Jonna Majgaard Krarup

Small Town Public Life

Introduction

Urban public space and public life is increasingly seen as a quality parameter in deciding and evaluating whether a city is attractive or not for people and for businesses, and therefore also for the cities themselves in their competition of attracting tax-payers and businesses. Different strategies and initiatives in realizing this are taking into consideration refurbishment of existing public spaces; design of new public spaces; organization of international cultural and sports events; initiatives that focus on health, food, and culture; redistribution and reorganization of traffic types and car parking; construction of bicycle paths; etc. Several major cities, capitals, and metropolitan cities have succeeded in this and have become role models for not only other large cities but also for minor cities and small towns in their striving for having a piece of the cake. The inspiration appears in impressive new designs and refurbishments of small town public spaces, but the ambitions of a resulting rich and vibrant urban life are often not fulfilled due to the lack of people. Who is to sit in the little café in the daytime? Who is to fill the streets?

Many small towns and villages are inhabited by families, but the work places are often located elsewhere, in the large city, or in other towns. Rush hours are characterized by the use of cars defining the urban life activity rhythm (Lefebvre 2004): Mum and dad bringing the children to school by car, commuting between home and work by car, picking up the children by car, going to the shopping centre by car and so forth. Everyday activities and destinations are spread out, distances are long, public transportation complicated or lacking, indicating that urban public life in smaller towns seems to be based on conditions that to some extent counteracts dreams—often stemming from examples of urban life in major cities—of rich, diverse urban life and activities.

Publicness by the numbers

A dominant line in urban space discourse measures 'publicness' by numbers of people, and by how long people stay in space–*publicness by the numbers*. The rationale behind this seems to be: the more people registered in urban public space, the better public urban life, and hence the better urban public spaces—this line is being promoted by, for example, Jan Gehl and the observational

study technique he promotes. This line of urban space and publicness thinking is easy to understand and communicate, and it is easy to use by urban designers themselves. It links the design of public space and the life and activities taking place at the site closely, and suggests that the quality of urban public life to a large degree depends on the spatial design.

Architecture and the architect thus comes into focus as the profession and the professional able to create successful public spaces and life and to repair unsuccessful public life by refurbishment of urban spaces. It cannot be excluded that this may actually be the case, but it may also be exaggerated and simply a too optimistic trust in the capabilities of both architecture and the architect.

The quantification of 'publicness' might prove handy and relevant as documentation and argumentation discussing public life and public urban space in major cities and metropolises, but it is here questioned when applied to smaller towns and villages, which are, per definition, small population-wise and which have limited variety of functional programs. Therefore one could assume that also the form of publicness differs from publicness seen and performed in the major cities.

The quantification of 'publicness' is gaining ground and is supported by the increasing use of tracking methods, where people's movements through the city and the urban spaces are tracked with GPS devices and smartphones. The data collected may be combined with maps by the use of GIS technology, and exemplified and illustrated in graphics and diagrams. These often persuasive and easily digested diagrams may be used as arguments and as proof–evidence–of the success, or the opposite, of specific design concepts, and thus accommodate an increasing societal demand for evidence-based solutions and proposals that also planning and architectural design are met with. Numbers seems neutral and therefore reliable. Questions and ambitions regarding public life and architectural qualities are not neutral; trying to answer them with numbers only will provide some of the answers. Large amounts of people in front of a railway station do not in itself say anything about the spatial qualities of this particular site, just that people have to come here. Therefore, we must be careful arguing with numbers discussing publicness.

How do we as architects and planners approach questions on small town publicness, and how do we overcome limitations of generic thinking within urban discourse and practice in order to adapt this to small town conditions? My claim is that public life in small towns in some ways differs from what is seen in large cities. This relates to site related and specific conditions. A tendency in our thinking about urban space and urban life is generic, developed within a traditional urban context and understanding and and it may therefore be insensitive towards small town life specifics and characteristics. As architects and planners we have to reconsider and adjust our approaches to and understanding of small town publicness in order to contribute to the development of high quality and relevant small town public spaces and publicness.

In the following I will try to exemplify and discuss this claim taking point of departure in a Ph.D. thesis and concrete examples of small town public space refurbishment and interviews with people telling about their public life behavior patterns.

