Feminist approaches to urban design

Chapter · January 2011

1 author:

Kristen Day
New York University
46 PUBLICATIONS **5,232** CITATIONS

Companion to Urban Design

Edited by
Tridib Banerjee and
Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris

11

Feminist approaches to urban design

Kristen Day

The design of cities and suburbs in the second half of the twentieth century has often neglected women's needs and their lived experiences. Women are disadvantaged in settings that were not created with their views and experiences in mind (Greed 2006). Consider, for example, the creation of isolated suburbs where mothers strive to care for households and participate in paid employment without ready access to nearby stores, schools, and jobs; the design of transportation systems meant to accommodate single adult commuters on their journeys to work, rather than women with children running errands; and the layout of urban environments that does not ensure safe travel. Increasingly, we recognize that fundamental changes in urban design and form are needed to create cities that are more equitable for women.

In the last three decades, research and practice have begun to address this gap. Scholars in urban planning, geography, architecture, anthropology, environmental psychology, and other fields have explored women's relationships with built environments (cf. Ahrentzen 2003; Altman and Churchman 1989; Anthony 2001; Berkeley and McQuaid 1989; Dandakar 1993; Greed 1994; Miranne and Young 2000; Rendell, Penner, and Bordon 2000; Rose 1993; Rothschild 1999; Spain 1992;

Sprague 1991; Weisman 1992; Wilson 1991). This chapter focuses specifically on the gaps and opportunities revealed by feminist approaches to urban design.

Feminist perspectives

While no single definition of "feminism" prevails, feminist perspectives share a belief that justice requires freedom and equality for women. These approaches argue that patriarchy – a social system that attaches power to masculine gender – disadvantages women. Patriarchy burdens women through the gendered division of labor and activities, gendered access to resources, and the construction of gendered identities (Law 1999).

Feminist perspectives emphasize the differences between women and men (Greed 2006; Sandercock and Forsyth 1992). If we assume that no differences exist, then we may create systems and spaces that reinforce the status quo (Rakodi 1991; Wallace and Milroy 1999; Weisman 1992). In considering difference, we must also consider differences among women themselves (Anthony 2001). Race/ethnicity, class, sexuality, religion, physical ability, age – all shape women's experiences and their relative privilege. Increasingly, feminist scholars recognize that the views and experiences

1 1992; Wilson
es specifically on
ties revealed by
ban design.

ves

)n of "feminism"
ives share a belief
lom and equality
)aches argue that
:em that attaches
er – disadvantages
is women through
ibor and activities,
:ces, and the con-
ities (Law 1999).
:mphasize the dif-
1 and men (Greed
Forsyth 1992). If
rences exist, then
and spaces that
) (Rakodi 1991;
);Weisman 1992).
:e, we must also
ng women them-
ace/ethnicity, class,
al ability, age – all
ces and their rela-
y, feminist scholars
s and experiences

of white, middle class women (whose voices dominated the US women's movement until the 1980s), do not represent the priorities and experiences of all women (Sandercock and Forsyth 1992).

The consideration of gender complicates and enriches urban design scholarship. Historically, urban design has emphasized the human experiences of place and the needs of users who will occupy the places created by designers and others. If, however, this focus on "residents" or "users" ignores gender and other identities, then it may mask differences in needs, perceptions, and experiences of the built environment (Rakodi 1991). Feminist approaches to urban design correct this oversight, by exploring how women's identities shape their use of urban environments, and how the design of cities and communities can better accommodate women's needs. Key groups of women to consider are those who are most disadvantaged by current design and planning practices, such as lower income workers, working mothers and single headed households, and older women (Rakodi 1991).

Many of the classic works on women and environments were written in the 1980s (see for example, Hayden 1980, 1984; Leavitt and Saegert 1989; Matrix 1984; Mazey and Lee 1983; McDowell 1983; Stimpson et al. 1981; Wekerle, Peterson, and Morley 1980). This classic literature focuses primarily on the experiences of white, middle class women (Miraftab 2007). More recently, empirical research has expanded to involve diverse groups of women in settings that vary by place type and geographic location. Scholars increasingly address the use of urban environments by women in developing countries (cf. Chhibber 2002; Dandekar 1993; Njoh 1999). The experiences of minority and low-income women in US and Western environments have received less systematic attention.

This chapter reviews research and theory tied to the experiences of women in different urban settings. In each setting, women's experiences can be understood as constrained, constraining, and/or as resisting (after Shaw 1994; Day 1999a). Constraints disadvantage women's use of environments. Constraints include housework and childcare responsibilities that limit women's ease of travel, and traditional gender norms for safety and modesty that hinder women's freedom in public spaces. Women's use of urban environments is potentially constraining when these experiences reinforce or reproduce oppressive gender relations. Examples include recreational spaces for women that encourage frivolous consumption (many shopping environments fit this description) or spaces that reinforce our preoccupation with women's physical appearance (such as nail and tanning salons). The use of urban environments can constitute resistance when women claim their own space and challenge restrictive gender norms about where they belong. Examples might include women's health centers and women's bookstores.

