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PROLOGUE

The residential district of Väike-Õismäe used to be the geometric sun sign of the capital of the Estonian S. S. R. It provided ideal sleeping quarters, plus playgrounds and green yards. On the commute home from work by trolleybus each night, the Õismäe resident could be content knowing that he didn’t have to see inhuman Soviet industrialization with all of its consequences (air pollution and the Russians) from his window at home.

For the inhabitant of Väike-Õismäe, his flat was a status symbol - not necessarily so in the eyes of other Tallinners - and a reason to be completely satisfied with life. Indeed, the shared TV antennas on Õismäe rooftops did give remarkably clear reception of Finnish television, and hot water did flow merrily into the neighborhood’s bathtubs. The resident of Õismäe wasn’t shy about using the word “elite” to describe his own living conditions. Being the first proletariat “petit bourgeois” in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Estonia was an admirable status indeed.

Despite the almost comic order of the district not a single shop or trolleybus stop was named after Russian cosmonaut. Inspired by the name of this pretty residential area (Õismäe means Blossom Hill), all noteworthy spots on the ring road were christened after flowers - Liver-leaf, Forget-Me-Not, Cornflower, Cowslip, Globeflower. Every resident of Õismäe knew the names and the order of the circularly positioned trolleybus stops by heart. Õismäe was like garland of national flowers, a concrete wreath - Soviet in form, national in essence - surrounding the community’s hydrocephalous center.

Another interpretation of the shape of Väike-Õismäe is that of a flower. In this case the round pond formed the center of the blossom, with schoolchildren scurrying around like bees, running the compulsory 666-metre-lap around the pond during gym class. In winter, the randy womb of Õismäe has sucked more than one schoolboy under its ice and drowned him. Then, people started falling from the slender Õismäe high-rises. A hapless suicide victim actually snapped into two when colliding with a handrail. Slowly, the bloom of the sun had grown into a “fleur du mal”.


The decline of Väike-Õismäe started in the mid 1990s with the silent aging of its inhabitants. The number of pupils in the factory-like schools showed a decline. The schools did their best to specialize in the humanities and sciences but, as is to be expected in an aging working class district, the educational institutions of Õismäe are still at the bottom in terms of the national examination scores.

The circle as a powerful geometric form has managed to mould the life of Õismäe residents into a story with a circular frame. Walking around the Õismäe ring road on a Sunday night, together with dog-owners wearing sweat pants and slippers, one can’t silence the waking realization that, over time, Õismäe has become the sleeping quarters of the mind. Sleep tight, Väike-Õismäe!

Jaan Kilmi
ABSTRACT

Väike-Õismäe is one of the three panel housing areas in Tallinn, a home for 27 000 residents. The Little Blossom Hill, in translation, was once shaped by glorious ideologies of Soviet Union, but is now facing a silent degradation emphasized by negative public opinion and stigmatization.

The time now is crucial for Väike-Õismäe, as there is a rising concern about aging buildings and population, increasing deficiency of parking places, poor outdoor environment not being sufficient for the current living standard and low social interaction that is the cause of safety concerns. The dimensions and interlacing of those issues is immense. In the same way as it is not possible to cure cancer with painkillers, it is not possible to solve spatial concerns merely by proposing new design solutions. Dealing superficially with the spatial symptoms seems to be currently the leading urban planning practice, but it would not heal Väike-Õismäe from its ills. Thus it is necessary to re-address the questions in a more fundamental way.

Where do those spatial problems originate from? How do those spatial problems relate to chaotic democracy, caused by malfunctioning communication between top-down decision-makers and bottom-up initiatives? What are the concerns urban planning is not capable of dealing with under the democratic paradigm? Based on Jan Gehl’s urban planning ideology and participatory planning approach for intertwining different organizational and spatial hierarchal levels, it is possible to answer those questions and facilitate a way to generate the planning approach for Väike-Õismäe.
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INTRODUCTION

Väike-Õismäe is one of the three biggest panel-housing areas in Tallinn. Often being referred “the blossom of Tallinn’s hills” as in translation the name “Väike-Õismäe” means “Little Blossom Hill”. Jaan Kilmi in his writing (2011) presented in Prologue, describes the essence of Väike-Õismäe in its socio-spatial dimensions. He shows vividly the transformation of Ōismäe and how it was once shaped by the glorious ideologies of Soviet Union and under democratic paradigm is reaching a silent degradation that is emphasized by negative public opinion and stigmatization (Alas 2010, Jõesaar 2011).

In Estonia panel housing areas have been in the centre of attention in the past 10 years. The topic is discussed in different offices of City Government, in public media, conferences, (Tallinn Architecture Biennale 2013, XI Urbanism and Landscape Days 2014), among urban planners, architects, sociologists and engineers (Välkloeng 2015), and it has been the focus of several students’ work (Kongo 2013, Viljasaar 2013, Tuvikene 2009). Despite that, there are not any elaborated approaches for dealing with aging buildings and population, lack of parking places, poor outdoor environment and low social interaction, that characterize panel housing areas.

The problems associated with the external spaces in Väike-Õismäe cannot be solved solely by spatial design since they result in large part from the inherited structure of Soviet times overlaid by modern pressures and poor social structures. This is exacerbated by poor connections and communications between the public bodies responsible for planning and management (top-downers) and a large, fragmented resident community (bottom-uppers) with poor capacity for involvement in planning and decision-making. This leads to power imbalances, a lack of strategic decision making which has the support of the community, lack of engagement by local people and persistent spatial problems due to an inability to solve the fundamental issues of what kind of external spaces should be created there.
Objective
The objective of this research is to explore the extent to which the spatial problems are the result of a) poor top-down planning processes, b) inadequate participation by local people and c) malfunctioning communications between top-down and bottom-up stakeholders and to look for new approaches to break this deadlock.

