***"Diversity** is being asked to the party. **Inclusion** is being asked to dance"*

(Sherbin and Rashid HBR Feb, 2017)

INCLUSIVE FOODSCAPES

How can the role of landscape architecture facilitate community
engagement in redesigning inclusive multicultural spaces?

BY

Jiwon Clara Choi

A 120-point thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Landscape Architecture
(Professional)

Victoria University of Wellington
School of Architecture

2019

ETHICS

Research ethics approval was obtained from
Victoria University Human Resource Committee in order to conduct this
thesis.

Approval no. 0000026030

The participant information sheet and consent form are included as
Appendix A

ABSTRACT

Urban communities face risks of disintegration and segregation as a consequence of globalised migration processes towards urban environments. Linking social and cultural components with environmental and economic dimensions becomes the goal of all the disciplines that aim to shape more sustainable urban environments. Solutions require interdisciplinary approaches and the use of a complex array of tools. One of these tools is the implementation of community gardening, which provides a wide range of advantages for creating more inclusive spaces and integrated communities. Since food is strongly related to the values and identities of any cultural group, it can be used as a medium to promote social inclusion in the context of urban multicultural societies. By bringing people together into specific urban sites, food production can be integrated in multifunctional spaces while addressing social, economic and ecological goals.

The goal of this research is to assess different approaches to urban agriculture by analysing three existing community gardens located in Newtown, a suburb of Wellington, New Zealand. As a context for developing research, Newtown offers different approaches to urban farming and is really valuable for observing current trends of socialization in diverse and multicultural societies. All three spaces are located on public land owned by Wellington City Council and confined to a small, complex and progressively denser urban area.

The developed analysis was focused on social, cultural and physical dimensions, combining community engagement with different techniques of spatial assessment. At the same time, a detailed

investigation of each community garden was conducted with comparative analysis methodologies. This multidirectional setting of the analysis was established for extracting from the case studies both specific and typological knowledge. Each site was analysed and categorised under three broad themes: people, space and food. The analysis revealed that all three case studies had really different spatial settings, different approaches to food production and varying profiles of supportive communities. The main differences identified were demographics, values, objectives, internal organization, appropriation and perception of the space.

The community gardens were approached as case studies for developing design research. Following participatory design processes with the different communities, the knowledge gained from the analysis was used for proposing changes in the physical environment. The end goal of the design research was to improve the capacity of the spaces to facilitate social inclusiveness. In order to generate tangible changes, a range of small, strategic and feasible spatial interventions were explored. The smallness of the proposed interventions facilitate implementation by reducing time frames, technical resources, funding needs and legal processes, working within the community's own realm. These small interventions are expected to be implemented over time as part of an ongoing collaboration between the different communities, the university and the local council. The applied research methodology showcases the capacity of universities to develop civic engagement by working with real communities that have concrete needs and face overall threats of disintegration and segregation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I still remember the first day of University, I was lost and could not even find my class. From finding my class to the completion of this thesis, there were always people around me who supported me in many ways. Thank you everyone, for making my time at Victoria University full of love, joy, and laughter.

Special thanks to my supervisor, Carles Martinez-Almoyna, for your ongoing support over the past years. Your guidance helped me get out of my comfort zone and challenged myself to have a wider perspective on landscape architecture.

Thanks to all my friends who spent sleepless nights together and talked about how caffeine was essential for our lives. I will never forget the view and scent of the dawning sky we enjoyed together.

Lastly, to my mum and dad – thank you for providing me with the opportunity to experience the wider world. No words can express my gratitude for the sacrifices you have made for me. What I am today cannot be completed without your unconditional love and support. You mean the world to me.

1. INTRODUCTION

Research Discourse	16
Research Objectives	22

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Literature Review + Precedent Study	28
<i>Space and Inclusiveness</i>	30
• <i>The Park for Everyone</i>	32
<i>The Discovery Garden</i>	33
<i>Sociability of Food</i>	34
• <i>Mobile Ethnic Garden</i>	36
<i>Everybodies Table</i>	37
<i>Participatory Design Process</i>	38
• <i>The Edible Estates</i>	40
: Reflection	42

3.1 TARGETING A SPECIFIC GROUP + SITE

Introduction

[Background]

Initial Ideas on Research Opportunity	47
Initial Hunch	48
Targeted Group	50
: Summary & Reflection	51

[Defining the Research Site]

Selecting physical context	55
Exploring the chosen context	59
Selecting a specific research site	65
Analysing the chosen research site	66
: Summary & Reflection	71

3. DESIGN-LED RESEARCH

3.2 STEP BACK, OPENING UP POSSIBILITIES

Introduction

[Re-Defining the Site for Research]

Selecting physical context 74

Exploring the chosen context 78

Selecting site 82

Analysing the chosen sites 84

: Summary & Reflection 85

[Comparative Analysis]

Site-specific Analysis 96

: Findings + Outcomes 116

Typological Analysis 120

: Summary & Reflection 124

[Working with the Communities]

Types of community engagement 128

: Methods + Outcomes

: Summary & Reflection 138

3.3 FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

[Concept Design]

Design Process 144

Site (1) Carrara Park 146

: Outcomes and Reflection 160

Site (2) Workerbe Oasis 164

: Outcomes and Reflection 176

Site (3) Hanson Court Apartment 180

: Outcomes and Reflection 192

[Development Design]

Site (1) Carrara Park 198

Development process 200

Design Strategies 204

: Summary & Reflection 218

4. CONCLUSION

Critical Reflection 222

Closing discussion 225

5. THESIS REFERENCES

Figures 228

Bibliography 229

THESIS STRUCTURE

Fig 1.01 Thesis structure diagram

This thesis consists of:

1. **Introduction**
2. **Theoretical Framework**
3. **Three Design-Led Research chapters**
4. **Conclusion**

1. INTRODUCTION presents the research topics of ‘people’, ‘food’, and ‘space’ in urban multicultural contexts. Research opportunity, objectives and methodology are discussed to demonstrate the approach of redesigning foodscapes to promote social inclusion.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK explores the three topics:

- (1) Space and inclusiveness*
- (2) The sociability of food*
- (3) Participatory design process*

to develop the design criteria and methods for redesigning socially inclusive spaces.

The following three Design-led Research chapters show the process of developing the research in chronological order.

CHAPTER 3.1: TARGETING A SPECIFIC SITE AND GROUP shows the initial attempt to find the most suitable site and a specific cultural group for developing the research.

CHAPTER 3.2: STEP BACK, OPENING UP POSSIBILITIES illustrates the process of re-assessing the research site and investigating existing community gardens as the case studies. The social, cultural and physical setting are analysed by combining comparative analysis and community engagement.

CHAPTER 3.3: FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT explores a set of design strategies to propose changes in the physical environment of the three chosen sites. The aim is to increase the capacity of the spaces to facilitate social inclusion, based on the knowledge gained from the analysis

In **4. CONCLUSION**, the main findings and limitation of the research are discussed along with potential contribution to the different communities and the landscape architecture discipline.

1. INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Setting the scene for this research: Introducing the problems, proposition and methodology of the research, followed by a brief introduction to the site.

Fig 1.02 New Zealand changing from bicultural to a multicultural society

The links between people, food, and space highlight the importance of creating inclusive spaces that can promote a sustainable and inclusive approach to food.

In this research, I identified three inter-related problems of segregation in multicultural urban environments, which were discussed in the following pages.

RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES - PEOPLE

Example

BICULTURAL
(MAORI + PAKEHA)

MULTICULTURAL
(PACIFIC PEOPLES + ASIAN
+ EUROPEAN + ME/LA/A)

SOCIAL SEGREGATION
BETWEEN DIFFERENT
CULTURAL GROUPS

Fig 1.03 Diagram describing social segregation as a result of increasing cultural diversity

New Zealand is now changing from a bicultural to a multicultural society due to the increasing number of immigrants (Barker, 2012). A growing cultural diversity has increased the social consciousness towards re-cognising cultural differences.

RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES - FOOD

Fig 1.02 Diagram explaining the idea of food inequality

The social, cultural and economic environment we belong to conditions our choices and values around food. Therefore, food inequality in multicultural societies is often observed, where one's food culture is difficult to be maintained due to the changing environment.

RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES - SPACE

Fig 1.04 Diagram illustrating the need for creating spaces for all

Cultural values and preferences influence the way people perceive and react to the environment. Thus, the varying conditions of spaces can be inviting for some people, but not for others in diverse settings.

ROLE OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Fig 1.05 Community gardens as an initial hunch for enhancing the links between people, food and space

PROPOSITION - OPPORTUNITIES FOR DESIGN RESEARCH

Q. How can the role of landscape architecture facilitate community engagement in redesigning inclusive multicultural spaces?

This research focuses on urban multicultural areas of increasing residential density and social disconnection. Community gardens, as the typology of foodscapes, exhibit a spatial condition that can enhance the connections between people, food and space.

The aim of this research is to create socially inclusive spaces by investigating the different settings of community gardens with community engagement. The notion of socially inclusive spaces can be interpreted in multiple ways. In the scope of this research, it is understood as spaces where diverse people feel welcomed as both individuals and members of wider communities.

The overall ambition for this design research is to empower multicultural communities within urban environments whilst engaging them through the design process

This prompts the following question for the design-led research:

RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Using landscape architecture alongside the participatory design process, this research investigates and redesigns existing community urban foodscapes that respond to the diversity of social and cultural values in multicultural societies.

- *Develop design methodology and strategies for creating socially inclusive spaces within urban multicultural environment*
- *Design sustainable foodscapes that respond to the diversity of people's values*
- *Explore the designers' role in participatory design approach to promote community engagement.*

METHODOLOGY

Fig 1.07 Research Methodology diagram highlighting the role of community engagement in the design process

Community engagement is critical in revealing various people's interaction with the different setting of the space, which becomes the valuable information for designing inclusive foodscapes. On-going discussion with the communities can bridge the gap between a landscape architectural design approaches with the desires of the diverse community.

SITE OF FOCUS - NEWTOWN

1900s <.....> 2000s

Fig 1.08 Photos of Newtown from 1990s to today

The site of research is Newtown, an inner-city suburb of Wellington, New Zealand. Newtown is identified as the most suitable context for developing this research due to the following reasons:

- *Multicultural society*
- *Urban densification due to a strong population growth*
- *A limited availability of quality public spaces*

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

A chapter discussing the relevant literature and precedents from international and local backgrounds that frame the approach taken in this research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To expand my knowledge and tactics for creating inclusive foodscapes, I reviewed a collection of texts from multidisciplinary backgrounds alongside the literature in landscape architecture. Reviewing the three following themes were important in revealing a set of design principles for designing inclusive foodscapes:

- 1. Space and Inclusiveness*
- 2. The Sociability of Food*
- 3. Participatory design process*

Due to a small amount of empirical studies provided in the discovered literature. I studied international and local precedents to investigate how the important elements, discussed in each theme of literature, were implemented in practice. The precedent study developed the findings from literature review, and revealed various design strategies for facilitating social inclusion in space.

Fig 2.01 Literature review diagram illustrating the three themes and driving questions

1

Space + Inclusiveness

The literature on 'social inclusion' is extensive and the terms are often used interchangeably due to the broad concept. 'Social inclusion' is often defined as an opposite concept of 'social exclusion,' which refers to the marginalisation of specific groups based on socio-economic condition, gender or ethnicity (Le Boutillier & Croucher, 2010). In this respect, a socially inclusive society can best be described as; where individuals feel valued, their differences are respected, and their needs are fulfilled (Cappo, 2002). Thus, promoting a sense of inclusion in space is of greater importance for a multicultural society where diverse culture coexists. Different cultural groups respond to environments differently as they have diverse values and preferences shaped by their own cultures (Leikkila et al., 2013)

For a culturally diverse society, Inclusion becomes the keyword for urban planners and city leaders to create healthy and integrated communities (Open City Projects, 2018). In relation to landscape architecture, there has been a growing interest in creating community spaces for diversity (Sandercock, 2000; West & Badham, 2008). These include the advanced roles of space for stimulating social interaction (Steele, 1981; Waldenberger 2000), a sense of cultural identity and empowerment (Ghose & Pettygrove 2014), and promoting physical and psychological health for the community (European Agency, 2018), especially those who are socio-economically disadvantaged (Roe, 2016).

Many texts of literature acknowledge the extended role of space in terms of what it can offer society, but empirical studies on how to create or design is much lower (Putnam, 2007). Moreover, the existing community spaces designed with the purpose of bringing diverse people together tend to consider one dominant culture or attempt to integrate various cultures into one (Marne, 2001;

Lovelock, 2012). The risk of unifying different cultures is the needs and perspectives of minority groups can be neglected, while asking to adapt themselves to the new environment. Wood and Landry (2008) stated that the ideal form of integration should be a two-way process, where different cultures both maintain and adapt at the same time. This signifies that a sense of inclusion can be enhanced by allowing the coexistence of diverse cultures, instead of fully assimilating themselves with one another.

"Diversity is being asked to the party. Inclusion is being asked to dance" (Sherbin and Rashid HBR Feb 2017)

Several researchers express concerns about overcoming the passivity that may occur between those who are not familiarised with each other in designed spaces (Jay & Schraml, 2009; Peters et al., 2010). However, Putnam (2007) suggested that the provision of activities that diverse people can contact and participate will lessen the hesitancy or indifference occurred between a wide variety of people.

Applications into design research

Learning from the current body of knowledge around how 'space and inclusiveness' it is applied into this design research through:

- *The investigation of different spatial qualities and interactions, which will disclose the important design considerations for enhancing social inclusion.*
- *The exploration of the medium to increase the chance of interaction once people are attracted to the designed spaces.*

THE PROCESS OF BUILDING RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE

WHAT CAN BE REVIEWED IN PRECEDENT STUDY

Fig 2.02 Applicable knowledge identified from Space and Inclusiveness literature review

PRECEDENT STUDY - INTERNATIONAL

Expression of cultural diversity through designing an urban park

Los Angeles, USA

*Adaptability
of space*

*Plant
species*

*Accessible
Location*

*Use of
Colour*

Fig 2.03 Image showing the Performance Lawn and Community Terrace within Grand Park (Rios Clementi Hale Studios)

Grand Park by Rios Clementi Hale Studios

- A community gathering space to **represent the multicultural society** of Los Angeles

1. **Adaptable open space** allows the diverse activities and give people control of space

2. Gardens with **plants from different origins** for a sense of belonging

3. **Accessible** location; Located in the heart of downtown near many iconic buildings.

4. Bright **colour** use for a welcoming and vibrant environment

Potential Improvement?

- The overall **layout** of the park inspired by the world map to represent the diversity

; Only recognisable from the aerial image or view. It could have expressed the diversity in planting around the world as a noticeable feature.

PRECEDENT STUDY - LOCAL

Aim to shape a community space to bring diverse people and plants together

Wellington

**Edible/
Medicinal
Plants**

**Child-
friendly**

Multifunction

**Natural
Material**

The Discovery Garden by Isthmus Group

- A range of **edible and medicinal plants** (e.g., kumara, artichoke, and olives) to attract Wellington's diverse communities

1. A sequence of **playful and learning** spaces: child-friendly, an attraction for both individual and family users

2. Pavilion + **Multifunction** space that allows the different events in the Park: Adaptability, Usability of space

3. The use of wood for structures and furniture for an **inviting** and **natural looking** environment

Potential Improvement?

: Diverse ways of interacting with plants – of edible plants for cooking or cultivation purposes to increase the interactions

Fig 2.04 Images showing the overall section and medicinal plants of the Discovery Garden (Isthmus Group)

Food, an essential part of our lives, means more than just eating. Socio-economic, cultural and technological changes in the past century have brought about enormous differences in our relationship with and perceptions of food (Roe et al., 2016). Due to the evolving characteristics of food culture, different cultural groups have their own meanings of food, from means of survival, making money, to the way of connecting with other people (SaldivarTanaka & Krasny, 2004; De La Salle & Holland, 2010). This highlights the importance of understanding the relationship between food and diverse people which will inform the tactics of utilising food in space, as a medium to bring people together.