Feminist critiques of the separation of land uses

Women are fundamentally restricted by the separation of land uses and the distinction between public and private roles. In Western cities, this distinction has its roots in the Victorian "separation of spheres," which delineated separate economic and spatial realms for women and men (Franck and Paxson 1989; Hayden 1984; Rose 1993). Historically, private (domestic) spaces and virtues were associated with women, and public spaces and activities with men. The capitalist economy (dividing production and reproduction) and suburbanization further reinforced this dualism (Valentine 1992). For many low income women and women of color, however, restriction to home and domestic sphere

was a "luxury" that was rarely achievable (Rose 1993). These women's daily routines necessitated significant time spent working in other women's homes and in public settings.

The rigid separation of land uses into public and private, urban and suburban, still disadvantages women in multiple ways. Dolores Hayden's landmark *Redesigning the American Dream* (1984), documents how traditional suburban environments encourage individual consumption and impede women in performing their multiple roles as workers and mothers. At the same time, in the US and elsewhere, low income, predominantly minority women remain isolated in urban environments with limited employment, housing, and educational opportunities (Massey and Denton 1993). The problems identified by Hayden and other feminist writers – the lack of public transportation to everyday destinations, the unwieldy distances between homes and places of employment, the absence of nearby shops – will sound familiar to today's urban designers and planners. These critiques resonate with the more recent New Urbanist, Smart Growth/sustainability, and Active Living movements. Arguably, these newer movements have had more impact on design and planning practice (Greed 2006). Feminist perspectives, however, have been notably absent from these recent movements, raising questions about how best to link feminist scholarship and urban design practice.

Feminist approaches to urban design have blurred rigid distinctions between public and private, bringing some "private" issues into public conversation (for example, sexual assault in public spaces, Day 2000a), and reframing some "public" issues as private decisions (for example, the legal definition of who can live in a household, Ritzdorf 1994). In women's lives, rigid boundaries between public and private may be meaningless and constraining.

Women's use of public spaces

Contemporary Western and especially US urban design scholarship reveals a nostalgia for a perceived loss of public life (Brill 1989) and a scorn for the increasing privatization of public spaces (cf. Huxtable 1997; Sorkin 1992). Critics advocate a return to the traditions of idealized, "truly public" spaces to overcome limitations on civil rights (free speech, assembly), increased exclusion, and a growing focus on consumption in public space.

From a feminist perspective, however, there is no such thing as "truly public" space that is experienced in the same way by all groups (Mozingo 1985; Ruddick 1996). Gender shapes women's experiences of public space. The oft-celebrated right to observe and mingle with strangers in public space, for example, is not shared equally among women and men. Women are less likely to approach strangers in public space and more likely to be approached by them, than are men (cf. Henley 1977). Experiences of objectification (of the male gaze) can shape some women's use of urban environments (Borlsoff and Hahn 1997; Gardiner 1989). Also, the characterization of an idealized public sphere where all come together in equal and free exchange of ideas, does not resonate with some women's experiences (Fraser 1992). In accounts of urban life, women are typically characterized as part of the "background," rather than as part of the "action" (Lofland 1975, in Sandercock and Forsyth 1992).

For many women, responsibility for home and children and fear for safety constrain their activities in public space (Franck 2002; Franck and Paxson 1989; Harrington et al. 1992). Gendered social norms further limit women's public space participation (Gardiner 1989; 1994), by encouraging women to curtail their behavior to keep up socially desirable self-presentations of femininity.

ɔlic spaces

ıd especially US
reveals a nostal-
public life (Brill
ıncreasing priva-
s (cf. Huxtable
ıtics advocate a
'idealized, "truly
ɔme limitations
eech, assembly),
a growing focus
: space.
ıective, however,
ıs "truly public"
in the same way
1985; Ruddick
ʋomen's experi-
ıe oft–celebrated
ƒle with strangers
ple, is not shared
nd men. Women
strangers in pub-
:o be approached
:f. Henley 1977).
ıtion (of the male
women's use of
ırlsoff and Hahn
ȝo, the character-
l public sphere
in equal and free
ıot resonate with
:es (Fraser 1992).
life, women are
part of the "back-
ırt of the "action"
cock and Forsyth

ınsibility for home
r safety constrain
.c space (Franck
1989; Harrington
:ial norms further
ıace participation
by encouraging
behavior to keep
f-presentations of

Women's bodily experiences of public spaces are also distinctive. For example, women may have smaller "personal space" bubbles than men. People tend to stand closer to women than to men, and women move out of the way for others more often than do men (Mozingo 1989). Women are touched more in public spaces than are men. Women often find crowding less stressful, compared to men, and may even find some crowded situations appealing (Mozingo 1989), assuming that crowding does not involve groping or sexual harassment.

Women's use and experience of public spaces differ significantly with race/ethnicity, culture, sexuality, age, and physical ability. Recent years have seen an increase in research on women's use of public spaces around the world and especially in developing countries (cf. Alizadeh 2007; Chhibber 2002; Mazumdar and Mazumdar 2001; Mills 2007; Sangwha 1999; Seedat et al. 2006). Much of this research involves case studies of women in one country or city. Still needed are comparative studies that integrate these cases and advance theories of women and public space.

