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ABSTRACT

GENDER AND SEXUALITY IN DESIGN: DISCOURSES ON GENDER, SEXUALITY AND INCLUSIVITY IN COMMUNITY DESIGN AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR GENDER-NEUTRAL AND GENDER-SENSITIVE DESIGN

Phaedra Maria Maicantis      Advisor:  
University of Guelph, 2016                  Cecelia Paine

Exploring issues of gender and sexuality in landscape architecture is lacking in theory and practice. The purpose of this research is to reconcile the role of landscape architecture with socio-political facets and its role in community design, with a focus on gender and sexuality. The intent is to examine and challenge ingrained design assumptions about how spaces are perceived, used and designed in landscape architecture. As issues regarding gender and sexuality increasingly become visible and demographics change, with it arises new opportunities as values and needs experience a dynamic shift. It is within this new paradigm that landscape architecture can share an influential and relevant role in shaping and designing spaces to create greater inclusion, through an examination and compilation of available data and gender-neutral and gender-sensitive frameworks, case studies, and a comparative analysis of existing design guidelines in landscape architecture.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

Over decades the focus of landscape architecture theory has shifted away from socio-political issues, with the discourse reoriented towards a deeper focus on ecology and sustainable practices (Cosgrove, 1984, p. 9). This fixation concentrated on the natural environment with a diminished focus on human complexities and communities, overlooking human interactions and needs within the inherently political landscape. Exploring issues of gender and sexuality in landscape architecture has had little dissemination in theory and practice. Various studies in other disciplines such as geography, tourism, planning, law, gender studies, and architecture have examined the role that gender, sexuality and cultural constructs play in the differing perceptions of public space, its perceived safety and its usage. The purpose of this research is to reconcile the role of landscape architecture with socio-political facets and its role in community design.

Gender and sexuality are not visibly and significantly addressed in landscape architecture, yet changing social and political dynamics render it a significant topic left commonly unexplored in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Depending on the discipline, theory can range from the abstract to the concrete. In this research, theory is assumed to be a mechanism that attempts to explain or conceptualize aspects of human nature (language, history, society, culture). In this case, theory is a means for conceptualizing the abstract nature of gender and sexuality and its connections to landscape architecture community design.

As issues regarding gender and sexuality increasingly become visible and global, new opportunities are afforded as values and needs experience a dynamic shift. It is within this new paradigm that landscape architecture can
share an influential and relevant role in shaping and designing gender-sensitive and gender-neutral guidelines, in order to create more inclusive spaces. Delving into a thorough examination of working examples of inclusive designed spaces, coupled with case studies and data, the intent is to examine and challenge ingrained and normative design assumptions about how internal and external spaces are perceived and designed.

**Purpose of the Study**

The goal is to increase the level of knowledge between the relationship of gender and sexuality to design and spatial perception, and to highlight its role in landscape architecture. The specific objectives are as follows:

1) Identify key research in gender and sexuality as it relates to disciplines closely associated with landscape architecture (including planning, sociology, geography, and architecture). Thereby increasing the level of knowledge between the connections of gender and sexuality to landscape architecture, by including it in the greater conversation.

2) Highlight the importance and need to consider gender and sexuality as part of the design process, in order to create greater inclusion in the design process and meet a wider range of user needs.

3) Identify possible barriers and identify successful examples of inclusive urban space and community design.

4) Examine and compare an existing set of design guidelines in landscape architecture and community design theory, in conjunction with existing gender data and gender-sensitive guidelines, in order to assess the inclusiveness of the aforementioned guidelines.
Definition of Terms

The references to gender and sexuality extend beyond their literal meanings or biological functions. Gender includes the gender binary classification that refers to distinct and opposite forms of masculine and feminine dynamics. These dynamics not only include physical differences but social behaviours and the cultural constructs that gender encompasses, otherwise known as traditional gender roles and assumptions. Johnson and Repta (2012) identify six types of conceptualized gender: “institutionalized gender, gender as constrained choice, gender roles, gender identity (including masculinities and femininities), gender relations, and gender as performance (embodied gender)” (p. 21). Other gender and sexuality researchers argue that characterizing gender as separate masculine and female qualities leads to discrimination and social inequalities. Anne-Fausto Sterling (1993) argues for gender fluidity, not only because of the existence of intersexuality throughout human history, but also because of the constraints and oppressiveness of defined notions of masculinity and femininity existing in only one gender (i.e. the idea that only men inhabit “masculine” qualities or that only women inhabit “feminine” qualities). Hence, this research focuses on the issues and barriers that concern gender but with a strong emphasis on the female gender.

Sexuality is entwined with gender, but it is not always in accord with the normative gender binaries of heterosexuality. For the purpose of this research, the term sexuality is associated with the LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer) designation. Though being transgender or queer does not propose a specific sexual orientation, it is a major component of the LGBTQ initiative for rights and recognition and is therefore the all encompassing. The Human Rights Campaign (2016) identifies transgender as: “An umbrella term for people whose gender identity and/or expression is different from cultural expectations based on the sex they were assigned at birth. Being transgender does not imply any specific sexual orientation” and queer as: “A term people
often use to express fluid identities and orientations” but the term, queer, is also most commonly used as an umbrella term for those that identify as LGBT but do not want to adhere to any specific labelling.

Gender-sensitivity encompasses the notion of raising awareness about specific gender needs and it endeavours to promote gender equality and empowerment.

Gender-neutral encompasses the idea that language, spaces, and institutions should avoid distinguishing and separating genders in order to avoid discrimination and exclusion.

Gender-mainstreaming was adopted by the United Nations in 1997, with the idea to promote gender equality in planning and policies and promote women’s empowerment and involvement (Lacey, et al., 2013). It was an attempt to make gender visible by identifying the different needs and priorities of women and to address the gender bias in policy, planning and budgeting, and challenge normative assumptions of ongoing gender constructs (p. 145).

Intersectionality theory was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) in which she argued that experiences of being a black woman cannot be understood if her blackness and her gender were separated into distinct parts; they are connected and reinforce each other (p. 1246). It is essentially the theory of how different forms of discrimination interact in oppressive institutions.

In this body of work, the term “inclusive” refers to addressing the spatial deficiencies in which the needs of gender and sexual minorities are taken into consideration in planning, design and implementation.

Organization of the Study

Thesis chapters are presented in the following manner. Chapter 1 proposes the research, details the problems under investigation and defines the terms. Chapter 2 is a review of relevant literature that explores theories on gender and sexuality in disciplines that are closely related to and overlap with
landscape architecture. Chapter 3 describes the methods used to analyze data, identify patterns, and the analysis of the theoretical frameworks for gender-sensitive and gender-neutral design. Chapter 4 describes the findings which include case studies, data, coding patterns, and a comparative analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the results with regards to the discipline of landscape architecture, contains a critique of the methods, and provides suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter begins with a synopsis of the discourse surrounding gender and sexuality. It then delves into a greater exploration of gender and sexuality as it relates to the field of design and planning. This section is divided into six parts.

“The unexamined profession is not worth pursuing.”
- Ian Thompson

Discourse on Gender and Sexuality

In order to identify, examine, and address barriers and solutions as they relate to gender and sexuality in design and spatial delineation, a brief review of the past and present theories in landscape architecture, and related fields, was vital in understanding their values and significance in the design of inclusive spaces. This chapter draws upon some essential theories in related landscape design disciplines, such as planning, sociology, geography, and architecture.

Gender and sexuality are elemental parts of the human condition and personal identity; they shape the way the world is perceived and how one perceives the self. Philosopher and social theorist Michel Foucault dedicated three volumes of his seminal work, The History of Sexuality, to an analysis on the discourse surrounding sexuality and gender (with a focus on masculinity and femininity constructs). Foucault (1976/1990) approached his analysis using three axes: “(1) the formation of sciences (savoirs), (2) the systems of power that regulate its practice, and (3) the forms within which individuals are able, are obliged, to recognize themselves as subjects of this sexuality” (p. 4). The first two points largely dealt with analysis involving “medicine and psychiatry” and then with “punitive power and disciplinary practices” – meant to control or shame
sexual practices and encourage an adherence to proper moral conduct of the
times, whether heterosexual or homosexual (p. 31-65). For Foucault, sexuality is
intertwined with power relations, arguing that sexuality is constructed by the
same discourses that claim to be analyzing it, what he referred to as the
changing regimes on discourse with their “coded contents and qualified
speakers” (p. 28). According to Foucault (1976/1990), “there were two great
systems conceived by the West for governing sex: the law of marriage and the
order of desires” (p. 39-40). He also heavily explored issues of homosexuality,
how female sexuality was repressed and not addressed, and how the
“legitimate couple” with their normal sexuality were given privileges and a right
to greater discretion. Others, the deviants or the sexually peculiar, were treated
as medical subjects – like an illness or a dysfunction that could be detected,
then treated and “cured.”

On the subject of gender, philosopher and social theorist Simone de
Beauvoir released her seminal work The Second Sex (Le Deuxième Sexe) in 1949.
This masterwork laid the groundwork for what was to become the first wave
(and subsequent waves) of feminism and gender theory in western culture. She
challenged the notion of what it meant to be a woman and explored the history
of subjugation and inequalities that women faced throughout history, including
the “otherness” of women. Based on the interpretation of Beauvoir’s work,
“otherness” or “othering” refers to how the identity of minority groups are
constructed, differentiated, or alienated by society. Beauvoir based her analysis
on Hegel’s master-slave rational as a comparison to the man-woman
relationship in regards to the social and cultural treatment of women throughout
recorded history. Beauvoir (1949/2011) argued that prior philosophers and
theologians perpetuated the concept of the gender-binary and of male
dominance in that binary. She believed that women’s inferiority was not bred
from natural differences, as philosophers and theologians suggested, but
stemmed from the differences in upbringing and the social constructs that
came with it. Beauvoir spent much of her book examining the myth of the woman figure – the social constructs that determined her sexuality and her gender through a male gaze of femininity and purity. Through biology, psychoanalysis, and history, she traced the ways in which they deemed women inferior but found no evidence to suggest there was any justification for their subordination. In earlier times, the written female perspective was commonly invisible or overlooked. As the old adage goes, history is written by the victors and the victors throughout most human history had been predominantly male.

These early philosophy and social theories paved the way for an array of disciplines to explore the role of gender and sexuality – sociology, planning, geography, tourism, psychology, and architecture among many others. Hence, it is no coincidence that gender and sexuality have been central areas of study in a multitude of disciplines over the decades, with a wide range of intersecting discourses. Yet, the topic has largely been avoided in landscape architecture theory. It is curious that a discipline that is associated with the subject of nature and the natural world, having been heavily analyzed and debated since the Romantics, has not joined other cross-disciplinary discourses in analyzing the role of gender and sexuality in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. By bringing attention to the lack of discourse paid to the subject from landscape architects, through awareness, allows landscape architects to play a greater and far more understanding role in creating spaces of opportunities, equality and community inclusiveness.

In Landscape Architecture

Established theory in the discipline of landscape architecture is largely inconsistent, shifting direction depending on the disciplinary focus of the writer. There are two notable authors who compiled readers in attempts to create a cohesive and varied collection of landscape architecture theory: Swaffield and Thompson. In Swaffield’s (2002) reader, the topics range but are generally
focused on three umbrella branches: Ecology (nature/science), Design (the process), and Representation (meaning/experience). On the other hand, Ian Thompson (2009) proposes that landscape architecture theory is built on and borrows from three empires: the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities (p. 7). Both authors attempt to represent the gamut of theories that stem from landscape architecture theory, but Thompson also presents how landscape architecture theory has been influenced by other disciplines.

