start if they were to plan a feminist urban space. I seek to continue with this collection, and I wish to share it to whomever and be transparent about my findings as well as open to other perspectives. Therefore, this is not a finished product but an insight to an ongoing work with slowly building a toolbox for a feminist urban planning approach.

As of now, the idea is that you can follow 4 steps that relates to the process of planning. First step is called **Defining**:  
- The project aims to address a social issue in a specific context  
- Consider your privilege before addressing a social issue, preferably together with colleagues and other associates  
- There is a clear group of actors that have lived experience of the problem or issue that you are aiming to address  
- Investors and/or funds are actively involved throughout the process  
- There is a clear group of main stakeholders that are actively involved in the planning process and decision making throughout.

Next step is called **Current**:  
- Multiple other stakeholders are involved in some way during the process  
- Explore other good practices and examples  
- Consider the human needs

![Figure 17 Toolbox](image-url)
The third step is called Implementation:
- Include stakeholders in implementation of interventions, as much as possible
- Validate the final outputs with all the stakeholders that have been participating in the entire process and revise if necessary.

The last step is called Future:
- Measure the impact to understand how the developments have impacted the public space and the community.
- Once the process is completed, take some time to gather feedback from the participants, key stakeholders and decision-makers about the overall process.
- Communicate good practises, so others can get inspired and validate a similar process to investors.

These steps are in some cases connected to specific practises, methods, or readings that one can do in order to get the work going. Therefore, the list can keep going and others can add to it as well. I am hoping to evaluate it further with this thesis and I hope to quality check it at some point with other researchers and especially with users.
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Invitation and program for workshop in Danish
Registration form

Feministisk byplanlægningsværksted - tilmelding

Ved at udfylde formularen bekræfter du tilmelding til Feministisk byplanlægningsværksted ved COurban 2021. Værkstedet vil foregå online d. 4. marts kl. 13.00 - 15.00. En uge før vil du få tilsendt et link, program og en deltagerliste. Hvis du har kommentarer eller spørgsmål til begivenheden (f. eks. om du ønsker at det afdales på Engelsk) kan du skrive dem i formularen eller besvare emailen med invitationen. Vi glæder os til at tale om feministisk byplanlægning og vores projekt Buens Tory sammen med dig!

*Skal udfyldes

1. Mailadresse *
   ____________________________

2. For- og efternavn *
   ____________________________

3. Titel (hvordan ønsker du at blive præsenteret for de andre deltagere) *
   ____________________________

4. Kommentarer/spørgsmål
   ____________________________

Dette indhold er hverken oprettet eller godkendt af Google.

Google Analyse

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1Mmuq-zNv08w9b_0XfINCxaxPEVtALWq5n0QsQYo8Sj40/edit
Miro – outputs from workshop in Danish

**Gruppe 1**

**Gruppe 2**

**Gruppe 3**

**Gruppe 4**

**HVAD SIGER PIGERNE?**

**KØNNET UDFORDRINGER I BYENS RUM**

**OVERORDNEDE TEMATIKKER AT ARBEJDE VIDERE MED**

- Piger og kvinder oplever tryghed anderledes end drenges og mænd i byen.
- Piger og kvinder skal inddrages og synliggøres i byplanlægningsprocesser endnu mere.
- Piger og kvinder er mindre fysisk aktive i det offentlige rum.
- Feministisk byplanlægning gør alle, ikke kun piger og kvinder, til.

**Fleksible og inkluderende**

- Aktiviteter er forbundet med alle involverede
- Byen制药 - opmærksomt på slagsmellem
- Byen制药 - aktiviteter for de med
- Det mange aktiverer
- Det er aktiverer
- Aktiverer de også piger og
- Aktiverer de også
- Aktiverer de også

**Kommunikationer**

- Kommunikationer
- Kommunikationer
- Kommunikationer
- Kommunikationer

**Identifikationer**

- Identifikationer
- Identifikationer
- Identifikationer
- Identifikationer

**Problemer og muligheder**

- Problem 1
- Problem 2
- Problem 3
- Problem 4

**Forlængelser af workshop**

- Workshop forlængelser
- Workshop forlængelser
- Workshop forlængelser
- Workshop forlængelser
Interviewguide Danish
Anne Nielsen - Urban and Cultural Planner/architect, Urbanistas

Vil du med dine egne ord beskrive feministisk byplanlægning for mig?

Hvad har du selv erfaret i relation til at arbejde med feministisk byplanlægning i dk?

Hvilke barrierer oplever du i forbindelse med feministisk byplanlægning?

Hvordan tror du man kan implementere en mere feministisk tilgang til byplanlægning i dk?

I dit arbejde, oplever du at kollegaer/samarbejdspartnere kender til feministik
byplanlægning?

Hvordan kender du til feministisk byplanlægning/hvornår blev du opmærksom på feltet?

Hvilke spørgsmål bør man stille i en feministisk planlægningsproces i DK?

Hvilke elementer/metoder/processer er vigtige hvis man ønsker at arbejde feministisk i et
byplanlægningsprojekt?