Mapping Urban Public Space and Public Life with Smartphones

The first example I will discuss is a Ph.D. thesis by Eric Scharnhorst. The study is an example of the use of new technology to involve the users and provide user data by quantification in mapping urban life and spaces. Scharnhorst's ambition was to develop a mapping method using smartphone positions in place and time in urban spaces in order to identify slow places—meaning good places—in Copenhagen. The thesis was conducted and defended (2015) at The School of Architecture, Copenhagen, Denmark (KADK). The theoretical framework in the thesis draws on what I term generic thinking within urban design, and it illuminates some of the pitfalls that may occur by un-critical confidence in generic thinking. The method developed by Eric Scharnhorst is thus based on a quantification of publicness, and hence follows the described dominant line in urban space discourse introduced at the beginning of this paper.[1]

In his thesis, Scharnhorst documents and interprets human movement as a way of identifying slow sites in the city. The identified slow sites are linked to and discussed according to specific 'good' urban public space characteristics drawn from urban design discourse. The concept of *Slowness* is positioned as a leverage point for human, city, economics and environmental health, and as a quality parameter for urban life. Slowness is defined as sites—urban public spaces—where people walk, bike, or dwell.

The theoretical framework in the thesis draws on texts, analysis, and recommendations from J. Jacobs, J. Gehl, Active Living Researchers, and The Nordic Studies. From here twelve theoretical points and the according site character aspects are listed. It is assumed that these twelve aspects produce and support slowness. The aspects are linked with the place data (maps) and with people data (GPS tracking of people). The three parts—site characteristics, place data, and people data—are the components in the design of the slowness mapping method. The study discusses and questions the traditional way of selecting sites for observation,[2] and aims to overcome what Scharnhorst defines as a problem, namely the way that the experiences and preferences of the experts in selecting sites for observation often are biased. Hence, the study may be seen as an example of an approach that tries to overcome the limitations of what Hajer and Reijndorp (2001) describe as, *common themes and attitudes of involved parties*, that is biased and generic thinking in urban public space discourse and practice regarding the selection of sites for observation.

The theoretical framework in Scharnhorst's thesis represents one dominant line of thinking within the discourse on urban design and urban life

2 Gehl 1971/2011; 2010; 2013.

stemming from William Whyte (1980/2001) and his observational studies of how people position themselves, interact, and pass through public spaces, and from Jane Jacobs (1961) and her critique of urban planning and her activism for creating better cities for people. Many researchers and practitioners within the field of planning and urban design all over the world refer to this line in urban discourse in their research despite geographical position, cultural context, and urban typology the research is undertaken in, or where the design projects are situated geographically and culturally. As such, this thinking in urban space discourse may be described as *generic*, and as part of an *urban canon*.[3]

3 Amin 2006.

The line has inspired and informed popular observational methods in urban design, where 'publicness' is measured by numbers of people, and by how long people stay in space. Scharnhorst's study builds on this approach, and he contributes to its further development by using smartphone technology in the counting of people instead of having a group of research assistants positioned for hours and days in various urban spaces.

The strength of using smartphones to gather information on urban space and people in the way it was done by Scharnhorst was, that his study was not limited by the experiences and preferences of the experts. In more traditional observational study techniques, the selection of locations may be done within a specific and unarticulated framework of understanding and based on criteria, which can be colored by preferences of the ones selecting. That is what Hajer and Reijndorp (2001) call, '*common themes and attitudes of involved parties/players.*'

The tracking method used in Scharnhorst's study was designed to be more automatic and passive than more traditional observational study techniques. Hence, the participants did not have the chance to annotate the maps produced or to explain what was happening, how they felt, or what was interesting about a certain part of the city. This passivity of the digital approach meant that the maps were created at a distance from the spaces and people being mapped. The pointing out of sites, as it was done in Scharnhorst's study, was not in its own a way to analyze the site or to document other activities or a mix of activities going on at the site since it could only be detected where and how long the participants were present at the different positions, and, in the case of overlaps between more people and places, how many people stayed at the same positions. Another weakness in Scharnhorst's study was that the gathered information only represented the participants where the non-participants were not represented. The participants were mainly younger people that had volunteered via a homepage and the major part hereof were students, which often live a different life, and use the city and the public urban spaces in a different manner, than families with small children or elderly people do. First, this suggests a combination of approaches and methods to be used in mapping of peoples' movements in urban space—for example, a combination of traditional observation studies, questionnaires, and new technology based tracking. Secondly, the architectural analysis of the sites still has to be done.