There is danger in overstating women's constraints in public space. Certainly, women enjoy public spaces and traverse them freely under many circumstances (Lofland 1984; Wilson 1991). Indeed, women's use of public space can constitute resistance, when women define their own identities through participation in self-determined, meaningful activities. Consider, for example, women's use of lesbian bars (Wolfe 1992), or creation of feminist public art (Lacy 1995), or young Latinas' claims on dangerous urban street environments (Hymas 2003), and even homeless women's occupation of highly visible public spaces (Casey et al. 2008), as cases in point.

If the goal of urban design is to create accessible, diverse, and open public spaces, then we must recognize that no single setting will meet the needs of all groups at all times (Franck and Paxson 1989). Rather, it is more appropriate to think about a network of spaces that can accommodate the meaningful characteristics of specific social groups. Public spaces will be more useful for women if these spaces provide perceived and actual safety and facilitate women's multiple roles by allowing women to conveniently entertain children, complete work tasks, and/or accomplish household responsibilities such as shopping or other errands. Examples include airports that offer play spaces for children and fitness centers that provide child care.

Women and transportation

Since the late 1970s, feminist scholars have examined the role of gender in travel behavior and the implications of women's travel for the design of cities and transportation systems (cf. early work by Giuliano 1979; Rosenbloom 1978; 1980). This research is part of a broader recognition of the mobility needs of "transportation disadvantaged" groups including women, older adults, and others (Law 1999). Early studies characterized women as deprived in their access to cars, dependent on public transportation, and burdened in their travel by children and household responsibilities (Coleman 2000). Later studies have provided more nuanced descriptions of the travel experiences of diverse women. Research on women and transportation focuses predominantly on developed countries and especially emphasizes women's work trips (Law 1999).

Women's mobility continues to be constrained by factors that include gendered division of household and childrearing labor, gendered access to time and money, gendered attitudes about women and travel, and segregated patterns of urban land uses (Law 1999; Njoh 1999). The separation of land uses, discussed earlier, has important implications for women's mobility, making it more difficult for

women to travel between different uses and increasing children's and others' dependency on women for transportation.

Women's travel and mobility are distinctive in many ways. Because of their greater responsibility for children and households, women's trips are more likely to be multipurpose and "trip chained" (multiple trips strung together), compared to men's travel (Blumenberg 2004; Hamilton 2000; Hu and Young 1999). Women generally make about the same number of trips as men, but women's trips are often shorter and more local in nature, making support for travel to nearby destinations especially important. Due to differential access to cars and the shorter nature of some women's work trips, women are more likely to travel on foot or public transportation than are men (Greed 2006), though Black and Latina women do not necessarily have shorter commutes to work (Law 1999).

At the same time, women may be less likely to cycle to work compared to men, due to safety concerns, a lack of changing facilities at work, and beliefs about women's proper appearance (Greed 2006).

Planning for public transportation has typically concentrated on work trips during prime commuting times (Blumenberg 2004). This is problematic, since women (who frequently work part time) are less likely to travel at rush hour than are men (Greed 2006; Njoh 1999; Rakodi 1991). Planners sometimes view women's nonwork trips as a nuisance that slows and interferes with public transportation planning (Greed 2006). Instead, we must recognize women's travel as essential activity and design transportation systems to serve the times when women – and men – need to travel. This may mean, for example, more investment in bus transportation during evenings and weekends, rather than the creation of additional park and ride facilities to serve workers during traditional commuting hours (Hamilton 2000).

154

Public transportation should consider the needs of women with children, who may face special burdens while traveling (strollers, need for restrooms, etc.); women conducting household errands that require carrying heavy or bulky loads; and older women, who are less likely to have driver's licenses (Coleman 2000; Pickup 1989; Rosenbloom and Winsten-Bartlett 2002). Such consideration would improve access to public transportation from different parts of the city, and lead to the design of systems with chairs for sitting and waiting, fewer steps, places for strollers and bags on board, and other accommodations.

The realities of women's travel may cause us to reconsider our prescriptions about what constitutes "good urban design and planning." Contemporary urban designers strongly advocate a shift away from cars to public transportation to promote sustainability and to increase physical activity. And yet many of women's car trips actually provide efficient transportation for others in the household (Greed 2006; Law 1999). Many such trips (chained together, involving children) would be difficult to accommodate by most public transportation systems, especially in suburban environments where public transportation is more limited. Car travel may be more necessary for women with young children than for other groups (Hillman *et al.* 1974, in Pickup 1984). In fact, in terms of increasing low income and single mothers' mobility and their access to more and better jobs, policies to increase auto ownership may actually be more helpful than focusing exclusively on increasing access to public transportation in urban environments (Blumenberg 2004).

Women and safety in urban environments

Extensive research examines women's experiences of fear and safety in the city. Women consistently report greater fear in urban

should consider
th children, who
s while traveling
ms, etc.); women
rands that require
loads; and older
ly to have driver's
); Pickup 1989;
n-Bartlett 2002).
d improve access
i from different
l to the design of
tting and waiting,
llers and bags on
odations.
's travel may cause
escriptions about
urban design and
y urban designers
away from cars to
promote sustain-
physical activity.
n's car trips actu-
ransportation for
(Greed 2006; Law
chained together,
ld be difficult to
blic transportation
iburban environ-
portation is more
e more necessary
children than for
al. 1974, in Pickup
of increasing low
iers' mobility and
etter jobs, policies
ip may actually be
ng exclusively on
c transportation in
imenberg 2004).

