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Presentation and Rationale of the Standards derived from the Demands

Land – Regulation (LR)

LR1. Zoning for building uses distinguishes only between mixed use and industrial use.
LR2. All waterfronts are public land.
LR3. Land not zoned for building use is accessible at all times for pedestrian use.

Land – Provision (LP)

LP1. Vacant public land is accessible at all times for pedestrian use.
LP2. Public entities create and maintain green areas for recreational use and ecological purposes.
LP3. Public entities acquire land in favourable locations and make it available for low-threshold-housing.

Network – Regulation (NR)

NR1. The existing mesh of public corridors is safeguarded. Its public character is maintained.
NR2. In new development areas, a mesh of public corridors is established. The grid size corresponds with the needs of pedestrian use.

Network – Provision (NP)

NP1. All public corridors are designed and operated in a way which allows safe and dignified pedestrian use.
NP2. Public corridors are not specialized as to their traffic function: no freeways, no pedestrian zones.
NP3. All urban corridors allow pedestrian crossing at any point. No freeways, no fly-overs, no underpasses, no foot-bridges.

Building – Regulation (BR)

BR1. Building plots are defined by public planning. Their dimension follows the necessities of public space.
BR2. Maximum building heights apply to all buildings of an area. No privileged superelevation.
BR3. Every building on a plot has direct access to a public corridor.
BR4. Provide legislation and due enactment of norms concerning rent levels and security of tenure in housing.

Building – Provision (BP)

BP1. All social support infra-structure is located as to allow dignified pedestrian access, connected to public transport.
BP2. Public entities operate or support temporary shelter for persons in need - independent of status.
Johannes Fiedler

SPATIAL JUSTICE - A system of values for urban planning and design
The value systems that are used in the design of buildings, urban space and in territorial organisation are subject to continuous change. In addition to the established system of “sustainability”, the criterion of “justice” is increasingly applied to the production of space (see: P. MARCUSE et al.: Searching for the Just City1, E. SOJA: Seeking Spatial Justice2, S. FAINSTEIN: The Just City3). In contrast to paternalistic practices of the past, the current approaches for establishing justice in space support cultural diversity, freedom of choice and self-determination.

The research on Spatial Justice, which was conducted at the Institute of Urban Design at TU Braunschweig from the summer of 2010 onwards, was supported by the Institute of History and Theory of Architecture and the City (GTAS) and aimed to develop this emerging planning paradigm which was formulated in the United States against the background of neo-liberal spatial planning policies in a cross-cultural perspective. This work also included an exchange of ideas with Edward SOJA, who joined us in Braunschweig to review our work in November 2011. One central question arises: Haven’t the demands of the North American critics of space – such as for participation in decision-making, for state engagement in housing or for public transport – already become part of the professional and political consensus in Europe and many Latin American and Asian countries?

However, for planners like us who are embedded in these systems and discourses, the “justice” approach evokes great expectations. We know that it is not enough to harp on again and again about the ecological and social consensus. What matters is how these principles are implemented. It is moreover unproductive to refine and complicate the system of planning and urban policy further. Instead, the question should be asked as to how far state action can go, what it can achieve and how it legitimises itself. The term “justice” raises the hope that something
like straightforward, just framework conditions can be established, which bring about such levels of diversity, self-determined action, building and usage which characterise those places and inspire our ideas of cities.

Engaging with Spatial Justice requires reflection on what distinguishes the criterion of “justice” in the design and provision of space from other criteria. With reference to John RAWLS the overwhelming characteristic appears to be that the rule emerging from a consideration of justice is applicable to an unknown future situation and thus, with reference to the Capabilities Approach by Amartya SEN and Marta NUSSBAUM, will enable individual and collective future development.

Hence, it is also the strategic value of Spatial Justice to enhance the potential for continuous advancements and for an open future. Thus, Spatial Justice is in sharp contrast to the deterministic understanding of planning which prevailed in the 20th century. From this perspective, the approach of justice is the opposite position to the assumption that one knows exactly what people need and accordingly, what the world should look like. The confrontation with Spatial Justice forces planners to face the uncomfortable fact that one cannot know what needs and what spatial form future societies will have.

Starting from the justice approach, one soon arrives at completely different solutions in many areas. For example in the field of transport: The pedestrian underpass represents the deterministic solution, whereas, against the background of justice, the principle of Shared Space would be appropriate – the common and respectful use of a public pathway. These new approaches are all the more necessary as a kind of eco-functionalism, an update of the deterministic system of regulation threatens to emerge from the logic of sustainability. In contrast to such tendencies, “justice” can be positioned as an umbrella term for environmental justice, gender justice, diversity and democracy – as a mode of on-going change, not as a goal in itself.