Thirdly, in order to avoid biased and limited participants, and thus to produce representative data, the rules for participating in such studies obviously have to be addressed, no matter, if using traditional or adjusted observation study techniques or not.

Scharnhorst's study did reveal a general picture of where in the study area different speeds (fast and slow) occurred, but also where the two types of movement collide, and thus questioned a basic assumption by Gehl, namely that 'good' public spaces and public life are slow spaces characterized by slow activities. The study further revealed that some of the chosen twelve aspects from the literature were not mappable, and some findings, which displayed other urban characteristics than the listed aspects, were left unnoticed and thus undiscussed.

Common for the findings in Scharnhorst's study, which displayed other urban characteristics than the ones described by the chosen twelve aspects, were their landscape (scenic) features and character, which were out of range of the analytical framework in the thesis. This points back to how the analytical framework was constructed, but also to the geographical, cultural and discursive context in which the aspects were originally defined. This suggests that the thinking on urban space and public life, in this line of urban space discourse, is developed in a context and upon an understanding of the city based on a traditional dichotomy between landscape and city, meaning that landscape features weren't characterized or regarded as important to these authors. Following this, no one would look for landscape features or typologies, besides the urban park, within the city. Nor did Scharnhorst. It may be that it was irrelevant for Jacobs and Whyte to discuss landscape features in relation to urban spaces within their urban context at that time, but it may be relevant now regarding small towns and villages, and in the context of a current urban concept where the old antagonism between landscape and city to some degree has been dissolved.[4]

Scharnhorst's study thus illuminates general imbedded site in-sensitiveness in generic approaches and references within urban discourse, and thus some of the pitfalls when approaching a problem and a site with the wrong concepts. This suggests that it maybe wise to examine the possible correlation between theories and concepts and the geographical, cultural, temporal and typological context in which they originates. What were the dominating paradigms in the urban discourse at the time the theories and concepts were coined? And are they relevant here and now?

Limitless (Local) Public Life

The following discussion takes its point of departure in an article in the Danish planning magazine Byplan Nyt (3/2015) and an example from Vordingborg Municipality in the South Eastern part of Denmark. In this example, local authorities, together with small town citizens, addressed the question on publicness in developing plans and projects for a series of small and shrinking towns within the municipality. The article in Byplan Nyt (3/2015) is based on

4 Smets 2002; van der Velde and de Wit 2009.

interviews with people describing how they, on a daily basis, transgress city limits and regional and national borders as part of their everyday life. Even though the article isn't based on valid research, I refer to it as an indicator of some characteristics of small town public life.

In the example from Vordingborg Municipality, the idea is to adapt shrinking small towns structurally, spatially, and functionally in order to make them attractive for both citizens and tourists. Providing and qualifying urban spaces was part of the project and aside from the 'clean-up' by demolition of abandoned buildings, it was *the* main initiative in supporting public life in these small towns and villages.

In Denmark, different national and political development strategies have, for several years, concentrated on Copenhagen and other major cities such as Aarhus, Odense, and Aalborg. A result hereof is an increase of these elements in these cities, and a general decrease of inhabitants, investments, activities, industries and wealth in larger parts of the rest of the country, known as "The Rotten Banana" or the outskirts. The term, "The Rotten Banana," refers to a functional, economical, and geographical in-balance between the major cities, including Greater Copenhagen, and the western and southern parts of Denmark. The expression is ascribed to Hanne W. Tanvig, senior adviser at Forest & Landscape at the University of Copenhagen, and originated in the '90s, while she was involved in setting the agenda on rural development in Denmark. "The Rotten Banana" stretches from Skagen in the north of Jutland running west and south of the highway structures connecting Aarhus, Odense, and Copenhagen, and ending at Bornholm. These areas form a banana shape; the paraphrase refers to the "Blue Banana", a term from 1989, when the French geographer Roger Brunet pulled a blue banana over the European map to illustrate that France stood outside the European growth center. The blue banana stretches from the north-west of London, Brussels, Amsterdam, Cologne, Frankfurt, Luxembourg, Stuttgart, Strasbourg, Zurich, and Milan.