**in
ts**

ies women's expe-
in the city. Women
ter fear in urban

environments than do men (Gordon and
Riger 1989; Grabowsky 1995; Stanko 1987).
Fear especially impacts those women with
the fewest resources to ensure their safety.
In the US and other Western countries,
women who are most fearful include older
women, women with limited education
and lower incomes, and women of color
(Gordon and Riger 1989; Pain 1997a;
Thompson *et al.* 2002). These women are
more likely to reside in high crime neigh-
borhoods, which may explain their higher
fear (Gordon and Riger 1989; Loukaitou-
Sideris and Fink 2009; Pain 1997b).

Physical features associated with women's
(and men's) fear of crime include the pres-
ence of hiding places, limited vistas, and
low potential for escape (Fisher and Nasar
1992; Nasar and Fisher 1992); graffiti;
poor maintenance; dense vegetation; and
inadequate lighting (Cooper Marcus and
Wischemann 1983; Day 2000a; Nasar
and Fisher 1992; Wekerle and Whitzman
1995). Fearful places include pathways,
alleys, bus and transit stops, parking lots,
tunnels, and natural areas (Cooper Marcus
and Wischemann 1983; Gordon and Riger
1989; Loukaitou-Sideris and Fink 2009;
Loukaitou-Sideris *et al.* 2002). Women's
fear is especially heightened at night time
(Valentine 1992; Warr 1990). Social inci-
vilities, such as public drinking, panhan-
dlers, and rowdy crowds, are also tied to
fear in urban environments (Day 2000a;
Rohe and Burby 1988).

Women's fear in urban environments is
attributed to many factors, including
past victimization, women's sense of them-
selves as physically weak, warnings of
women's vulnerability, and especially
women's specific fear of sexual assault
(Gordon and Riger 1989; Loukaitou-
Sideris and Fink 2009). Women are vic-
tims of crime in both public and private
places. Yet women's primary association of
fear with public spaces belies the reality
that women are more often victimized
in private and domestic environments

(Gordon and Riger 1989; Koskela and
Pain 2000; Valentine 1992).

For women of color, the notion of safety
in urban environments is broader than the
absence of assault or disorder. Safety also
involves feeling welcome and accepted in
a setting (see Day 1999b). Walking alone in
a neighborhood, hiking in an urban park,
or participating in community events
require reassurance that individuals will
not "stand out" uncomfortably in terms of
race or ethnicity, and will not be targeted
by race harassment or violence.

Fear functions as a form of social control
over women's use of urban environments,
since women are persuaded to significantly
curtail their travel and behavior in public
spaces out of fear (Deegan 1987; Valentine
1989). Women have made considerable
strides in reversing their exclusion from
public spaces, and yet social rules for
appropriate behavior for women still
restrict their full and equal access. These
social norms designate "unseemly" places
where women should not go – especially
not alone or at night, or else risk sexual
assault or harassment and be blamed for
any harm that may occur (Gardiner 1989;
1994). More recently, researchers have
expanded the study of women and fear to
also examine women's resistance to fear in
urban environments (Hyams 2003; Koskela
1997). This research is important for help-
ing us to understand women as bold and
assertive users of urban environments and
not only as victims.

The question of fear in urban environ-
ments is one of the few areas in urban
design research where we also see research
that addresses *men's* experiences from a
gender (and typically a feminist) perspec-
tive. Such research is still in the early stages.
For many men, fear in urban settings is
intimately tied to their masculine identi-
ties. Settings can be judged fearful depend-
ing, in part, on whether they challenge
men's masculine identities. Men's fear in
urban environments may be tied to the

155

need for control and to potential confrontation with other men (Day 2006; Day et al. 2003). Race and racism critically shape men's experience of fear and of being feared in urban settings (Brownlow 2004; Day 2006; hooks 1992).

Feminist urban designers and planners have undertaken several initiatives to enhance women's safety in cities (see also the chapter by Whitzman in this volume). One example is the groundbreaking work of METRAC in Toronto, where a special committee has implemented numerous planning projects to increase women's safety (Modlich 1986; Wekerle and Whitzman 1995). Similar efforts have also taken place in the Netherlands (Sandercock and Forsyth 1992). Feminist scholars warn us that we must exercise caution in turning to urban design as the (only) solution to enhancing women's safety in urban environments (Koskela and Pain 2000). Many of the underlying issues that cause women's fear and danger will not be resolved by better lighting and safer transit, as important as these issues are. Indeed, increasing women's safety will also require a fundamental rethinking of women's roles and place in the city.

Conclusions

Research on women and environments — in urban design and in other fields — has proliferated over the past three decades. Researchers have shifted their focus over time in accordance with changes in urban design and women's studies scholarship. As in other areas of feminist research, the emphasis is increasingly on the construction of gender identities in urban environments, and less on the identification of constraints to women's use of cities (Law 1999). This shift in focus has both costs and benefits. It encourages us to identify structural factors that disadvantage women in urban environments, but it may neglect

practical issues that must be addressed to improve "conditions on the ground."