There are two principal works that are collected and compiled readers of the theories on landscape architecture and landscape. The first is entitled, Theory in Landscape Architecture: A Reader, edited by Simon Swaffield (2002). This reader is largely composed of the contributions of landscape architects and designers but also geographers and planners, exhibiting the symbiotic relationship between the disciplines. Though a few mentions are made in the reader in terms of gender, there are none on sexuality. Geoffrey and Susan Jellicoe’s (1987) excerpt from, The Landscape of Man, in Swaffield’s reader pertains to the philosophy of landscape design and its relation to time, history and the threat of forgetting. Yet it posits itself from a solely male perspective, neglecting the role that women played throughout history in art, religion and design. Elizabeth Meyer (1997) in, The Expanded Field of Landscape Architecture, affirms herself as a “feminist landscape architect” (p. 167) and advocated for landscape theory to rely on specific terms – through experience and all the human senses – and proclaimed that it is also situational, historical and pragmatic. Furthermore, Meyer warned against any discourse that prescribed any gender affiliation, whether overt or implied, to the landscape – citing arbitrary archetypes that decree the “feminine” in constricting and archaic terms – “irrational, wild, chaotic, emotional, (and) natural” (p. 168) and that such discourses must be reconstructed to weave primary sources/documents to concurrent history and trends. Meyer also notes that architectural history has been largely male dominated and too often focused
on the works of men, with few women sharing the title of “great landscape architects” (p. 168). Though there are prominent female landscape architects, like Beatrix Jones, they have been neglected in major literature in comparison to their male counterparts (Streatfield, 2012). Meyer (1997) argues that viewing landscape architecture through the male gaze relegates it to a body of fiction and one that has deep ideological implications. Ultimately, by addressing gender issues, the theory and the practise become far more inclusionary as a result. Randolph Hester, Jr. (1974) in Community Design addressed how white privilege and upper class values, which were often shared by the landscape architect, drove the design of community and park spaces. Hester argues (p. 56) that there is public concern for designers taking artistic liberties which do not take into consideration the needs and values of the local users, whereas designers equally feel that their creative process is being stymied. He further highlighted the deficiencies of designers who failed to consider the values of the neighbourhood, thereby leading to inept design. While the author does acknowledge racial minorities, there is no attention given to gender issues in the community design process.

The second key work of compiled landscape theory is entitled, Rethinking Landscape: A Critical Reader, edited by Ian Thompson (2009). This reader is much more varied in its content and its authors, drawing from disciplines outside of landscape architecture. The essays contained in the reader take on a much broader philosophical perspective and approach to landscape architecture – from pluralism, rationalism, empiricism to functionalist aesthetics, to design movements such as Modernism, Classicism and the Sublime (Romanticism), to ecology and ethics, to phenomenology and to the genius loci. The essays take on a weighty and deeply metaphysical approach to landscape architecture. Though the various authors never come close to explicitly examining gender or sexuality, the discourses do inadvertently highlight its importance. Such is the case when examining phenomenology and perception, and its occupation
with human experience, spatial implications and meaning of the dwelling - which, based on Heidegger’s philosophy, meant more than just merely existing: it dealt with the very notion of belonging (Thwaites and Simkins, 2009, p. 212).

However, there is one notable compilation that does focus on women in landscape architecture. Landscape architects, Louise A. Mozingo and Linda Jewell (2012), edited a compilation of essays, entitled, Women in Landscape Architecture: Essays on History and Practice, which focus on how gender has influenced the history, design practice and perception of landscapes. Topics range from a historical perspective of women in landscape architecture – from the early landscape architects, such as Beatrix Jones, to women’s role in the “City Beautiful” movement and “Garden City” movement – to an examination of, architect and urban historian, Dolores Hayden’s argument that the design of public and private spheres serves to disadvantage women rather than provide for them (Salvadori, 2012, p. 164). The last chapter, entitled, Landscape Architecture: A Gendered Past, a Potential Feminist Future, by Sally Schauman (2012) reflects on the roles and limitations of women in landscape architecture. Schauman (2012) argues that, “Women landscape architects have been accepted from the beginning, but for more than half of the twentieth century, these women designed mainly in limited “separate spheres” or as assistants to men, who designed the major projects.” (p. 218). Schuaman (2012) further argues that women and people of colour were frequently left out of the planning, designing and implementation processes, which were controlled by elite groups that lacked in diversity and openness to other perspectives (p. 219). Schauman (2012) also touches upon the internal conflicts in landscape architecture and its perceived lack of understanding and respect from outside the profession. A perception, Schauman argues (2012), that stems from a lack of visibility and a prevailing patriarchal perspective of landscape as a feminine entity from other professions and scholars, such as Marx (p. 221-222); gendering and labeling of the landscape as a female entity also serves as a form of coding.
and enforcement of power hierarchies (i.e. that the landscape is a “feminine”
respect because it deals with the landscape, a female domain.” (p. 222).
Perhaps it is because of those prevailing and out-dated perspectives that have
partly contributed to the largely inconsistent body of theory from landscape
architecture, and the underlying reason behind why the topics of gender and
sexuality have largely been shied away from in theory in practice.

Which brings us to a core essence in this research: how do gender and
sexual minorities mould communities and how are they part of the design
process? Women, although rarely a minority but often treated as one, were
historically not part of the dominant design and implementation process. Sexual
minorities, too, were not openly included in the process and they often moulded
niche communities in which they felt like they could belong. However, the
problem with not addressing gender and sexual inequalities does not make the
problem disappear; it simply manifests itself in poor design, neglected social
issues and a lack of authoritative positions for women and other minorities in the
profession.

Considering the interdisciplinary nature of the landscape architect, it is no
coincidence that much of the discipline’s theory is highly influenced by other
established practices. Hence, it is valuable to the discipline to continue to
examine theories and trends in other disciplines, to contribute to a greater good
and improve the work and stature of landscape architecture as a whole.

In Planning and Sociology

Urban social theory emerged in its infancy in London, Paris and Berlin.
Several prominent urban theorists such as Weber, Simmel, Benjamin and
Lefebvre published seminal works in the early part of the 20th century. Though all
of them took different approaches in methodology and inquiry (which is most
radical in Benjamin’s work, as he shunned traditional academia and its
constraints of disciplinary boundaries), they all focused on the city and the human condition as their source of critical inquiry and reflection. It is also within these discourses that the notion of ‘the sexualized city’ and ‘the gendered city’ began to form.

Benjamin’s discourse, originally written in the 1930s, was an attempt to understand the modern city and the consumption that comes with being a part of it. Growing mass consumption, Benjamin argued, gave rise to the ‘sexualized city’. To Benjamin, the city became a theatrical arena, as he writes, “in the form taken by prostitution in the big cities, the woman appears not only as commodity but, in a precise sense, as mass-produced article” (Hanssen, 2006, p. 103). This environment fosters the professional appearance (which makeup provides) over the individual expression. Benjamin describes fashion as an “erotology of the damned” and where fashion “prostitutes the living body to the inorganic world” (Hanssen, 2006, p. 103). Thus, the fashionable woman is a consumer, but she is doomed to be consumed. These notions are especially prevalent in capitalist societies, where to Benjamin “money becomes a mad passion and love a financial affair” (Hanssen, 2006, p. 103); prostitution is thus a by-product of the city, and the commodification of sex and women have influenced modern perceptions regarding sexuality and desire. Many of the specialized sex districts and sex tourism areas commonly found throughout urban settings are manifestations of ‘the sexualized city.’ Where ‘the sexualized city’ circled around notions of sexuality, desire, deviance, consumption and commodity, ‘the gendered city’ was born out of the work of early social/urban theorists, Beauvoir and feminist theory. ‘The gendered city’ circled around notions of the feminine/masculine dynamic, social and cultural constructs, social and professional inequalities, accessibility, and fear and safety.

Other prominent and earlier works by theorists focused on relating how history, phenomenology, philosophy, economics, politics and culture became key areas of methodological approach to urban and social theory. Jane
Addams, who co-founded Hull House, was considered the pioneer of urban sociology in Chicago (Parker, 2004), and she took a keen interest in social issues and practical action. Hull House developed surveys that included large-scale colour designations that mapped income level and ethnicities of the city population. The Hull House maps even identified “deviant” social behaviour, such as the location of brothels. Further surveys from Hull House examined and mapped a breadth of urban studies which included prohibition, immigration, education, juvenile crime, and the women’s movement (Parker, 2004, p. 37). This inventory and mapping of the city paved the way for academic studies that focused on the human condition, though it did not distinguish social issues and inequalities in terms of gender.

The emergence of urban theories on sexualized and gendered places came from sociology, most notably from the Chicago School of thought beginning in the 1920s and 1930s, and the Los Angeles School. Other anthropological socialists such as W. F. Whyte and Redfield attempted to interpret a social history that focused on “sub-culture” in urban landscapes (which generally centred on “illicit” behaviours such as crime and violence and largely centered on young men). These theories emerged as urbanization rapidly expanded and began to overtake the dominant form of human dwelling and gathering. Early studies found that that “the city” attracted a plethora of people from different backgrounds, religions, ethnicities, colour, genders and sexualities.

Planning with sexuality as a focus is a fairly new concept; it is only in recent years that the ideas have been met more openly, as previous decades saw strong resistance from the dominant hierarchies to even acknowledge their existence. Queering Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice by Petra L. Doan (2011) is an edited volume that questions planning assumptions and practices about queer space. The essays, many of which integrate queer theory with planning theory, pose a number of
questions that are aimed towards scholars and practitioners. They challenge the intentions of urban developers and ways in which planning practices have neglected the needs of the LGBTQ community. Many of these communities have become gentrified due to severe developmental pressures and many other iconic queer spaces have disappeared. This has sparked some debate within the LGBTQ community in regards to whether gays and lesbians should assimilate into mainstream culture, as they gain greater visibility and cultural acceptance in North America, or resist and maintain their “otherness” and appropriate spaces for themselves.

Planning was an exercise in power and creating order in the urban environment that has led to a lack of inclusion. And, since planners were predominantly white heterosexual men, they envisioned an environment that favoured their conceptions of order (p. 3). Doan (2011) highlights the importance of diverse perspectives, with lessons from two groups in particular: women and people of colour. Doan (2011) traces the ways in which women struggled for inclusion into the planning profession and how the women’s movement defined the link between the quality of women’s lives to it. Subsequent planning and geography scholars argued that spaces are gendered, and that a gendered lens provides greater perspective and all-encompassing inclusion (for all genders). Furthermore, scholars argue that in order to include gender issues, more women need to be involved in the profession and at every stage of the planning, design and implementation processes. Doan (2011) further argues that it is important to recognize that discrimination exists in local government and in the field of planning. She notes that in America, in the early twentieth century, discrimination and neglect led to the creation of inner cities plagued by crime and poverty. This also led to radically different and defined neighbourhood boundaries. Planners greatly contributed to this dysfunction through zoning codes that defined areas based on family definitions. This type of planning greatly and negatively affected
African-Americans, creating areas of complete spatial segregation. Doan (2011) highlights the failure of planners to consider the conditions and realities of life in inner cities and the lack of sensitivity to issues of injustice and oppression. It is awareness coupled with knowledge that provides the first tools towards equity and greater inclusion. However, that idea of planning for the LGBTQ community is fairly new. While previous “gay villages” or “gayborhoods” formed out of a necessity for safe spaces, there was never a conscious decision to consider the LGBTQ community as part of the urban fabric. The communities they did form were something “other,” a queer heterotopia. In many ways, they share many commonalities with ethnic immigrant “ghettos,” due the same sense of exclusion, discrimination, and “otherness” that they felt.

In 1998, the American Planning Association (APA) created the Gays And Lesbians In Planning division (GALIP) and it was met with strong disapproval within the planning community, with many arguing, and still to this day, that LGBTQ issues do not deserve planning attention (p. 8). Some planners were disturbed by the idea that there were LGBTQ planners, while others feared a “gay agenda.” But of more interest to Doan (2011) were the letters from planners that couldn’t even conceive of another perspective that didn’t cater to heteronormative needs and assumptions. Many of them even argued that race, sex and sexual orientation have no role in good urban design (p. 10). The LGBTQ community was seeing the same resistance that women, African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans, faced and often continue to face in creating paradigm shifts in planning. Like many other minority communities, there was a concentrated effort to keep the LGBTQ community invisible and silent by not engaging with the community.

