6. CLOSURE
ANALYSIS...

In this final chapter of my report it is my intention to summarize the analysis I have made and conclusions that I have come up to in my own work. I have presented three different design proposals for an existing square, a new park and a new green link within the city of Malmö. I chose these three areas because I found them interesting in the way they today, in my opinion, lack a proper urban recreational usage and/or green space.

Both Drottningtorget and Kv. 22 are situated within areas in the city centre that lack green space according to the deficiency analysis in the Greenplan (see graphic below, left, and further reading in the Deficiency analysis section). Sofielund industrial area constitutes not only an interruption in the Rosengård green corridor (see graphic below, right) but also a plug in the bike/pedestrian track running in an east-west direction. I saw potential in all three areas.

I started off by reviewing Malmö Greenplan 2003 since this is the document that is of importance when it comes to green space and recreational planning in Malmö. The Greenplan is not a legislative document but it is used as a guide in decision-making. The vision is that the Greenplan be rooted into the planning process in all authorities.

The Greenplan constitutes of a green policy, divided up into general, recreational and biological aims. In order to fulfil these aims, a number of correlating strategies have been proposed. The graphic to the right shows how my design proposals respond to these strategies and thus how the new areas I present should correspond to the goals set up by the city council. This analysis is based on my personal conclusion.

It is quite interesting to see how well my proposal for the green link falls out according to the proposed strategies. The biological aims where not my main concern in the design process since the three areas I have been working with are set in an urban location, however I state that the proposals I present in Sofielund and Kv. 22 can affect the biological environment since they are set in relation to existing green space areas with biological life. The proposal for Drottningtorget has more focus on recreational aspects and it is therefore not surprising that it correlates to these strategies. Overall: the recreational strategies are the ones that my three proposals correlate best to.
strategies

**general**

- To secure existing valuable green space areas and protect them from exploitation.
- To erect new green space areas.
- To avoid exploitation in green space areas.
- To apply the “precaution principle” in all actions that affects the green values.
- To apply the “compensation principle” if exploiting valuable green space areas.

**biological**

- To maintain existing green space areas with biological values.
- To enhance the biological status in existing green space areas by complementing with new habitats and species.
- To start from defined landscape types when creating new green space areas and developing habitats.
- To develop and connect the characteristic areas with similar habitats and structure within the different landscape types.
- To start from existing and documented habitats within the region when establishing new areas as well as enhancing existing ones.
- To create good conditions for habitats which today are underrepresented in the municipality.

**recreational**

- To maintain existing green space areas with recreational values.
- To develop through quantity or quality existing green space areas with recreational values.
- To erect new green space areas in deficiency areas.
- To reduce the inaccessibility from roads and other barriers.
- To improve the accessibility of green space areas that today has limited access (i.e. golf courses and allotment gardens).
- To create a green network covering the municipality.
- To extend, strengthen and tie together existing green corridors through new greeneries and green links.
- To erect new green corridors in areas like along water streams, bicycle tracks, riding tracks etc. where they have opportunity to develop.
- To increase the accessibility of the green space areas within the city from the suburban residential areas by creating green walking paths and bicycle tracks.

**drottningtorget**

**kv. 22**

**sofielund industrial area**
Continuing my analysis I have put together a graphic showing how my sources and their research within the area of human preferences in urban environment correlate to each other. These are: PPS (Project for Public Space), Patrik Grahn, the Kaplan couple and Tom Turner. In an attempt to compare these researchers I found that they more or less come to the same result on how we humans prefer our outdoor environment, what we long for and what activities we perform.

The structure of the graphic is a concentration of areas like space, pleasure, coherence, relaxation in the upper part, symbolized by Tom Turner’s green, blue and white colours. In the bottom part one finds a concentration of peoples places like the common, festive ornament, openings, attractions, public transport, play parks etc. symbolized by Tom Turner’s red and orange colours.

In my analysis I found that the factor of management was the one that I could correlate with most sources. It seems management is needed in both the pleasure and relaxations areas, as well as in the more active areas such as openings, meeting places etc. PPS is the only source mentioning public transport as a preference however PPS’ key factors address a strikt urban environment. Grahn, Kaplan couple and Tom Turner all address the preference of mystery and wildness.
In the graphic to the left a comparison between this research of preferences and how well my proposals responds to it is envisaged. The analysis is my personal reflection treating the connection and it is based on how I perceive my proposal. Drottningtorget corresponds well to what PPS (Project for Public Space) presents as the four key factors in becoming a succesful public place. It also correlates to the more active preferences of Patrik Grahn such as festive ornament and the common, and the Kaplans’ coherent areas due to the way I organized the ground layout.