In comparison to the massive amounts of research on food in many disciplines (Levi-Strauss, 2013; Tagtow, 2016; Warde, Obesity Action Coalition, 2009; Woodham, 2011), the literature in relation to landscape is minimal. However, the idea of foodscape shows the growing interest in studying the relationship between people, food and landscapes (Roe et al., 2016). Foodscape is understood as any place where people gain their meanings from food through the growing, cooking, eating or sharing of food such as the local supermarket, restaurants and community gardens (MacKendrick). Due to its ability to reveal the variety of people's values and preferences around food, the study of local foodscapes can will be undertaken as an effective process to develop the design criteria.

Linking social and cultural components with environmental and economic dimensions becomes the goal of many disciplines. Community gardens show the potential to strengthen social ties and environmental qualities (Egoz & De Nardi, 2017). The current work of literature acknowledges the multiple benefits of community gardens to create more sustainable and inclusive urban environments in urban

multicultural societies. These include the implication of community gardens as a place of meeting, learning and accessing high-quality food resources (Gerodetti & Foster, 2016; Roe et al., 2016), an opportunity to contact with nature and landscape while promoting community health and participation (Hancock, 2001; Agustina & Beilin, 2011). As community gardens are active spaces where people can express themselves for working and socialising, what gardens can offer is clearly distinguished from other community spaces that are often perceived as more passive space (Francis, 1987).

In the context of New Zealand, food gardening is not a new idea or tradition, since it was a significant survival skill for both Maori, the indigenous Polynesian people of New Zealand, and early European settlers in colonial history (Earle, 2011). However, it is a relatively recent phenomenon and trend as compared with the body of international research on community gardens. In this respect, Earle (2011) provides different insights into the creation of community gardens, concerning the challenges in establishing and managing gardening spaces. The scales and forms of gardens vary in urban areas for different reasons (Viljoen and Wiskerke, 2012), but the common challenges are identified to be limited resources (e.g., time, budget, labour and site), long-term management and the risk of failure in attracting various users (Egoz & De Nardi, 2017; Watson; 2006).

Applications into design research

Learning from the current body of knowledge around how 'sociability of food' it is applied into this design research through:

- *The analysis of local foodscapes to reveal essential design principle to shape socially inclusive environments.*
- *The exploration of the appropriate planning and design method to ensure the design outcomes respond to different values and needs of the community.*

THE PROCESS OF BUILDING RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE

DRIVING QUESTIONS FOR PRECEDENT STUDY

Fig 2.05 Applicable knowledge identified from the Sociability of Food literature review

San Francisco, USA

**Adaptable
structure**

Simplicity

**Low
Maintenance**

PRECEDENT STUDY - INTERNATIONAL

Aim to bring people and their cultures together with food-related furniture

Mobile Ethnic Garden by Atelier Cho Thompson

- Edible garden as a way of **learning** and **expressing** one's culture, **attracting** diverse communities, and **interacting** with others.

1. Located in the Harvard Graduate School of Design – **transforming a yard into a place** for the university, neighbours, and children to gather and interact

2. Raised garden beds with seating and storage – allows both **visual and physical interaction with the structure**

HOW

3. Movability – easily **applicable** and expandable in other places and conditions.

4. Weathered timber
- **low maintenance and cheap**

5. **Simple** structure – increase the **feasibility** and reduce the timeframe to build the design

Potential Improvement?

: A capacity to accommodate larger groups of people and individual, or larger capacity for bigger crops.

Fig 2.06 Images of the Mobile Ethnic Garden.
Top: (Atelier Cho Thompson) Bottom: (Christina Cho)

*Working within
the community's
realm*

*Revitalisation
of disused spaces*

*Minimal
materials*

PRECEDENT STUDY - LOCAL

Free meal event organised by local collectives for integrated communities

Everybodies Table by local Collectives

- The concept of “Every Bodies” means for everybody, total inclusiveness. The purpose of the events is to **activate functions or activities for the community** through food, especially for **those in need and isolated** from society.

- **Diverse range attendees** in terms of culture, socio-economic and health conditions.

- Remarkable **changes in the society**
: *begging and aggressive behaviour on the streets reduced*
: *barriers between the community broke down*
: *community members started to support those in need*

- Organised by the cooperation of **Local collectives**. Assets are always shared for community events
- Held at the disused service station
: **Revitalisation of space**

- Simple use of trestle tables and chairs from the local facilities : **quick and readily-available resources**

Potential Improvement?

: *Organising regular events to allow more people to come and strengthen the relationship between those who attend to create semi-permanent features*

Fig 2.07 Photos of Everybodies Table in Newtown

The practice of encouraging participation of users or stakeholders is increasingly common in various development projects (Halskov & Hansen, 2015), including urban planning and landscape architecture (Toker, 2007). The definition of participation varies from the implicit goals of 'involving users' to more elaborate ideas of 'participation as the primary aspect of participatory design' (Lundmark, 2017). Most urban spaces are designed and planned by the landscape architect and urban planners, but not always accompanied by community participation. The typical result of this is the underutilised and incompatible spaces for the communities. (Ismail, 2015) Thus, it is critical to involve community participation in the process of designing socially inclusive spaces, to ensure the long-term use of environments are favoured by the variety of users.

Traditional landscape approach of analysing cultural values tends to focus on what is valuable for discipline-specific typologies, which therefore may not fully reveal the richness of values experienced by insiders (Stephenson, 2008). Thus, the importance of embracing public opinions on their living environment is gaining more attention to ensure successful outcomes of designed spaces (Ismail, 2015; Ministry of the Environment, 2002). The social and political benefits of carrying out participatory design are recognised in many pieces of research (Nettle, 2014; Hou, 2018). However, it is still questionable how effective participatory design is carried out in actual practice. Several projects appear to use the title of the participatory project but are not deeply involved with the community until after the research or design is proposed (Open City Projects, 2018). The active engagement of participants is closely linked to the successful creation of spaces that facilitate social inclusion.

Toker (2007) provides insights into the different roles of professionals in community design and discusses the 'facilitator' as an approach to ensure that designed spaces respond to various people's desires.

Facilitation as "a means of bringing people together to determine what they wish to do and helping them find ways to work together in deciding how to do it (Sanoff, 2000: 38)"

Sanoff's (2000) definition of facilitation expands the appropriateness of advocating 'facilitator' as the ideal role of designers because it gives people the active role from the early stage of design to the decision-making process.

On the other hand, there is a concern over the possibility of satisfying everyone's needs and therefore claims that the participatory process should only be considered as a tool to grasp the possible influence of design on users (Memluk, 2013). However, the real benefits of following participatory design appear to lie not only in the outcomes but also in its processes. Lundmark (2017) emphasizes the participants' experience in the participatory design process, beyond considering it as a design method or technique. Since participatory design invites diverse people to share their ideas, it provides an opportunity to interact with the wider community. The sense of empowerment and responsibility for space also increases when people see their views considered in shaping their environment. Thus, it can be said that the participatory design process contributes to the formation of inclusive spaces and integrated communities, which is useful in designing community gardens (Mees, 2017).

Community gardens created through a participatory design process appear to best reflect the diversity of people's cultural values in space. By establishing personal relationships between both other community members in creating a shared goal for improving local spaces.

Applications into design research

Learning from the current body of knowledge around how the 'Participatory design process' it is applied into this design research through:

- *The attempt to carry out project as the role of facilitator to increase the level of community engagement from the early stage to the end of design.*
- *An on-going discussion with communities to lead the design to develop in consideration of their aesthetic and functional preferences.*

THE PROCESS OF BUILDING RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE

DRIVING QUESTIONS FOR PRECEDENT STUDY

Changes observed at the start and end of participatory design process

Strategies used to promote community engagement

Benefits at a personal level

Fig 2.08 Applicable knowledge identified from the Participatory Design Process literature review

London, England

On-going
conversation

Attracting
children

Fixed
users

PRECEDENT STUDY - INTERNATIONAL

The process of transforming remnant spaces into community gardens

Edible states, by local communities and organisations

- People used to be **skeptical** about establishing a garden on a highly exposed lawn, but the garden is now favoured by a **wide range of users** such as children from surrounding schools and social housing residents.

- An on-going conversation slowly builds **the trust and interest** from people about transforming their spaces into gardens

- **Children** were core supporters while new people come and go: Helpful in making a **lively and friendly environment** while also **maintaining space** as they hang out

- Enjoy the opportunities to cultivate **edible plants** and **interact** with other residents who they have never talked to before.

Potential Improvement?

: Regular events or activities to bring discussion and people together on a reoccurring basis for long-lasting use of the space.

Fig 2.09 The context and various users of Edible Estates community garden (Greenlab)

APPLICATION OF FINDINGS INTO THE RESEARCH METHOD

Combining the literature and corresponding precedent study was a useful tool to build both theoretical and practical knowledge on the topic of 'people, food and space'. To find the links between the three topics, I began by investigating the overlaps between each of the three topics. The three overlaps were implemented in the research as a method for redesigning inclusive foodscapes.

Fig 2.10 Application of findings from the literature review to the establishment of the research method

Methods

(a) The social, cultural and physical dimensions of the existing community gardens analysed as case studies to reveal both site-specific and typological knowledge through: regular site visits, desk research and engagement with the communities.

(b) An on-going involvement with the communities as a means of gathering knowledge and sharing design ideas. This stage involves the Community Design Workshop, meetings with the local council and gardening groups as part of the participatory design process. The gained knowledge is spatialised into physical elements for design testing.

The design testing and development based on community feedback

(c) Design testing and development based on the criteria established by synthesising the findings from (a) and (b). This stage focuses on creating and iterating design strategies for the community gardens to facilitate the level of social inclusion.

3.1

TARGETING A SPECIFIC GROUP + SITE

[BACKGROUND]

Fig 3.1.1 Image of Riddiford Street, Newtown

INTRODUCTION

3.1 TARGETING A SPECIFIC SITE AND GROUP describes and reflects upon the initial stage of the research (first three months), which was the beginning of creating the methodology, note it is different from the final thesis outcome, but was used to evolve the research methodology.

The sub-chapter [BACKGROUND] shows the initial attempt to find a specific cultural group, that seemed excluded, for developing the research. As a starting point for building a community relationship for testing the participatory design technique with later on.

As one of the immigrants in New Zealand, I have a personal interest in the globalised migration process and how people from diverse cultures adapt themselves in a host country. This spontaneously led me to pay attention to social segregation between locals and immigrants. Social segregation is closely linked to the unequal distribution of healthy food, which results in lower quality health. This is identified to be a more significant problem for those who were socio-economically disadvantaged, and they were immigrants in many cases. (Earle, 2011)

INITIAL IDEAS ON RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

Figure.3.1.2 Research opportunities diagram showing 'social segregation,' and 'food insecurity' as the initial focus of research

"the places and spaces where you acquire food, prepare food, talk about food, or generally gather some sort of meaning from food"
(MacKendrick, 2014)

DISCIPLINARY IDEAS

What has been said, explored or yet to be explored?

Figure.3.1.3 Important aspects of foodscapes identified from food literature

An initial of literature and precedents review focused around food and its particular benefits for immigrants. A set of design principles derived from the literature and precedent studies were developed, driving the process. These beginning ideas were accessibility, multifunction, inclusiveness, and sustainability.

We connect to our cultural groups through
similar food patterns
= Cultural Identity

We are
immigrants!

*The Community Unity Project
Aotearoa, Lower Hutt.*

Sister project

*Figure 3.1.4 Image of the Community Unity project
including Urban Kai and Unity Kitchen*

- A Charity + **locally** owned enterprises
- Engaged with **School project**
- **Left over space** on a soccer field
- **Aim** to provide **2500 meals** for **local children**

This stage was strongly focused on the idea of promoting social and physical health for immigrants, the initial hunch was to explore the potential of foodscapes as a technique to achieve this.

FINDING A TARGETED GROUP

Why Pacific Peoples?

3rd Wave

"New Zealand has always had close links with its Pacific migrants"

Migration from the Pacific Islands encouraged by the Government due to **rising demand** for **unskilled labour** in NZ

In order to find a specific cultural group who would be benefited from the creation of a socially inclusive space, New Zealand history of migration was explored. Pacific Peoples were identified to be the most suitable group due to their historical connection to New Zealand, economic hardships, and close physical and spiritual relationship to food (Barnett, 2007).

Figure. 3.1.5 Characteristic of Pacific Peoples

Summary and Reflection

Increasing cultural diversity is a growing trend in our society. A change always accompanies both positives and negatives. Multicultural society involves a range of benefits in the social and economic sectors. However, a growing number of immigrants increases people's concerns and conflicts toward recognising cultural differences. This can further bring about food insecurity due to the imbalance between the availability of food and the increasing demand for people.

The four criteria were identified as an essential aspect of a socially inclusive space:

(1) Accessibility, (2) Inclusiveness, (3) Multifunction and (4) Sustainability.

The use of the four criteria in the design foodscapes for the Pacific community was identified as a strategy to create inclusivity, as it was identified that their close connection to food, lower-income and health quality in comparison to other ethnic groups in New Zealand was in need of intervention.

Moving Forward

The findings from this chapter highlighted the need for selecting a site that was appropriate for the targeted community, meeting the outlined criteria in an existing community space.

3.1

TARGETING A SPECIFIC GROUP + SITE

*[DEFINING THE
RESEARCH SITE]*

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is under 3.1 TARGETING SPECIFIC GROUP AND SITE chapter, where I was looking for a specific cultural group and a research site

Continuing from the [BACKGROUND] sub-chapter, [DEFINING THE RESEARCH SITE] shows the process of finding appropriate research sites for the Pacifica community.

The aim was to develop an understanding of the spatial conditions that prohibited social inclusion in existing community foodscapes. This was approached by the remote studies into demographics at multiple scales, followed by the analysis of available social facilities. Through regular site visits and community engagement, a potential research site was selected to discover their use and accessibility for Pacific people in relation to the local community.

SELECTING PHYSICAL CONTEXT

National to Regional Scale

Figure. 3.1.6 Demographic mapping showing the selection of Wellington City as the appropriate research context due to the high levels of multicultural communities in urban areas

“98% of Pacific people in New Zealand living in urban areas...”

(NZ Institute of Economic Research, 2003)

SOCIAL FACILITIES IN WELLINGTON CITY

City Scale

★ Vegetable market	• Public toilet
○ Recreation centre	● City library
Community garden	● Playground
● In use	● Swimming pool
● Not in use	○ Community hall
□ Sports ground	△ Supermarket
	■ School

Figure. 3.1.7 Wellington City scale analysis to compare the availability of social facilities in each suburb 1:50,000

COMPARISON AMONG DIFFERENT SUBURBS

Suburban Scale

**OUTDOOR
SOCIAL FACILITIES**

Fig. 3.1.8 Comparative diagram showing the rationale for shortlisting Berhampore, Kilbirnie, and Newtown due to the lack of outdoor social facilities compared with a high Pacific Peoples population density

SHORTLISTED WELLINGTON SUBURBS FOR A RESEARCH SITE

Figure. 3.1.9 Comparison diagram of Berhampore, Newtown, and Kilbirnie

Selection of Newtown as an area of focus due to the high social deprivation index, lack of outdoor social facilities, and the largest Pacific population density (Wellington City Council, 2018).

EXPLORING THE CHOSEN CONTEXT

How does design criteria inform the site analysis method?