Building on her previous work, Doan released another book in 2015 entitled, Planning and LGBTQ Communities. The theme of these works center around looking beyond the obvious and to instead consider the marginalized communities within the LGBTQ community (women, people of colour,
transgender). These works offers guidance on methods to strengthen LGBTQ communities and promotes a broader awareness of these special user needs, which also has implications on the policy and management side of the government. While there is no single model to point to, there is evidence to suggest that the LGBTQ community still needs spaces that protect them from violence, protect them from unequal housing opportunities and growing gentrification of their neighbourhoods, promote safe areas for queer culture, and planning that addresses the lack of fixtures/amenities that serve LGBTQ needs in local neighbourhoods. However, different cities need to address these issues on an individual basis. For example, there are many places in the United States where segregation is still visible and still regarded as a planning barrier. These areas would benefit from having community centres established in their neighbourhoods. However, in Toronto, there are 519 community centres in the Gay Village and surrounding area alone, but Toronto’s LGBTQ community is becoming increasingly widespread throughout the city (Doan, 2015, p. 9) due to gentrification, the marginalization of women, people of colour and transgender people, and a growing LGBTQ youth population. Hence, the book focuses on three key sections: (1) the role of LGBTQ communities and queer space and how planning shapes these spaces, (2) how the LGBTQ community organizes itself outside “gay villages” (which is predominantly composed of lesbians, people of color, recent immigrants and transgender people), and (3) lastly it also explores the concept of intersectionality and planning, which is a web of discrimination in planning practice and policies. This web of discrimination has limited services and contributes to keeping these marginalized communities invisible and barred from being involved in the planning and implementation process. As Doan (2015) implies, it is the responsibility of the planner and designer to acknowledge these marginalized user groups and their needs, understand how to get them involved in the planning process, and then proceed to create spaces of greater inclusion.
In Geography

The geography discipline is the most abundant source of research regarding culture, socio-economics and socio-politics of gender and sexuality. The discipline of geography is divided into two branches: physical geography and human geography. Landscape architecture often draws upon the research conducted by both branches but there is valuable research to be further gleaned from the human geography branch as well. Human geography is further subdivided into other areas of concentration such as ‘sexuality and space’ (which is arguably part of the cultural geography subfield). Sexuality and Space pertains to a range of studies: environmental and architectural psychology, urban sociology, gender studies, queer studies, socio-legal studies, urban and rural planning, housing studies, and criminology (Binnie & Valentine, 1999). These studies are pivotal in understanding communities, needs and values when designing public spaces. They all contribute to addressing issues of inequality and exclusion. A common relation between geography and landscape deals with the creation and use of space and place. As geographer Lawrence Knopp (1995) explained, “Cities and sexualities both shape and are shaped by the dynamics of human social life. They reflect the ways in which social life is organised, the ways in which it is presented, perceived and understood, and the ways in which various groups cope with and react to these conditions.” (p. 149). Issues of gender and sexuality are even more intertwined in human geography than most other disciplines, from the way women experience space to the way queer space is constructed.

In 1989, Gill Valentine released her seminal research paper, The Geography of Women’s Fear, which explored women’s fear of male violence and the female perspective of public space. The premise of the research begins with a murder of a woman that occurred in a public train compartment in 1988. From this incident a number of questions were raised regarding the use of space by women and male violence. Media and police implied the victim was in some
way to blame for her murder and that she should not have been out on her own. It implies that she put herself in a vulnerable situation simply by being alone in a public space. This assumes that women lack a certain amount of freedom in their range of mobility and a limit to what spaces they can appropriate for themselves. Yet the fear of violence has and continues to limit the mobility of women and their use of space, and that their use and experience of space is determined by their age, income, and lifestyle (p. 385-386). Valentine (1989) argues, “Women develop individual mental maps of places where they fear assault as a product of their past experience of space and secondary information. In particular, girls are socialized into a restricted use of public space through observing both their parents' differential fears for them and the control of the spatial range of their activities in relation to boys” (p. 386). She further points out how women’s spaces are frequently appropriated by men whether by intimidation, harassment or humiliation, limiting their choices in how to interact within spaces and greatly affecting their sense of security. Valentine’s research leads to an analysis that indicates that women perceive themselves most at risk in spaces that tend to be unregulated, which she groups into two categories: (1) open large spaces that are seldom used and (2) closed spaces with limited exits and concealed visual lines. Women’s senses are especially heightened when in areas of perceived risk, especially at night, where they become hyperaware of the micro design features of their environment and adjust their route and pace accordingly (p. 388), this creates a major barrier for women as cultural trends shift towards women becoming more independent and seeking successful careers. This state of fear, Valentine argues, is what distinguishes the experiences and perceptions of women and men in their use and appropriation of public space.

In 1995, David Bell and Gill Valentine compiled theories that explored sexuality from a geographical perspective, specifically in terms of LGBTQ resistance and how they appropriated spaces. Mapping Desire (1995) is split into
four sections: “cartographies/identities”, “sexualized spaces: global/local”, “sexualized places: local/global”, and “sites of resistance”. Some of the earliest studies on homosexual geographies revealed that lesbians and gay men lived distinct lives (in part because of the reaction towards their sexuality) revealing a “variety of spatial expressions creating distinct social, political and cultural landscapes” (p. 4). However, gender differences were still largely evident even in the LGBTQ community. Gay neighbourhoods were predominantly populated by men and were dominated by institutions that catered to men; hence most of the work regarding homosexual geographies largely focused on men. Lesbians did not appropriate spaces the way that gay men had; their spaces were chiefly hidden, ephemeral and relegated to the inner sphere. Bell and Valentine (1995) cite the work of Manuel Castells (1983) whose research revealed that lesbian “women are poorer than gay men and have less choice in terms of work and location” (p. 5) suggesting that gender differences were still highly evident within minority and marginalized communities. Another common issue, not only affecting sexuality but gender differences, was that of housing. Housing not only has a long history of discrimination towards the LGBTQ community but it has also been a site of oppression and liberation through heteronormative definitions of ‘the family’ and a resistance to it.

Dissident Geographies by Blunt and Wills (2000) is a self-described exploration of radical perspectives in human geography, with a particular focus on political systems such as anarchism and Marxism, feminism, sexual politics and even post-colonialism. Blunt and Wills (2000) argue that gender is distinguished from sex (p. 92). While sex seems to have specific anatomical or biological differences, gender is a social construct that varies throughout time, culture, and spaces – and the very ideas about what constitutes “masculinity” or “femininity” are social and cultural constructs that vary from time and place (p. 93). Furthermore, it is through these gender constructs that “proper” behaviours and gendered aspirations are ascribed. These constructs are powerful as they
shape every facet of people’s everyday lives. Identifying the constructs distinguishes between the biological and the social, exposing how gender roles and relations have been constructed and dynamic rather than a fixed state developed at birth. However, they also note the work of Judith Butler (1990) who argued that sexual differences and ideas about biological sex are themselves gendered and promote gendered sexual roles. Butler (1990) calls it a “heterosexist matrix,” which normalizes opposite sex desire (p. 94) while “othering” sexualities that do not fit that definition, thereby rendering other sexualities as “deviants”. Yet history has shown that gender identities, and the kinds of sexual practices that are culturally acceptable, are constructs that have varied throughout time and space. For example, another form of “othering”, was described by Edward Said (1978) in what he described as “orientalism” in which the eastern land, culture, and body were romanticized by westerners and highly sexualized (p. 185), not only sexualization of the body but also the sexualization of eastern “spaces”, creating a lens in which colonial powers subjugated non-western cultures, especially women.

In Architecture

Studies regarding gender and sexuality in architecture were significantly influenced by research in gender studies, psychology, and geography. However, even earlier, architecture held a special place for many social theorists. Perhaps it was due to philosophical concepts regarding the external and internal world and the differing realms between genders and between sexualities. Foucault, though not an architect, was one of the first to discuss architecture and space in terms of gender and sexuality; it was not until the latter half of the 20th century that academic architects began writing about sexuality and its relation to architecture. For Foucault and subsequent scholars and architects like Beatriz Colomina, spaces are encoded with meaning and
the built environment is representational and reflects the socio-political attitudes of its designers.

The notions of control and the delineation of spaces greatly interested Michel Foucault. In a lecture to a group of architects in 1967, what is now an essay known as “Of Other Spaces” or “Heterotopias”, Foucault (1967/1984) begins by setting his argument in historical context, examining the historical development of the western perception of spaces. For instance, he argues that in the middle ages there was a hierarchical ensemble of space – sacred space and profane space, protected space and exposed space, urban space and rural space. He then argues that those notions of hierarchical points were replaced by notions of extension – which Foucault defines as relations of proximity between elements – and that notion has now been replaced by the notion of stacking (the storing of goods, of people), which makes a fine analogy for the high-density built up urban areas (think high-rises). He argues that it is space – and our efforts to appropriate space – not time, that are causing great anxiety in our era. Foucault (1967/1984) continued to argue that we do not live in heterogeneous spaces or void spaces, but we do live in spaces where relations, or networks of relations, are what delineate spaces. He introduces his concept of heterotopias using six principles to describe different versions of it. In contrast to utopias, which literally translates to “no places,” heterotopias literally translates to “other places.” Where utopias are mere idealized conceptions of spaces and impossible to locate, Heterotopias are found in every culture, are layered with meaning and represent socially constructed spaces, which tend to fall outside the social and institutional norms; it is cultural and tangible, can be found but not necessarily physically be. The first principle (1) is referred to as the “crisis heterotopia” that denote spaces where “a coming of age” takes place. The second principle (2) is referred to as the heterotopia of cemeteries, where spiritual beliefs regarding life/death were first created by the close proximity of the home, church and cemetery, but as a society of urban and suburban
spaces we are now removed from that design concept. The third principle (3) refers to juxtaposed spaces, like the Orient gardens (which act as microcosms of various plants from around the world; a small contained space that represents the world). The fourth principle (4) refers to museums and libraries, which are spaces that enclose people in time and space, where discovery and knowledge takes place. The fifth principle (5) refers to spaces of purification and ritual, which represents spaces that are both open and closed - that are inviting but also exclusionary (a club, a church). The sixth principle (6) refers to heterotopias all being connected in relation to each other through space. There are two roles that they play: it is either ‘heterotopia as an illusion’ to expose a real space (like a theatre or a film) or it is a ‘heterotopia of compensation,’ to create real space that is other - that is perfect and completely regulated (like a completely regulated and highly ordered society). Foucault, focuses on meaning and symbolism of what spaces dictated or were perceived by the user, and was more interested in deconstructed spaces rather than tangible spaces. Heterotopias are a means of creating or identifying “other” spaces – the feminist heterotopia, the queer heterotopia, the black heterotopia, and so on. It is essentially the spatialization and arrangement of peoples/experiences into spaces, particularly as the “other.”

Academic research in architecture theory involving gender and sexuality was notably highlighted by the seminal work of architect and professor, Beatriz Colomina, entitled, Sexuality and Space. According to Colomina (1992), the work was partly inspired by Princeton University putting an end to their housing discrimination against partners of gay and lesbian graduate students in 1991. In 1985, the addition of the words “sexual orientation” to the university’s Equal Opportunity Policy marked the first public acknowledgement of gay and lesbian students. Colomina (1992) argued that “the politics of space are always sexual, even if space is central to the mechanisms of the erasure of sexuality.” She used Princeton’s housing policy change as an example of close relationships
between sexuality and space which are obscured by everyday practices and often ambiguously connected to space or sexuality. Colomina felt that architecture theory and discourse had largely ignored issues of sexuality (and, to a slightly lesser degree, gender), which were brought to the forefront of academic discourse through feminist theory. Colomina’s reader compiled a range of discourses on sexuality, gender, perception, identity and its relation to the built and imagined spaces. Colomina states, “Architecture is not simply a platform that accommodates the viewing subject. It is a viewing mechanism that produces the subject. It precedes and frames its occupant” (p. 83). On the topic of gender and sexuality, Jennifer Bloomer (1992) argues that sexuality is often confused with gender identity (p. 171) and architecture and even designers themselves are not free of the masculine and feminine labels. The career of famed Prairie School architect, Louis Sullivan, known for his highly influential and then underappreciated omate style, took a steep decline after his participation in the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago. His contribution to the event was the Transportation Building, known for the Golden Doorway. Sullivan’s style was in direct opposition to the Beaux-Arts classicism architectural style of the White City that chief planner and architect Daniel Burnham was known for. In the early biographies written about Sullivan, there was an attempt to explain why Sullivan’s career and architectural style fell into decline, some omitted any references to Sullivan’s sexuality while others referred to him in feminine stereotypes, criticizing his work as not “masculine” and that his artistic inclinations lacked manliness. Robert Twombly, one of the biographers, suggested that Sullivan was obliviously broadcasting his homosexuality throughout the Midwest via his work. Bloomer (p. 173) points to this as an example of the intersectionality of homophobia and misogyny as manifested through the lens of examining Sullivan’s works and private life. Not only is gender and sexuality being treated as one and the same thing (i.e. in this case a queer man is relegated to the status of being a woman based on his sexuality) but it
reveals the deep-seeded barriers, power hierarchies and often insular vision that are in place in the architecture profession.