Ultimately, something like a consensus on fundamental values could arise from the understanding of Spatial Justice, comparable to citizens’ rights, whose validity has successfully become detached from concrete and current situations.

Literature:

1 Peter MARCUSE, James CONOLLY, Johannes NOVY, Ingrid OLIVO, Cuz Potter, Justin STEIL et al.: Searching for the Just City, Routledge, Oxon 2009
2 Edward SOJA: Seeking Spatial Justice, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 2010
3 Susan FAINSTEIN: The Just City, Cornell University Press, 2010
5 “Der Schleier des Nichtwissens” in: RAWLS 1979, Kapitel 3, Abs. 24
The choice of justice as the governing norm for evaluating urban policy is obviously value laden. It reacts to the current emphasis on competitiveness and the dominance in policy making of neoliberal formulations that aim at reducing government intervention and enabling market processes. [...] The justice criterion does not necessarily negate efficiency and effectiveness as methods of choosing among alternatives, but rather requires the policy maker to ask, efficiency or effectiveness to what end?

Susan Fainstein
The Just City, 2011, p. 8-9

I argue that the best approach to this idea of a basic social minimum is provided by an approach that focuses on human capabilities, that is, what people are actually able to do and to be, in a way informed by an intuitive idea of a life that is worthy of the dignity of the human being. I identify a list of central human capabilities, arguing that all of them are implicit in the idea of a life worthy of human dignity. The capabilities are then presented as the source of political principles for a liberal pluralistic society; they are set in the context of a type of political liberalism that makes them specifically political goals and presents them in a manner free of any specific metaphysical grounding. Presented and commended by argument in this way, the capabilities, I argue, can become the object of an overlapping consensus among people who otherwise have very different comprehensive conceptions of the good. I argue, further, again relying on the intuitive idea of human dignity, that the capabilities in question should be pursued for each and every person, treating each as an end and none as a mere tool of the ends of others.

Martha C. Nussbaum
Frontiers Of Justice - Disability, Nationality, Species Membership, 2010, p.70
Cases - Issues - Demands - Standards

Methodology: from intuitive notion to urban design tools
In the seminars and design studios realised at the Institute of Urban Design of TU Braunschweig the attempt was made to develop spatial planning instruments based on the criterion of "justice". To date this objective has been pursued in the following manner: As there can be no full coverage of all aspects of spatial justice or injustice, the task given to students in several courses was to search for cases, spaces or episodes which in the opinion of the individual course participants raise issues of spatial justice. Depending on the format of the course, these cases were then elaborated on either as a critical monograph, an analytical design or as an anecdotal report. Based on this material, problems, requirements and standards were systematically derived. The structure of this process is shown in the chart below.

CASES - ISSUES - DEMANDS - STANDARDS
Each of these Cases refers to one or more problems, to Issues, that occur not only in the case portrayed, but also elsewhere. From each of these problems, Demands can be developed, aiming to promote a higher degree of justice. Given the numerous, globally scattered cases each with their own problems - a large number of Demands arises. Most of these demands coincide with principles which have already been established in the urban discourse over the last few decades and which relate to ecological and social values. Now the question arises: Which spatial means, which urban design Standards are necessary to fulfil these demands? The drafting of Standards was done selectively and tentatively, without any claim to fully cover the principles expressed in the Demands. In fact, we followed the idea that there could be spatial and organisational standards which ensure a minimum level of quality in collective space - regardless of the quality of architectural design and of the involvement of players and target groups. In any case, the Standards ought to reflect the essential characteristic of justice – the non-specific applicability, validity without taking into account local constellations – analogous to the legal phrase “irrespective of the person concerned”. Of course such Standards sometimes nudge one into a degree of radicalism that is hardly tenable in practice. Nevertheless, we have deliberately pursued these radical positions as they seem to be a suitable vehicle to convey a new value system.
For around ten years numerous real estate projects for the upscale market – office towers, residential towers, shopping palaces – have been built in the historic part of Kiev. The existing buildings, the green spaces and the interests of the residents are hardly taken into consideration. The resistance of professionals and those affected is blocked by an opaque city council. The large investment companies which are intertwined with politics enforce their interests. The projects already realised and under construction illustrate the impact of this development: The historic skyline is dominated by the new objects, the symbolic space of the city is claimed by the new user milieu. As the residential towers are built in the form of walled sites, the quality of public space and its walkability suffers. Green spaces are privatised or devalued by the building developments.

- Building plots are defined by public planning. Their dimension follows the necessities of public space.
- Maximum building heights apply to all buildings of an area. No individual superelevation by height.
Berlin: Diverging usage interests on the upper Stadtspree

Anne Kettenburg

The banks of the Spree river in Kreuzberg are characterised by industrial use. Despite its function as public waters and urban space the river has few access points. Many plots along the banks lie fallow. When considering the future use of this land, there is a clash of conflicting interests between the local residents, the land proprietors and the city council.