Figure. 3.1.10 The main analysis method for exploring Newtown

Typological analysis of existing social and food facilities was conducted to explore the relationship between the current physical conditions of the spaces and the way people use, interact and experience the site. Consultation with local residents and collectives provided an insider's perspectives on their spaces including the both positives and negatives.

B. CARRARA PARK

Figure. 3.1.11 Carrara Park typological analysis

Figure. 3.1.12 The relationship between spatial elements and user behaviour

The drawing is one example of typology analysis conducted in this chapter.

Each site was regularly visited to observe the spatial interactions of people. The analysis followed four criteria; (1) Accessibility, (2) Inclusiveness, (3) Multifunction and (4) Sustainability was a useful tool to remind what needed to be examined in the site and helped me categorise the information gathered from the analysis process.

The data collected from the social and food typological analysis was narrowed down to five findings (figure). The findings proved that physical elements have the ability to change people's perception or behaviour. This supported the idea of creating inclusive spaces favoured by people from different cultural backgrounds through the exploration of different spatial intervention.

However, the analysis appeared to be too vague or general as it did not decouple the cultural identities of people observed and also the differences in behaviour in relation to cultural background. Moreover, the data collected from site observation was limited and involved a simplification because it was not conducted over the span of a whole day.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT - RESIDENTS + LOCAL COUNCIL

Figure. 3.1.13 Findings from engagement with the local council and communities

Socialising patterns and values of Newtown residents identified from the conversation with the residents and the local council including surveys published online. I discovered through the consultation of councils documents that Pacifica people were identified to be excluded from the Newtown Society, the intention was to encourage them to be more involved and connected to the wider community.

To gain further insights into the current lifestyle of Pacific Peoples and the wider Newtown community, more direct engagement with the local council and residents was attempted.

A major discovery showed the need for outdoor community spaces that promoted community integration. Also identified, Pacifica communities was an excluded group from society.

Engagement with local community assured that Newtown was the most suitable site for proceeding the investigation in response to the research question.

DIFFERENT LEVEL OF ACCESSIBILITY TO SOCIAL & FOOD SPACES

“ BOTH **SOCIAL** AND FOOD FACILITIES ARE **LESS** ”
ACCESSIBLE TO PACIFIC PEOPLES

“ BOTH **SOCIAL** AND FOOD FACILITIES ARE **MORE** ”
ACCESSIBLE TO EUROPEAN NEW ZEALANDER

Fig 3.1.14 Comparison diagram showing the different level of accessibility to social and food facilities from the local and Pacifica people's household

RATIONALE FOR CHOOSING CARRARA PARK AS A RESEARCH SITE

Low level of accessibility to social and food facilities for Pacifica people informed the need for finding a site that was in close proximity to households or locations where they spend most of their time. Carrara Park was chosen as a specific study site because it had the potential to attract Pacifica people and a diverse population due to the following reasons:

- Proximity to the main road which was highly populated most of the time
- Close to where majority of Pacifica people' live or hang out; Private homes, social housing, and Pacific churches
- Neighbourhood park surrounded by houses + Nearby community building and schools

Fig. 3.1.15 Diagram expressing that Carrara Park was the most appropriate site that could add the needed food accessibility to the pacific community.

Fig 3.1.16 The context of Carrara Park within Newtown and its proximity to the community facilities and Pacific Peoples household 1:20,000

CARRARA PARK AS A CASE STUDY

What is observed and known about Carrara Park?

Fig 3.1.17 Carrara Park Site Plan 1:1,500

Fig 3.1.18 Diagrams showing the past and present use of Carrara Park

Carrara Park is a neighbourhood green open space which is one of the most frequently visited parks in Newtown. The surrounding houses have private access to the park through their backyards; the space feels relatively safe, but feels private at the same time.

The Park used to be offer community gardening with raised garden beds, which was established and managed by the local community groups and council in 2013. The local gardening groups and nearby residents worked in the garden regularly, but it has not been in active use for over a year for no identified reason. The research at this stage had the ambition of revitalising the gardening activities of the Park bring people together and support healthier food habits.

OPPORTUNITIES TO INCREASE THE LEVEL OF INCLUSION

How do existing conditions affect people's behaviour?

1. Entrance - Not attracting people - *Walk pass*

2. Flat grass - Openness + Private Fence - *Spread out/ Uneasy*

3. Play area - Children with their parents - *Populated*

4. Main path - Clarity and Materiality - *Shortcut*

Fig 3.1.19 Existing spatial conditions of Carrara Park and further implication on users

Fig 3.1.20 Carrara Park keymap

The current use of Carrara Park is predominately a short cut from, or to the main road. Only the space around the children's playground is highly occupied. The main question raised here is, what spatial qualities influence the partial and short-term use of the park. The site conditions are identified as the following:

1. Carrara Park was not visible from the busy road, and the long entranceway was not attractive to captivate people's eyes or attention. If people did not know about the park, they would be unlikely to visit the Park.
2. The largeness of the open lawn area led people to spread out, rather than gathering together. Individual users tended to occupy spaces around the edges of the park or near the tall trees. However, the surrounding fence appeared to make people feel uncomfortable by making them think that they were in someone's private backyard
3. The children's playground was one of the most inclusive aspects of the park, which attracted diversity of users in terms of age groups, gender, and ethnicity. Parents started to have conversations while watching their children mingle together.
4. The main path materiality asphalt clearly differentiated it as a surface to continue to travel across, due to its cold and hard qualities. Unlike the lawn's softness which affords linger, relax or even play.

Analysing Carrara Park in specific parts was helpful for visualising and identifying relationships between people's behaviour and spatial qualities from a user perspective. This further led to the formulation of design aspirations (fig 3.1.21) for facilitating social inclusiveness of Carrara Park that followed the four design criteria outlined before: Accessibility, Multifunction, Inclusiveness and sustainability.

DESIGN ASPIRATIONS FOR CARRARA PARK

Fig 3.1.21 Design aspirations of Carrara Park

Summary and Reflection

Newtown is culturally diverse and has a range of social and food spaces. However, it is questionable if the spaces provide a sense of social inclusion for the diverse population, especially for Pacifica people. The typological analysis identified that spatial qualities influence the way people perceive and use the space. This reveals the potential of experimenting with different spatial intervention to facilitate social inclusiveness. Analysing the physical elements that discourage the cultural interaction was an initial part of the designing process, to discover what small changes could be established to change people's interaction with the existing space. However, I realised upon reflection after this block of work was completed, that having a targeted group could be a contradiction to my idea of creating inclusive spaces. Since the integration should be a two-way process. This means that the locals (dominant group in society) and immigrants (minority) learn from each other by maintaining and adapting their culture at the same time, rather than asking the minority to alter their way of life to be part of a wider community.

Moving Forward

Since Pacifica people would no longer be a focus group, the need for re-assessing the investigation method of Newtown was highlighted. Additionally, a clarification if Newtown was the most suitable site for developing this design-led research was required. Through the evolution of the methodology developed in this stage, to become suitable for designing for all-inclusiveness.

3.2

STEP BACK, OPENING UP POSSIBILITIES

060518
Brown - church
yellow - social housing
pink - fast food
(coloured)
(outline) - fruit market
(dairy-like)
Cafe.

the main st highly populated
commercial
(fast food stores)
community garden
away from
the main st
riddiford

People
concentrated
around cafe
&
bus stop

spine shape

Big supermarket
easy access.

flow?
work?
day/weekend/night

[RE-DEFINING THE RESEARCH SITE]

main road...
that I can implement design
unless it's indoor...
then where else ???

don't
necessarily think
feel the need
to grow their own
vege...

how do you
shorten the "journey?"
- Grenada
North
Cold stone
- Wholesale
Limited...
deliver \$\$
not sustainable
downtown

Martin
Hanley
Hanson St

Carrara
meeting

urban
oasis

NT park lift

INTRODUCTION

This chapter shows the second of the three stages of research, where I attempted to be open to more options and gain as much understanding as possible about the existing community gardens through the developed analysis tool.

The three sub-chapters exhibit the process of:

- *re-assessing the appropriateness of the research sites*
- *developing the analysis tool for revealing physical and social conditions of community gardens*
- *reflecting upon the series of community engagements developed throughout the whole process of this research.*

In this first sub-chapter, I began by examining if Newtown was still the most suitable site for developing this research since I was no longer looking at Pacifica communities as the focus of this research. The context of Newtown and existing community gardens were analysed under the three broad themes: people, space and food. Having these criteria revealed more detailed and valuable information from the site for the purpose of creating inclusive foodscapes.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF WELLINGTON SUBURBS

Which suburb has multicultural society + need for outdoor social spaces?

Fig 3.2.1 Selection of Newtown as a physical context for further research due to the lack of social facilities and multicultural society compared with other suburbs in Wellington City

Re-investigation of Wellington suburbs indicated that Newtown was still the most appropriate context for developing this research due to their high multicultural society and the need for outdoor social space that can invite a wide range of users.

Population of other ethnic groups were added to the parameter for selecting the research site, since the research aim from this stage attempted to focus on creating spaces for diverse users, instead of focusing on one specific cultural group

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING PHYSICAL CONTEXT

From New Zealand to Newtown

Fig 3.2.2 Site selection process at multiple scales

To determine the most suitable site for developing the research, multi-scale analysis was conducted with different parameters:

- Multicultural society (demographics of different ethnic groups)
- Lack of social space (Existing outdoor social facilities)
- Urban densification (Increased net migration)

The reason for having these parameters was to gain information on the current trend of socialisation in urban multicultural environments, which was essential knowledge for creating inclusive spaces

NEWTOWN CONTEXT - PEOPLE

*Household for each ethnic group is presented by the same colour in Newtown Context Plan (Fig. 3.2.3)

Fig 3.2.4 Newtown demographics and values for residents

Fig 3.2.3 Newtown Context Plan 1:10,000

Although most immigrants tend to settle in highly urbanised areas, Newtown was still more culturally diverse than Wellington City. However, there seemed to be a spatial division between the residential sector by different cultural groups. Café, restaurants, takeaway shops and supermarkets on the main road were highly populated most of the time, while outdoor social spaces such as parks and community gardens were less of their destination. This was a contrast to how Newtown residents identify natural environment, people, food and culture as the essential features to make a special space.

This signifies that the redevelopment of existing community gardens which is an aggregate of 'people, space and food,' have the potential to attract a wide variety of users and form integrated communities.

NEWTOWN CONTEXT - FOOD+SPACE

Appreciation of the spaces

Carrara Park

- Public

Workerbe Oasis

- Semi-public

*South Wellington
Intermediate School*

- Semi-public

Hanson Court Apartments

- Communal

Newtown Park Apartments

- Communal

Te Ara Hou Apartments

- Communal

Fig 3.2.6 The four chosen community gardens as the case studies

In total, six existing community gardens were visited and experienced to choose the specific sites, used as the case studies to develop this research. All of the six existing community gardens were council-owned land, but some space felt more public than the others. Thus, the visited gardens were firstly categorised by the perception of space; from public, semi-public to communal.

Public: *Carrara Park*

Semi-Public: *Workerbe Oasis*
South Wellington Intermediate School

Communal : *Newtown Park Apartment*
Hanson Court Apartment, Te Ara Hou Apartment

THE FOUR CHOSEN COMMUNITY GARDENS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

The four chosen community gardens among the visited sites was used to study how different physical and social settings of those spaces influenced the way diverse people interact with the spaces and other people.

One community garden from each of the 'public' and 'semi-public' gardens were selected, while the two garden sites were chosen from 'communal' category. The reason was to investigate if there were notable differences between community gardens in social housing contexts.

Fig 3.2.7 Newtown Plan with the selected four community gardens 1:10,000

① Carrara Park

Entire site
4140m²

- Neighbourhood Park with edible garden beds surrounded by houses
- Anyone can work and harvest the edible plants

② Workerbe Oasis

500m²

- Productive ground beds near the hospital.
- Volunteers are only allowed to work in the garden under the farm manager's instruction

③

Hanson Court Apartments

230m²

- Communal gardens at social housing owned by the local council.
- Gardeners are assigned a plot to work in the garden after their application is approved by the council

④ Newtown Park Apartment

108m² +50m²

- Communal gardens at social housing owned by the local council.
- Gardeners are assigned a plot to work in the garden after their application is approved by the council

Fig 3.2.8 Introduction to the four existing community garden sites

	SPACE		PEOPLE	
	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Demographic</i>	<i>Internal Organisation</i>
① Carrara Park	<p><i>Neighbourhood park child-friendly</i></p>	<p><i>Improve neighbourhood green space with edible garden</i></p>	<p><i>Local community</i></p>	<p><i>Horizontal. Open. Volunteering. Local groups. Coordinator.</i></p>
② Workerbe Oasis	<p><i>Semi-public. Unsure if allowed to enter the site</i></p>	<p><i>Production(\$) +Functionality</i></p>	<p><i>Local community + European</i></p>	<p><i>Vertical. Specialised. Volunteering. Partnership with local business</i></p>
③ Hanson Court Apartment	<p><i>Located behind the communal building - Feels private</i></p>	<p><i>Production (for self-consumption) + Cultural background</i></p>	<p><i>Various cultural groups (e.g. Chinese)</i></p>	<p><i>Individual. Local government. Residents. Coordinator</i></p>
④ Newtown Park Apartment	<p><i>Innermost garden -Feels private</i></p>	<p><i>Production (for self-consumption) + Cultural background</i></p>	<p><i>Various cultural groups (e.g. Chinese)</i></p>	<p><i>Individual. Local government. Residents. Coordinator</i></p>

	FOOD	
	<i>Crop types</i>	<i>Perception</i>
	<p><i>Availability</i></p>	<p><i>Gardening as a secondary function</i></p>
	<p><i>Low input High yield crops</i></p>	<p><i>Gardening as a primary function</i></p>
	<p><i>Staple or 'Home' food</i></p>	<p><i>Gardening as an exclusive space</i></p>
	<p><i>Staple or 'Home' food</i></p>	<p><i>Gardening as an exclusive space</i></p>

The four community gardens in Newtown were located on public land owned by Wellington City Council and were confined to small, complex and progressively denser urban areas. They offered different approaches to community gardening which revealed valuable knowledge for observing current trends of socialisation in the context of urban multicultural societies.

I found that a more specific analysis of the four selected community gardens was necessary at this stage to gather valuable information for revealing specific design considerations.

Fig 3.2.9 Table showing the analysis of the four community gardens under the three broad themes: space, people and food

3.2

STEP BACK, OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES

060518
Brown - church
yellow - social housing
pink - (coloured)
(outline) - fruit market (dairy-like)
Cafe.

People concentrated around cafe & bus stop

flow?
work?
day/weekend?

spine shape

the main st highly populated
commercial (fast food stores)
community garden
away from the main st
riddiford

Big supermarket
easy access.

People don't necessarily think or feel the need to grow their own vege...

main st doesn't have a space that is open unless then where else ???

A. Site Specific Knowledge

B. Typological Knowledge

how do you shorten the journey?
- Grenada North Cold stone
- Wholesale Limited...
deliver & \$
not sustainable
downtown

Martin Hanley Hanson St

Carrara meeting

urban Oasis

NT park lift

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is under **3.2 STEP BACK, OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES** chapter, where I was open to more options and aiming to gain as much understanding as possible about the existing community gardens

[Comparative Analysis] aimed to develop a design-led research method. Each community garden was analysed and categorised by detailed categories under three broad themes: people, space and food. This multidirectional setting of the analysis was established for extracting from the case studies both specific and typological knowledge.

SUBDIVISION OF SPACE/PEOPLE/FOOD CATEGORIES

People, Space, and Food were subdivided into detailed categories, to develop a design-led research method for deeply understanding the diverse aspects of community gardens in different contexts. Sub-division of categories allowed the focus on a single aspect at a time, which resulted in more detailed analysis and applicable findings.