Despite many recommendations to improve gender equity in urban design and planning, actual impacts on design and planning practice have been limited (Greed 2006). Model programs do exist, such as the METRAC program in Toronto, discussed earlier (Wekerle and Whitzman 1995). In other examples, in Italy, recent legislation allows mayors to coordinate the hours of employment, retail, and other facilities, to allow women to balance employment with their substantial family responsibilities (Belloni 1998). In Oslo, Norway, municipal government officials undertook a comprehensive process to incorporate women's perspectives into local planning decision making (Skjerven 1993, in Greed 2006). These are isolated cases, however. We have yet to see a more widespread movement to enhance gender equity in city planning and design. This limited impact may reflect the fact that women still occupy peripheral positions in planning and design decision-making, despite their large numbers in schools of planning (Greed 2006; Sandercock and Forsyth 1992). We must continue to promote the advancement of women and men who support feminist agendas to positions of power in planning and design.

We must also recognize the numerous ways in which women play leadership roles in the shaping of cities and communities. Women are leaders in creating urban gardens; spearheading neighborhood improvements; grassroots organizing; supporting urban parks; establishing national women's policy think tanks; documenting public history; and in struggles around housing, childcare, and neighborhood preservation (cf. Bland 1989; Cranz 1981; Dubrow 2007; Feldman and Stall 1994; Hayden 1997; Rakodi 1991; Spain 2001). These efforts are often driven by a feminist "ethic of care" for places and for the people that occupy them (Day 2000b;

156

;t be addressed to
the ground."
mmendations to
i urban design and
:s on design and
:en limited (Greed
do exist, such as
i in Toronto, dis-
: and Whitzman
es, in Italy, recent
; to coordinate the
retail, and other
>men to balance
substantial family
1998). In Oslo,
vernment officials
ensive process to
perspectives into
making (Skjerven
These are isolated
yet to see a more
:o enhance gender
; and design. This
flect the fact that
ipheral positions in
decision-making,
ibers in schools of
; Sandercock and
t continue to pro-
if women and men
gendas to positions
id design.
iize the numerous
:n play leadership
f cities and com-
leaders in creating
ding neighborhood
ts organizing; sup-
;tablishing national
anks; documenting
i struggles around
neighborhood pre-
989; Cranz 1981;
in and Stall 1994;
1991; Spain 2001).
driven by a femi-
places and for the
hem (Day 2000b;

Krenichyn 2004). We must acknowledge that, in a time when cities are abandoning their public responsibilities, these activities can sometimes exploit women's free and unpaid work in the name of "women's empowerment" (Miraftab 2007). At the same time, however, women's leadership in these efforts represents a powerful force for advancing equity in urban design and planning. We should work to strategically link women's community work to formal planning and design processes and resources and to other planning movements (sustainability, active living, etc.) that share similar values.

Finally, we must work to reduce the constraints that shape women's use of urban environments (and especially those tied to caring for children and households), while at the same time challenging the restrictive gender roles that disadvantage women. Often, the most strategic solutions will not be design interventions. We must work with policy makers and others to address underlying issues tied to women's roles and status, while we continue to improve the quality of urban environments to support women's and men's lives.

References

Ahrentzen, S. (2003). "The space between the studs: feminism and architecture." *Signs*, 29(1), 179–206.

Alizadeh, H. (2007). "Changes conceptions of women's public space in the Kurdish city." *Cities*, 24(6): 410–421.

Altman. I. and Churchman, A. (Eds.) (1989). *Women and the environment*. New York: Plenum Press.

Anthony, K.H. (2001). *Designing for diversity. Gender, race, and ethnicity in the architectural profession.* Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Belloni, M.C. (1998). "Tempi delle città: Italy's urban time plans and policies." *Time & Society*, 7: 249–263. At: http://tas.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/7/2–3/249.

Berkeley, E.P. and McQuaid, M. (Eds.) (1989). *Architecture: A place for women.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Bland, S. (1989). "'Miss Sue' of Charleston: Saving a neighborhood, influencing a nation." In Berkeley, E.P. and McQuaid, M. (Eds.) (1989). *Architecture: A place for women.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 63–76.

Blumenberg, E. (2004). "En-gendering effective planning: Spatial mismatch, low-income women, and transportation policy." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(3), 269–281.

Borlsoff, D. and Hahn, D.F. (1997). "The mirror in the window: Displaying our gender biases." In Drucker, S. J. and Gumpert, G. (Eds.), *Voices in the street. Explorations in gender. Media and public space.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 101–117.

Brill, M. (1989). "Transformation, nostalgia, and illusion about public life and public environments." In Altman, I. and Zube, E. (Eds.), *Public places and spaces.* New York, NY: Plenum, 7–29.

Brownlow, A. (2004). "A geography of men's fear." *Geoforum*, 36(5): 581–592.

Casey, R., Goodie, R., and Reeve. K. (2008). "Homeless women in public spaces. Strategies of resistance." *Housing Studies*, 23(6): 899–916.

Chhibber, P. (2002). "Why are some women politically active? The household, public space, and political participation in India." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 43: 409–429.