**Conclusion**

Cross-disciplinary research and theory is invaluable in terms of influencing the creation of holistic and inclusive design processes and implementations. The profession and theories of landscape architecture allies with other professions and it routinely creates, borrows and builds upon the work of scholars and practitioners in other related fields. The historical context, philosophy, and theories are vital because they reveal the many, and often contentious, discourses that have taken place in related professions. The discourses also bring attention to voices and perspectives that have not historically been the focus—in this context, it is the marginalization of gender and sexuality which is also compounded by layers of race and class—yet all of these facets play a role in planning, designing and implementing changes. They play a role in determining stakeholders, in determining intersectionality in government policy and planning, and identifying gender and sexuality inequalities in the profession. All of these discourses have aided in expanding knowledge in their respective fields and broadening their reach in terms of the work they have been able to plan, design and implement. The discourses are meant to subvert and encourage landscape architects to see the profession as something beyond just the physical, but also take into account the political, the psychological, the sociological and the metaphysical nature of the environment and the human condition. By seeing the environment and design through these different lenses, then the profession becomes far more aware, not only of the sometimes subtle layers of intersectionality, but of the layers of human experience as well and the different needs of various user groups.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS

This chapter explains the methods used to collect and analyze data. The methods are outlined into two distinct categories of qualitative methods. The first method (1) is a form of data collection and analysis in order to determine theories, criteria and meaning for the second method, (2) which compares and analyzes how inclusive an established set of landscape architecture design guidelines are in terms of gender and sexuality.

There are two method approaches that shaped this research:

(1) A grounded theory approach, which involved case studies, gender-sensitive design guidelines, and data review of key research concerning the topic. Common trends and key words were also analyzed and then coded to identify and conceptualize patterns and underlying issues.

(2) A comparative analysis approach is usually a part of grounded theory. This involved an examination and compilation of established landscape architecture design guidelines combined with case studies and statistics. The intent was to determine how inclusive the guidelines are in terms of gender and sexuality issues, in comparison to those determined by the data, case studies and coding in method 1.
Grounded Theory

Since gender and sexuality theory is largely absent in landscape architecture, the grounded theory approach is utilized to analyze existing data and case studies in order to recognize areas of inequalities regarding gender and sexuality, identify patterns, and form hypotheses or inquiries regarding the inclusivity of existing landscape design guidelines.

The data collection varies from existing statistics and data concerning gender and sexuality, and gender-based design case studies. The case studies include gender-sensitive designs for parks, housing and transit/mobility in Vienna, Austria. The collected data, revealed gender disparities and common needs and values. Those common trends and values found in the studies and statistics set up the criteria for examining relevant guidelines for gender-sensitive and gender-neutral design. All the related statistics and data are culled from a variety of government and NGO sources and have a gender and LGBTQ focus. The bulk of the data is from North America and Europe. The data and statistics are then selectively coded to identify patterns and underlying issues that correlate to the literature, and that focus the theory and criteria for critiquing the design guidelines in the comparative analysis.

The coding process involved the compiled statistics and case studies, which indicated that there are common trends where inequalities are glaringly present. While there is limited research and data to determine the exact reason behind some of these inequalities, assumptions and inferences were made based on the literature. The focus of this section is also to highlight the frequency of terms that have appeared throughout the data and studies (lighting, open space, accessibility) and the coded underlying meanings behind them, as drawn from an historical and theoretical perspective. When Simone de Beauvoir and Michel Foucault wrote their seminal works, their goal was not only to challenge the dominant systems that were controlled and dictated by societal hierarchies, but also to explain how these power systems came to be. The
subsequent theories that followed in other disciplines sought to do the same. These encoded spaces are in their own measure a kind of heterotopia that is layered with meanings. The way the data was coded is dual natured. It recognized patterns in the language but it also attempted to emphasize the theory and history behind that language - how gender, power and speech have influenced the planning, design and implementation of spaces.

**Comparative Analysis**

In order to validate the grounded theory and illustrate its relationship to landscape architecture, a comparative analysis was conducted to examine how inclusive and currently relevant established landscape design guidelines are. The main design guidelines/criteria that are examined are from People Places by Claire Cooper Marcus and Carolyn Francis (1990). The Marcus and Francis design guidelines were selected because this is one of the most well-known and long established set of guidelines available from landscape architects, for landscape architects. Furthermore, the authors compiled their own data through a combination of literature reviews, case studies, existing data, and coding. They also explicitly stated that they wanted to create guidelines that take greater consideration of different user groups, including gender and ability. This provided an ideal set of guidelines in order to measure areas of inclusion and exclusion using literature, case studies, data, and coded patterns via comparative analysis.
Figure 3.1: Research Structure
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

The theory and analysis criteria in this study were generated from several sources. The literature reviewed in Chapter Two provided information using a historical, theoretical and philosophical cross-disciplinary perspective on how related disciplines have engaged the discourse on gender and sexuality. This chapter examines statistics and concerns that pertain to sexuality and gender inequalities, along with case studies, in order to identify and code data to identify commonalities, patterns, and meaning that are used to inform the analysis for gender-sensitive and gender-neutral design guidelines. The case studies, data examination and coding are meant to determine the adequacy of landscape architecture design guidelines as they pertain to gender and sexuality via comparative analysis.

Method 1

The grounded theory approach, involves a literature and data review of key research concerning the topic. Common trends and selected words are analyzed to create the applicable criteria for analysis; data is then coded to identify, examine and conceptualize patterns and underlying issues.

The Case Study: Vienna

Vienna, Austria has a long history of addressing gender-specific issues in urban planning design, starting in 1991 with an exhibition titled, ‘who owns public space? – women’s daily life in the city,’ started by two young female planners working for the city planning department (Irschik & Kail, 2013). From there it took off and a Women’s Office was established in 1992, paving the way for further projects that considered gender disparities when conceptualizing and creating new design projects. In 1998, a planning unit was established entitled,
“Co-ordination Office for Planning and Construction Geared to the Requirements of Daily Life and the Specific Needs of Women” (short form is simply, “the Co-ordination Office”). This group was under the “Executive Group for Construction and Technology” umbrella. In 2010, the Executive Group hired their first female director and she relocated gender experts from the Co-ordination office to the Urban Planning Department and to Public Works and Building Construction, so they would become more involved at all levels to incorporate their knowledge into every step in decision-making processes. The city has since become a role model for gender planning.

Park Space

Einsiedlerpark and St. Johann Park (now called Bruno Kreisky Park) in Vienna, Austria were the sites of two of the earliest pilot projects involving a re-design of public park space that adhered to a set of gender-based design criteria. Vienna is a densely built city and spaces that did exist were usually dominated by particular groups; playground facilities were geared towards the interests of boys and male teens (Irschik & Kail, 2013). The goal was essentially to offer spaces that afforded equal opportunity to boys and girls and to make the parks attractive to both genders. Studies indicated that girls aged 10-13 showed signs of spending less time in public parks (Gender-sensitive park design, 2015) and boys appropriated spaces at a much wider and dominant pace. This was a troubling problem, because equality in mobility and spatial use means equality in education, equality in competition and equality in the workforce. Hence the idea was to incorporate more of the needs, preferences, aesthetics and atmosphere that girls and women favoured to create spaces of equal opportunity and access. In 1999, the City of Vienna offered a Europe-wide design competition for the site, which generated an intensive and professional exchange of ideas from consulting companies. Vienna used a combination of data based on sociological studies, an all-female group of planners, and
employed a sociologist to monitor the sites as they were in their current form and use. The city then conducted a planning phase that involved numerous meetings and focus groups with local residents and local grade schools. Internal and external experts were also used to determine the best criteria and design guidelines to implement the project. A jury panel of combined experts selected the winning proposal which came from an Austrian landscape planning firm called, ‘tilia.’ By 2001 the parks were completed.

The results of the park design were a success in increasing park usage by girls. They addressed specific elements that were asked for by the stakeholders involved in the workshops and meetings, as well as the suggestions outlined in the sociological studies. For example, a group of eight local girls took part in a planning workshop where the girls formulated three basic requirements: (1) a girls-only retreat area (2) a sports and play area not dominated by boys and (3) a “communication zone” for group socializing and making new contacts (Irschik & Kail, 2013). Further outreach with the target demographics also revealed that girls preferred spaces that offered high and low levels of activity, including areas of seclusion and privacy. A greater analysis was then conducted to draw out wider conclusions, including further evaluations of other park spaces. It was through stakeholder input and organizations (including planners and landscape architects) working with each other and exchanging ideas, that led to the creation of guidelines for gender-sensitive design. Some of the provisions in the guidelines included safety and visibility, sports activities preferred by girls and calm spaces and quiet areas. Irschik and Kail (2013) argue that it is important to divide larger play areas into smaller sub areas in order to avoid the large areas being dominated by one particular group. Spaces were also clearly organized, lighting was improved and paths were lit to encourage use by girls and the elderly. Specific elements of gender-neutral games (soccer) and gender-preferred sports (for both genders) were all considered in the park design. Calmer and secluded areas were implemented, play areas were situated along
pathways to encourage onlookers to use the space, which has motivated girls to stay active and spend more time in parks and to appropriate spaces for uses like their male counterparts, providing them with confidence and equal opportunities in public space. These spatial arrangements and gender-sensitive design areas also had the added benefit of improving equality for all user groups, including boys who were shy or less dominant than other boys, allowing them, too, to appropriate spaces that fit their needs.

Given the success of the pilot projects and the high transferability of their guidelines, since 2007, the recommendations and guidelines in conjunction with the Vienna ‘Park Design Guidelines’ were all adopted in the planning and design process in the Department of Parks and Gardens (Irshik & Kail, 2013).
Figure 4.1: Einsiedlerpark (Irsc hik & Kail, 2013)
Gender-sensitive Design Guidelines

The following page contains direct excerpts of some of the design guidelines that have been developed by the City of Vienna to accommodate gender-mainstreaming in their planning and design implementations. These guidelines will simply be referred to as the “Vienna model” in this chapter. Table 4.1 addresses guidelines regarding spatial structures and the delineation of space, Table 4.2 addresses guidelines on perception in regard to safety and security, and Table 4.3 addresses guidelines regarding the activities of girls and frame conditions, which are a set of conditions needed for the site to work.

Table 4.1: “Spatial Structure” (Urban Development Vienna, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Structure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking of open spaces</td>
<td>Spatial and functional networking of open spaces and popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gathering places of children and young people by means of urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Network</td>
<td>The footpath network of the park enables visitors to walk around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(circular route) and is integrated into everyday trips and walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(crossing options).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Spatial</td>
<td>Combination of smaller-scale and larger-scale sub-zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Combination of both functionalised zones and open-ended, flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub-zones for multiple uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring Into Sub-zones</td>
<td>Especially in case of high utilisation pressure, it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recommended to structure the larger zones of the park (e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>areas for ballgames) into sub-zones to ensure their simultaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use by several groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In non-functionalised zones, focal points (e.g. seats) are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important because they help less confident groups to stake a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>claim for appropriating the surrounding areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design of spatial boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>The facilities should offer flexibility and leeway for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
change (trends in leisure activities, space for temporary activities).

Design of Boundaries

Zoning of the public open space by means of multifunctional boundaries that are also suitable for play.

By providing transparency, suitability for play and places for gathering and lingering, boundary design can foster or prevent interactions between sub-zones.

Peripheral or transition areas between functionalised sub-zones should be usable for play, tranquility, lingering and/or communication.

Table 4.2: “Subjective Feeling of Safety/Security” (Urban Development Vienna, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Feeling of Safety/Security</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Good visibility and clearcut organisation of footpath system. Clearcut design of main footpaths (visibility inside niches, minimum distance of hedges and shrubs from path borders).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Visibility and Social Control</td>
<td>Fostering frequency of use and enlivening main paths. Visual axes creating links to lively areas (e.g. adjacent streets). Attractive, clearly designed park entrance zones. Seating and lounge zones for adults (e.g. next to toddler playgrounds).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>Efficient lighting of main footpaths, key access routes and intensively used sub-zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Facilities</td>
<td>Well-maintained and clean public toilets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens</td>
<td>Protected, shady pockets with visual axes to more lively zones should be available for elderly persons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3: “Activity Range of Girls and Frame Conditions” (Urban Development Vienna, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Range of Girls</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial and Play-Related Offerings</strong></td>
<td>The overall spatial concept is to stimulate a variety of activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Play (movement play, creative play, role play, games and exploratory play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sports games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Communication, meeting-points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relaxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Roaming, rambling, strolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Childminding tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas For Ballgames</strong></td>
<td>The design of ballgame areas should be as open and multifunctional as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas for rest and lingering must be provided in the peripheral zones of ballgame areas (for play, watching, communication).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Configuration For Play-zones</strong></td>
<td>Taking account of interactions between different groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas designed to attract more girls (e.g. sports areas, volleyball court) should if possible be located within sight of the main gathering points of girls in the park (e.g. playground with equipment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Play equipment</strong></td>
<td>Use of multifunctional play equipment (to foster communication in addition to movement and motor skills).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of integrative play equipment (the following should be jointly usable: bird’s nest swings, carousels, climbing structures, water features, rocking plates, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of possibilities for “play on the go” (balancing beams or walls, sound elements, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furniture</strong></td>
<td>Multiple pieces of furniture elements that are attractive for several user groups should be available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | Seating of various types should be available and partly also movable (benches, chairs, wooden
Platforms, pedestals, low walls, chair/bench combos).