Fig 3.2.10 Image showing the process of developing and sub-dividing categories under the three broad themes: Space / People / Food

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS METHOD

This multidirectional setting of the analysis was established for extracting :

Fig 3.2.11 Comparative Analysis method diagram

SPACE

Location L - linkage with public facilities

Near schools, churches and social housing

Location M - Accessibility

Surrounded by neighbouring house.
Not highly visible from the road

Location S - Visibility (inside) - Exposure (outside)

Seating Along the short-cut path

Microclimate condition

The site itself gets full sunlight, but trees loose leaves too late and make the ground damp and boggy. Varies depending on where dry, damp and sunny.

Vegetation

- Privacy for residents
- Shade-loving plant (silverbeet, spinach, lettuce are good)
- Perennial plant (mediterranean herbs, oregano, sage, rosemary)
- Deciduous tree (current trees lose leaves too late - shaded/boggy)
- deciduous tree
- Dense vegetation
Tall trees

Workerbe Oasis

Near hospital and the edge of Mt Victoria

Close from the main road, but situated on lower ground so not highly visible. Tend to be cautious near the entrance due to the cars coming from the Southern Hospital road

On a flat grass field

The grassfield gets full sunlight + a few trees planted sparsely. Dense vegetation on the adjacent hill

- Small to medium sized trees
Tall trees on townbelt = dominant feature
Sparsely planted trees - Loose leaves too late

Hanson Court Apartment

Near the supermarket and cafes

Close to busy roads, but situated on higher ground. Pedestrian using this path will be mostly housing residents

At the back of community building

Partially shaded by the adjacent hill, but mostly gets full sunlight. Surrounded by vegetation. Relatively sheltered

- Dense vegetation (multi layers)

Newtown Park Apartment

Near the school and Zoo

Situated at the far southern end. Less busy. Accessible for residents and feels uncomfortable for pedestrian to enter

One next to the play area, another

Full sunlight all day + strong wind

Shady most of the day + Sheltered due to the slope

- Dense vegetation (multi layers)

- looks unmanaged

FOOD

PEOPLE

Project type/goal	Production -structure	- compost	- crop types	- product use	- harvesting	- maintenanc	- working unit	- main users	- events
<p>Establish edible gardens and improve neighbourhood green spaces</p>	<p>3 raised garden beds</p>	<p>1 Crate compost bin</p>		<p>For immediate consumption</p>	<p>Local gardening group / residents</p>	<p>Local residents</p>	<p>Active + Passive : Christmas song, barbecue, music band, kindergarten class Local People (NZ European) Varies</p>
<p>Permaculture based. Provide nutrient dense production and organic food. Eliminate waste and gain more spaces to grow food. Reconnect people to green spaces</p>	<p>500 m2 garden beds</p>	<p>6 Crate compost bin</p>	<p>10-20 High Yield Low Input Vegetables</p>	<p>For sale to local restaurants + Donate to food bank</p>	<p>1 Farm manager Volunteers</p>	<p>1 Farm manager Volunteers</p>	<p>Aim to have 3-4 events a year around different seasonal shifts. Many visitors from the Hospital Local People (NZ European) 20-35 people</p>
<p>Encourage gardeners to work together and share their skills to grow vegetables and build community spirit</p>	<p>100 m2 - raised garden beds + tyre / polystyrene garden</p>	<p>1 Compost tumbler</p>		<p>For immediate consumption + Share with other residents in the community meeting</p>	<p>Local residents</p>	<p>1 Community garden coordinator Absolutely Positively Wellington City Council Mr Mike Ki Pender</p>	<p>Birthday Party, Vegetarian dishes, drama class, Cap chat, Christmas events, dumplings, drums Asian people (Chinese) 25 people</p>
<p>Encourage gardeners to work together and share their skills to grow vegetables and build community spirit</p>	<p>100 m2 - raised garden beds + tyre / polystyrene garden</p>	<p>1 Compost tumbler</p>		<p>For immediate consumption + Share with other residents in the community meeting</p>	<p>Local residents</p>	<p>1 Community garden coordinator Absolutely Positively Wellington City Council Mr Mike Ki Pender</p>	<p>Birthday Party, Vegetarian dishes, drama class, Cap chat, Christmas events, dumplings, drums Asian people (Chinese) 25 people</p>		

Fig 3.2.12 An initial version of the comparative analysis

** It is important to note that this was a first draft of the developed analysis. The refined analysis will be presented in the following pages (chapter 3.2)*

REFINING THE CONTENTS AND STYLE OF ANALYSIS

Fig 3.2.13 Modification of the initial comparative analysis

The first set of drawings for the developed analysis were too diagrammatic and hard to grasp the spatial context of each garden. Moreover, the data for the 'people' category could be explored further since it was important to identify the demographics of communities involved in the project and their motivations.

The revised developed analysis was presented in the second design review; however, I felt that the community gardens at Hanson Court Apartment and Newtown Park Apartment did not explicitly show any differences.

Thus, I decided to carry on with the three sites

- Carrara Park (perceived as Public)
- Workerbe Oasis (perceived as Semi-Public)
- Hanson Court Apartment (perceived as Communal)

Which still provided the information of community gardens in different social and physical contexts.

Fig 3.2.14 Choosing Carrara Park, Workerbe Oasis and Hanson Court Apartments as the final research sites

3.2

STEP BACK, OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES

060518
Brown - church
yellow - social housing
pink - (coloured)
(outline) - fruit market (dairy-like)
Cafe.

People concentrated around cafe & bus stop

flow?
work?
day (weekend)?

spine shape

[COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS]

- Site Specific Knowledge

- Typological Knowledge

main st doesn't have a space that I can use unless it's a shop then where else ???

the main st highly populated
commercial (fast food stores)
community garden
away from the main st
riddiford

Big supermarket
easy access.

People don't necessarily think or feel the need to grow their own vege...

How do you shorten the journey?
- Grenada North Cold store
- Wholesale Limited...
deliver & \$
not sustainable
downtown

Martin Hanley Hanson St

Carrara meeting

Urban Oasis

NT park lift

Fig 3.2.15 Diagram showing the Individual analysis to gain site-specific knowledge

Individual analysis of community gardens were illustrated by each site to reveal site-specific knowledge which led to the creation of the initial design framework for facilitating social inclusiveness.

①

Carrara Park

4140m²

- The largest garden area, a small part of the site
- The centre of Newtown

- People from nearby public facilities are involved in gardening activities

- Surrounded by private houses: fixed users
- A short cut from busy main roads to residential area

- Not highly visible from the roads or attracting users

Eyes on the space

SENSE OF COMFORT

- Private access to the park: gave a sense of ownership for surrounding residents but private-backyard feeling for visitors

VIEWS ON THE SITE

- A clear view

- The entire site comes into sight

- Feel secluded in the underused concrete space

SPACE

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

MICROCLIMATE

VEGETATION

- Shade-loving plant (Ideal - silverbeet, spinach, lettuce)
- Perennial plant (Mediterranean herbs; oregano, sage, rosemary)
- Deciduous tree (current trees lose leaves too late - shady/boggy)

PEOPLE

DEMOGRAPHICS

MAIN USERS

NUMBER

- Varies

AGE

30-50

ETHNICITY

- Local community

PROJECT GOAL

- Establish edible gardens and improve neighbourhood green spaces

MOTIVATION

ACTIVITIES

- Music band, barbecue, Christmas event, Kids workshop

ORGANISATION

HARVESTING

Local gardening group

Local residents

PRODUCT USE

Immediate consumption

MAINTENANCE

WORKING UNIT

- Most frequent meetings
- Several groups working together with different motivations

USE OF SPACE

PHYSICAL ELEMENTS

from where people sit, the entire site still comes into view, so they still feel part of the community

① Being able to see is important for sense of inclusion.

A - Seating

: Broad Appeal to different users. The layout influenced the way they position themselves (e.g. eye contact / face each other)

centre of the park

another type of seating made people sit and face outwards

mostly passive activities
- talking
- watching

The orientation of seating allows people to sit and face towards the centre of the park.

family unit
- more active
- more interaction between parents and kids

B children play area

: one of the most inclusive aspect in space

: Parents started to make conversation while watching their kids playing

People tend to sit on a proper bench or near the trees.

C - Planting

: The adaptive use of nature
: different use of space was observed by various people

LOCATION

CROP TYPES

- Weather dependent

STRUCTURE

3 raised garden beds

SIGNAGE/LABEL

Inside the garden beds - not visible

① CARRARA PARK

Fig 3.2.16 Design framework for Carrara Park 1:1000

Each colour refers to the strategies of:

- ○ Space
- ○ People
- ○ Food

- Developing the existing fence condition with planting has the ability to improve the private-backyard feeling of the space, whilst maintaining the surrounding residents to feel attached to the park.

- Child-friendly space to attract diverse users in terms of age, ethnicity and size of groups.
- Experiment with seating layout to increase the chance of interaction by allowing people to sit or face each other.

- Develop interactive garden beds that bring people together and allows both visual and physical interaction.

②

Workerbe Oasis

500m2

- The second largest garden area, the entire site is used for garden
- Set back from the main road

SPACE

CONTEXT

SITE

SPACE

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

MICROCLIMATE

- Full sunlight + partially damp (topography) + shady in the afternoon (Dense vegetation on a hill)

VEGETATION

- Ornamental

PEOPLE

DEMOGRAPHICS

MAIN USERS

NUMBER

AGE

20-60

- Various age groups

ETHNICITY

- Local community

PROJECT
GOAL

- Permaculture based. Dense production. Make the use of land

MOTIVATION

no space at home
personal interest
Environment
Health
To learn

- Health + Environmental

ACTIVITIES

- 3-4 events a year around different seasonal shifts. Visitors from the Hospital

ORGANISATION

HARVESTING

1 Farm manager
Volunteers

PRODUCT
USE

Sale to local restaurants
+ Donate to food bank

MAINTENANCE

1 Farm manager
Volunteers

WORKING
UNIT

- Systematic. Irregular

A- Same gear & Activities
: Sense of community and belonging.

B- Table
: Attract people to stay
: Indication of public space

C- Planting
: The ability to encourage and discourage the use of space

LOCATION

CROP TYPES

- Low input High yield crops

STRUCTURE

500m2 garden beds

SIGNAGE/LABEL

At the entrance - indicating the main function of space

Fig 3.2.17 Design framework for Workerbe Oasis

Each colour refers to the strategies of:

- ⦿ **Space**
- ⦿ **People**
- ⦿ **Food**

- Creation of multiple comfortable spaces that are surrounded by plants to allow people to linger and explore to increase the probability of contact
- Improve the entranceway design to give a favourable first impression and inviting feeling.

- Providing activities that give people a sense of unity
- Use of standard outdoor park furniture as an indication the site is for public use

- Various types of garden structure that accommodate a range of users
- Provision of garden space for public use as a reward for community participation

3

Hanson Court Apartment

- A small-backyard type
of community gardens
at social housing

PUBLIC FACILITIES

- No strong relationship with the surrounding facilities

FLOW

- High traffic and flow around the site due to the supermarket, cafe and bus stops
- Located on high ground, not a place to stop by

VISUAL CONNECTION

SENSE OF COMFORT

- The garden is located at the back of community building. Not highly recognisable, but the separation from busy roads make the workers feel intimate

ACCESSIBILITY

- Signage at the entrance; feel private

VIEWS ON THE SITE

- At the back of community building; hidden but safe feeling

- Feel cozy and protected by the slopes with dense vegetation

- Open views out to the city

SPACE

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

MICROCLIMATE

- Partially shaded + sheltered by the adjacent hill
Mostly full sun, but can be shady in the afternoon

VEGETATION

- Contribute to the experiential quality
:comfort, views

PEOPLE

DEMOGRAPHICS

MAIN USERS

NUMBER

AGE

40+

ETHNICITY

- Various ethnic groups

PROJECT GOAL

- Work together. Share skills.
Community spirit

MOTIVATION

ACTIVITIES

- Diverse. More engaged. Food-related

ORGANISATION

HARVESTING

Local residents

PRODUCT USE

For immediate consumption +
share with other residents

MAINTENANCE

1 Garden
Coordinator

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council
Me Heke Ki Pōneke

WORKING UNIT

- Garden coordinator = resident
- Intimate relationship

- Planting
: Cultural expression
: Plants from 'home'

aesthetically
pleasing
+
looks natural

- Shelter
: Enhance the usability
of the site. Indication of
'socialising space'

7
gardeners have
their own plots
+ numbers on it
= people feel ownership
of it

- Label
: Feel ownership of a
space, but separate
working system

LOCATION

CROP TYPES

- Staple or Home food

STRUCTURE

Raised garden beds + tyre / polystyrene garden

SIGNAGE/LABEL

On the community building wall - not visible

③ HANSON COURT APARTMENT

Each colour refers to the strategies of:

- ○ **Space**
- ○ **People**
- ○ **Food**

Fig 3.2.18 Design framework for Hanson Court Apartments

- Advertise the presence of the garden to local residents about the community space
- Revitalise the threshold to the garden, by developing the uncovered pergola and outdoor furniture (since the local council does not support the area outside the existing gardening space)

- Maintaining the individual garden plot for different types of social inclusion (e.g. being left alone and work individually) and provide more space-efficient garden beds

- Use of plants as a cultural expression for gardeners and a personal attachment to the space for non-gardeners from the same cultural backgrounds.

Summary of 3 community garden analysis

The developed analysis revealed that all three community gardens had significant differences in the spatial settings, approaches to food production and varying profiles of supportive communities. The main differences identified were demographics, values, objectives, internal organisation, appropriation and perception of the space.

I discovered the deeper analysis method of each site provided specific features identified by particular spatial elements. The findings from the three sites were summarised in the following page (Fig.xx)

SPACE

CONTEXT

1 CARRARA PARK

- The largest garden area, a small part of the site
- The centre of Newtown

Public facilities

- People from nearby public facilities are involved to learn or work in the garden

Flow

- Surrounded by houses - direct access from their house = neighbourly, fixed users on the site
- A short cut from busy main roads to residential area

$\times \frac{1}{3}$

2 WORKERBE OASIS

- The second largest garden area, the entire site is used for garden
- Set back from the main road

- Gardening activities supported by the neighbouring people and facilities

- Not highly visible from busy roads
- The short-cut through the next block and townbelt walkway is not recognisable

3 HANSON COURT APARTMENTS

- A small-backyard type of community gardens at social housing

- No strong relationship with the surrounding facilities

- High traffic and flow around the site due to the supermarket, cafe and bus stops
- Located on high ground, not a place to stop by

SITE

Visual connection

Accessibility

Views on the site

Sense of comfort

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Microclimate

Vegetation

Public facilities

Flow

Accessibility

Visual connection

Environment

This page is a preview of how the comparative analysis method is to be read as a whole and shows the multidirectional setting of comparative analysis. The individual drawings will be scaled up and explained in the following pages.

Fig 3.2.19 The preview of comparative analysis as a whole

3.2

STEP BACK, OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES

060518
Brown - church
yellow - social housing
(coloured)
(outline) - fruit market (dairy-like)
Cafe.

People concentrated around cafe & bus stop

flow?
work?
day/weekend?

spine shape

the main st highly populated
commercial (fast food stores)
community garden
away from the main st
riddiford

Big supermarket
easy access.

People don't necessarily think or feel the need to grow their own vege...

main st doesn't have a space that can be used for design unless then where else ???