INVESTORS’ INTERESTS ARE PRIORITIZED OVER RESIDENTS’ NECESSITIES

The banks of the Spree river in Kreuzberg are characterised by industrial use. Despite its function as public waters and urban space the river has few access points. Many plots along the banks lie fallow. When considering the future use of this land, there is a clash of conflicting interests between the local residents, the land proprietors and the city council.

DEMANDS

- organize inclusive and transparent planning processes
- make politics respect dwellers’ interest in the sale of public property
- make green areas available for public use
- guarantee public use along water edges
- make public land accessible

STANDARDS

- All private land not zoned for building use is accessible at all times for pedestrian use.
- All waterfronts are public land.
- Vacant public land is accessible at all times for pedestrian use.
Oxford: Colleges taking over the city

Anissa Schlichting

There are numerous colleges in the historic centre of the university town of Oxford. Approximately 40,000 young people study there. Most of them also live in the colleges located in the old town. Due to the increasing number of students and because the colleges have no option for expansion, there is a compression and merger of colleges to establish new libraries and classrooms. As the colleges acquire and absorb adjacent houses and plots, the number of access points decreases and the city’s permeability and liveliness suffers.

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AGLOMERATE IN DETRIMENT OF DIVERSITY AND PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY

- Zoning for building uses distinguishes only between mixed use and industrial use.
- The existing mesh of public corridors is safeguarded. Its public character is maintained.
- Every building on a plot has direct access to a public corridor.
- Building plots are defined by public planning. Their dimension follows the necessities of public space.

DEMANDS

- guarantee transparent decisions in planning
- avoid monofunctional areas
- maintain mesh of public corridors
- make buildings communicate with public space
- limit size of project units

STANDARDS

- In new development areas, a mesh of public corridors is established. The grid size corresponds with the needs of pedestrian movement.
Braunschweig-Hagenmarkt: Barriers to walkability
Merle Woköck

**ISSUE**

**DESIGN OF PUBLIC SPACE DAMAGES USABILITY AND SAFETY**

The location of the former Hagenmarkt square is today characterised by large transit axes and is more of a crossroads than a place to linger. The church which originally shaped the square lost its anterior due to the car-oriented design, resulting in the square losing its unique shape. A car lane and a tram track separate the church from the green space with a fountain. The wide streets make it difficult for pedestrians to cross, centre islands serve as waiting points for pedestrians because often the streets cannot be crossed in one traffic light cycle. Due to the many stairs, there is also no barrier-free passage.

**DEMANDS**

- guarantee indiscriminate use of public space
- user-friendly design of pedestrian system

**STANDARDS**

- Urban corridors are not specialized as to their traffic function: no freeways, no pedestrian zones.
- All public corridors in cities are designed and operated in a way which allows safe and dignified pedestrian use.
Braunschweig Station Area: The decay of the city’s entryway
Jan Augsberg

DESIGN OF PUBLIC SPACE DAMAGES USABILITY AND SAFETY

A new through station was built in the southeast of Braunschweig in around 1960 and a large urban redevelop-
ment was carried out according to the model of the car-friendly city with an explicit segregation of modes
of transport between automotive and pedestrian traffic. Kurt-Schumacher-Straße, which serves as the
connection to the city centre, is designed especially for car traffic and tramlines. Taking this route by bicycle
or on foot is unattractive because of the rear of constructions along the one side and the lifeless green area
along the other, and it is perceived as unsafe.

DEMANDS

- make buildings communicate with public space
- guarantee indiscriminate use of public space
- user-friendly design of pedestrian system
- avoid road systems with dividing effects

STANDARDS

- Every building on a plot has direct access to a public corridor.
- Urban corridors are not specialized as to their traffic function: no freeways, no pedestrian zones.
- All public corridors in cities are designed and operated in a way which allows safe and dignified pedes-
  trian use.
Halberstadt: The usability of the historic town for the elderly
Jan Beetz

HISTORIC CITY CENTER NOT ACCESSIBLE FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED PERSONS

The historic centre of the town of Halberstadt is suffering from population decline and a lack of economic activity. Recently, the last tramline was also discontinued. One aspect of the demographic development is that the proportion of elderly people in the city is increasing. This population group values the old town and the provisions and events it offers. These inhabitants are very important for the revitalisation of the city and the preservation of its heritage-protected areas. The problem, however, is that the public pathways in the old town are not designed to meet the special needs of elderly people. There are numerous barriers, unsuitable surfaces and pedestrian-unfriendly designs.