Coleman, C. (2000). "Women, transport, and cities: An overview and an agenda for research. In Darke, J., Ledwirth, S. and Woods, R. (Eds.), *Women and the city. Visibility and voice in urban space.* New York: Palgrave, 83–97.

Cooper Marcus, C. and Wischemann, T. (1983). *Campus open space: An underutilized potential.* Mimeo. Department of Landscape Architecture, University of California.

Cranz, G. (1981). "Women in urban parks." In Stimpson, C.R., Dixler, E., Nelson, M. and Yatrakis, K.B. (Eds.), *Women and the American city* (pp. 76–92). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dandekar, H. (Ed.) (1993). *Shelter, women and development: First and third world perspectives.* Ann Arbor, MI: George Wahr.

Day, K. (1999a). "Introducing gender to the critique of privatized public space." *Journal of Urban Design*, 4(2): 155–178.

—— (1999b). "Embassies and sanctuaries: Race and women's fear and welcome in privatized public space." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17(3): 307–328.

—— (2000a). "Strangers in the night? Women's fear of sexual assault on urban college campuses." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research,* 16(4): 289–312.

—— (2000b). "The ethic of care and women's experiences of public space." *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 20: 103–124.

—— (2006). "Being feared: Masculinity and race in public space." *Environment and Planning A,* 38: 569–586.

Day, K., Stump, C., and Carreon, D. (2003). "Confrontation and loss of control: Masculinity and men's fear in public space." *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 23: 311–322.

Deegan, M.J. (1987). "The female pedestrian: The dramaturgy of structural and experiential barriers in the street." *Man-Environment Systems,* 17, pp. 79–86.

Dubrow, G. (2007). "Honoring the landmarks of feminist planning thought while embracing the future." *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 73(1): 114–115.

Feldman, R.M. and Stall, S. (1994). "The politics of space appropriation: A case study of women's struggles for homeplace in Chicago public housing." In Altman, I. and Churchman, A. (Eds.), *Women and the environment* New York: Plenum Press, 167–200.

Fisher, B. and Nasar, J.L. (1992). "Fear of crime in relation to three exterior site features. Prospect, refuge, and escape." *Environment and Behavior,* 24(1): 35–65.

Franck, K. (2002). "Women and environment." In Bechtel, R. and Churchman, A. (Eds.) *Handbook of environmental psychology.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 347–362.

Franck, K. and Paxson, L. (1989). "Women and urban public space." In Altman, I. and Zube, E. (Eds.), *Public places and spaces.* New York: Plenum, 121–146.

Fraser, N. (1992). "Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy." In Calhoun, C. (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 109–142.

Gardiner, C.B. (1989). "Analyzing gender in public places: Rethinking Goffman's vision of everyday life." *American Sociologist,* 20(1): 42–156.

—— (1994). "Out of place: gender, public places, and situational disadvantage." In Friedland, R. and Boden, D. (Eds.), *Now Here. Space, time*

and modernity. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Giuliano, G. (1979). "Public transportation and the travel needs of women." *Traffic Quarterly,* 33: 607–616.

Gordon, M.T. and Riger, S. (1989). *The female fear.* New York: Free Press.

Grabowsky, P. (1995). "Fear of crime and fear reduction strategies." *Trends and Issues* Paper 44. Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Greed, C.H. (1994). *Women and planning: Creating gendered realities.* London: Routledge.

—— (2006). "Making the divided city whole: Mainstreaming gender into planning in the United Kingdom." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie,* 97(3): 267–280.

Hamilton, K. (2000). *Public transport audit London.* At: www.uel.ac.uk/womenandtransport.

Harrington, M., Dawson, D. and Bolla, P. (1992). "Objective and subjective constraints on women's enjoyment of leisure." *Society and Leisure,* 15(1): 203–221.

Hayden, D. (1980). "What would a non-sexist city be like? Speculations on housing, urban design, and human work." *Signs,* 5(3): S170–187.

—— (1984). *Redesigning the American dream: The future of housing, work, and family life.* New York: W.W. Norton.

—— (1997). *The power of place. Urban landscapes as public history.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Henley, N.M. (1977). *Body politics.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hillman, M., Henderson, I., and Whaley, A. (1974). *Mobility and accessibility in the outer metropolitan area. Political and Economic Planning Report to the Department of the Environment.* London: Policy Studies Institute.

hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks. Race and representation.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hu, P.S. and Young, J.R. (1999). *Summary of travel trends: 1995 Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.

Huxtable, A.L. (1997). *The unreal America. Architecture and illusion.* New York: The New Press.

Hymas, M. (2003). "Adolescent Latinas body-spaces: Making homegirls, homebodies, and homespaces." *Antipode,* 536–558.