A. Site Specific Knowledge
B. Typological Knowledge

how do you shorten the journey?
- Grenada North Cold stone
- Wholesale Limited...
deliver & \$
not sustainable
downtown

Martin Hanley Hanson St

Carrara meeting

Urban Oasis

NT park life

THE 'TENDENCIES'

Fig 3.2.20 Diagram showing the comparative analysis to gain typological knowledge

Typological Analysis (The Tendencies)

While the developed analysis method revealed the site-specific knowledge (i.e., horizontal analysis), the typological knowledge was conducted through the comparison of each category to find the 'tendencies' which referred to the particular relationships between them.

The tendencies could express the gaps, opportunities, or design principles depending on the further implications.

Fig 3.2.21 The Tendencies diagram

a

Expanding the gardens could make people perceive the gardening as the main function of space.

b

Public and semi-public community gardens invited the wider community to interact, whereas the communal gardens only fostered the interaction between the housing residents.

c

The entrance made a significant contribution to the overall image of the space: whether the space was perceived as inviting.

d

The conditions of comfortable spaces involved a clear view on the site and being away from the entrance or busy roads. Improved comfort made people linger longer and resulted in the increased chance of interactions

e

People were inclined to interact more with others more within a comfortable environment.

f

Gardens with a practical approach and fixed user groups tended to last longer. Many gardeners at the social housing context preferred to work individually.

g

Regularity of events strengthened the relationship between those who attended, which could further expand the range of attendees by inviting their acquaintances.

f

The challenge arose with the:
public garden- *let people know about the public use of gardens.*
semi-public garden- *attracting regular volunteers with no rewards.*
private garden – *encouraging the interaction between gardeners.*

g

Low-maintenance design could prevent the hiatus of garden by reducing time and effort required.

h

Outdoor furniture formalised the publicness of space, and had the ability to encourage cultural interactions.

i

Garden structure had an impact on the range of potential users and types of interaction (e.g. visual or physical).

j

Plant species reflect the diversity of people's values.

FROM COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS TO DESIGN CRITERIA

Findings from Individual Site Analysis

Space

- Planting for creating private and public feeling
- Welcoming entrance
- Different types of outdoor furniture

People

- Child-friendly space
- Seating layout
- Common activities
- Standard look of park furniture
- Individual spaces
- Space-efficient gardens

Food

- Various types and function of gardens
- Gardens for public use
- Plant species for cultural expression and connections.

Findings from Comparative Analysis

Comparing similar and varied discoveries in each site led to the creation of 'tendencies', which reflected the particular patterns or potentials observed in different garden settings.

The findings from the Individual site analysis (strategies) outlined a list of physical elements that could facilitate social inclusion in each of the sites. However, the strategies expressed too much individual components to be used as a design criteria. I used the comparative analysis as a way of extracting commonalities between those components and synthesised them into five design points.

DESIGN CRITERIA

I. Improve **cognitive and physical accessibility** to the site

II. Provide opportunities that allow the **adaptive use of local nature** for **diverse** group of people

III. A space with a **sense of personal attachment and meaning**

IV. Increase of **interaction** between all cultures

V. Propose a design for **long-term sustainable gardening space**

Fig 3.2.22 Design Criteria

3.2

STEP BACK, OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES

060518
Brown - church
yellow - social housing
pink - houses
(coloured)
(outline) - fruit market
(dairy-like)
Cafe.

People
concentrated
around cafe
&
bus stop

• spine shape

[WORKING WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES]

that I can implement design
unless it's indoor...
then where else ???

• the main st highly populated
commercial
(fast food stores)
+ community garden
away from
the main st
riddiford

△ Big supermarket
easy access.

↓
people don't
necessarily think
they need
to grow their own
vege...

how do you
shorten the "journey?"
- Grenada
North
Cold stone
- Wholesale
Limited...
deliver \$\$
not sustainable
downtown

Martin
Hanley
Hanson St

Carrara
meeting

Urban
Oasis

NT park lift

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is under **3.2 STEP BACK, OPEN UP POSSIBILITIES** chapter, where I was open to more options and aiming to gain as much understanding as possible about the existing community gardens

This portion of work is a collection of the community engagement methods used in this research. It will articulate the process, methods and outcomes of all community engagements. Involving the community was an integral part of the research to grasp the variety of people's values to-wards community spaces and gardens.

TYPES OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Fig. 3.2.23 Types of community engagement conducted throughout the research

1. BEING ENGAGED WITH PEOPLE

Fig. 3.2.24 Community engagement through the local council meeting and social housing events

- Starting from the observation of people, I engaged with the communities through attending the local events (e.g., weekly gathering at social housing) and council meeting
 - to build relationships with Newtown Residents.
 - to get an overall idea of people's lifestyle around food and their ways of socialising

People appeared to be more favourable when I introduced myself as a student and explained that the questions were for non-profit project

2. BEING INVOLVED IN THE GARDEN

Fig. 3.2.25 Community involvement through the gardening session and events

- For a deeper engagement, I started to be involved with the community through volunteering and working in the gardens to
 - build a new or strengthen the relationships that were previously established
 - get hands-on experience to understand the social and physical working environment
- Working in the garden and being familiarised with the community allowed people to feel more comfortable to share information. This generated more detailed information about personal values and experience on the site.

3. BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER

Fig. 3.2.26 Purpose of Community Design Workshop

Fig. 3.2.27 People, Food, Space.- Community Design Workshop

- Advancing from engagement and involvement with people through attending the existing events, I felt the need for organising an event specifically for this research to
 - ask more specific questions about their relationships with food, space and their community gardens

Fig. 3.2.28 Online and offline promotion of the Workshop

- Online and offline advertisements of Community Design Workshop used to invite a wide range of people
- Held in Newtown Community and Cultural Centre which was accessible and familiar to all residents

One way to secure adequate attendance was to invite people in person. This was done through the interaction of members at local community meetings and those as a part of existing community gardens in Newtown.

I decided to organise one workshop instead of three separated ones for each research site to understand how the wider public as well as the working groups experienced the spaces. Bringing people together into one place allowed them to interact and exchange ideas. The Workshop was not only beneficial for getting valuable feedback but also became a venue for promoting integrated communities.

"PEOPLE,FOOD,SPACE" DESIGN WORKSHOP

Vote!

Share your experience!

Pin down!

Fig. 3.2.29 Photos from the Design Workshop

Make a wish!

Tell me about you!

Write!

Interactive and playful activities were designed to attract as many participants as possible, which led to the collection of quality information. The questions were to reveal:

- Preferences around food and outdoor activities by demographics
- Conditions for comfortable outdoor spaces
- Wishlist in their public spaces
- Motivations to work in the gardens
- Positives and negatives on the existing community gardens
- The voting for the community garden with the most potential (or suggestion for a new site)

Write and win the prize!

Draw!

Vote!

Fig. 3.2.29 Photos from the Design Workshop

The Community Design Workshop identified that the Newtown residents:

- liked the idea of growing food regardless of their age, gender and ethnicity
- had different preferences around the outdoor activities
(active+passive > active> passive activities)

One of the most notable features was that their Wishlist in public spaces; the conditions of comfortable space, and motivations to work in the garden could be grouped into the six physical elements (i.e., seating, plant, shelter, table, playground, and lighting).

1 EXISTING - CARRARA PARK

Practical approach

1 NEW - HANSON ST PLAY AREA

Visionary approach

Fig. 3.2.30 Comments on Carrara Park and a potential new garden site

The intention at this stage of the research was to work with one existing and another new garden site for design investigation. The reason was to compare the design outcomes between the existing garden site with a practical approach and the new site with a visionary approach. I believed that the comparison between the two designs could reveal how the inclusive community foodscapes could be designed with many restrictions, and designed with its full potential (without restrictions).

However, there were difficulties in finding potential users who could give feedback on developing design on a new garden site. The Comparative analysis on the three existing community gardens was also already a part of design process as it outlined the site opportunities to enhance social inclusion. Therefore I decided to keep developing a concept and developed design for the original three research sites: Carrara Park, Workerbe Oasis, Hanson Court Apartments

Summary and Reflection

The deeper I engaged with the communities, the richer quality of information was collected. People tended to be more open to discussion when I built the relationships with them and therefore I was perceived as less of an outsider. However, it had to be acknowledged that the data collected could be overly positive about the idea of growing food and redeveloping the garden sites. Since those who I encountered in the gardening-related events or attended my event would have been interested in the gardening already.

The Community Design Workshop was an extension of the relationships with the community built over the different types of engagements. It was essential to involve them from the beginning through to the end of the design process to ensure that the designs fulfil the needs and inclusiveness of the diverse communities.

The five physical elements (i.e., seating, plant, shelter, table, playground, and lighting) had the potential to bring people together, which accorded with the results from the Comparative Analysis. They became valuable resources for iterating different design options to propose inclusive community foodscapes.

3.3

FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

#1 path could be more highlighted & aesthetic could be improved.

#2 The boundary for the composting area is highlighted, but the boundary of the path is not as clear.
→ people might step on it.

- Smoothly integrated with the surrounding
- path clearly identified.

[CONCEPT DESIGN]

1. Carrara Park
2. Workerbe Oasis
3. Hanson Court Apartment

Introverted people & those who like passive activities still feel part of a larger community within the space, while making them still feel comfortable enough.

→ orientation of seating (space)

behind front.
protected open feeling.

how to create seating OR seating space?

① proper seating

② mound (topography)

③ planting

INTRODUCTION

[CONCEPT DESIGN] is a sub-chapter under **3.3 FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT**, where the knowledge gained from the analysis was used for proposing changes by iterating design concepts by the physical environments for the three research sites: *Carrara Park*, *Workerbe Oasis* and *Hanson Court Apartments*.

The concept design for all three sites were developed in parallel, however, was explained as an individual project in this chapter to clearly describe the process of testing and refining strategies. The common aim of the design investigation was to improve the capacity of the spaces to facilitate social inclusiveness.

Fig. 3.3.1 Design Criteria for facilitating social inclusion

In this chapter, the different design strategies were tested and examined by the five design criteria which were derived from the synthesis of site analysis and community engagement. The different colours were used as an indication for each design criteria (fig. 3.3.1).

Fig. 3.3.2 Design Process diagram

DESIGN PROCESS

The design process for each site contained the following components. This process diagram is a guide to inform which design stage was communicated through the drawings. The diagram is placed on the top right corner of pages

**The words in [] is used as a shortened form in the process diagram.*

[INITIAL
SKETCHES] Initial idea sketches with design aspirations

[PHYSICAL
ELEMENTS] Physical elements discouraging the social inclusion

[INITIAL
ITERATIONS] Initial iterations tested against the design criteria

[SYNTHESIS] Synthesised design to present to the communities

[FEEDBACK] Feedback and discussion from the stakeholders and patrons

[DEVELOPMENT] Development of selective ideas based on the feedback

[CONCEPT DESIGN] Concept design plan and sections to show the main design strategies

[REFLECTION] Reflection of designs upon the design outcomes and further development requirements

3.3

FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

[CONCEPT DESIGN]

- 1. Carrara Park**
2. Workerbe Oasis
3. Hanson Court Apartment

INITIAL DESIGN IDEAS

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Design framework resulted from the Comparative Analysis

DESIGN FRAMEWORK

- More gardening spaces and planting
- Inviting Entrance
- Lighting
- More child-friendly aspects
- Shelter and more seating
- Revitalise the underused concrete space

ADDED RESTRICTIONS AND DESIRES

- No lighting or active sports in underused concrete space due to the report by the surrounding house
- Outdoor BBQ area
- Maintain the size of open lawn
- Plan to relocate the playground

FEEDBACK SUMMARY

Fig. 3.3.3 The process of defining the revised design aspirations

Recap

The design investigation of Carrara Park aimed to implement more gardening spaces and outdoor furniture, while also revitalising the underused concrete-pad space. Improving the private-backyard feeling of the spaces was critical in forming a welcoming environment for all

I attempted to achieve the design aspirations by reiterating the existing physical elements that discouraged social inclusion. The purpose was to improve the existing site conditions and fulfill the needs of the community at the same time.

**The analysis of the existing physical elements that discourage social inclusion is continued in the following page.*

REVISED DESIGN ASPIRATIONS

- More gardening spaces and planting
- Inviting Entrance
- Relocation of children play area
- Shelter and more seating
- Revitalise the underused concrete space
- Maintain the size of open lawn
- Outdoor BBQ area

PHYSICAL ELEMENTS

- ① UNINVITING ACCESSWAY
- ② LIMITED NO. OF SEATING
- ③ ORNAMENTAL GARDEN BEDS
- ④ UNDERUSED CONCRETE SPACE
- ⑤ OPEN LAWN

PHYSICAL ELEMENTS DISCOURAGING SOCIAL INCLUSION

Fig. 3.3.4 Carrara Park plan with physical elements discouraging social inclusion

Focusing on physical elements that discouraged social inclusion gave specific goals for design testing

A

- ① UNINVITING ACCESSWAY
- Not attracting users

B

- ② LIMITED NO. OF SEATING
- People were spread out
- ③ ORNAMENTAL GARDEN BEDS
- No physical interaction

C

- ④ UNDERUSED CONCRETE SPACE
- No attraction for people
- ⑤ OPEN LAWN
- No Shelter
- No BBQ area
- Fence: Private backyard feeling

Working with perspective drawings enabled me to analyse and redesign the site at the same time since it allowed me to experience the site from user's perspectives.

Fig. 3.3.5 Perspective images showing the different parts of Carrara Park

INITIAL ITERATION: TESTING DIFFERENT DESIGN OPTIONS

The five physical elements were tested by adding or relocating them. Each option was tested against the design criteria to find the best strategies facilitating the sense of inclusion.

* some elements could be classified under more than one category (④), or had more than one segment that could be tested (⑤)

① ACCESSWAY

② ④ SEATING

③ ④ GARDEN BEDS

- ① + Enhance the Park's presence
- ② + Visual attraction to the Park
low maintenance + shade-tolerant plant
- ③ + Indirect lighting: safety at night

* The coloured ones best respond to the design criteria, thus used to create synthesised plan in the following page

- ① + Encourage people to stay and experience the gardening space
- ② + Watch people playing sport/activities in the lawn area and playground
- ③ + Revitalise the underused space: give a purpose to visit

- ① + The layout of the garden: Pocket spaces
+ Private access for surrounding houses
- ② + The size of open lawn remain the same
- ③ + Revitalise the underused space with gardens
- ④ + Playful and visually appealing plants next to playground: texture, scent, colours
- --● Plant species - familiar looking or plants from diverse people's 'home'

Design Criteria

- Physical/Cognitive accessibility
- Adaptive use of space
- Personal attachment
- Chance of interaction
- Long-term management

④ ⑤ SHELTER

- ① + Visible from both entrances
- Located next to the path (short-term stay)
- ② + Shelter as a gathering point: revitalisation
- Potentially occupied by the homeless
- ③ + Close to entrances / playground
+ Visible from all parts of the site
- ④ - No structure allowed; the only access point for big machines getting big materials

④ ⑤ BBQ AREA

- ① + Visible from both entrances. Potentially in conflict with activities in the lawn area
- ② + Give a purpose to visit
- A distance from the entrances
- ③ + The centre of the park: accessible from all parts of the site

④ ⑤ PLAYGROUND

Fig. 3.3.6 Plan iterations of Carrara Park

- ① + Visible from both entrances
- Potentially block the access to open lawn
- ② + Revitalise the underused concrete area
- Far from entrances; pram access?
- ③ + The centre of the park: Visible + accessible
- Take up the open lawn space
- ④ + Closed to the main path.
- The concrete area - more neglected

SYNTHESISED ITERATION - A

SYNTHESISED ITERATION - B

Fig. 3.3.7 Synthesised plan of Carrara Park 1:1000

The different design options were used to create synthesised iterations A and B. The reason was to present the community as many design options as possible, to get feedback on a diverse range of ideas and potentials.