DEMANDS

- involve people with restricted mobility in design process
- user-friendly design of pedestrian system

STANDARDS

- All public corridors in cities are designed and operated in a way which allows safe and dignified pedestrian use.
Dakar: Housing needs of the migrant population
Hannes Langguth und Jan Müller

The city of Dakar is experiencing constant immigration and has become one of the most important hubs for international migration. As there is little financial or infrastructural government support for migrants, they settle at the edges of the city, mostly in low-lying areas which are at the mercy of floods. Without urban facilities and economic opportunities these settlements soon become slums. Yet there are potential settlement areas in central locations, for example on the grounds of the former airport or on the flat roofs of the centre. Here, opportunities should be created for migrants to live in dignified conditions.

RURAL-URBAN MIGRANTS DO NOT FIND APPROPRIATE DWELLING IN THE CITY

The city of Dakar is experiencing constant immigration and has become one of the most important hubs for international migration. As there is little financial or infrastructural government support for migrants, they settle at the edges of the city, mostly in low-lying areas which are at the mercy of floods. Without urban facilities and economic opportunities these settlements soon become slums. Yet there are potential settlement areas in central locations, for example on the grounds of the former airport or on the flat roofs of the centre. Here, opportunities should be created for migrants to live in dignified conditions.

DEMANDS
- respect migrants’ necessities in housing support systems
- provide shelter to persons in need
- make low-threshold rental housing available

STANDARDS
- provide the access to infrastructural use for rural-urban migrants
- public entities operate or support temporary shelter for persons in need - independent of status
- provide the possibility for individual participation in housing design
- public entities acquire land in favourable locations and make it available for low-threshold
Operational levels, spaces
How and where can these standards be applied? To get an idea of what needs to be done for the Standards to take effect, they are classified in an operational matrix. In the matrix the operational levels and spaces in which the standards are to be applied interconnect.

We identify two categories of operational levels: the process level and the material level. This is done with reference to a distinction by Susan FAINSTEIN. She discerns deliberative elements of justice and substantive elements of justice. As any physical measure must be based on a decision process, this distinction is also a hierarchy of operational levels.

Within the physical category, one can distinguish between the levels of “regulation” and “provision”. This idea is based on an established practice of public action: The state – on the one hand - fulfils the sovereign functions (such as physical planning, land register, construction methods, etc.) and is an economic player on the other - building and operating swimming pools, business parks or social housing in a role of public proprietor. While the state is in a unique position in terms of sovereignty granted by the constitution, the institution, which for instance operates social housing, acts as a private player operating in the housing market with its own resources and objectives. The distinction between these areas of state action represents one of the central challenges for any society and is for this reason a persistent topic of political debate.

As all instruments of Spatial Justice are ultimately found at the public level, the distinction between regulation and provision is of great importance against the background of the planning criterion of ”justice”. This could lead to the impression that Spatial Justice is pursuing an agenda of renationalisation and paternalism. Something different is to be achieved: In a rule-of-law context, a clearly defined and efficient sovereign sphere secures spatial rights and enforces commitments. Within this secured framework, individuals should be able to evolve according to their own capabilities and ideas.

What physical and economic services should additionally be provided by the state is another, much more pragmatic operational level, a matter of everyday political negotiation. Here the application of justice parameters is also of great importance. How many public resources flow into private-public partnerships, which risks are taken on by public players? The distinction of operational levels are relevant to the consideration of Spatial Justice because they clarify questions of legitimacy.

Which interference with ownership or use rights is justified and how is the concomitant decision made? As it is impossible to competently deal with such issues of political science and philosophy of law within an urban design educational programme, the entire complex of decision-making (deliberative elements) was not further dealt with. Instead, there was a concentration on the material area, on
the formulation of rules and tools of spatial design – knowing of course that the application of any of these rules and tools must be based on a legitimate decision-making process. The value of material standards is also in the support of decision making - by providing an idea of their spatial impact.

The spatial categories (land, networks, buildings), as they appear in the matrix, are to help imaging the Standards, and are also an indication of the professional disciplines addressed. The matrix provides an overview of the Standards that have been formulated within the programme so far. It is to be understood as an open system which can gradually be filled with further items.
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DEMANDS

LP 1 - Vacant public land is accessible at all times for pedestrian use.

LP 2 - Public entities create and maintain green areas for recreational use and ecological purposes.

LP 3 - Public entities acquire land in favourable locations and make it available for low-threshold-housing.

STANDARDS

NP 1 - All public corridors are designed and operated in a way which allows safe and dignified pedestrian use.

NP 2 - Public corridors are not specialized as to their traffic function: no freeways, no pedestrian zones.

NP 3 - All urban corridors allow regular pedestrian crossing. No freeways, no fly-overs, no underpasses, no foot-bridges.

BP 1 - All social support infrastructure is located as to allow dignified pedestrian access, connected to public transport.