Krenichyn, K. (2004). "Women and physical activity in an urban park: Enrichment and support

CA: University of

: transportation and
en." *Traffic Quarterly,*

1989). *The female fear.*

c of crime and fear
ds and Issues Paper 44.
iminology, Canberra.
and planning: Creating
Routledge.

divided city whole:
nto planning in the
:hrift voor Economische
: 267–280.
transport audit London.
enandtransport.
l. and Bolla, P. (1992).
:tive constraints on
leisure." *Society and*

ould a non-sexist city
iousing, urban design,
5(3): S170–187.
e *American dream: The*
l family life. NewYork:

ace. *Urban landscapes as*
, MA: MIT Press.
ly politics. Englewood

I., and Whaley, A.
sibility in the outer met-
ind Economic Planning
it of the Environment.
Institute.
es. *Race and representa-*
End Press.
. (1999). *Summary of*
ionwide Personal Trans-
;ton DC: U.S. Depart-
in, Federal Highway

The unreal America.
New York: The New

lescent Latinas body-
;irls, homebodies, and
536–558.
men and physical activ-
irichment and support

through an ethic of care." *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 24: 117–130.

Koskela, H. (1997). "'Bold walk and breakings': Women's spatial confidence versus fear of violence." *Gender, Place, and Culture,* 4: 301–319.

Koskela, H. and Pain, R. (2000). "Revisiting fear and place: Women's fear of attack and the built environment." *Geoforum,* 31: 269–280.

Law, R. (1999). "Beyond 'women and transport': Towards new geographies of gender and daily mobility." *Progress in Human Geography,* 23(4): 567–588.

Lacy, S. (1995). (Ed.). *Mapping the terrain. New genre public art.* Seattle, WA: Bay Press.

Leavitt, J. and Saegert, S. (1989). *From abandonment to hope: Community-households in Harlem.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Lofland, L. (1975). "The 'thereness' of women: A selective review of urban sociology." In Millman, M. and Kanter, R. M. (Eds.), *In another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science.* New York: Anchor Books.

—— (1984). "Women and urban public space." *Women and Environments,* 6(2): 12–14.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A. and Fink, C. (2009). "Addressing women's fear of victimization in transportation settings. A survey of U.S. transit agencies." *Urban Affairs Review,* 44(4): 554–587.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A., Ligget, R. and Iseki, H. (2002). "The geography of transit crime. Documentation and evaluation of crime incidence on and around the green line stations in Los Angeles," *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 22: 135–151.

Massey, D.S. and Denton, N.A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass.* Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matrix (Eds.) (1984). *Making space: Women and the man made environment.* London: Pluto Press.

Mazey, M.E. and Lee, D.R. (1983). *Her space, her place.* Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers.

Mazumdar, S. and Mazumdar, S. (2001). "Rethinking public and private space: Religion and women in Muslim society." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research,* 18(4): 302–324.

McDowell, L. (1983). "Towards an understanding of the gender division of urban space." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 1: 59–72.

Mills, A. (2007). "Gender and mahalle (neighborhood) space in Istanbul." *Gender, Place, and Culture,* 14(3): 335–354.

Miraftab, F. (2007). "Planning and gender as seen from the global South." *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 73(1): 115–116.

Miranne, K.B. and Young, A.H. (Eds.) (2000). *Gendering the city. Women, boundaries, and visions of urban life.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Modlich, R. (1986). "Women Plan Toronto," *Women and Environments,* 8(1).

Mozingo, L. (1985). "Public space in the balance." *Landscape Architecture,* 2: 43–47.

—— (1989). "Women and downtown open spaces." *Places,* 6(1): 38–47.

Nasar, J.L. and Fisher, B. (1992). "Design for vulnerability: Cues and reactions to fear of crime." *Sociology and Social Research,* 76(2): 48–58.

Njoh, A.J. (1999). "Gender-biased transportation planning in sub-Saharan Africa with special reference to Cameroon." *Journal of African and Asian Studies,* 34(2): 216–233.

Pain, R. (1997a). "Old age and ageism in urban research: The case of fear of crime." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 21(1): 117–128.

—— (1997b). "Social geographies of women's fear of crime." *Transportation Institute of British Geographers,* 22: 231–244.

Pickup, L. (1984). "Women's gender-role and its influence on travel behaviour." *Built Environment,* 10: 61–68.

—— (1989). "Women's travel requirements: Employment, with domestic constraints." In Grieco, M., Pickup, L. and Whipp, R. (Eds.), *Gender, transport and employment: The impact of travel constraints.* Avebury: Aldershot.

Rakodi, C. (1991). "Cities and people: Towards a gender-aware urban planning process?" *Public Administration and Development,* 11: 541–559.

Rendell, J., Penner, B., and Bordon, I. (2000). *Gender space architecture.* London: Routledge.

Ritzdorf, M. (1994). A feminist analysis of gender and residential zoning in the United States. In I. Altman & A. Churchman (Eds.) *Women and the environment* (pp. 255–279). New York: Plenum Press.

Rohe, W.M. and Burby, R.J. (1988). "Fear of crime in public housing." *Environment and Behavior,* 20: 702–720.

Rose, G. (1993). *Feminism and geography: The limits of geographical knowledge.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rosenbloom, S. (1978). "Editorial: The need for study of women's travel issues." *Transportation,* 7: 347–350.

—— (Ed.) (1980). *Women's travel issues: Research priorities and needs.* Washington DC: Department of Transportation, Research and Special Programs Administration.