The two iterations responded to the criteria at a similar level as the assessment was made by myself with some degree of assumption, in terms of how people would feel or use the space.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK - RESIDENTS MEETING

Fig. 3.3.8 Presentation at the Residents' association meeting

Community engagement revealed that:

- Make the entrance feel welcoming.
- Have the children playground close to the entrance.
- Use of plants from various origins

Carrara Park keymap

ITERATIVE PROCESS: FURTHER DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

What needs to be improved?

①

UNINVITING ACCESSWAY

I. ACCESSWAY

II. POCKET SPACE

III. SEATING

IV. FLEXIBILITY OF SPACE

Fig. 3.3.9 Iteration sketches for further design development

I. ACCESSWAY

- Aim* To capture people's eyes and attract more users
- strategies*
- a. Vertical wall
 - b. Archway
 - c. Laneway planting
- Selection*
- c.
 - Visually appealing*
 - Shade-tolerant species*
 - Low-maintenance*
 - Relatively simple construction*

II. POCKET SPACE

- Aim* To create more informal seating spaces
- strategies*
- a. Access from private houses and seating space within the pocket space
 - b. Access from private houses and seating space are not within the pocket space
- Selection*
- b.
 - To protect privacy of surrounding residents / give comfortable environment for park users*

III. SEATING

- Aim* To increase the chance of interaction
- strategies*
- Different shape of seating
- Selection*
- a & b
 - People facing each other*
 - accommodate more people*

IV. FLEXIBILITY OF SPACE

- Aim* To provide more seating space while maintaining a free movement of passersby
- strategies*
- Adding simple structures around the existing deck
- Selection*
- a.
 - Seating option for both individual and group users*

③
ORNAMENTAL
GARDEN BEDS

V. GARDEN BEDS

④
UNDERUSED
CONCRETE SPACE

VI. CONCRETE SPACE

WORKING MODEL

⑤
OPEN LAWN AREA

VII. SHELTER

VIII. (EDIBLE) PLANTING

V. GARDEN BEDS

- Aim* To encourage physical interaction
- strategies* Different shape & layout of garden beds
- Selection* *a. Allow the access from all sides of garden beds*

VI. CONCRETE SPACE

- Aim* To revitalise the use of space
- strategies* Grass mound
- Selection* *Multifunction - Informal play element & seating & potential gardening space*

VII. SHELTER

- Aim* To enable the use of space in different weather
- strategies* Openness + transparent roofing material
- Selection* *Accessible from all directions
Allow natural sunlight*

VIII. PLANTING

- Aim* To encourage gardening for diverse users & improve the fence condition which made feel people that they were in private backyard
- strategies* Plants along the fence to improve the private-backyard feeling
- Selection* *Opportunities to participate in communal activities
Different height of garden beds allowing diverse users*

CARRARA PARK CONCEPT DESIGN PLAN AND SECTIONS

Fig. 3.3.10 Carrara park concept design 1:1000

Design Criteria

- Physical/Cognitive accessibility
- Adaptive use of space
- Personal attachment
- Chance of interaction
- Long-term management

Fig. 3.3.11 Carrara park proposed sections

REFLECTION ON CARRARA PARK CONCEPT DESIGN

Process

Since there was a variety of stakeholders involved in the Park development, the challenges occurred in distilling the large amount of information and translating their needs into the design. Moreover, keeping the communities interested about the research required several tactics:

- Asking specific questions to get explicit answers.

For example, I asked people what made space feel inclusive in the first meeting which appeared to be a too broad question. Thus I asked them how they felt if we relocated, added or removed certain elements from the site. This extracted a range of answers based on their personal experience or values.

- Providing different ways to answer the question.

Instead of having an open discussion all the time. Some people found it more comfortable talking to me in person while others found it easier to leave comments on the notes. This made me realise that the approach of the designer has a significant impact on the level of community engagement which further influenced the design outcomes.

- Clarity and Simplicity of Drawings to allow people to quickly grasp the contents in the presentations.

Drawing preparation for the community meetings especially required clear and simple drawings since I was only given a short amount of time to present and communicate ideas

Strategies

The main design strategies could be categorised into the following three themes:

PLANTING

- (Non) Edible planting to improve the fence condition and provide more seating spaces for individual and group users.

OUTDOOR FURNITURE

- Interactive garden beds to encourage community participation and therefore increase the chance of interactions.

FLEXIBILITY

- Open lawn area to give people sense of empowerment by allowing an adaptive and personal use of space

- Shelter + BBQ + Edible garden area to accommodate the different activities at the same time, facilitating direct or indirect interaction between many different users.

- Grass mound seating to provide different ways to interact with the environment and site, as: playful, restful and, restorative.

** Some strategies could be classified under more than one theme, thus they were grouped into more relevant category*

3.3

FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

[CONCEPT DESIGN]

1. Carrara Park
- 2. Workerbe Oasis**
3. Hanson Court Apartment

Hand-drawn site plan for a community garden project. The plan shows a triangular plot with a road on the left and a river on the top. Key features include:

- Vegetated swale for surface drainage or edible rain garden** (along the road)
- help with neighbouring runoff too?**
- mound** and **B.T. tree** near the road
- storage** area with a **lock** and **gate**
- vehicle access**
- socialising space + (raised) garden beds for people in wheelchairs + planting - edible - native**
- wheelchair access**
- compost bins + signage + cover**
- first thing people would see.**
- Sun Trust & design**
- medical planting**
- wheelchair ramp**

DESIGN FRAMEWORK

- *Improving the short-cut connection*
- *Shelter & seating*
- *Maintain the level of production*
- *Various garden structures*
- *Entrance planting*
- *Pleasant-looking fence*

The short-cut through to Drummond St - not visible - uncomfortable walking right next to houses

PATH CONVECTION IMPROVEMENT (WHEELS)

MUST NOT BE DISTURBED

PLAN TO BECOME A DEEP DRAINAGE SWALE THING. (OPEN TO IDEAS)

BORDER PLANTING FOR PUBLIC USE OR MEDICAL PLANTS

damp drainage

signage

The entire site comes into sight = feel invited.

NOT MANY PPL Socialising + exposed - 1 table 1 seating

Information / communication / education aspects relative to strategic plan of college

good looking / lightweight bird protection or raspberries along pit border 4 ME?

Unrased garden beds may limit the range of uses involved in the projects

NO STRUCTURE CLOSE TO THE FENCE LINE (1500MM CLEAR ZONE)

holding bays for materials (e.g. compost) (1500 x 2000mm) SOLUTION?

composting area

- aesthetic

- information for potential participants

not as high traffic as main roads, but exposed to the road

more natives + windbreak

FLOODING

REQUIREMENTS FROM THE MEETING

FEEDBACK FROM THE EVENT

- garden beds off the ground
- good signage for compost
- Not in clear view from the main road

- Wheelchair-accessible path
- No structure close to the fence line
- No design around the Composting area (managed by the local business)

FEEDBACK SUMMARY

The space allowed design investigation

Fig. 3.3.12 The process of defining the revised design aspirations

REVISED DESIGN ASPIRATIONS

- Improving the short-cut connection
- Shelter and more seating
- Various garden structure
- Wheelchair-access path
- Visually-appealing planting + fence

Recap

The design investigation of Workerbe Oasis aimed to enhance the 'publicness' feel of the space by facilitating areas for community participation:

- The garden with the greatest level of productivity.
- Lack of garden beds for public use and spaces for socialising.
- Need for elements that allow people to linger and participate, especially for visitors from the nearby kindergarten and the Hospital.

*The analysis of the existing physical elements that discourage social inclusion is continued in the following page.

PHYSICAL ELEMENTS

- ① PATH CONNECTION
- ② NO SHELTER/SEATING
- ③ UNPLEASANT FENCE
- ④ ENTRANCE PLANTING
- ⑤ A SINGLE TYPE OF GARDEN

A

- ① PATH CONNECTION
- Uncomfortable feeling walking through the narrow path next to private houses

B

- ② NO SHELTER/SEATING
- No gathering point
 - Weather-dependent
 - Limited use of space

C

- ③ UNPLEASANT FENCE
- No user attraction
- ④ ENTRANCE PLANTING
- No user attraction
 - No wind-breaking plants
- ⑤ A SINGLE TYPE OF GARDEN
- Allow limited range of users (frequently visited by people from the nearby Hospital)

Perspective drawings allowed me to realise that:

- the uncomfortable user experience caused by the private houses and dense vegetation, beyond the width of paths (①)
- the first impression of the site was letting down by the appearance of existing fence (③)

Fig. 3.3.14 Perspective images showing the different parts of Workerbe Oasis

SYNTHESISED ITERATION - A

SYNTHESISED ITERATION - B

Fig. 3.3.15 Workerbe Oasis Synthesised plan 1:1000

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK - RESIDENTS MEETING

Fig. 3.3.16 Presentation at the Residents' association meeting

Community engagement revealed that:

- Proposing different types of garden structures were strongly favoured as some people found it difficult to crouch down for a long time
- The appearance and maintenance were important for people's motivation to work in the garden
- Different colour and scents of gardens appeared to be the attraction for diverse users
- People preferred the shelter or seating to be located away from the road for a sense of comfort

Workerbe Oasis keymap

What needs to be improved?

① + ③

PATH CONNECTION
UNPLEASANT FENCE

ITERATIVE PROCESS: FURTHER DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

I. PATH CONNECTION

II. UNPLEASANT FENCE

III. SHELTER

②
NO SHELTER
/SEATING

Fig. 3.3.17 Iteration sketches for further design development

I. PATH CONNECTION

Aim To improve short-cut connection and accessibility of the site

strategies

- a. Wider path
- b. Planting along the fence of private house
- c. Visually appealing plant on the opposite side of private house

Selection c.
on public land. + quick implementation

II. UNPLEASANT FENCE

Aim To improve the visual appearance of fence

strategies

- a. Planting to cover the fence
- b. Vertical garden
- c. Garden beds

Selection b.
Make the use of left-out space
Different heights - invite various users
Spacing between garden beds - people facing each other while working in the garden

III. SHELTER

Aim To create a gathering point and enable people to use the site in the different weather conditions

strategies

- a. Located next to the path
- b. Part of the path

Selection b.
An increased chance of interaction between people in the shelter and passersby

②
NO SHELTER
/SEATING

III. SEATING

④
ENTRANCE
PLANTING

IV. ENTRANCE PLANTING

⑤
A SINGLE TYPE
OF GARDEN

V. TYPES OF GARDEN STRUCTURE : DIVERSE USERS

Fig. 3.3.17 Iteration sketches for further design development

III. SEATING

Aim To provide more seating

strategies a. in one place
b. spread out on the site

Selection b.
More efficient and accessible for people

IV. ENTRANCE PLANTING

Aim To express the gardening function of the site
and improve the user's first impression

strategies - Wind breaking through the layering of edible plants
- Seasonal changes that provide a variety of looks
throughout the year

V. GARDEN STRUCTURE

Aim To allow diverse users to work in the garden
Small and light structure concerning limited
space allowed for design investigation

strategies - Vertical and wheelchair accessible garden
which do not take up too much space

WORKERBE OASIS CONCEPT DESIGN PLAN AND SECTIONS

Fig. 3.3.18 Workerbe Oasis concept design 1:500

Design Criteria

- Physical/Cognitive accessibility
- Adaptive use of space
- Personal attachment
- Chance of interaction
- Long-term management

Fig. 3.3.19 Workerbe Oasis proposed sections

REFLECTION ON WORKERBE CONCEPT DESIGN

Process Workerbe Oasis initially had many spatial limitations and the local gardening groups did not want to make any big changes. Thus, I could only work with a tiny part of the site with small design interventions that did not take up much space or interruption.

The site was undergoing their own redevelopment project which added more restrictions and came into conflict with the design development of this research. Some design ideas had to be taken out completely in some cases. In order to keep track of evolving conditions of the site, more frequent meetings had to be arranged which required additional time and effort.

The challenge experienced while taking a 'facilitator' approach was to raise the relevant ideas within the vast amount of information accumulated through the participatory design process.

Strategies The main design strategies could be categorised into the following two themes:

PLANTING

- *Plant species as an attraction*
 - : seasonal changes
 - : first impression of the site
- *as a point of contact*
 - : communal activities
 - : as a personal attachment to the site
 - : plants from different origins
- *as a play and restoration*
 - : especially for children and visitors from the Hospital
- *Low maintenance as a selection criteria*
 - : Since people perceived the space as 'uninviting' when it looks unmanaged

GARDEN STRUCTURE

- *Vertical and wheelchair-accessible gardens to allow diverse users to participate in gardening activities which could be as a start of conversation and interaction*

3.3

FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

[CONCEPT DESIGN]

1. Carrara Park
2. Workerbe Oasis
- 3. Hanson Court Apartment**

INITIAL DESIGN IDEAS

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Design framework resulted from the Comparative Analysis

DESIGN FRAMEWORK

- Strengthen the garden's presence
- Shelter and more seating to support outdoor activities
- More gardening area

REVISED DESIGN ASPIRATIONS

- Strengthen the garden's presence
- Shelter and more seating to support outdoor activities
- More gardening area
(only allowed within the fenced-off area)

Fig. 3.3.20 The process of defining the revised design aspirations

PHYSICAL ELEMENTS

- ① PRESENCE OF GARDEN
- ② UNCOVERED PERGOLA
- ③ SEATING CAPACITY
- ④ GARDEN STRUCTURE
- ⑤ FENCE

* The further analysis of physical elements was presented in the following page.

Recap

The design of Hanson Court Apartments aimed to facilitate gardening areas by providing new spatial elements that would support the outdoor activities. Residents tended to spend time in their rooms thus encouraging them to come out and socialise with others was critical for the design

PHYSICAL ELEMENTS DISCOURAGING SOCIAL INCLUSION

Fig. 3.3.21 Hanson Court Apartments plan with physical elements discouraging social inclusion

A

① PRESENCE OF GARDEN

- Located at the back of the community building : not highly visible

B

② UNCOVERED PERGOLA

- Weather-dependent
- Limited use of space

③ SEATING CAPACITY

- No capacity to accommodate 30+ people who usually attend the outdoor events

C

④ GARDEN STRUCTURE

- Individually allocated plots

⑤ FENCE

- Exclusive use of garden for those who applied and were given the plot

The community garden in Hanson Court Apartments is managed under strict regulations from the local council.

- The gardens within the fenced-off area are supported only, therefore design elements that promote the gardening activity are better to be developed within the zone.