BP 2 - Public entities operate or support temporary shelter for persons in need - independent of status.

provision

invest, operate
The following catalogue provides the rationale behind individual standards and describes their effects. Although one formulation or the other may sound familiar from well-meaning planning and strategy documents which are produced in large quantities, a closer look reveals that a consistent application of the standards presented would actually bring about a completely different city. These are not planning principles to be applied here and there relating to certain projects and locations, but standards that have been designed with the aim of universal applicability in any physical and cultural context. The radical element is therefore in the abstraction arising from the claim of universal applicability. Now, of course, these standards have to be assessed in different contexts – with the intention of fine-tuning and further concentration on the essential. Ideally, this does not lead to a broad catalogue of wishes, but to a few viable, consensual urban planning and design standards.
In most societies practicing spatial planning, it is common to define different types of residential areas. In addition to the physical parameters, a distinction is made with regard to usage, such as “residential-only areas”, “tourist areas”, or “core areas”. This distinction is in fact about the level of usage which might negatively affect residential use. This practice is unjust. It causes or reinforces the tendency towards social disintegration that is latent in all cities. Different levels of admissibility of non-residential uses create a situation in which residential areas with higher commercial activity end up with lower residential quality and lower housing costs. These areas are therefore settled by poorer population groups – resulting in poorer people being affected by emissions to a greater extent. This development, spawned by the dynamics of the market and undesirable from the point of view of a just use of space, is not to be supported by state land use planning. Physical planning, whose objective is to protect certain areas from exposure to emissions, conversely generates “affected areas”. In many cases this will cement unjust conditions, often setting in motion a downward spiral. In contrast, a just city allows for housing and work, trade, services and production in every building zone. The prerequisite for this, however, is that all these uses are also designed to be “living-compatible”. In this regard, the biggest problem faced in post-industrial countries is no longer the emissions caused by commercial or industrial activities themselves, but rather the car traffic induced by it. Hence, the prerequisite for the compatible operation of a business in a building zone is the condition that it is not designed in a car-dependent way. Only those business activities whose operational emissions are incompatible with habitation – such as industrial production, ports and airports - need a special designation in physical planning. Conversely one has to ensure that an industrial zone is not misused for other non-residential uses such as car-oriented consumer establishments.
Although most societies have rules regarding the keeping clear of the areas along public waters, there are diverse variations in the enforcement of these rules. In one case, use concessions are granted to businesses and tourism facilities, in another, extensive grandfathered uses remain entirely untouched. Often waterfronts are appropriated de facto without any opposition. From the perspective of spatial justice it is of great importance that general accessibility to waterfronts is guaranteed de facto and de jure. In some cases this happens in the specific interest of diversified economic use, while elsewhere the waterfront plays an important role for mobility or recreation. In any case, waterfronts are of particular ecological importance. Essentially, each water’s edge stands for “access”: It is a place for non-foreseeable forms of use and interaction. The waterfront thus embodies a central aspect of justice – equal access to unanticipated opportunities.

LR 2 – **All waterfronts are public land.**
LR 3 – Land not zoned for building use is accessible at all times for pedestrian use.

The implicit understanding rooted in most societies that open land may be accessed at all times independently of its ownership status is being endangered by the increasing commodification of land and property and by increasing utilisation pressure. Where people or companies become landowners who are not committed to the traditional forms of land use and who are not involved in the social norms of the community, there is a trend towards preventing the public from entering meadows, fields, fallow land and forests by imposing structural and legal barriers. The progressive de facto privatisation of open land means the loss of important spaces for recreation and interaction. Traditional paths are cut and established social contexts are disrupted. From the point of view of just space it thus makes sense to ensure universal access to open land areas for the purpose of transit or recreation. These users must of course be careful not to damage cultures or features of these areas and they are responsible for their own safety. Any area that is not zoned for construction is considered to be an open land area. As a just city will have a limitation on the size of building plots, one can assume that all large plots are classified as open land and that they will thus be accessible to the public. Consequently there are no fenced golf courses or hunting grounds, no separated recreational areas and of course — with reference to LR2 – no private waterfront zones.
Supplementing the standard of the general accessibility of open space areas, spatial justice demands all vacant public property zones – including areas zoned for building, fallow lands in the city, gap sites and unused business spaces – to be publicly accessible at all times. Not only those areas which are the property of state institutions are subject to this standard, but also those of companies with majority public ownership such as housing corporations, energy suppliers and municipal service providers. In addition to the aspects that apply here in the same way as to open land, the general accessibility of public construction plots is also a means to control privatisation trends. The sale of an area, which through its general use has adopted the character of a social space, is politically difficult to justify. In addition to the granting of access, the public owner must also ensure the area’s safe use in a basic way. Lack of safety must not be used as an argument to withhold an area from general use.
DEMAND: MAKE GREEN AREAS AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC USE

LP 2 – Public entities create and maintain green areas for recreational use and ecological purposes.