Regardless of the name, many small cities and towns in Denmark have lost population and work places due to the structural and economical development, leaving houses, institutions, and farms abandoned and almost impossible to sell. In 2010, the former Ministry of Social Affairs deposed funds of 150 million Danish Kroner (approx. 20 million Euros) to strengthen the efforts for upgrading the physical environment in these areas in Denmark. The municipalities could apply for subsidies to purchase private property and certain types of farm buildings; secondly, to cover costs of demolition or renovation and the clean-up of stored scrap, old cars, and waste on private plots; and thirdly, to compensate the municipal share of the general urban development activities in rural areas. Additional 100 million Danish Kroner (approx. 13 million Euros) were added in 2011 to continue the efforts. In November 2015, a new national growth strategy was introduced by Erhvervsstyrelsen (Danish Business Authority) to replace the initiative.

In 2014 the municipality of Vordingborg received around 12 million Danish Kroner, and the municipality itself was able to provide roughly equivalent contributions totaling 20.5 million Danish Kroner for "Funds for village renewal". In 2014 the local Council of Møn and Vordingborg Municipality invited all interested to a public meeting to discuss proposals for future village plans for five villages, proposals for future village plans for the five villages, Hjertebjerg, Elmelund, Borre, Nyborre and Magleby, all located on Møn, an island within Vordingborg Municipality. These villages have been shrinking for some years and the idea was to invite the citizens to contribute and participate in developing the plans. As part of the process, the Municipality of Vordingborg used the concept of local development plans (LUP, Lokale Udviklings Planer). The purpose of the LUP was to give the local councils a tool to approach the process of preparing local development plans, and to strengthen the interaction between the local community and the overall municipal planning. Some of the concrete results of the process, with impacts on the publicness, are:

A   The purchase of a property as a local community house in the area. The building now functions as an office and meeting room and is used by different groups for different activities such as lessons in painting, as a club for teenagers in the area, and as a exhibition space mainly exhibiting local history.

B   The Municipality also purchased and demolished a property next to Borre Church. A cooperation between the local council, the owners of the surrounding properties, the church, the store, and the supermarket, and individuals prepared a design proposal for a central square in the city. This proposal has now been executed.

C   Financial assistance for the renovation of landmark buildings and demolition of obsolete buildings was allocated after application.

D   As a result of the demolition of some obsolete buildings in Elmelunde, a public park came into being.

The above mentioned concrete projects function very well both in respect to the everyday life of the citizens and in relation to tourists passing through these small villages on their way to the main attraction on Møn, Møns Klint, an impressive natural chalk formation and a new museum and exhibition space disseminating knowledge on the geological processes that have formed the spectacular landscape on East Møn. None of the initiatives and village projects may be appraised for their architectural features, but they function as planned and are carefully taken care of by the citizens themselves. The demolition of the houses left vacant lots in the villages. On some of these, small woods have been planted, others have been purchased by the neighbours and added to their garden areas.

The little public park in Elmelunde has been appropriated by the local kindergartens and school classes, using this little urban space as a playground

and as part of school teaching, illuminating a paradoxical need for public green spaces in rural towns and villages. In Denmark, 65% of the land is occupied by agriculture, and despite these areas being defined as Open Land, most of these 65% are privately owned and therefore, in principle, in-accessible for the public. Only with the owners' permission are you able to access it. So even if you live in a small town in the countryside, surrounded by open land—green areas—you will, apart from road and trail areas, picnic areas, public facilities, forest areas etc., in most cases only have visual accessibility to the open land. This paradox was addressed already in 1931 by landscape architect C.Th. Sørensen. In his book, *Parkpolitik i Sogn og Købstad* (Park Policy in Parish and Market Towns), he argues that park policies are as much needed for small towns and villages as in the major cities. Sørensen points out that in the larger urban communities there already exists an understanding of the need to provide urban public parks and access to green areas for residents. But also, that this understanding of the residents' needs for and access to parks and green spaces is still not established in the smaller urban communities, and therefore must be supported by park policies adjusted to the contextual conditions characterizing the smaller towns and villages. Sadly enough, very little has happened since then—the attention among to urban park policies and projects by planners, architects, politicians, and other actors have been focused on the large cities. Since then, the need for park policies and public spaces in small towns has even become stronger due to the structural development in Danish agriculture where fewer and fewer people are employed in ever-larger production units engulfing rural towns and villages as isolated islands in the landscapes.