Fig. 3.3.22 Perspective images showing the different parts of Hanson Court Apartments

SYNTHESISED ITERATION - A

SYNTHESISED ITERATION - B

Fig. 3.3.23 Synthesised plan of Hanson Court Apartments 1:500

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK - RESIDENTS MEETING

Fig. 3.3.24 Presentation at the Residents' association meeting

Community engagement revealed that:

- Residents tended to consider garden as a 'working' space, where they were empowered to grow whatever they wanted.
- Having an individual plot was expected to be a negative aspect, however it seemed to reinforce a sense of personal attachment to the place.
- The potential of encouraging cultural interaction through supporting outdoor activities such as BBQ events, where more people tend to gather

Hanson Court Apartments keymap

①

PRESENCE OF
GARDEN

ITERATIVE PROCESS: FURTHER DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

I. ACCESSWAY

a

b

c

II. SHELTER

a

b

a

b

Fig. 3.3.25 Iteration sketches for further design development

I. ACCESSWAY

Aim To extend the garden space

strategies

- a. Planting to highlight the way to the garden
- b. Colourful/edible gardens
- c. Event or activities using the garden products

Selection

a+c.
An opportunity to use it as a way of connecting to the wider community on a regular basis

II. SHELTER

Aim To enable residents to use the space regardless of the weather

strategies

- a. Adding the transparent roof on the top of pergola to block the rain but allow the sunlight
- b. expandable canopy as an extension of pergola

Selection

a+b.
Expansion of usable space
Easy construction method

③ + ⑤
SEATING CAPACITY
FENCE

III. SEATING

④
GARDEN
STRUCTURE

III. GARDEN STRUCTURE

Fig. 3.3.25 Iteration sketches for further design development

III. SEATING

Aim To increase the seating capacity within the limited space

strategies

- a. Seating/table which was changeable in height
- b. Expandable seating
- c. Foldable chair/table

Selection

c.
*Potential to be used for the selected idea in I. ACCESSWAY:
 The simplicity of structure tested through the making of
 prototype model
 + The use of colour to add a vibrancy*

IV. GARDEN STRUCTURE

Aim To provide more gardening spaces within the limited space that allows cheap and fast construction

strategies

- a. Vertical garden made out of recycled milk bottle
- b. Vertical garden made out of recycled wooden pallets

Selection

a
 People facing each other when working in the vertical garden which would increase the chance of interaction
 + c
 The idea was developed further later on by combining the structure with green house for all-year-long production

HANSON COURT APARTMENTS CONCEPT DESIGN PLAN AND SECTIONS

Fig. 3.3.26 Hanson Court Apartments concept design 1:400

Design Criteria

- Physical/Cognitive accessibility
- Adaptive use of space
- Personal attachment
- Chance of interaction
- Long-term management

Fig. 3.3.27 Hanson Court Apartments proposed sections

REFLECTION ON HANSON COURT APARTMENT CONCEPT DESIGN

Process Unlike Carrara park and Workerbe Oasis, the lack of community feedback and information was a challenging task in Hanson Court Apartment. The community members had no strong interest in developing their garden spaces which made it harder to get in contact with them.

The concept of social inclusion identified by the community seemed to be very different from the other two research sites. The residents from Hanson Court Apartment considered and valued the gardens as an individual 'working space'. They preferred to work individually and felt respected when they were left alone. I found that their perspectives provided the different insight into the idea of socially inclusive spaces.

Strategies The main design strategies could be categorised into the following three themes:

EVENTS

- *that not only invite the residents but also the wider community by using the products from gardens.*
- : *Opportunities to express themselves and interact with others*

ADAPTABLE STRUCTURES

- *Multifunction furniture to allow the adaptive use of space and encourage outdoor socialising.*

3.3

Design Meeting - feedback

FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

[DEVELOPED DESIGN] is a sub-chapter under **3.3 FROM FINDINGS TO DESIGN DEVELOPMENT** where I aimed to develop the design strategies suitable for each of the three research sites.

This chapter describes the rationale for selecting Carrara Park for further design development, out of the three research sites. The main aim of this chapter was to advance the concept design to a refined stage for Carrara Park, in response to the important spatial aspects that were concluded from the [CONCEPT DESIGN] chapter

CHOOSING CARRARA PARK FOR FURTHER DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Fig. 3.3.28 Rationale for selecting Carrara Park for further design development

Carrara Park was selected for further design development, since the applied design tactics were comprehensive for the design components in two other research sites. These include the designs of spatial, structural and planting elements.

The findings from the concept design of the three, identified the imperative aspects for creating inclusive foodscapes:

- *The freedom to use and move around the site.*
- *Spaces for diverse users from individual to groups.*
- *Allowing people to face or see each other.*
- *Flexible spaces for active and passive activities.*
- *Visually appealing and low-maintenance plants.*

Fig. 3.3.29 Carrara Park development sketches

I aimed to develop the Carrara Park concept design to gain specific knowledge on how social inclusion could be facilitated through the exploration of flexibility of space, planting and outdoor furniture.

REFINING THE CONCEPT DESIGN THROUGH THE ITERATIVE PROCESS

Fig. 3.3.30 Aspiration for Carrara Park developed design

1

On both sides

With plants

Working model

2

Passing through

3

Working model

Fig. 3.3.31 Sketches showing the process of developing the selective parts of Carrara Park

A FURTHER CONSIDERATION FOR DEVELOPING THE DESIGN

Fig. 3.3.32 Carrara Park further development sketches

+ To provide additional seating options and spaces for passive/individual users, plus further improvement on the fence condition was critical, which was done by applying the similar tactics as the vegetated pocket spaces.

+ The need for reducing the maintenance level, since the narrow and winding paths between grass mounds seating needed to be regularly mown

CARRARA PARK DEVELOPED PLAN WITH PLANT LIST

Fig. 3.3.33 Carrara Park developed design plan 1:400

Fig. 3.3.33 Transitional Planting 1:100

CARRARA PARK DEVELOPED DESIGN PERSPECTIVE PLAN

KEYS

1. Laneway planting along the entrance
2. Multi-function garden beds
3. Pocket space created by planting
4. Grass mound seating
5. Flexible space with planting
6. BBQ Space + Picnic table
7. Edible planting and herb garden
8. Shelter with translucent roofing
9. Open lawn
10. Individual seating
11. Grass mound seating + Discovery garden
12. Relocated playground
13. Private access from the surrounding house

Fig. 3.3.35 Carrara Park developed design plan at

CARRARA PARK - PROGRAM DIAGRAM

Fig. 3.3.36 Program diagram showing the different design aspects of Carrara Park

The program diagrams helped to clarify how the developed design responded to the five important aspects identified in concept design.

**The strategies used to incorporate the five aspects into the space will be explained in the following pages. One strategy reflected the multiple aspects in some cases, therefore the more relevant ones were chosen to clearly show its implication for facilitating social inclusion.*

I. CREATING SPACES FOR INDIVIDUAL&GROUP USERS + ACTIVE & PASSIVE ACTIVITIES *(Refer to Fig 3.3.35)*

Fig. 3.3.37 Different types of seating and spaces around the open lawn area

Strategy

Through the layout of the grass mounds and standard seating around the edges of the park, alongside the open lawn area in the middle.

Implication

- Individual/passive users get to have a clear view on the entire site while being within the vegetated pocket spaces where it feels cozy.
- Different types of users feel part of a community without having to physically or actively interact with each other all the time.
- The Discovery Garden with the range of plants, provided different ways to interact with the spaces through the act of meandering, resting, looking and playing.

Fig. 3.3.38 The view of the open lawn with the varying types of surrounding seating

Fig. 3.3.39 Perspective section showing the diversity of users and activities

SECTION AA'
 (Refer to Fig 3.3.35)

II. PROVIDING FLEXIBILITY OF SPACE (Refer to Fig 3.3.35)

Fig. 3.3.40 Improved permeability and a clear view alongside the variety of activities and functions

Strategy

The use of small components such as (in)formal seating, barbecue area, grass mounds and edible gardens to secure a clear view and permeability

Implication

- The layout of the components allows people to see and face each other while being led to the open lawn, which can increase the chance of informal contact.
- A variety of activities and spaces allows the adaptive use of space by giving people a choice to decide what they want to do and where they want to occupy.

Fig. 3.3.41 Different types of users feeling part of a community without having to physically or actively interact with each other

Fig. 3.3.42 The space providing the freedom for diverse users to choose how they want to use the space

SECTION BB'
(Refer to Fig 3.3.35)

III. THE USE OF OUTDOOR FURNITURE TO BRING PEOPLE TOGETHER (Refer to Fig 3.3.35)

Fig. 3.3.43 Increased chance of interaction around the garden beds

Strategy

The use of plants as a gardening function for the community participation and a design tool to secure the comfort for both surrounding residents and park users.

Implication

- The edges and corners of raised beds attracts passersby and park users to interact with the garden structures and other park users.
- The location next to the children playground ensures the adequate number of users around the beds as they are occupied by regular visitors.

Fig. 3.3.44 The accessible location of garden beds: between pocket spaces and playground

Fig. 3.3.45 Easy-to-construct and low-maintenance strategy for building the interactive garden beds

Fig. 3.3.46 Section showing the interaction around the garden beds

Fig. 3.3.47 Carrara Park planting strategy plan

Fig. 3.3.48 Different ways of interacting with plants: looking, touching and eating

- 1 Welcoming entrance through the laneway by planting and herb garden beds.

- 2 Edible plants from various origins to give a range of personal meanings + companion planting for low-maintenance

PLANTING STRATEGIES

- 3 The multiple pocket spaces created by a diversity of plants as a destination for park users to sit and linger, while securing the private access for surrounding houses.

4

Different types of seating spaces created by the combination of the standard outdoor furniture with a planting layout.

The type of seating implemented in the design was selected from the local council catalog. This shows how the standard furniture can be utilised to enhance social inclusiveness in combination with planting layout.

S1 Seating with back

Surrounded by the groundcover and grasses that are not far above the seating height

= give a sense of protection and coziness.

S2 Backless seating

combined with the partially bulged plants

= extra seating space (more exposed and enclosed ones)
= give people choice and options

S3 Open shelter/table

Accessible location of shelter from all parts of the Park

The adequate width of spacing between the seats, outdoor barbecue facilities and picnic benches

= Permeability of space

Fig. 3.3.50 Different types of seating spaces created by the combination of the standard outdoor furniture with a planting layout.

Fig. 3.3.51 Section showing the interactions with the varying types of grass mound and the discovery garden at

SECTION EE'
(Refer to Fig 3.3.35)

- 5 Low-maintenance grass and herb garden beds with recycled concrete path from the removal of former underused concrete-pad space.

VARYING TYPES OF GRASS MOUND SEATING

Fig. 3.3.52 Location of the grass mound seating

The different types of grass mounds allow the adaptive use of space and give people a purpose to interact with the far end of the Park.

The subtle differences in the angle, height of the mounds, and the length of footrest differentiates the probability of interaction with other park users. Therefore, people can choose which grass mounds they want to occupy depending on their willingness to interact with others

Fig. 3.3.53 Different types of grass mound and its implication on user behaviour and interaction with other people

GRASS MOUND CONSTRUCTION STRATEGY

The removal of an unused concrete-pad space and construction of grass mounds were designed to be relatively simple and sustainable, by the use of the recycled material and allow it to be built within the community's scale and capability.

Fig. 3.3.54 Construction strategy for grass mound seating

Overall, the developed design of Carrara Park signified that the strategies for creating inclusive community foodscapes can be simple and strategic. The developed strategies responded to the design criteria as follows:

PHYSICAL/COGNITIVE ACCESSIBILITY

- Visually appealing spaces through the use of various plants (*e.g., colour, texture, edibility, and shapes*)
- A clear and open view on the site and child-friendly space

ADAPTIVE USE OF SPACE

- Spaciousness of open lawn
- Multifunction elements
:*grass mounds as a seating and playful element*
:*vegetated pocket spaces for active & passive activities*

PERSONAL ATTACHMENT

- Plant species from various people's homes
- Intimate and snug feeling of multiple seating spaces

CHANCE OF INTERACTION

- Interactive garden beds as a gathering point and community participation
- Spaces where the variety of activities coexists

LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT

- Low-maintenance and companion planting
- Place the groundcover where needed to save the trouble for regular mowing

Fig. 3.3.55 Changes in the level of social inclusion in Carrara Park examined by the design criteria

The overall outcome did not seem to show dramatic changes at a glance, but the notable improvement in the level of social inclusion was identified when examined by the design criteria. The outlined strategies were developed in specific relation to the conditions of Carrara Park, however they were applicable to other sites in a similar context: urban multicultural environments

4. CONCLUSION

Critical reflection including answers to research objectives and closing discussion.

CONCLUSION

In summary, many urban communities are at the risk of facing social segregation as a result of increased globalisation and migration towards urban environments. Increased cultural diversity raised the issue of disintegrated communities, food inequality and lack of space that can invite a diverse population.

In response, this research has attempted to enhance the links between people, food and space by creating inclusive community foodscapes in an urban multicultural context. Especially those of increasing residential density, where the provision of the quality public space is imperative.

The multidisciplinary review of (inter)national literature and precedents outlined the research methods which were the collaboration of a participatory design and landscape architecture design approaches. A set of design strategies were tested and developed through an on-going engagement with the community in response to the research question and objectives. With a design concept expressed as an outcome of following the design methodology developed for this design-led research.

ANSWER TO RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

• Develop design methodology and strategies for creating socially inclusive spaces within urban multicultural environment

Developing the methodology for creating socially inclusive spaces required different approaches to the stages of data collection and documentation. Combining desktop research and on-site fieldwork was crucial to gain knowledge of how the site was experienced by the community. Understanding the perspective of an insider was significant for revealing the site potentials valuable as it adds further insight for the discipline-specific knowledge of the site. This process was enhanced by personal involvement with the site activities such as gardening sessions and social housing events. Analysing and visualising the findings through the landscape architecture fieldwork approach in addition to the community involvement allowed the creation of comparative analysis method.

Urban multicultural environments tend to have very compact and confined quality public spaces as discovered from the community garden case studies. The developed comparative analysis was a means of clarifying and simplifying the process for revealing the complex layers of site potentials. The subdivision of categories under the broad themes of people, food, and space allowed me to focus on one aspect at a time, which resulted in more detailed analysis outcomes. The multi-directional setting of analysis was a useful technique to re-explore the tendencies (or notable relations) between each of the site's components

The developed analysis methods were an efficient way of synthesising and establishing the design criteria suitable for iterating inclusive designs for each typology of community gardens. The tendencies could be presented to the community to find out their importance, before implementing them into the design stages. This could have been a useful tool for making a hierarchy of design criteria, which noted the important areas to focus the design on.

- *Design sustainable foodscapes that respond to the diversity of people's values*

The design criteria for creating socially inclusive space was established, however the different physical setting and supportive communities for each research site differentiated the design outcomes.

For example, concept design of Workerbe Oasis and Hanson Court Apartment revealed how the similar strategies were implemented in different scales and forms in response to their distinctive social and physical conditions:

- o *The important consideration for designing outdoor furniture in Workerbe Oasis was the capacity of accommodating a wide range of users, which was due to the regular visitors from the nearby Hospital and kindergarten.*

- o *Hanson Court Apartment had a very confined gardening space with few interactions between residents, which therefore aimed to redevelop a space that could accommodate a larger group of people and support their outdoor activities. This led to the development of adaptable outdoor structure that did not take up much space*

Even though the two research sites did not continue to the developed design stage, their foodscape strategies express the variety of approaches to gardening structures and interactions, which contributed to the further design testing of Carrara Park.

Developing iterations and designs of the three community gardens in parallel was beneficial for all sites since the strategies identified in one site could complement the designs of other sites.

- o Specifically in relation to Carrara Park, I found that the concept design lacked in the aspect of the long-term management criteria in particular when moving

into the developed design stage. Meanwhile, Workerbe Oasis concept design addressed the criteria well by proposing low-maintenance plants or paving material for wheelchair access. Therefore, the strategies from Workerbe oasis was incorporated into the Carrara Park design to ensure the long-lasting use of the space, through recycled concrete paving the garden and the groundcover, in the small gaps between garden beds, which saves the trouble for regular mowing.

Implementation of small and strategic interventions appeared to lead the creation of inclusive spaces that could accommodate the diversity of people's values. The strategies focused on allowing the design to be constructed within the community's own realm, by reducing the resources and time required. A temporary prototype installation could advance the knowledge on how the spatial elements actually change the way people use and interact with the site, which could further increase the chances of implementation by showing the potential social changes to the community.

- *Explore the designers' role in participatory design approach to promote community engagement.*

The Community Design Workshop was an integral part of promoting community engagement in the participatory design process. The workshop was organised as a method for inviting the diverse population to join my research and to collect a wide range of personal information, including their thoughts on the existing community gardens or more generally their values towards space and food. Benefits of the workshop was not only observed in the richness of data collected, but also in the process, where individuals feel empowered to share their ideas whilst seeing their opinions valued.