In the just city and in just space there is, in addition to the accessible private open spaces, a system of public open spaces which serve recreation, the microclimate and ecological balance. The system consists of different types of open space which are designed and dimensioned with reference to neighbourhood, city and region scales, and which are non-discriminatory in their layout and design. The provision of these open spaces is a contribution to ecological and socio-cultural sustainability. It is not geared to the specific interests of individual groups, but follows an overarching logic befitting the common good.
In the just city there is a system of public land provision: Land is bought or developed and is subsequently used to serve the creation of low-cost and low-threshold housing. One objective of public land provision is to facilitate various forms of affordable housing and to ensure minimum standards of quality in this sector. Another objective is to balance the market-dependent appreciation and depreciation trends which affect neighbourhoods and which result in the drifting apart of different social groups. Making low-cost dwellings available across the whole city promotes a process of cultural and economic approximation through schools, leisure activities and the common use of public space. This process has long-term effects and results in renewal, rejuvenation and enrichment of the respective districts. A prerequisite for this effect is that the plots of land set aside for the low-threshold housing do not have a dominating size and that they are linked with existing regions and with the higher- or lower-rated neighbourhoods in a functional everyday community. The most effective means thereby is spatial proximity, unifying walkable space.
The development of increasingly large construction projects and estates results in a trend to eliminate existing public paths and roads or to curtail their public function. Many actors perceive the inherited access pattern as an obstacle – especially in areas where it serves or could serve car traffic – the “road” being generally regarded as “enemy territory”, due to its mass automotive use. Hence, residential construction companies buy up public areas to protect their estates from traffic, companies overbuild public paths to optimise their operations. Residents cut off roads to reduce transit traffic: Existing streets are re-designed to play areas or cycle paths, resulting in the relocation of the burdensome traffic to other areas. All of these measures are contrary to the standard of an open, generic system of circulation, in which the burdens of access are justly distributed across the area, and that is consistently walkable. Both aspects require that everyday mobility requirements in the just city are not covered by private car traffic. Only then do the public corridors in the form of multifunctional streets have an invigorating effect, and only then will building and living along streets be perceived as attractive. The following aspects are essential in the implementation of this standard: First of all, the public corridors must be legally anchored as inalienable goods – not based on private servitudes or concession. Secondly, these corridors must indeed have a public character, i.e. not appear as part of commercial or residential compounds which would ultimately deter many people from using these spaces.

DEMAND: MAINTAIN MESH OF PUBLIC CORRIDORS

Network – Regulation (NR)

NR 1 – The existing mesh of public corridors is safeguarded. Its public character is maintained.
NR 2 – In new development areas, a mesh of public corridors is established. The grid size corresponds with the needs of pedestrian use.

The demand for maintaining the existing public access network results, according to the logic of spatial justice, in the necessity to extend this network in urban expansions and in the redevelopment of settlement areas. The paramount problem here lies less in the reduction and privatisation of existing public spaces but rather in the fact that all parties involved in urban expansion tend to agree that they can do without new public spaces and without new, finely meshed systems of access.

Therefore the definition and maintenance of public corridors is a significant sovereign task which must be enforced even against the interest of landowners. The same standards should apply for the development of public corridors in urban expansion as they do for the existing network. Firstly, even distribution of traffic loads, i.e. no specialisation into high performance roads, feeder roads and others, rather the design of all transport corridors in such a form that they can accommodate different types of vehicles as well as pedestrians. A precondition is that in the just city everyday transport requirements are not performed by car and that the streets are only used in a way which does not discourage pedestrians. Secondly, it is necessary to ensure in the design of the network of public corridors that the mesh width corresponds to the requirements of walking, so that no detours, which would ultimately make everyday pedestrian use unattractive, are required. Thirdly: The corridors’ public character must be secured factually, legally and by design: no compound-like design, no servitude or tolerance by private owners, but anchored as public property.
From the point of view of justice, walkable use of space is at the centre of all considerations. Walking enables all people to participate in the activities and opportunities of the city. The mass introduction of car traffic, supported by the state through the provision of space and funds, results in the distinction of two classes of traffic participants by individual economic strength: those who ride in cars and those who are on foot, whereby the latter bear the spatial effects produced by the former. This situation not only represents an injustice between individuals, but also on a collective level - due to a disproportionately higher consumption of natural resources by car traffic and the disproportionately higher cost to the public budget of this form of mobility. The daily negative perception of the consequences of vehicle traffic takes place in public space. It forms the mobility decisions of each and every individual. A corridor which is perceived to be dominated by cars will be avoided by pedestrians. When assessing the attractiveness, objective factors such as noise or dust play a lesser role than psychological aspects. Certain spaces are avoided because they appear inanimate, even if they do not pose a specific risk. They are avoided because pedestrians feel exposed and unilaterally controlled by the people in their cars and because they wonder why they have to walk along there when everybody else is avoiding the space. Those who have an alternative will no longer walk along these streets and may instead resort to the car, too. People who do not have this option find themselves in an undignified and discriminatory situation in areas polluted by car traffic. This feeds a self-intensifying spiral of destruction of space and increasing car traffic. This also erodes the public sphere and social coherence. In the just city, however, every transit space is dimensioned and fitted in order to be frequented by all people at all times in a safe and dignified way.
NP 2 – **Public corridors are not specialised as to their traffic function: no freeways, no pedestrian zones.**