Rosenbloom, S. and Winsten-Bartlett, C. (2002). "Asking the right question. Understanding the travel needs of older women who do not drive." *Transportation Research Record,* 1818: 78–82.

Rothschild, J. (Ed.) (1999). *Design and feminism: Re-visioning spaces, places, and everyday things.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ruddick, S. (1996). "Constructing difference in public spaces: Race, class and gender as interlocking systems." *Urban Geography,* 17(2): 132–151.

Sandercock, L. and Forsyth, A. (1992). "A gender agenda. New directions for planning theory." *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 58(1): 49–59.

Sangwha, L. (1999). "The patriarchy in China: An investigation of public and private spheres." *Asian Journal of Women's Studies,* 5(1): 9–.

Seedat, M., MacKenzie, S, and Mohan, D. (2006). "The phenomenology of being a female pedestrian in an African and an Asian city: A qualitative investigation." *Transportation Research Part F,* 9: 139–153.

Shaw, S.M. (1994). "Gender, leisure, and constraint: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's leisure." *Journal of Leisure Research,* 26(1): 8–22.

Skjerven, R. (1993). *Manual of alternative municipal planning.* Oslo: Ministry of Environment.

Sorkin, M. (1992). "Introduction: Variation on a theme park." In M. Sorkin (Ed.), *Variation on a theme park: The new American city and the end of public space* (pp. xi–xv). New York: Hill and Wang.

Spain, D. (1992). *Gendered spaces.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

—— (2001). *How women saved the city.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sprague, J.F. (1991). *More than housing: Lifeboats for women and children.* Boston, MA: Butterworth Architecture.

Stanko, E.A. (1987). "Typical violence, normal precaution: Men, women, and interpersonal violence in England, Wales, Scotland, the US." In J. Hanmer and M. Maynard (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control* (pp. 122–134). London: Macmillan.

Stimpson, C. Dixler, E., Nelson, M., and Yatrakis, K. (Eds.). (1981). *Women and the American city.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, J.L., Allen, P., Cunningham-Sabo, L., Yazzie, D., Curtis, M. and Davis, S.M. (2002). "Environmental, policy, and cultural factors related to physical activity in sedentary American Indian women." *Women and Health* 36(2): 59–74.

Valentine, G. (1989). "The geography of women's fear." *Area,* 21(4): 385–390.

—— (1992). "Images of danger: Women's sources of information about the spatial distribution of male violence." *Area,* 24(1): 22–29.

Wallace, M. and Milroy, B.M. (1999). Intersecting claims: Possibilities for planning in Canada's multicultural cities. In T. Fenster (Ed.), *Gender, planning and human rights.* London: Routledge.

Warr, M. (1990). "Dangerous situations: Social context and fear of victimization." *Social Forces,* 68(3): 891–907.

Weisman, L.K. (1992). *Discrimination by design: A feminist critique of the man-made environment.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Wekerle, G. and Whitzman, C. (1995). *Safe cities. Guidelines for planning, design and management.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Wekerle, G.R., Peterson, R. and Morley, D. (Eds.) (1980). *New space for women.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wilson, E. (1991). *The sphinx in the city: Urban life, the control of disorder and women.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wolfe, M. (1992). "Invisible women in invisible places. Lesbians, lesbian bars, and the social production of people." *Architecture and Behavior,* 8(2): 137–158.

Further reading

Dandakar, H. (Ed.) (1993). *Shelter, women and development: First and third world perspectives.* Ann Arbor, MI: George Wahr. Proceedings of a conference that sought to draw links between issues of shelter, women, and development, and to advocate for gender-sensitive housing policies.

Franck, K. and Paxson, L. (1989). "Women and urban public space." In I. Altman and E. Zube (Eds.), *Public places and spaces* (pp. 121–146). New York: Plenum. One of the first articles to

Nelson, M., and
31). *Women and the*
niversity of Chicago

P., Cunningham-
5, M. and Davis, S.M.
policy, and cultural
activity in sedentary
..." *Women and Health*

eography of women's
).

ger: Women's sources
spatial distribution of
1): 22–29.
l. (1999). Intersecting
planning in Canada's
Fenster (Ed.), *Gender,*
London: Routledge.
ous situations: Social
uization." *Social Forces,*

imination by design: A
ian-made environment.
Illinois Press.
, C. (1995). *Safe cities.*
esign and management.
Reinhold.
and Morley, D. (Eds.)
iomen. Boulder, CO:

x in the city: Urban life,
iwomen. Berkeley, CA:
Press.
women in invisible
bars, and the social
rchitecture and Behavior,

). *Shelter, women and*
l world perspectives. Ann
Proceedings of a con-
w links between issues
development, and to
itive housing policies.
(1989). "Women and
. Altman and E. Zube
spaces (pp. 121–146).
of the first articles to
give a historic overview of women's use of
public spaces in the city.

Hayden, D. (1984). *Redesigning the American dream:
The future of housing, work, and family life.*
New York: W. W. Norton. Excellent analysis
of the interplay between gender roles and
housing design.

Wilson, E. (1991). *The sphinx in the city: Urban life,
the control of disorder and women.* Berkeley, CA:
University of California Press. A compelling
critique of how planners and urban reformers
have repeatedly sought to regulate women in
cities.