Additionally, I believe the workshop was a chance for them to interact with other members in the community and perceive themselves as a valuable member of the society. Furthermore, it was an opportunity for me to build the relationship with the wider community and being familiarised with each other. When they started to perceive me as less of an outsider, they tended to be more open to discussion and find it easier to approach the idea of the project. Approaching them from a student position and reminding them that this was a non-profit design research was also helpful in increasing some groups' level of engagement.

Organising the same type of workshop for each of the three sites could have added a higher quantity and quality of data, which would identify specific findings to their social and physical settings of the community gardens.

- *Communicating the research ideas to the community*

Without verbally communicating ideas, it was difficult for some community members to understand or engage in the design process, which highlighted the importance of presenting simple and clear drawings that could facilitate discussion.

- *Shift in focus of research*

Undertaking an interactive process where I identified unexpected outcomes or found additional and stronger interests progressively developed the focus of my research. Engaging with the community and experiencing their and the designer's role in shaping inclusive environments gained more attention in my research. Food was the catalyst into the project but adapted away from exclusively designing a foodscape, but rather inclusive community spaces that used food as a medium to bring people together

LIMITATION

• *Community Participation*

The initial intention was to organise three Design Workshops, one for each site alongside their supportive communities. However, there were difficulties in arranging times and permissions from the site coordinators. Since the dominant groups that attended the community meetings were also the European New Zealand, the data collected may not express the wide enough variety of people perceived in the Newtown community. This may result in the making of assumptions or generalisations about their feedback.

• *Research Constraints*

Since I was not in the right position to make this research a community-focused project, there was a continuous collision to find a middle ground for fulfilling the aspirations of the approached community and a student developing an academic research thesis. The lack of fulfilling both ends of the project and research was an issue of timing with organising the community interactions and producing design outcomes at earlier stages for research reviewers.

CLOSING DISCUSSION

The challenges remained in this thesis include: the task of seeking for an opportunity to implement the design proposal. Initially, there was a chance of implementing the design outcomes. However it was constrained by the timeline of both local council and this research. If further engagement with the community and local council was made, this research could showcase the capacity of universities to develop civic engagement by working with real communities that face concrete needs and the risk of social segregation.

The idea of designing inclusive spaces through community engagement alongside the landscape architectural approach has potential to be explored further. I believe that the collaboration of (1) Comparative analysis, (2) the traditional landscape architecture, and (3) the Participatory design process in this research creates a method for designing urban spaces that meet the needs and inclusiveness of the approached communities. This research challenges the traditional architectural design process by enhancing and formalising the participatory process into landscape discipline.

5. THESIS REFERENCES

Thesis references including figure references, a bibliography, and appendix

FIGURE REFERENCES

Introduction

Clark, J, active 1900s. Newtown, Wellington. Ref: PA7-07-09. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand. /records/22779695

Newtown, Wellington. Ref: 1/1-019663-G. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand. /records/22863855

Harmer, B. (2012, March). [Photograph found in Wellington]. Retrieved April 27, 2018. (Originally photographed 2012, March)

Theoretical framework

Rios Clementi Hale Studios. (2018, March 21). The Park for Everyone [Digital image]. Retrieved May 3, 2018, from <https://www.rchstudios.com/projects/grand-park/>

Isthmus Group. (2018). The Discovery Garden [Digital image]. Retrieved June 25, 2018, from <http://isthmus.co.nz/project/the-discovery-garden/>
Atelier Cho Thompson. (2010). Mobile Ethnic Garden [Digital image]. Retrieved April 10, 2018, from <http://www.chothompson.com/mobile-garden>

Cho, C. (2010, May 27). Mobile Ethnic Garden [Digital image]. Retrieved June 20, 2018, from <https://gsdmobilegarden.wordpress.com/2010/05/27/welcome/>

3.1 Targeting a specific group and site

Gardenlab. (2007, May 25). [The context of Edible Estates and various users]. Retrieved April 8, 2018, from <https://www.fritzhaeg.com/garden/initiatives/edibleestates/london.html>

The Common Unity Project Aotearoa. (n.d.). [The Common Unity Project Aotearoa Logo]. Retrieved March 26, 2018.

The Common Unity Project Aotearoa. (n.d.). Urban Kai Farms [Digital image]. Retrieved April 26, 2018, from <https://www.commonunityproject.org.nz/urban-kai-farms>

The Common Unity Project Aotearoa. (n.d.). Unity Kitchen Menu [Digital image]. Retrieved April 26, 2018, from <https://www.commonunityproject.org.nz/menu>

3.2 Step back, opening up possibilities

Wellington City Council. (2010). Te Ara Hou apartments [Digital image]. Retrieved August 15, 2018.

Lenihan-Ikin, R. (2016, May 15). [Newtown Local gardening groups working in Carrara Park]. Retrieved September 26, 2018.

Marshall, L. (2017, May 24). [Newtown Local gardening group]. Retrieved August 26, 2018.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agustina, I., & Beilin, R. (2012). Community Gardens: Space for Interactions and Adaptations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 36, 439-448.

Barker, F. (2012). New Zealand identity - New Zealand's peoples. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/new-zealand-identity/page-5>

Barnett, J. (2007). Food security and climate change in the South Pacific. *Pacific Ecologist*, 14 (Winter 2007), 32-36.

Blaschke, P. (2011). Growing Individuals, Growing Communities: Well-being outcomes of participating in ecological restoration and community gardening initiatives (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Otago, Dunedin.

Burby, R. J. (2003). Making plans that matter: Citizen involvement and government action. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(1), 33-49

Cappo, D Monsignor, 2002, Quoted in VicHealth Research Summary 2 - Social inclusion as a determinant of mental health & wellbeing (January 2005)

Defining Social Inclusion for Children with Disabilities: A Critical Literature Review. (2018). *Children & Society*, 32(1), 1-13.

E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. (2007). *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137-174.

Earle, M. D. (2011). Cultivating health: community gardening as a public health intervention. (Master of Public Health), University of Otago, University of Otago. Retrieved from

Egoz, Shelley and Alessia De Nardi. "Defining Landscape Justice: The Role of Landscape in Supporting Wellbeing of Migrants, a Literature Review." *Landscape Research*, vol. 42, no. sup1, 2017, pp. S74-S89,

European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. (2018). Evidence of the Link Between Inclusive Education and Social Inclusion: Literature Review. Retrieved February 8, 2019,

Francis, M (1987) Some different meanings attached to a city park and community gardens. *Landscape J* 6(2):101-112

Gerodetti, N, & Foster, S. (2016). "Growing foods from home": Food production, migrants and the changing cultural landscapes of gardens and allotments. 41(7), 808-819.

Ghose R, Pettygrove M (2014) Urban community gardens as spaces of citizenship. *Antipode* 46(4):1092-1112

Halskov, K., & Hansen, N. B. (2015). The diversity of participatory design research practice at PDC 2002-2012. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 74, 81-92.

Hancock, T. (2001). People, partnerships and human progress: Building community capital. *Health Promotion International*, 16(3), 275-280

Hou, J., & Grohmann, D. (2018). Integrating community gardens into urban parks: Lessons in planning, design and partnership from Seattle. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 33, 46-5

Ismail, W. A. W., & Said, I. (2015). Integrating the Community in Urban Design and Planning of Public Spaces: A Review in Malaysian Cities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 168, 357-364.

Jay, M., Schraml, U., 2009. Understanding the role of urban forests for migrants – uses, perception and integrative potential. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 8, 283-294.

Le Boutillier C, Croucher A. 2010. Social inclusion and mental health. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy* 73: 136-139.

Leikkila, Jaana et al. "Promoting Interculturalism by Planning of Urban Nature." *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2013, pp. 183-190.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (2013). The culinary triangle [orig. 1966]. In C. Counihan & P. Van esterik (eds.), *Food and culture: A reader* (3rd ed., pp. 40-47). London: Routledge.

Lovelock, B., Lovelock, K., Jellum, C., & Thompson, A. (2012). Immigrants' experiences of nature- based recreation in New Zealand. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 15(3), 204-226.

Lundmark, S. (2017). Design project failures: Outcomes and gains of participation in design. *Design Studies*.

Marne, P. (2001) Whose public space was it anyway? Class, gender and ethnicity in the creation of Sefton and Stanley parks, Liverpool: 1875–1872. *Social and Cultural Geography* 2, 421–43.

Mees, C. (2017). Participatory Design and Self-building in Shared Urban Open Spaces Community Gardens and Casitas in New York City / by Carolin Mees: Cham : Springer International Publishing : Imprint: Springer.

Memluk, M. Z. (2013). Designing Urban Squares. In: *Advances in Landscape Architecture*. InTech, pp. 513-530.
Ministry of the Environment. (2002, March). People Places Spaces: A design guide for urban New Zealand [PDF]. Wellington.

Nettle, C. (2014). *Community gardening as social action*: London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

New Zealand Institute of Economic Research. (2013): Pacific Economic Trends and Snapshot. Report to Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment.

Obesity Action Coalition. (2009, March). Food Security for Pacific Peoples in New Zealand [PDF].

Open City Projects. (2018, January 25). Design for Diversity Toolkit. Retrieved April 10, 2018

Peters, K., Elands, B., Buijs, A., 2010. Social interaction in urban parks: stimulating social cohesion? *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 9, 93–100.

Roe, M., Sarlöv Herlin, I., & Speak, S. (2016). Identity, food and landscape character in the urban context. *Landscape Research*, 41(7), 757-772.
Roe, Maggie. "Editorial: Food and Landscape." *Landscape Research*, vol. 41, no. 7, 2016, pp. 709-713

Saldivar-Tanaka L, Krasny ME (2004) Culturing community development, neighborhood open space, and civic agriculture: the case of Latino community gardens in New York City. *Agric Hum Values* 21:399–412

Sanoff, Henry (2000) *Community Participation Methods in Design and Planning*. John Wiley and Sons. Inc. New York.

Steele, Fritz. *The Sense of Place* / Fritz Steele. CBI Pub. Co., 1981.

Stephenson, J. (2008). The Cultural Values Model: An integrated approach to values in landscapes. *Landscape and urban planning*, 84(2), 127-139.

Tagtow, Angie. "Food Security and Urban Agriculture." *Sowing Seeds in the City: Human Dimensions*, edited by Elizabeth Hodges Snyder et al., Springer Netherlands, 2016, pp. 11-22.

Toker, Z. (2007). Recent trends in community design: the eminence of participation. *Design Studies*, 28(3), 309-323.

Viljoen, A., & Wiskerke, J. S. C. (eds.). (2012). *Sustainable food planning: Evolving theory and practice*. NL: Wageningen.

Waldenberger S (2000) Barrio gardens: the arrangements of a woman's space. *West S Folk Soc* 59(3/4):232–245

Wellington City Council. (2018, January 1). Wellington City. Retrieved March 11, 2018, from <https://profile.idnz.co.nz/wellington>

West, S., Badham, M., 2008, 'A Strategic Framework for Creating Liveable Communities' prepared for the Growth Areas Authority Victoria with assistance from the University of Melbourne, Griffith University and the McCaughey Centre.

Wood, P., Landry, C., 2008. *Intercultural City – Planning for Diversity Advantage*. Earthscan, Oxford.

Woodham, Carly Louise. "Food Desert or Food Swamp? An in-Depth Exploration of Neighbourhood Food Environments in Eastern Porirua and Whitby." vol. Master of Public Health, University of Otago, 2011. general editor, Louise; Ivory Signal, Vivienne.

APPENDIX A

Inclusive Foodscapes

Participant Consent Form

This consent form will be held for 5 years.

Researcher: Jiwon Choi, School of Architecture and Design, Victoria University of Wellington.

- I have read the Information Sheet and the project has been explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I can ask further questions at any time.
- I agree to take part in an audio recorded focus group.

I understand that:

- I acknowledge that I am agreeing to keep the information shared during the focus group confidential. I am aware that after the focus group, I must not communicate to anyone, including family members and close friends, any details about the focus group.
- I can withdraw from the focus group while it is in progress however it will not be possible to withdraw the information I have provided up to that point as it will be part of a discussion with other participants
- The identifiable information I have provided will be destroyed on 31/12/2024.
- Any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher and the supervisor.
- I understand that the results will be used for a Master's thesis.
- I consent to information or opinions which I have given being attributed to my role in any reports on this research: Yes ☐ No ☐
- I would like a summary of the focus group: Yes ☐ No ☐
- I would like to receive a copy of the final report and have added my email address below. Yes ☐ No ☐

Signature of participant: _____

Name of participant: _____

Date: _____

Contact details: _____

Inclusive Foodscapes

Participants Information Sheet

You are invited to take part in this research. Please read this information before deciding whether or not to take part. If you decide to participate, thank you. If you decide not to participate, thank you for considering this request.

Who am I?

My name is Jiwon Choi and I am a Masters student in LAND 593 at School of Architecture at Victoria University of Wellington. This research project is work towards my thesis.

What is the aim of the project?

Multiculturalism highly relates to food because people connect to their cultural group through similar food patterns and use it as a way of maintaining immigrants' identity in the host country. Diverse cultural groups have different cultural values, needs and interests, which differentiate the way they use (public) space and access food. This highlights the importance of creating inclusive spaces for diverse cultural groups with a better accessibility to healthy food.

Therefore, this research aims to explore the way to create inclusive spaces in consideration of different culture's values and examine if community garden can be a potential solution.

This research has been approved by the Victoria University of Wellington Human Ethics Committee #26030

How can you help?

You have been invited to participate because of your knowledge of the community garden (e.g. operation and management). If you agree to take part I will interview you in Newtown. I will ask you questions about the topics outlined above. The interview will take a maximum of one hour. I will audio record the interview with your permission and write it up later. You can choose to not answer any question or stop the interview at any time, without giving a reason. You can withdraw from the study by contacting me at any time before 1st of August. If you withdraw, the information you provided will be destroyed or returned to you.

APPENDIX B

1

- 1. Path - Vertical wall on the private house building
- 2. Brick - Low maintenance. Well-drainage
- 3. Edible Plants - Windbreak Design: Equilateral shape
- 4. Raised garden bed - Invite various types of users
- 5. Seating - Offset from the road. Surrounded by vegetation: Feeling cozy and comfortable

2

- 1. Path - Grasscover planted between path and private house
- 2. Aggregate Concrete - Low maintenance.
- 3. Layer planting (Grasses, Shrubs, Trees) - aesthetic / interact
- 4. Vertical Wall - Use of existing fence
- 5. Seating - Close from the entrance/road

3

- 1. Path - partially cleared. A wider gap between private house and path
- 2. Agricultural lime - Easy and quick to apply
- 3. Tall trees - above eye level. The site is visible from the road
- 4. Edible garden for public use
- 5. Seating for both visitors and workers

APPENDIX C

- 1. Accessway - Edible planting - highlight the garden's presence
- 2. Pergola - Sheltered. Expandable canopy
- 3. Natural seating/deck under shelter - natureful/boundary less
- 4. Wooden structure for planting seedlings - Verticality (eye contact). Currently no space to grow young plants
- 5. Fence - Grow climbers - soften the boundary

- 1. Accessway - Tire garden (the extension of elements in the gardening space)
- 2. Pergola - Sheltered with transparent roofing sheets to block rain and allow sunlight
- 3. Adjustable seating - changes in height multifunction - seating/table
- 4. Recycled wooden pallets for garden - Feasibility. Verticality
- 5. Fence - Reduction in height - below eye level

- 1. Accessway - Vertical garden wall to draw people's eyes
- 2. Pergola - Sheltered. Reconfigure the existing timber slats to create hip roof - familiar shape for some cultures
- 3. Expandable Seating - Flexibility, Light/recycled materials. Adjustable for different size of groups
- 4. More raised garden beds - same as existing structure
- 5. Fence - Painted with colours (e.g. green - blends into the background)