The conventional strategy to mitigate the conflicts resulting from traffic is to specialise transport spaces - by the development of green corridors, pedestrian zones and residential streets on the one side and high-performance automotive corridors on the other. Such parallel systems are problematic from the point of view of justice. Each specialisation is also a form of discrimination – by focusing on a target group and their interests – for instance on that of the suburban middle class who would like to comfortably drive to the pedestrian zones by car, or strong and articulate groups in certain residential areas. It is generally not acceptable that pedestrian use on certain streets is sacrificed, forcing people to make detours or to avoid certain paths to give space to the requirements of car traffic. The just city avoids any form of specialisation of transport spaces by planning and design. With reference to the physical character of the different areas, a few different profiles are applied to the just city, all complying with the requirements of walkability, safety and dignified use. Trams, bus lanes and cycle lanes are integrated into the road. All the details of the design of roads are based on the assumption that motorised private transport is subordinate and runs at low speed. In the just city, there are therefore no non-intersecting high performance roads, no multilane one-way streets or other specialisations favouring car traffic. Conversely, there is also no public space which cannot be accessed by car – as accessibility is the central virtue of cities.
NP 3 – All urban corridors allow pedestrian crossing at any point. No freeways, no fly-overs, no underpasses, no foot-bridges.

The standard that the design of public corridors is non-specific in terms of their transport function results in the fact that there is no functional separation at the crossroads, i.e. no footbridges, no pedestrian tunnels and no underpasses or flyovers for vehicular traffic. This kind of separation of level damages the quality of social space in any case, be it through the necessary walls, ramp underviews, hidden angles, or through the hierarchy of traffic modes communicated by such specialisation. The just form of crossing is one that is level, that takes place on an equal footing. The standard that every public space must be safe and accessible in a dignified manner on foot at all times includes the option to walk on either side of the carriageway and to cross the road at any point while applying appropriate attention and respect to other users. In addition, there are facilities at regular intervals that allow a priority crossing of the road without pedestrians having to demand priority.
Building plots are defined by public planning. Their dimension follows the necessities of public space.

The horizontal extension of buildings along a street front has significant influence on the quality of public space and its walkability. Walking thrives on the small-scale experiences, on changing colours and materials, entrances to buildings, it is driven by encounters and culturally connoted sensations. If such experiences are not available, a change of route is imminent, followed by an avoidance of the route the next time. Even the varied design of large buildings provides no redress. People intuitively recognise the hidden homogeneity of the object, the institutional character, the lack of individual activity and history. If there is a homogeneous street front on the right and one that is diversely designed and constructed on the left, the pedestrian will choose the left. Thus there is a public interest in diversity at street level - in the service of walkability. This results in the need to limit the horizontal extension of buildings along roads and hence also the size of “production units”. This limitation also has another positive effect: If entire quarters or blocks of buildings are built and run by a single party, then ultimately the ability to develop will suffer. A large variety of parties and individual buildings, however, can compensate for a negative change in a single object from the other units, thereby always maintaining a certain degree of dynamism and quality. Diversity moreover generates the public sphere: Only the interaction of individual buildings and public pathways produces what is perceived in a positive way as “public space”. A strategy in favour of diversity thus requires small-grain designs and building plots that connect directly to the public pathways and which depend on public space for development and natural lighting. Only where the houses turn their faces to public space does it acquire social quality and will hence be experienced as safe and interesting. Therefore, in the just city maximum building plot sizes are set and have to be taken into account in each development of buildings or land. This setting must be regarded as an equally legitimate intervention in land ownership as the generally accepted limit to building height.
Limiting the height of buildings is a well-established tool in all cultures to minimise conflicts in the use of space. It considers not only the physical effects of building height such as shade, exposure or air exchange, but also cultural factors such as proximity or distance, openness or privacy, and last but not least to the symbolic use of the space. In traditional societies, religions and dominant groups assume the right to the symbolic occupation of space by height. Today, it is above all the strong economic actors who push for narcissistic self-depiction in space and who make use of the means of height. However, this means is only effective where a unique position, an accentuation – greater height in relation to other buildings – can be achieved. From the perspective of justice in space there is no justification for such distinction. What legitimises them to appropriate more space than the other actors in this area? The effect of such usurpation is in fact twofold: Firstly, the projection of adverse physical aspects of the building shape beyond its own plot onto the surroundings and secondly, the symbolic claim of space – with the effect that people are confronted with dominant symbolic messages against their will. In the just city it is impossible to provide a religious institution or a segment of the population with the privilege of physical superelevation. Hence in the just city a maximum building height must apply to all – a height that is defined by areas. The backdoor to an exception by declaring a building a “landmark” tends to be an unjustified privilege of individual parties which cannot be granted transparently. The just city does not exclude high-rise buildings: They can be built in areas where all buildings can be high-rises.
DEMAND: MAKE BUILDINGS COMMUNICATE WITH PUBLIC SPACE