A covered zone should be available in case of inclement weather and as a meeting-place or sheltered point.

| Sheltered Zones | Sheltered zones should be available in quiet areas of the park. |
| Exposed Spots | Exposed spots that grant a good overview of the park should be available (for meeting others, seeing and being seen). |

| Frame Conditions |

| Planning Participation | When planning or refurbishing a public park, it is highly recommended to involve children and young people who will be regular park users.  
Gender-sensitive expert monitoring of participation processes.  
Planning studios commissioned with park design should already be involved in the participation process. |
| Gender-Sensitive Work On-Site | Educational and pedagogical offerings (park monitoring services, mobile youth work, etc.) with a gender-sensitive approach. |
| Indoor Meeting Points | Additional special meeting-points and tranquil places for girls and boys close to the park (this must, however, not result in a curtailing of green spaces). |
Housing

Housing is a core issue that involves planners and designers on many levels; it has particular impact on the quality of life for the elderly, women, single-parents, people of colour, and LGBTQ people.

In Vienna, gender-sensitive housing model projects were designed starting in 1992. The first model was planned and completed from 1992-1997, known as the Frauen-Werk-Staudt I (FWS I). A number of master planning competitions took place to create the first model, but prior to the competition no female architects had been invited to submit proposals. Because of the focus on gender issues for FWS I, a number of female architects were attracted to compete for the project (Irschik & Kail, 2013). The Austrian version was modeled after German and Swiss projects which had seen remarkable success. The competition jury was headed by Kerstin Dörhofer, an architect, planner and professor, who developed gender planning in Germany. A number of women were chosen as winners in the competition and, with 357 units, it remains the largest housing project that caters to gender-sensitivity (Irschik & Kail, 2013).

During the entire planning, design and construction phases, it was overseen by The Women’s Office to ensure quality control during every phase of the project.

Because of the success of FWS I, planning and construction for Frauen-Werk-Staudt II (FWS II) was initiated in 2000. This project focused on elder care and assisted-living, as studies found that there is a much higher proportion of elderly women and most women are left to care for other women (Irschik & Kail, 2013). This process went through intensive discussion periods that identified key aspects for the design - such as cross-generational and integrative housing. The main theme of the housing project was that each unit be adaptable to the changing phases of life. Other key issues were also looked at, such as the locations and placement of utility rooms and staircases, communal pram storage rooms on every floor, and underground parking illuminated by natural lighting to mitigate fear. Another key factor that plays a role in both FWS I and
FWS II is the quality of open space available to residents and FWS II is especially ideal for multi-generational living. This in turn created successful, highly functional and communal spaces by providing for a wide range of special user needs. Since 2009, housing projects are now assessed by criteria based on architecture, economy and ecology and evaluated in terms of social sustainability.
Figure 4.2: FWS I (top) & FWS II (bottom) (Urban Development Vienna, 2013)
Table 4.4: “Excerpts of criteria for gender equity in housing projects” (Urban Development Vienna, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manageable size of residential community</td>
<td>If a block or building comprises more than approx. 30 housing units, the residential community may become anonymous, which hampers or even prevents social control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly organized entrance zones, allowing for contact (sight or earshot), with the surrounding flats</td>
<td>If the entrance door is positioned more than 2m inside the building or inside a passage-way, contact (by sight or earshot) with the surrounding (ground-floor or first-floor) flats is made difficult. Entrance zones that project far into the building can even create niches with poor visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier-free entrances/exits to garden or courtyard</td>
<td>Every building entrance should be barrier-free, and all circulation staircases should have one direct, barrier-free exit to the communal open space (garden/courtyard).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural lighting for corridors and staircases</td>
<td>Both staircases and corridors on a given floor should feature natural lighting all over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication enhancing-circulation areas</td>
<td>Attractively designed encounter zones in entrance areas on upper storeys promote communication between residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly organized car park with direct access</td>
<td>Direct access of the car park is to be safeguarded from all staircases leading to the flats, i.e. without long corridors or overly complex gate setups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural lighting for car park</td>
<td>Natural lighting for the car park enhances users’ subjective feeling of safety and security. Ideally, people inside the car park can also be seen and heard from outside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit/Mobility

According to EU research data by CIVITAS (2015), women are more frequently the users of public transit, biking, and walking than their male counterparts. Since labour markets have also changed, this means more women are participating in the workforce, having fewer children, and living longer than their male counterparts, leading to an aging population. This further highlights the need and importance of planning and designing spaces for women and the elderly that are safe, affordable and accessible. Women also spend most of their day at work, child-rearing, running errands or shopping for their family (p. 17) yet, most men will spend their day at work and on hobbies (p. 20). All these issues are further compounded by the fact that data consistently shows pay gaps, a 16.3% average in the EU, and employment gaps (more women tend to work part time and have various part-time jobs) in every EU country (p. 44), which also means that women are the ones frequently using transit and being mobile. For example, in order to accommodate the growing number of women in the labour force and address safety concerns at night, the City of Bolzano in Italy has introduced the “pink taxi” (“taxi rosa”) that is dedicated to serving women between 10pm to 6am. The hours are extended from 8pm to 6am for women over 65 and they are given a discount (p. 28). In order to address these changing dynamics, CIVITAS recommends that through gender-sensitive transit and streetscapes, policy initiatives, data collection, design guidelines, and knowledge sharing, gender-mainstreaming can be more widely implemented in the near future.

In 2002 the district of Mariahilf, in Austria, a densely built area, was chosen as the site of the “gender mainstreaming” pilot project, which also uses gender-sensitive design criteria. In preparation for the project, district maps were compiled in 2001. According to Irschik and Kail (2013), these maps contain detailed information compiled under two categories: “network qualities” and “network deficits”. “Network qualities” included details about sufficiently wide
pavements and “network deficits” included details regarding shortcomings – narrow pavements, obstructions, and accident hotspots. Also highlighted on these maps were key destinations such as schools, parks, and transit hubs. These maps were created in order to clearly show issues that politicians could understand. By 2004, the Mariahilf pilot project was completed and all the departments involved were asked to select lead projects from their departments in order to create greater identity of requirements and inclusion of user needs. Through numerous workshops and meetings, checklists were created which included “hard” and “soft” factors. The transformation of this district took place in small steps, implementing different phases every year. Lighting was greatly improved, streets were widened, squares were re-designed, seating facilities were added, and barrier-free designs were implemented.
Figure 4.3: Network Qualities and Deficits (Urban Development Vienna, 2013)
Fixtures - Washrooms

One of the most common and currently relevant design fixtures that have come up in the research for creating inclusive design is the washroom. This is a central component of gender and sexuality issues in urban and park design and is the site of discrimination and a barrier. It poses issues of accessibility, safety and health. This feature is not only essential for human biological needs but can also be a source of civic pride and good inclusive design.

Washrooms are frequently a source of gender inequality and poor design and planning. Clara Greed (2003) argues that washrooms are a common source of social exclusion and further argues that politicians and professionals rarely see, much less address, the broad range of user needs. User groups go beyond just the abled-bodied and gender-binary paradigm. User groups are far more diverse and increasingly demanding greater visibility. User groups include the elderly, the disabled, single-parents or single relatives with children, and those that challenge the gender binary (such as transgender and gender-non conforming people). In the United States, public washrooms have reflected discrimination in the form of gender, race, class, physical ability, and sexual orientation but only race and physical ability has been addressed in federal legislation (Anthony & Dufresne, 2009). Depending on how a user identifies, the labelling and design of washrooms has the ability to affect their safety and well-being. Offering a gender-neutral option allows not only those who do not conform to the gender binary a safe option, but it also allows those who are travelling with a family member, or friend, who may need assistance to enter a washroom that doesn’t correspond to their gender. There is also no statistical data to suggest gender-neutral bathrooms, or transgender people choosing to use the bathroom that corresponds to their identity, promotes violence and assaults (Brydum, 2015). Likewise, historically in post-war American and British culture, the washroom was a place that mixed homosexual activity and political repercussions and no signage could ever distinguish between a heterosexual
male and homosexual male (Lyndenberg, 2009), rendering the symbolism of segregation signs moot. Greed (2003) further argues that toilet symbols and language also cause exclusion and confusion. However, she does not consent to mixing boundaries or having sole unisex bathrooms unless they have been designed with women’s needs prioritized, because men have a tendency to appropriate spaces when spaces are not created with women in mind. This poses a problem since women are less likely to be involved in the development process and policy-makers are predominantly men, creating greater barriers for implementing changes.

Legal scholar, Sarah Moore, outlined four types of women’s washroom inequity (1) unequal washrooms – fewer, smaller, distant (2) inadequate washrooms – equal facilities but lack of amenities such as soap or running water (3) missing washrooms – women must share facilities and are not given an alternative choice and (4) no washrooms at all (Anthony & Dufresne, 2009). Greed (2003) traces the separation of the sexes to ancient Greece and Rome, where spatial divisions were created via spas and areas of socialization, which acted as a kind of zoning. Women are also the most frequent users of washrooms, since they are the ones most frequently out and about, using public transit, are often accompanied by children, and yet there are far less washrooms for women than men and, unlike men, women will rarely urinate in public (Greed, 2009). Sandra K. Rawls (1988) conducted a study that measured the average queue times for washrooms, for both men and women. Men on average took about a minute and a half but women spent double that time, meaning women wait an average of at least three minutes to use the washroom. The wait times become even longer if a user has children or is disabled, because they have to care for the needs of their children as well as their own or, if disabled, they may take longer due to the nature of their disability or they may have to wait for the disabled user stall to be free. This poses a significant problem since there are fewer accommodations for women
and washroom sizes are smaller. Further, there are a lack of proper provisions in washrooms, such as sanitary napkin dispensaries and disposal boxes (Anderson, 2009), leading to further inequalities. Hence, the washroom as a design fixture has been largely neglected until recently, yet it still faces many policy and legal challenges for implementation.

Existing Statistics

Combined with the theory literature review and the case studies, further examination of statistics in the North American and European context provided a fuller perspective on the depth of the inequalities faced in regards to gender and sexuality. These statistics provide concrete data that supports the argument that gender disparity does exist and continues to persist. Seeing and understanding the data allows designers to single out key points of concern in order to highlight areas that need greater attention.

North American (NA) and European (EU): Data on Gender and Sexuality

ParticipACTION (2015) identified several barriers that young girls face according to studies and reports: (1) higher amounts of teasing – about their appearance, coordination, and size/weight and (2) reported discomfort about feeling “watched” (3) girls, more than boys, reported higher amounts of teasing concerning their body and skills by the opposite sex. They argue that the findings indicate that girls tend to shy away from organized sports and instead gravitate towards non-contact sports (Lifestyle Tips, 2011). ParticipACTION data also indicates that if a girl isn’t active and involved in sports by age 10 then there is only a 10% chance she’ll be active at 25 (Let’s Keep Girls Moving!, 2016).

Issues of fear and safety are also compounded by statistical evidence that finds that women are also most commonly the victims of violence and assault, 20% more than their male counterparts (Statistics Canada, 2014) and disability is far more prevalent in women in almost every age group than their
male counterparts (Statistics Canada, 2012). These problems become far more glaring when confronted with the reality that single women (and singles in general) are the fastest growing demographic and will have the strongest voting power (Traister, 2016), and yet women are often at a disadvantage when it comes to having their needs met when it comes to planning and design.

The European data paints a similar but more optimistic portrait of gender and outdoor play than the US data, largely because some of the problems are currently trying to be addressed in some countries like Germany and Austria. Annette Harth (2007) argues it is largely cultural conditioning that promotes this inequality and that “parents keep a closer eye on girls and occupy them more with housework – whether on grounds of fear or conviction. They tend to be raised to show social consideration, while the exploratory urge is encouraged in boys.” From around the age of 10 to 11, a girl’s outdoor participation diminishes whereas for boys it begins to significantly expand (Harth, 2007). In studies conducted in Germany, the reasons behind a girl’s diminished outdoor and independent activities also correlate to cultural differences and expectations. This is especially true for girls residing in urban environments, and the more densely built, the less likely it is that the urban environment provides adequate and high quality open space. Though participation in competitive sports is still skewed towards boys, there is mounting evidence to suggest that gender-neutral sports are becoming increasingly popular as well as previously-male dominated sports (such as soccer). However the same is not true for boys, as they have not moved towards embracing activities that have been traditionally associated with girls (Harth, 2007).