The proposals for Kv.22 fulfills an even range of preferences of all four sources. With its varied range of park characters it is a place that attracts different kinds of people. It constitutes of both a play park, pleasure park, mystery areas, meeting places, the canal provides a sense serenity and the school museum constitutes attractions.

The new park area togehter with the green link and the existing park Gullängen in Sofielund is of a larger park character which correlates well to the Kaplan couple’s preferences. It fulfils all five: coherent areas, smooth ground, sense of depths, mystery and openings. As well with Tom Turner this proposal, with its many different characters, corresponds to his colour scheme. The long stretches of green grass in Gullängen provides relaxation and space and the plaza and canopy room in the new park area provides an opening and meeting place. The new Youth Centre and the green asphalt on the bike track constitutes the attractions in this proposal. Or is it just my preference?

Tom Turner is the one researcher that sticks from the rest of teh group since his research is based on a slightly different angle of approach, a colour scheme. I find this very interesting, however analysing it is very risky since it to a very high extent is based on personal opinion. And then again, maybe not. The science of colour and how it is percieved by humans is an interesting yet uninvestigated field. However I sympathize with Tom Turner to that extent that I propose a design action in Sofielund industrial area based on Tom Turners colour perceptions theory: green coloured pavement on the bike/pedestrian track.
I believe Drottningtorget has high potential of becoming an attractive urban square in Malmö due to its beneficial location in between the city centre and the new city entrance. Furthermore, one of the most critical disadvantages for Drottningtorget was its lack of an image, a problem that now seems to be an solution to since these parts of the city are becoming renowned for its ecological activities. Shops and cafés are popping up around Drottningtorget taking advantage of the laid-back atmosphere and social life.

Parks can, if they are designed and constructed correctly, contribute positively to the social, environmental and the economical aspect of a functioning city. It is often shown that the economical factor is the decisive one, in many cases this is correct. In many case this is equally wrong. The decision to redesign the area in Kv.22 is based on my notion that the qualities that come with green space in this particular area are not valuable in money. The office building located there today is visually disturbing and does not fit into the surrounding, neither aesthetically nor what it contributes to the people living in the area. This part of the city lacks green space.

Another solution to this problem would be to transform the left-over lots you find around the city centre (with no obvious function other than for car park, which can be solved in other ways) to low-maintenance pocket parks, creating a green grid throughout the city centre. The city council should in my opinion not be afraid to see green space planning solutions as an economical profit.

Sofielund industrial area is a forgotten back-side area of Malmö that holds high potential of becoming a well-functioning and mixed area based on its robust character. An areas industrial character does not exclude all city functions. Interaction between activities is the key to a qualitative industrial/mixed use area. Why not construct the next skate-park in Sofielund or build a new Youth Centre, provide the area with an attraction, increasing the flow of people during after work hours, adding to activities for the neighbourhood kids etc. etc.

Erect and maintain safe bike/pedestrian passages through the area, work with urban lighting solutions, let green space areas be an refreshing element amidst the grey concrete buildings. The bike/pedestrian track existing today could easily be strengthened. I have proposed all of these suggestions with in my proposal for the link through Sofielund.
ACHIEVEMENTS

Drottningtorget:
- adding life to recreational space that today is underused
- strengthening the eco-image
- enabling activities
- visible order the sense of “placeness”
- increasing the green space
- solving parking problems
- renew the urban lightscene

Kv.22:
- adding green space to an area that today lacks neighbourhood parks and greeneries
- creating a green play environment for the kids attending Österport School
- creating a multi-facetted neighbourhood park with different characters
- enabling access to the canal front
- strengthening the promenade
- enhancing the neighbourhood character
- renew the urban light scene

Sofielund industrial area:
- establishing the missing link between the bike/pedestrian track
- connecting the Rosengård corridor
- adding green space
- interacting city functions [industry/activity]
- improving activity scene for kids, teens & parents
- strengthening the neighbourhood name
- renew the urban light scene
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