BR 3 – **Every building on a plot has direct access to a public corridor.**

The principle that individuals, groups or businesses portray themselves to the surrounding society in a built form is rooted in every culture. This creates a level of commitment and allows mutual social appreciation. In this sense, “the house” is an extended form of the person, its façade a face. The more faces that are identifiable in public space, the better this space works. Buildings that are erected with their back to public space and buildings that are placed far from the public space in inner courtyards, on green areas, isolated by roadside structures or walls, damage public trust and cause public space to lose its social quality. The standard requiring all buildings to have direct access from the public corridors is a tool against “compounds” – against the typological idea which consists in the creation of an autonomous system of circulation, open space and building structure on a building plot, equipped with an autonomous legal regime. Such complexes are largely independent from the quality and possible changes of public space and relate to it only at limited access points. In contrast to the direct relationship between house and street, between individual and general public, in “compounds” an intermediary, institutional, anonymous entity comes into play. From the perspective of spatial justice, the “compound” is a threat in any form: Desolation of the public space, social disintegration, loss of mutual respect and social control, institutional production instead of buildings promoted by their users. Ultimately, avoiding the “compound” is also a way to foster the unmediated relationship between the individual and the general public and to thus address the responsibility of each and every individual in a just city.
DEMAND: MAKE LOW-THRESHOLD HOUSING AVAILABLE

BR 4 – **Provide legislation and due enactment of norms concerning rent levels and security of tenure in housing.**

The resources that are applied in a just city to organise dignified, environmentally friendly, generally accessible and viable dwellings must be broad-ranging and established at various levels. From the perspective of justice, the focus is on the legal framework, on technical standards, financial instruments and land policy. Public social housing, i.e. the physical provision of dwellings by state actors, tends to define the requirements of housing narrowly - against the background of economic considerations, thereby simplifying the dwelling to a product which is then being institutionally produced and technically and economically optimised. This rigidity of public social housing opposes the objectives of diversity and developability, which are of great importance for just space. The institutions of an open society can contribute in this sector especially through the securing of a framework which allows a high degree of legal certainty and a non-discriminatory access to real estate and capital markets for individuals and self-determined groupings. In the just city attention is also focussed on providing a sufficient supply of rental housing with low threshold access – especially for people who have recently migrated to the city – to provide for spontaneous changes to the shape of the family or to the place of employment, or for training and transition times. The means to ensure the supply of low-threshold rental housing include, for example, rent control, housing allowances, standardised terms of contract, mediation and counselling.
DEMAND: LOCATE SOCIAL SUPPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IN ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS

Building – Provision (BP)

BP 1 – All social support infrastructure is located as to allow dignified pedestrian access, connected to public transport.

It is assumed that the just city provides a network of public institutions for social and cultural life such as health care and nursing facilities, schools, sports facilities and much more – because the residents appreciate their community value and their role in a peaceful development of society and therefore provide the necessary public funds. In addition to the quantitative dimensions and the architectural design, the positioning of these facilities is also essential – specifically that access is indeed guaranteed for all sections of the population, i.e. that ownership of a car is not required to get home after an event, that children can get to school or use public transport by themselves already at an early age, that there is no need for humiliating walkways or delays in a public space when using a job centre or a social base. People who rely on public support because of their status as migrants must not be expected to accept higher levels of inconvenience to enjoy public benefits than members of the local population.
In addition to the numerous measures undertaken in the just city to ensure good housing conditions, special attention is also given to those residents who have no access to commercially available forms of housing due to specific limitations caused by illness, cultural disposition or because of their unclear legal status and who do not expect to linger at a certain place because they are en route to another location, or already settled elsewhere. For these people, any just society provides temporary accommodation which ensures a humane stay in a simple form, protected from the weather and persecution, supplied with food, and supported by specialists who are familiar with local conditions.