5 Petersen 2015.

Regarding the results of opening the planning process and involving the citizens, an evaluation[5] was undertaken in August 2015. It revealed that,
A The expectations of the output of the LUP differed between the municipality (especially the administration) and the local councils. The authorities and planners had hoped that the LUPs could contribute to support the strategic and overall development plans for the municipality.
B Several local councils found it difficult to relate to the visionary and strategic issues and ideas for the local areas.
C Local projects are usually understood as concerning specific, spontaneous, and manageable activities of daily life and assessed by 'rapid successes.' The success criteria usually cover the extent of activities and projects, rather than how they impact the development. Hence the strategic perspective was mainly sporadically addressed, as local councils have 'no authority' in general find it difficult to influence and assess policy goals.
D Several local councils had difficulties in getting input to the LUP from local actors. Many local councils experienced to be left alone with this task.

The examples from Møn and Vordingborg Municipality focused on the small scale and on what was defined as the local area and the locals, emphasizing the notion on the importance of local, urban public space as the framework for public life. But also emphasizing the believe in involving the local residents in the planning processes. The following evaluation of the process

showed that planning in general, and strategic planning in particular, was difficult for non-professionals to relate and contribute to. Individual hands-on projects are more feasible and easier to relate and contribute to. This indicates some rather complex challenges in making planning more inclusive and democratic. How to work with time and scale aspects and how to empower locals and at what levels, are some of the open questions. But, it also raises questions on what local actually means, who the locals are, and what the potential of local could be?

Localization of spaces, activities, and people seems to some individuals and groups more important and attractive than local urban spaces and local public life. New technology supports this and negotiating meetings, activities and where to meet, and navigating the city, and other cities and city districts, looking for the most interesting events, discussions, people and parties etc. have become part of contemporary urban life behaviour.[6] This could be seen as a big city phenomenon, but is actually also part of current small town public life and behavior as illustrated by the following accounts by the three interviewed persons.

6 Bryson 2011; Amin 2006; Bille and Schultze 2006; Kvorning 2007.

The first interview in the article in Byplan Nyt (3/2015) is with a 20-year old woman. Twice every week she goes from Nykøbing Falster, where she lives and studies, to Copenhagen for handball training sessions. The trip takes about an hour each way, and the time spent commuting is used for socializing, sleeping, doing homework or simply relaxing. She says,

> "I never really think about in which region or municipality I am, I am just going to training. Nor is my network of friends determined by geography (…) If I really feel like shopping and spending money I go to Copenhagen on the weekend with my mother or with a friend."

A similar attitude is displayed by a retired 65-year old blacksmith, originally from the Netherlands, but living in Denmark for most of his life. His car is filled with tools and materials for the many different projects that he takes part in such as shipbuilding and renovation of old ships and sailing tours in Denmark and the Netherlands. He says, *I am not limited by borders. (…) I am there where a blacksmith is needed, and where people are.*

The third example is a 40-year old man from Sweden but living in Denmark and commuting between his home and wife and children in Copenhagen, and his work in Sweden. He says, *crossing boarders is no big deal. (…) We want to live in Copenhagen because this is where our social network is, and because Copenhagen is an international city.*

Noteworthy is that the one of the three most local-oriented interviewee is the one living in a large city. Through his children, their school and friends, his public life, and his socializing is to a large extent concentrated within the city district he lives in. The two others display a public life behavior pattern more determined by activities and friends than by geography and places. They both contribute to the publicness in their home areas by living there, studying

there, and surely also socializing there, but they also contribute to publicness in other places, in other cities and other countries. They navigate and use a network of small and larger cities and spaces depending on which activities they want to take part in and which people they want to be with. The importance of local urban spaces and local urban life is thus relativized by the two of the accounts, suggesting that their publicness is different and more diverse, than the idealized local public life suggested in the generic literature and supported so often in architectural designs and advices. Local urban spaces and local urban life is important to some groups and some people, perhaps especially families with smaller children and elderly people, but to assume that this is applicable to all, and at all times, is to draw too far-reaching conclusions.