Harth (2007) further highlights a number of statistics found in various EU studies to highlight some key differences regarding women in outdoor space, such as women tending to place higher value on open spaces, public squares and parks. Though there is a significant role of ‘child-minding’ when it comes to the values and uses of outdoor space, there is also a great desire for socializing
and being in nature. Accessibility and safety were also two of the defining characteristics that women look for in open spaces, while younger generations of women view open green spaces more favourably, older generations do not, and often associate it with danger. This generational difference may be a result of women becoming increasingly independent and appropriating more spaces. There are no significant differences between males and females when it comes to design preferences, but girls and women do appreciate a highly sensory and atmospheric quality to their outdoor surroundings (variety in vegetation, sunny/shady areas, and attractive furniture). The German studies also found that men prefer central and exposed views, whereas women prefer quieter, calmer and protected positions from which they can observe (William Whyte also recorded this observation in his 1980 book, The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces, in NYC).

It is important to note that Harth (2007) warns against using gender as the only indicator for how girls/women and boys/men use outdoor spaces. Other factors do play a role, but the data is still valuable in terms of recognizing that there are differences (though the reasons behind them may differ from culture to culture and other variables such as socio-economic factors). There is simply a lack of studies that focus on the preferences, needs, and perceived deficiencies of male and female users with different ways of life. Furthermore, designers must take heed to not inadvertently create design attributes that contribute to stereotyping and gendered spaces that exclude rather than include. The presence of women greatly increases if their needs, values and preferences are taken into account in the design process and implementation (quiet spaces, security/safety, aesthetics/atmosphere, etc.). Harth (2007) further argues that gender disparity will be reduced once those preferences are also taken into account. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that there is a greater convergence between male and female activity, yet that owes more to female appropriation of spaces rather than an expanding repertoire of the male
designer (i.e. women have taken over spaces as their own and moulded them and more women have entered occupations that centre around urban and park design).

**Coding Patterns**

The patterns that are revealed in Table 4.5, indicate two concepts: (1) the importance of the literature review, as it emphasized the gravity of the historical and cultural context. It illuminates how these disparities and inequalities manifested through various means over centuries, and how they continued to manifest themselves in current design practices and (2) the language that was used, largely based on theories from the literature review, reveals recurring patterns that affect gender and sexuality – i.e. fear is a deterrent, power is a cultural/social construct meant to shape spaces for specific groups (e.g. zoning laws that segregated African-Americans), and safety is a prominent theme that frequently shows up in data and the literature (i.e. indicating a strong preference from women).
Table 4.5: Coded Data and Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Found in Studies and Data</th>
<th>Coded Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation of spaces</td>
<td>Empowerment, Autonomy, Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>Judgment, Shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling watched</td>
<td>Fear, Judgment, The Body, Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy away from organized sports</td>
<td>Power, Competition, Judgement, Shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls show social consideration</td>
<td>Culture, Constructed Social Hierarchies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls outdoor participation diminishes at 10 years</td>
<td>Fear, Shame, Constructed Social Hierarchies, Power, Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher value on open space/squares</td>
<td>Socializing, Connection, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being in nature</td>
<td>Calm, Connection, Refuge, Health, Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open green spaces/elderly associate with danger</td>
<td>Autonomy, Fear, Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate a highly sensory and atmospheric quality</td>
<td>Mood, Scent, Genius loci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From which they can observe</td>
<td>Vigilance, Safety, Child-Minding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quieter, calmer, protected positions</td>
<td>Refuge, Safety, Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of areas with hidden corners</td>
<td>Safety, Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-neutral washroom</td>
<td>Safety, Disability, Child-Minding, Fear, Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women will rarely urinate in public</td>
<td>Culture, Propriety, Constructed Social Hierarchies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women wait...3 minutes to use a washroom</td>
<td>Control, Health, Barrier, Constructed Power Hierarchies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer accommodations/smaller spaces</td>
<td>Control, Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of the sexes</td>
<td>Control, Delineation of Space, Constructed Social Hierarchies, Barrier, Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing boundaries</td>
<td>Empowerment, Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labelling and design</td>
<td>Delineation of space, Control, Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow pavements, obstructions, accident hotspots</td>
<td>Mobility, Barrier, Disability, Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural lighting to mitigate fear</td>
<td>Safety, Vigilance, Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces were also clearly organized</td>
<td>Order, Security, Delineation of Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A girls only retreat area</td>
<td>Empowerment, Safety, Appropriation, Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area not dominated by boys</td>
<td>Empowerment, Appropriation, Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “communication zone” for group socializing and making new contacts</td>
<td>Empowerment, Connection, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground facilities geared towards the interests of boys and male teens</td>
<td>Constructed Power Hierarchies, Constructed Social Hierarchies, Barrier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method 2

The comparative analysis approach involved an examination of established landscape architecture design guidelines. The goal is to determine how inclusive the guidelines are in terms of gender and sexuality issues, in comparison, to those determined by the findings in Method 1.

Comparative Analysis and Existing Design Guidelines Overview

The dominant landscape architecture guidelines that will be examined to determine their effectiveness, in addressing issues of gender and sexuality, are presented in People Places: Design Guidelines by Clare Cooper Marcus and Carolyn Francis (1990). The literature, data, patterns (Table 4.5), and gender-sensitive design guidelines (Table 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4) are the combined criteria used to examine the quality and relevance of the aforementioned design guidelines.

People Places: Design Guidelines

People Places: Design Guidelines by Clare Cooper Marcus and Carolyn Francis (1990), landscape architects, is an edited book that contains a variety of case studies and corresponding checklists to address the needs of different types of open space. The book is a compilation of findings and research that culminate in an offering of guidelines and recommendations for creating inclusive open spaces.

The compilation is divided into seven chapters that correspond to distinct forms of open space design. The chapters are as follows: (1) urban plazas (2) neighbourhood parks (3) miniparks and vest-pocket parks (4) campus outdoor spaces (5) housing and outdoor spaces for the elderly (6) day care outdoor spaces and (7) hospital outdoor spaces. For the purpose of this research and analysis, there will be a focus on the chapters concerning “neighbourhood parks” and “housing and outdoor spaces for the elderly”.
Marcus' and Francis' open spaces are divided into categories by assigning common characteristics to each major component (i.e. hard and soft components, fixed/movable components, a central focus/characteristic, and target user needs.). These specific components can then be broken down into smaller components to fit individual spaces (i.e. a space targeted for children between the ages of 5 to 10 and the specific components for that user group). Marcus and Francis note, however, that the research they reviewed that refers to users assumes that the user is “abled-bodied, relatively young, and male” (p. 6), whereas Marcus and Francis state that their belief is that spaces should be accessible to all people and for people not be excluded due to some aspect of design.

Neighbourhood Parks Analysis

Marcus' and Francis' chapter regarding “Neighbourhood Parks” begins with a brief section on the history of the American park and a section on the future of neighbourhood parks. They then provide a section of key literature on parks that pertain to social issues and urban parks, naming such works as The Death and Life of Great American Cities by Jane Jacobs, and various other social theorists that have looked at some social aspect of park use such as park activities and habits. They note, however, that children, teens, and the elderly are greatly overlooked in the process even though they are the dominant users of neighbourhood parks.

Research, Data Collection and Coding

Marcus and Francis outline two frequently cited reasons for park use: a natural setting and social contact. In examining data for the “natural setting,” in London, the emphasis for users was ‘being in nature’ but in Manhattan the emphasis was on ‘relaxing and resting.’ Women in general, especially older women, placed greater emphasis on being in nature. This corresponds with
recent findings, as exemplified in the data in Method 1, which is that women and the elderly still largely prefer being in a highly sensory and atmospheric natural environment. Furthermore, as cities continue to grow, the need for natural settings that also offer areas of relaxation and rest becomes more necessary. In the European and North American data, both nature and relaxation were still key factors that female users seek in park design.

Marcus and Francis then conducted their own version of coding, examining data for phrases that contained key words that would fall under their “park as retreat” classification system. Some of the words they noticed were, “greenery,” “nature,” “relaxing,” “comfortable,” “tranquil,” “peaceful,” “calm,” “urban oasis,” and “sanctuary.” While there is a higher need for high-density urbanites to seek areas of relaxation and rest there was still a need to also experience some form of nature or notions of “untamed wilderness.” Marcus and Francis then provide guidelines in order to delineate spaces that both have areas of controlled nature and areas that give the illusion of a wild, untamed nature to satisfy both frequently cited needs - not unlike Alexander Pope’s lines regarding the genius loci in his Epistle IV, to Richard Boyle, Earl of Burlington - which not only adheres to the concept that every design should be adapted with context in mind or the “spirit” of the site, but that places can also be designed with a dual intended and controlled purpose. Marcus and Francis also cite data throughout their recommendations for a nature and relaxation oriented park space, similar to German studies they cite that found that people go to parks to experience “silence.”

Socialization and Contact

The next section of the neighbourhood parks guidelines delves into the human need for socializing and human contact. Marcus and Francis note that while people may say that they go to parks for the natural environment, behavioural studies have found that most people actually go to people-watch.
and socialize - both overtly and covertly. They list two versions of overt socializing: visiting a park with others and visiting a park in the hopes of seeing other regulars. Though the authors do not make note of it in their research, visiting parks in groups or in the hopes of seeing regulars is a common activity for women (Harth, 2007). Young girls tend to be accompanied by friends, whereas older women tend to be frequently accompanied by children. These settings are especially important for women with young children, in order to meet and socialize with other adults, as this period can often lead to feelings of isolation. Marcus and Francis offer a variety of guidelines for overt socializing, generally ranging from movable furniture, arrangement of furniture, attractive entrances, and encouraging the delineation and appropriation of spaces by different groups as distinguished by age, gender or recreation. Their description is similar to that of the Vienna model, in which they recommend that spaces are networked properly (of open space and mobility), differentiated and structured into subzones to allow different groups to each get a chance to appropriate spaces for their own use, thereby minimizing the opportunity for just one group to dominate the space. In their guidelines for covert socializing, the authors note that this is an activity that is common among elderly park users. In these settings elderly people will often meet up, sit on a bench in an open space without obstruction, and people-watch as they socialize with each other.

Special User Groups: Elderly User

The next section of the chapter is a considerable examination of “special user group needs.” Marcus and Francis argue that there are many special user groups that would like to frequent parks more often, but their needs are often not understood or not incorporated into site designs (p. 74). These groups include the elderly, the disabled, pre-school children, school-aged children, and teenagers. Their data indicates that inner city neighbourhoods are increasingly inhabited by elderly people, most of whom live alone and spend most of their
time alone, and they are the most frequent users of inner city parks. This makes
the neighbourhood park a crucial reprieve from loneliness and boredom for
many elderly people, especially for women as they tend to considerably outlive
men. Marcus and Francis claim that elderly users are also divided in their
preferences; some prefer quiet reflection alone while others seek friendship and
companionship in park settings. Some of the guidelines they outline that cater to
erly users involve seating near entrances, bus stops near entrances, fixtures
such as fountains and washrooms, shelter from the elements, comfortable
seating that promotes longer stays, and a looping path system for walks in the
park. The Vienna model has a brief section on “senior citizens” that also
highlights the need for protected and shady areas but that also contains a view
more lively areas of the park. The authors also highlight ideal paving materials
and a variety of spatial programming that may appeal to the elderly, such as
gaming stations and garden plots where applicable. Marcus and Frances are
quite thorough in addressing some of the social nuances and social needs of
the elderly, including accessibility, yet the guidelines are lacking somewhat in
addressing disability issues that the elderly face, especially women. On the other
hand, the Vienna model focuses slightly more on issues of safety and security.
Nevertheless, the section on elderly users meets many of the concerns that
gender-sensitive design entails.