The idea of local seems to be more nuanced to the locals than perhaps assumed and local is not necessarily confined to one site or one town,

7 Korff 2013.

> "It seems as if, as a legacy from the classical period (in Anthropology), it is assumed that everybody knows what local is and thus there is no need for further elaboration. This can be taken as one reason why the current literature dealing with 'local', is not at all explicit about what is meant by it. Implicitly local is linked to spaces socially and culturally integrated in specific ways. (…) global denotes an abstraction from space in terms of flows, ideas, virtual realities and images, while local in contrast refers to real spaces. '(…) Localities are not isolated from each other. If there is one feature of the global age that can definitely not be doubted, it is the global networks of communication and media. Thus between localities which used to be far apart, now regular interactions take place. (…) Social interaction is always spatially bound and never covering all space. Selections and classifications of interaction—space linkages are constantly made and places perceived as favorite, less favored and avoided. These classifications are internalized through routine and taken for granted. In other words, an accommodation takes place.'"[7]

According to Korff space linkages are fluid and negotiable, suggesting that the demarcation of local space is rather dynamic, which also the local users therefore must be. This suggests that, in observing and understanding what local may mean and for whom, exploring and documenting how far the reach of a local culture stretches in physical space, and mappings of patterns of choices of urban spaces and activities are needed. This indicates a very site and cultural sensitive approach in observational studies. Scharnhorst's contribution to observation methods with smartphones may be very productive in such an exploration and provide substantial empirical material for further analysis and theorizing. We should therefore also see the individual small town urban public spaces as part of a network of public spaces, suggesting that programs, activities, character, atmosphere and design of the individual urban space may very well differ from others in other small towns and from the ones seen in major cities. The ambitions and success criteria for a small town urban

space may therefore also differ from those applied to urban spaces in larger cities, which is not the same as saying that the architectural quality should or could be lower in small town public spaces, but they are subject to different parameters, conditions, and behavioral patterns. A nuanced concept of local also questions the close link assumed between a particular site and identity,[8] and suggests a kind of nomadic publicness. Nomadic in the sense that the performance of publicness for some small town citizens is a product of their choices of homes, activities, friends, workplaces, and the like, just like large town citizens, but in contrast to these, the small town publicness is spread out and may include several formats, urban spaces in different geographical and urban contexts, and across scales. Does that mean that small town citizens are rootless and without identity, or that they don't contribute to create site identity? One could answer with a question: Is the nomad rootless and without identity? No, not necessarily, one may have roots in several places, and part of the specific nomadic identity is exactly that it is nomadic and guided by patterns and rhythms of functions, time, sites, and activities and other people. Following this, the accessibility and connectivity in such a network of spaces, and the diversity of spaces and activities, are equally important as the notion of 'local' space and 'local' users. This questions the idea of and emphasis on the local and locals in the democratization of planning processes as an indisputable 'good' and in a way it perhaps points back to the ideas and understandings within the context in which this idea is developed. Ideas and understandings in which local is associated with small scale, safety, meaningful socializing, traditional family patterns, and the like. In several ways, an antidote to current lifestyles, anti-urban and nostalgic in its essence.

Conclusion

This reflection started by claiming that public life in small towns in some ways differs from what is seen in large cities, and that this relates to site related and specific conditions. This reflection also started by claiming that our thinking on urban public space and urban life tends to be generic and too closely related to large city problematics, and thus insensitive towards small town life specifics and characteristics. And further, that we as architects and planners therefore have to reconsider and adjust our approaches to and understanding of small town publicness in order to contribute to the development of high quality and relevant small town public spaces and publicness. The discussion of the examples suggests that an advantage of generic thinking and methodologies is that they provide a common ground, and a commonly accepted ground. A disadvantage is that in order to be generic they also tend to become insensitive towards site and time specifics. A result hereof may be that we as architects and planners overlook site specifics, potentials, challenges, and resources because we are blinded by a discourse and its imbedded framework of rules, and thus our thinking on public urban space and publicness itself becomes a barrier.

Scharnhorst's study illuminates this general imbedded site in-sensitive-ness in generic approaches and references within urban discourse, and also

some of the pitfalls when approaching a problem and a site with the wrong concepts.

As the two interviewees illustrate, the concepts of publicness and local, are perhaps not so locally fixed as often assumed by architects and planners. The idea of local seems to be more nuanced to the locals than perhaps assumed and local is not necessarily confined to one site or one town. This is why the often used observational study technique, which describes publicness with numbers, may provide some of the answers on what small town publicness is and could be, but it cannot provide substantial and comprehensive answers on its own. Localization of spaces, activities and people seems to some individuals and groups more important and attractive than local urban spaces and local public life, suggesting that small town publicness may also be described as nomadic.

Author

Jonna Majgaard Krarup is associate professor and affiliated to *The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts*, School of Architecture, Copenhagen, Denmark. She holds a master and a PhD in Landscape Architecture. She worked for 12 years in praxis before returning to academia in 1999. Since then she has been teaching and conducting research within landscape and urban studies at different universities in Denmark and abroad.