Special User Groups: Disabled User

The second user group discussed is the “disabled park user.” Marcus and
Francis argue that everyone is disabled at some point in their life due to
accident, illness or old age. They argue that physical disability should not
exclude those from enjoying urban parks and that open park space is crucial to
health and healing (p. 77). This is where emphasis is placed on barrier-free
design. The authors list seven categories that should be paid attention to: walks,
stairs and ramps, parking, vegetation, signs, and furniture. Some of the key
recommendations they point out are that designers should provide drinking fountains with two outlets that accommodate wheelchairs and children, provide double hand-rails, provide lit or reflective signage with dark lettering against white backgrounds and provide braille strips on signs if possible. The Marcus and Francis guidelines are from 1990, hence, the term gender-neutral or “family washroom” was not widely used. But there is one understandably glaring omission from the guidelines; washrooms were not addressed at all in this section regarding disabled users. Providing gender-neutral or family washrooms to accommodate those who are disabled would be greatly beneficial, in terms of accessibility and comfort. Gender-neutral washrooms allow young disabled users to be accompanied by their parent of either sex; similarly they also allow elderly disabled users to be accompanied by friends or relatives if they need assistance.

Special User Groups: Preschool User, School-Aged User, and Teenage User

The third user group discussed is the “preschool users.” The authors define this age group as 1-5 and that neighbourhood park use is highly popular with this user group. The recommendations for the group focuses on creating tot-lots, providing washrooms that cater to parents with children and babies (including furniture for diaper changing), surface paving, seating, fountains, play equipment and play-zones. Since play activities between the sexes at age 1-5 are remarkably similar, the guidelines are suitable in creating cohesion between a focused space of activity for preschool users and their parents/caregivers who are looking to socialize with other parents/caregivers.

The fourth user group discussed is the “school-aged children.” The authors define this age group as 6-12 and describe them as the least-heard from and least-designed for user group, resulting in this user group often not using a park specifically for play. Marcus and Francis recommend areas that combine mystery, excitement and some elements of perceived danger. They list creating
areas that are left naturalized, varying topography, water play, natural play elements, play equipment that offers some challenge and physical exertion, and, if funding allows, a recreation staff to organize activities. The Vienna model, literature and data suggest that this is the most crucial age group to consider and nurture. It is the period where gender disparities begin to show and social and cultural constructs begin to take greater hold. Yet, gender differences are never discussed nor alluded to. It is merely assumed that this user group will break off and organize themselves into areas and activities that attract them. But because it is the least-heard from and least-designed for group, Marcus and Francis have only very broad suggestions to offer designers. Though some suggestions are crucial – such as a varied topography and different play equipment that provides different challenge levels – the guidelines fail to address power dynamics, the appropriation of spaces by dominant groups and gender, and the growing safety concerns as girls mature. This is where the Vienna model makes the most notable distinction between the two sets of guidelines. Because the model has data and research for that specific age group, and confronts gender issues, the Vienna model is more precise in identifying problem areas and guidelines to address them (ex. by designing gender-sensitive and gender-neutral play areas, delineated spaces and detailed play equipment).

The fifth user group discussed is “teenaged users.” Marcus and Frances describe this user group, which are usually boys, as having very special needs that are rarely catered to. They prefer privacy and greater independence in their activities but their presence in large groups has a tendency to dominate and appropriate the spaces they are in. However, this also can lead to conflicts with competing groups and discomfort from less dominating groups. Marcus and Francis recommend offering spaces for organized sports but warned that this user group prefers unstructured activities and ways to relieve boredom. Some of the broader suggestions include a recreation center, delineation of
specific areas that are attractive to teenagers (particularly close to the street and where there is traffic, but also allows other groups to claim spaces), defined areas with a variety of levelled seating, spaces near parking lots to hang out near their cars, and creation of some hidden and private areas. Marcus and Francis spend considerably more time on this user group, examining their lunchtime uses of the park and their typical activities which are split into two groups: “conventional activities” and “unconventional activities.” Conventional activities cover hard court activities (basketball) and informal recreation areas (sunbathing, lawn games, jogging, skating, sledding, and picnicking). Unconventional activities include dog walking, cycling, skateboarding, and roller-skating. They also devote a section to what is referred to as “antisocial activities,” these activities include vagrancy and vandalism. Vagrancy constitutes behaviours such as gambling, drug-use, prostitution, and drinking. They cite a solution suggested by William Whyte, which is to make spaces so attractive to the “legitimate” user groups that “undesirables” move on (p. 87). However, what constitutes a “legitimate” user isn’t clear, since issues of racism are still prevalent in many western cultures and the concept of “legitimates” harkens back to forms of social control and power relationships involving people of colour. The Vienna model makes no explicit mention of “legitimate” users or “undesirables” but presumably, since it focuses a great deal on safety and security, several of their guidelines may be able to address some of those issues. However, cultural differences between Vienna and the United States and Canada may also play a role in some of these issues. Some design suggestions Marcus and Frances include involve creating active and well-used spaces, walkways and views that police cruisers can monitor from the streets, and fencing. Vandalism in particular is a problem for inner city parks and is usually perpetrated by males between the ages of 10-25. They offer a number of suggestions to curb vandalism, most of which rely heavily on spatial design, furniture selection and placement, and materials. However, as in previous user
groups, gender is treated neutrally which only further contributes to ignoring the root of many user design problems.

Case Studies and Checklists

Marcus and Francis conducted extensive research on case studies to distil their design guidelines and create an extensive checklist. They examined low-high density neighbourhoods and low-high income neighbourhoods. All of the examples are from California, from San Francisco to Berkeley. They assess the location, context, uses and users, and identify successful and unsuccessful features of each case study. Marcus and Francis identify ethnic groups of each park but gender is again ignored or generalized. Even race, though noted, is still generalized in terms of park use and needs. However, several of the parks that were examined do contain main features that would fall under the Vienna model of gender-sensitive design, particularly the ways in which spaces are broken up to accommodate different groups and the ways in which many gender-neutral sports are made available. Yet these design features are mainly based on income rather than gender. For example, a gender-neutral sport like tennis was far more commonly available in high-income or gentrifying neighbourhoods. Other unsuccessful issues with the parks also centered on location, spatial arrangement, lack of furniture/fixtures and a lack of maintenance.

The design review checklist finishes off the chapter by organizing each criterion into subgroups. The first group is “General User Needs” that mainly addresses issues regarding furniture, materials, fixtures, circulation and spatial design. Then the “Special User Group Needs” are categorized into “Elderly Persons,” “Disabled Persons,” “Preschool Children,” “School-aged Children,” and “Teenagers.” “Typical Activities” are then subdivided into “Conventional Activities,” “Unconventional Park Activities” and “Antisocial Activities,” in all 137 design criteria were created for neighbourhood park design. Some of the
criteria were very specific in terms of asking questions regarding placement, material, fixtures, spatial sense, atmosphere and security/safety issues yet they were still largely too general when it came to special user needs. The selected guidelines in Table 4.6 reflect some of the guidelines that best address issues of gender and all that it encompasses (accessibility, safety, atmosphere, tranquility, refuge, orientation, fixtures, and spatial organization).

Table 4.6: Selected Excerpts from the Neighbourhood Parks Checklist (Marcus & Francis, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpts From The Checklists</th>
<th>Selected Guidelines of Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL USER NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are there a number of isolated benches to give a sitter pleasant views of the greenery?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do plantings and detailing create a rich and varied aesthetic environment, with ranges of color, texture, shape and smell?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are there some areas for sitting that are close to the park’s perimeter, for use by those with mobility problems, little time, or concerns about security?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the seating allow a variety of arrangements, both to support socializing and to permit use without intrusion by strangers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL USER GROUP NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elderly Persons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Are there seating areas just inside the park for the elderly people who cannot or do not wish to walk farther into the park?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Have entries been planned to coincide with bus stops and crosswalks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Are there drinking fountains, restroom facilities, and sheltered area nearby for use for older people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Are benches placed where a wall or planting behind them will add to a sense of security?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabled People</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Do park signs use dark lettering on a light background?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43. Are major park signs lit for night visibility?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44. Are Braille signs placed where they can be easily touched?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47. Do drinking fountains have two spigots, easily operated – a lower one for children and people in wheelchairs, as well as a higher one?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preschool Children</strong></td>
<td><strong>52. Do some benches overlook the tot lot, for supervising adults?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>53. Are some benches oriented to encourage adults’ socializing?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-aged Children</strong></td>
<td><strong>57. Has some area of the park been left undesigned or carefully crafted to be natural, leftover space?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teenagers</strong></td>
<td><strong>66. If there is considerable teen population in the neighborhood, has a potential hangout area been created, preferably at a park entrance with both pedestrian and vehicular traffic, that will allow teens to claim the location without creating conflict between them and other users?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>68. Are the boundaries of the hangout clearly defined?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>71. Can a few, small private areas be created in the park where couples or small groups can sit out of sight of authority?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing and Outdoor Spaces for the Elderly Analysis

Marcus and Francis also provide a section on housing but this solely focuses on housing for the elderly. Literature from social scientists, leisure studies, and gerontology is reviewed and examined to compile data where they reveal two major trends: (1) calls for a more comprehensive approach to planning, design and management of housing for the elderly and (2) the need to develop manuals that also focus on external design. They conceptualize three overlapping groups of elderly people, the first are the “go go’s” (active), the second are the “slow go’s” (active but need some assistance), and third group are the “no go’s” (passive and need more care).

Marcus and Francis outline general layout and clustering guidelines, along with how to mix different levels of care on the same site. The layout and clustering of houses, fixtures and amenities are crucial factors in the success of creating functional, safe and comfortable housing communities. The clustering of amenities, such as benches, patios and houses, creates a sense of activity and encourages communal use by residents. Circulation is also a central component of a successful layout that promotes order and safety. Encouraging a sense of community, safety and inclusion is also shared goal of the Vienna model. Microclimate guidelines are also highlighted, which is especially important in hotter and colder climates and for the comfort of the elderly. Social and psychological needs are also taken into consideration from spatial organizations for socializing and mobility to patio and garden areas - with a particular emphasis on comprehensibility and usability/opportunities. Other important factors such as site entry, court entry, parking entry, and building access are also heavily focused on, especially as they relate to spatial arrangement, materials, lighting, fixtures, stairs/ramps, clearly marked areas/signs, and mobility. Communal gardens and shared patios are another heavy feature in the design guidelines. Marcus and Francis follow their procedure of examining case studies once they have reviewed the literature
and collected their data. However, unlike the Vienna housing models, the Marcus and Francis guidelines and case studies are strictly elderly-only housing and not focused on intergenerational housing that accommodates people from youth to old age. Yet, many of the criteria that benefit the elderly also fit in with the Vienna model criteria that women and the elderly prefer as well, from spatial arrangements, to mobility to safety, to even its focus on the importance of nature and sensory details. This is a particularly important detail since women do on average tend to live longer than men and are often left to take care of each other or are left living alone. The intergenerational housing models in Vienna still take into account the needs and health of the elderly by offering assisted living features but they also take into account how much more enriched the lives of the elderly can also be by having the option of being around and being cared for by younger generations and family members, which can possibly lead to a greater care and compassion for the elderly and their needs.

Table 4.7: Selected Excerpts from Housing and Outdoor Spaces for the Elderly Checklist (Marcus & Francis, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpts From The Checklists</th>
<th>Selected Guidelines of Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals of the Outdoor Space</strong></td>
<td>4. Have design concepts and features been included that encourage independence while providing support and assistance for outdoor use when needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Has a flexible design been created to accommodate changing needs and activity preferences over time? As the project matures and the residents “age in place,” will the initial goals set for outdoor use be appropriate after seven to ten years with a more frail population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Users</strong></td>
<td>6. What is the residents’ anticipated ability level? If there are any special limitations, are design features included to ensure safety, accessibility, and comfort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Mass and Microclimate Conditions</strong></td>
<td>11. Are activities and facilities on the site clustered to give a sense of vitality and use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Site Entry and Arrival Court** | 19. Does the tree planting provide sunny and shady areas for outdoor seating?  
21. Is the site entry on a relatively major street, for ease of visibility and access and, when possible, proximity to public transport?  
22. Does the layout and location of the entry drive ensure safety and easy building identification and access? |
| **Parking and Secondary Building Entrances** | 40. Is there adequate lighting for the secondary entrance and entire parking area?  
41. Is parking located for easy access to the building and for visibility from the building, to ensure security?  
Is parking clearly identified with the building or unite cluster?  
42. Is the parking-lot layout clear and easy to follow, with good visibility and adequate turning radii? |
| **Circulation and Orientation** | 48. Has the outdoor area been designed with some kind of spatial hierarchy in mind to prove easily remembered visual cues to orientation?  
61. Is the pavement wide enough for two people to pass with a wheelchair or walker? |
| **Sensory Details** | 120. Does the planting have a marked variety of lead textures, colors, plant forms, and perfumes?  
121. Do pathways in sunny weather have a variety of deep shade, and sunny areas (without abrupt transitions) and a variety of open and enclosed areas? |
| **Security** | 143. Is there adequate night lighting on the site and at all building entries? |
| **Lighting and Signage** | 168. Is there high-intensity lighting for security at building entries and in parking areas?  
170. Has lighting along pathways been installed so as to direct light downwards, to help define paving edges and to prevent deep shadows?  
171. Do site and building signs have a consistent pattern and hierarchy? |
Conclusion