References

Amin, Ash (2006): "Collective Culture and Urban Public Space," in: Caroline Kihato, Mejgan Massoumi, Blair A. Ruble, Pep Subirós (eds.): *Inclusive Cities. The Challenges of Urban Diversity: Problems and Assets*, Washington, D. C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press/Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bille, Trine and Günther Schulze (2006): "Culture in Urban and Regional Development," in: David Throsby, Victor Ginsburgh (eds.): *Handbook on the Economics of Arts and Culture*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1052-1099.

Bryson, John M. (2011): *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations—A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement* [1988], New York: Wiley.

Damm, Martin (2015): *"Den rådne banan" og "Udkantsdanmark" gør mere skade end gavn*, www.kl.dk/menu/Den-radne-banan-og-Udkantsdanmark-gor-mere-skade-end-gavn-id174836/ (December 12, 2015).

Dansk Byplan Laboratorium (2013): *Vejkantsdanmarks fremtid—re scenarier for modellandsbyen Skrumpelev*, livogland.dk/vidensbase/litteratur/rapporter/vejkantsdanmarks-fremtid (December 18, 2015).

Dansk Byplan Laboratorium (2015): *The Regional City—Limitless Planning Byplan*, *Byplan Nyt*, vol. 15, no. 3.

Gehl, Jan (1971): *Livet mellem bygningerne*, Copenhagen: Arkitektens Forlag.

Gehl, Jan (2010): *Cities for People*, Washington, D. C.: Island Press.

Gehl, Jan and *Birgitte Svarre (2013)*: *How to Study Public Life*, Heidelberg: Springer/Washington, D. C.: Island Press.

Hajer, Marten and *Arnold Reijndorp (2001)*: *In Search of New Public Domain. Analysis and Strategy*, Rotterdam: NAI010 Publishers: Rotterdam.

Jacobs, Jane (1961): The Death and Life of Great American Cities, New York: Vintage.

Jacobsen, Rasmus Giese (2015): *Større og større landsbyer taber indbyggere*, www.kl.dk/Momentum/momentum2015-20-2-id193303/?section=132442 (December 10, 2015).

Korff, Ruediger (2003): "Local Enclosures of Globalization. The Power of Locality," *Dialectical Anthropology*, vol. 27, issue 1: 1-18.

Kvorning, Jens (2007): "Strategisk Byplanlægning," *Byplan*, vol. 5, no. 1: 3-9.

Lefebvre, Henri (2004): *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life* [1992], London: Continuum.

Norberg-Schulz, C. (1971): *Mellom jord og himmel*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Petersen, Claus Lyngby (2015): *Evaluering af koncept for Lokale UdviklingsPlaner (LUPer)- Et værktøj til lokal udvikling for lokalrådene i Vordingborg Kommune, Vordingborg Kommune August 2015,* www.vordingborg.dk/Everest/Publications/Afdelinger/Stab%20Udvikling/Nærdemokrati/Koncept%20for%20Lokale%20Udviklingsplaner/20150922135929/CurrentVersion/Evaluering%20af%20koncept%20for%20Lokale%20UdviklingsPlaner%20_LUPer_%20%20Endelig.pdf (December 12, 2015).

Referat af Borgermøde (2014): *Borre, 5 Marts 2014*, www.vordingborg.dk/.../20140618132143/.../Referat%20af%20borgermoede (December 19, 2015).

Scharnhorst, Eric (2015): *Mapping the Slow City,* PhD thesis, The Royal Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, Copenhagen.

Smets, Marcel (2002): "Raster, Hülse, Lichtung und Montage," in: *Topos*, vol. 10, no 38: 88-101.

Smith, Michael Peter (2001): "Power in Place: Retheorizing the Local and the Global In Urban Studies," in: Norges forskningsråd (ed.): www.forskningsradet.no/.../oslopaper-smith,0.doc (December 5, 2015).

Sørensen, C. Th. (1978): *Parkpolitik i Sogn og Købstad* [1931], Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers Forlag.

Van der Velde, René and Saskia de Wit (2009): "The Landscape Form of the Metropolis," in: *Footprint. Delft Architecture Theory Journal*, vol. 3, no. 5: 55-79.

Whyte, H. Whyte (2001): *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces* [1980], New York: Project for Public Spaces.

Recommended Citation