The literature review and case studies regarding gender-sensitive design and gender-mainstreaming provided a palette of successful examples that have specifically focused on gender inequality and revealed barriers. The available North American and European Union data further corroborates the argument that there are sexuality and gender inequalities and that it is still an irrefutable problem that planners and designers have not fully addressed, specifically as it pertains to landscape architecture. The coding of the data highlights the historical implications and how vital theory is when it comes to evaluating the work and perspective of the profession. This is why it is important that landscape architecture theory push the boundaries of what encompasses landscape architecture. The disciplines that expounded on theory regarding gender and sexuality and confronted the historical and current power dynamics, appear to have a far more successful grasp on, not only creating, but understanding the need and function of inclusive spaces. The coded patterns were identified via the recurring themes found in the literature and data (i.e. a focus on safety, power, and atmosphere, among others) and recurring design problems became evident – such as the reliance on being too general, as exemplified by some of the design guidelines by Marcus and Cooper. Perhaps these generalities were created in an effort to avoid directly confronting and placing onus on previous power dynamics and social constructs. Outside of specific features (such as washrooms), treating all spaces and guidelines as gender-neutral appears to provide more detriments than solutions, because it does not specifically address gender inequalities. Yet, it is still important to keep in mind that Marcus and Francis released their guidelines in 1990, when gender-sensitive design was still in its early stages of development in Europe in 1991. And a general guideline approach was a common method to use at the time, though they did attempt create greater inclusivity by focusing on special users. Hence, the guidelines and format provided by Marcus and Francis are relatively
thorough in attempting to attain greater inclusion. The guidelines are also easily replicable and can be seamlessly updated to accommodate the growing visibility of previously neglected user groups.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter provides a summary and will further discuss and interpret the findings of the information gathered by the case studies, existing data and established design criteria in landscape and community design. Furthermore, it assesses the distinction and importance between gender-sensitive and gender-neutral designs, the greater need for LGBTQ inclusion, a critique of the methods, additional applicability, and recommendations for future research.

“Thoughtful design takes into consideration existing knowledge.”
- Clare Cooper Marcus & Carolyn Francis.

Summary

A major objective of this study was to increase the general understanding and importance of gender and sexuality issues as they relate to design and perception. Another major objective was to analyze how inclusive a set of established landscape architecture design guidelines were in terms of gender and sexuality. Due to the sparse amount of literature regarding the topic in landscape architecture, in Chapter 2, the underlying assumption was that the design guidelines were not wholly inclusive in terms of gender and sexuality. Data findings in Chapter 4 revealed gender inequalities and patterns, which indicated social and cultural constructs that promote gender and sexuality bias. Furthermore, as shown in the Vienna case studies, successful planning, design and implementation of inclusive design that focus on gender and sexuality, as part of the process, have been successful and lead to better and more inclusive spaces and work environments. In addition, a compilation of landscape design guidelines that were designed by women proved to take into account some...
consideration of the design and spatial disparities concerning gender issues but not sexuality issues.

Significance of Research

The significance of this research is first dependent on the level of knowledge and experience of the reader and, presumably, the designer. The literature review of the theories and discourses on gender and sexuality gives prominence to how crucial theory has been in elevating the ideas and work in related disciplines. If landscape architecture is deemed an “allied profession,” why is thoughtful discourse regarding gender and sexuality lacking? Landscape architecture does borrow from other disciplines, which is necessary to expand knowledge and design applications, yet it would be helpful to compile updated guidelines that take greater consideration of the changing cultural and social landscapes. It would be useful for landscape architects to be broadly aware of the levels of intersectionality involved in design and planning. There have been discourses that focus on age groups, but there has also been a lack of attention focused on how gender roles, sexuality, and social constructs have influenced and shaped not only how spaces are used, but also how they are designed. These various discourses have the potential to enrich the perspectives and sensibilities of prospective designers and planners, thereby contributing to greater awareness and implementation of sensitive and inclusive design. It does this by providing a lens to see and experience the “other” and by illuminating the power of defining and appropriating spaces for the “other” – whether it be women’s spaces, queer spaces, elderly spaces, or spaces for the disabled. In order for the profession to progress and take a greater role in planning, design and implementation processes then the profession must also address the lack of theory and critical thought on subjects that are vital to creating inclusive and successful designs.
Coding the data revealed patterns that frequently appeared in the literature, such as the underlying intent, whether the designer is fully conscious of its effects or not, and of how social constructs and power hierarchies have shaped the use and design of public spaces – particularly towards minority groups. The coding allows the viewer to see and comprehend the depth at which these constructs have been deeply entwined in the assumptions about space and design. This new perspective not only puts the data in context for the scope of its implications, including its historical and theoretical context, but underlines essential concerns that should be addressed in the discipline of landscape architecture.

A comparative analysis of established landscape design guidelines, in comparison to the data and gender-sensitive case studies, was conducted to test the appropriateness and level of inclusion of the Marcus and Francis landscape architecture design guidelines. These guidelines were especially significant for two reasons (1) it is one of the most well-known set of guidelines that was compiled by landscape architects into a comprehensive list of guidelines and case studies for specific needs and user groups and (2) it was written from a different perspective that also considered other neglected user groups (in this case, women). The case studies, data, and coded data were helpful in recognizing key areas for improvement and assessing areas of success, as it pertains to inequalities regarding gender and sexuality. Analysis of the Marcus and Francis guidelines suggests that they still have wide applicability and can easily be moulded more precisely, to address specific problems and not just generalities.

**Gender-sensitive or Gender-neutral?**

A crucial point of contention is whether or not spaces should become more gender-neutral to accommodate growing visibility of the LGBTQ community, but also to accommodate those that have other needs that do not
necessarily conform to gender expectations or need assistance. However, there
is concern that planning and designing space, and fixtures, with a gender-
neutral perspective actually exacerbates the problem because it assumes
equality. Yet the data clearly shows that there are discrepancies and clear
inequalities. Marcus and Francis, though acknowledging inequalities, still framed
their design guidelines in a gender-neutral format. However, inequalities cannot
be addressed unless they are directly exposed, understood, and broken down.
That is not to say that gender-neutral spaces and fixtures do not have a place in
design; they certainly do, especially as it pertains to LGBTQ people (gender-
neutral washrooms have a long history in queer culture), but options need to be
available and if options are not available then the designs must be planned
and implemented with a gender-sensitive approach, because spaces are still
largely appropriated by men if not designed with women in mind. Gender-
sensitive design, and selective gender-neutral design, has not led to a decrease
in use or discomfort by male counterparts. In fact, the opposite has been true,
as they have begun to be widely implemented on school campuses and public
government buildings. By addressing a critical area of need, gender-sensitive
design has veritably created greater equality and safety for everyone involved –
boys, girls, elderly, and LGBTQ. Furthermore, the recognition of these design
problems and dynamics allowed for a holistic critique of a dominant set of
landscape architecture design guidelines, and provides a canvas to layer on
existing guidelines that can accommodate gender and sexuality. This is an area
landscape architects can build upon and adapt to, as new information and
perspectives come to light.

LGBTQ Inclusion

The power of defining spaces plays a pivotal role in creating inclusive
spaces; much like the efforts to create spaces for women there has also been a
concentrated effort to create “positive spaces” or “safe spaces” for the LGBTQ
community. These initiatives were largely created by grassroots organizations and university students on campus – the “positive space” symbol and initiative, which indicated to LGBTQ students that they were safe from anti-LGBTQ sentiments. The symbol would then spread to businesses and service establishments to indicate their positive attitude towards LGBTQ clients. As LGBTQ visibility becomes more prominent so, too, do special user needs and designs guidelines. Being conscious and aware of the LGBTQ perspective is crucial in building spaces of safety and inclusion. Gender-neutral design guidelines play a greater role in LGBTQ inclusion, but gender-sensitive design must also be accounted for. Recognition of the role that intersectionality plays in creating barriers and exclusions for the LGBTQ community are also crucial, in order to be mindful of the layers of discrimination that they experience. Greater and wider acceptance of the LGBTQ community can lead to healthier community relationships and greater housing equality, an issue of vulnerability for the LGBTQ community, particularly for the elderly.

A Critique of the Research Methods
The literature review in Chapter 1 served to establish the use and exploration of gender and sexuality theory in related disciplines to landscape architecture, it further demonstrated how little dissemination there is of gender and sexuality in landscape architecture theory. However, the literature review was not sufficient, not only to explain the relevance of gender and sexuality, but to also explain how it can be applied in landscape architecture. Since gender and sexuality are not necessarily tangible qualities or indicators, the grounded theory approach was a reasonable method to use in order to understand a highly theoretical subject and its application.

Grounded theory is an inductive method used to generate new theory or produce hypotheses, and appropriate in this situation since the main purpose of this research was to create a paradigm shift in how spaces and their users are
perceived, designed and implemented. Existing research and data was examined and compared. Coding is essentially determined by the researcher’s selection and interpretation of the data. This research utilized open and selective coding, which revolve around a core variable – or theme – and the theory or hypotheses are then developed in part through that method. This particular research focused on the language used in the literature review, and data to identify underlying issues and theoretical themes, that identified areas of importance and recognized the systemic and institutionalized cultural barriers regarding gender and sexuality. The comparative analysis is often part of the grounded theory process, but it was separated into a distinct method in order to simplify a rarely used and difficult to understand method (grounded theory). As part of the developing theory regarding gender and sexuality in landscape architecture, a comparison analysis of a set of established design guidelines were used to test the theory of gender and sexual inclusion.

The strength of using the grounded theory approach is that it allows a looser method to interpret various types of data, old and emerging. Furthermore, this method demands more of the researcher and the reader, because it relies greatly on interpretation and examining the research through different lenses. The weakness of using this method is that there is a plethora of data and a lot of “noise” to block out; meaning that, because of the breadth of the topic, choosing relevant data and areas to analyze is highly subjective. This can often lead the theory or hypotheses to be insufficiently developed, which is why the future research component is a vital part of the research. It is meant to be continuously built upon and expanded upon as new data and practises emerge.

**Applicability**

This research project has the potential to benefit a wide range of users and practitioners. Not only will the literature, case studies and data yield a
greater understanding and identification of the socio-political and socio-economic issues at work, but it has the potential to lead to design criteria that considers gender and sexuality as part of the planning, design and implementation processes, thereby leading to a thoughtful design process in designing public/private internal and external spaces. These criteria can be applied to create greater spaces of inclusion on school grounds, college grounds, community spaces, public amenities, housing projects, and park space.

Future Research

Further research needs to be conducted and compiled on inequalities between the genders and sexualities, particularly in a much more thorough study. Pilot projects in Canada (parks or school yards) might yield some insight and data, particularly with long-term assessment of pilot projects. An interview-based approach might help identify trends in the landscape architecture and planning, and gauge thinking and attitudes about these socio-political issues in North America. All of these research facets have the potential to contribute to creating a viable design strategy and upgraded guidelines for inclusive spaces in landscape architecture.

Conclusion

Exclusion leads to inequality, which manifests itself in the form of marginalized groups who are excluded from the design and decision-making processes. Although gender and sexuality are fundamental aspects of human identity and behaviour, they rarely take the forefront in planning and design, although they are all inherently, and often inadvertently, part of any decision making design process. In a broader sense, gender and sexuality are rooted in experiential factors that influence the way in which a person perceives their environment, and its influence on the design process is evident. It is evident
through the design decisions that are made, both by the designer’s own experiences and perspective, or through the outreach processes that incorporate the experiences and perspectives of its community. Hence, if a designer is not actively aware of the needs and wants that pertain to those differences or not actively applying and modifying designs that attempt to create a sense of design neutrality or sensitivity, then spaces can become places of exclusion even with the best intentions.

There are two scales that the creation of inclusive design must address: (1) the macro scale, which involves scale-ranging changes in policy and educational reforms and (2) the micro scale, which involves the design and implementation of inclusive spaces or addressing spatial deficiencies on existing, localized sites. However, before attempting the difficult task of broaching the macro level, addressing issues of gender and sexual inequality at the micro level may gradually lead to an increasing cultural acceptance in planning and implementation. Once these sites become commonplace and the public, presumably, positively responds to them by acknowledging their value, then the task of broaching the macro level becomes persuadable, manageable and less susceptible to oscillating politics.
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