Research question
What is the spatial and organizational (top-down and bottom-up) capital for participatory approach that would generate future planning, intertwining different hierarchical levels managing the area?

Which is accompanied by two sub-questions
- What characterizes the present spatial problems and what are their origins?
- Who are the decision-makers in the area, how do they operate?

The objective and research questions required collecting in-depth data about the matter, hence the qualitative research method was chosen. The study intertwines 2 traditional methods: face-to-face interview, focus-group and two alternative methods: networking and scenario planning. The research by its methodology manifests as fundamental step towards participatory approach.

The first chapter (Theoretical Framework: Politics Meets Urban Planning) gives an overview how power and politics affect urban planning and the background of top-down and participatory planning in a relation for creating sustainable, healthy, safe and livable cities. The second chapter (Case-Study: Väike-Õismäe Meets Planning) deals with the case-study Väike-Õismäe in multi-scalar dimensions, reflecting how the strategical and political decisions reach to reality and how it is affected by Socialist origins. In the chapter Methodology: Researcher Meets Stakeholders, is given overview about two traditional methods (interviews, focus-group) and two alternative methods (networking and scenario planning). In the chapters “Results: Spatial Problems Meets Organizational Problems” and “Discussion: Spatial and Organizational Capital Meets Participatory Approach“ are discussed the spatial and organizational malfunctioning in terms of possible participatory approach.
To Friedrich, Simon, Benjamin, Miodrag, Arvo, Tauri, Madle, Maria, Heili, Jaana, Gloria, Signe, Beate, Peeter, Maire, Anna, Väino, Maire, Aino (in memoriam), Linnalabor, Väike-Õismäe
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1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: POLITICS MEETS URBAN PLANNING

1.1. Power And Politics

As power is multi-faceted and has several ways of expression, it is fundamental to consider its extension while analyzing the processes of landscape and cities. Understanding the dynamics of power broadens the possibilities for landscape architect looking for potential changes not only in physical landscape, but in the complexity of landscape as being organizational mechanism which produces physical landscapes.

For understanding the ways power and politics manifest, a practical tool - The Power Cube has been produced (figure 1). It is the conceptualization of power and can be used for understanding and analyzing the way power works in processes of governance, in organizations, and in social relationships. The Power Cube combines several dimensions of power that are presented by „forms“, „spaces“ and „levels“. The forms dimension refers to the ways in which power manifests itself. The spaces dimension of the cube refers to the potential arenas for participation and action. The levels dimension of the cube refers to the differing layers of decision-making and authority held on a vertical scale, including the local, national and global (The Power Cube 2011).

Figure 1. The levels, spaces and forms of The Power Cube (The Power Cube 2011)
The cube gives a chance to visually map oneself and the current situation, including other actors, relationships and forces. Identifying the existing, even in conceptual way, is crucial for future movement, mobilization and change. Identification allows people to plan advocacy and to find entry points for action (The Power Cube 2011).

While the levels of power manifest in global, national and local scale (figure 1), the gaps in between those political levels have led to confrontation of top-down and bottom-up policies in the territorial circumstances. Local and regional development policies have developed in response to the territorial defiance generated by economic globalization. As the spatial reorganization of economic activity has accelerated recently, the efficiency of former top-down policy has been convicted. This addresses the question for dealing with these new challenges. Empowering local actors and making them directly responsible for finding solutions to the new challenges, bottom-up policies have been regarded as an effective alternative to traditional top-down approaches. Policy makers are in need for accessible and easily manageable tools to deal with the new global scenario and bottom-up policies might be able to provide them with convenient response (Crescenzi, Rodríguez-Pose 2011).

In theory top-down and bottom-up development policies coexist, interact with, and impact upon the same agents and territories, but so far have shown limited synergies. It is believed that this separation is the result of the lack of a common theoretical, conceptual ground, which is the sign of absence of collaboration. Therefore there is a need to mix top-down and bottom-up approaches by combining them in an integrated framework. This integrated approach could provide a common conceptual background for both top-down and bottom-up policies (Crescenzi, Rodríguez-Pose 2011).

1.2. Urban Planning: Top-Down And Bottom-Up
The parallel from top-down and bottom-up politics has a clear connection to urban planning, as planning follows politics. Top-down and bottom-up are the two main approaches, which have been distinguished throughout the history of urban planning. The essence of each is very much in contrary. On the one hand top-down discourse as systemic and rational planning centers the use of standards. On the other hand bottom-up approach lacks any methodological references as it strays at
uncoordinated level and excludes any use of standards. In general top-down approaches, despite their weaknesses, rule planning practice throughout history and still today (Pissourios 2014).

The golden era of planning standards and top-down planning is considered to be after World War II, when planners emphasized the importance of standards to urban planning and believed that their main task was to identify and implement the ‘right’ standards. The fundamental flaw of the approach is focusing on the perspective of decision-makers and the fact that this likely disregards other actors. Because of that, top-down models are difficult to use in democratic situations where there is no dominant policy or agency, but rather several governmental institutions and actors (Pissourios 2014).

In the context of post-socialism and emerging civil society, the contrasting approach to a traditional top-down perspective – communicative planning - has become the major interest in urban planning theory during the past decade (Martens 2005). Communicative, participatory and collaborative planning all indicate some form of bottom-up approach. Karel Martens (2005) defined communicative planning as follows "In its ideal form, communicative planning envisages a decision-making process which involves all stakeholders and provides a deliberative space in which all forms of knowing, valuing and giving meaning are recognized and accepted as legitimate". The bottom-up, or communicative planning models, as their names suggest, are often initiated and organized by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and strongly supported by citizens. As these models confront traditional top-down planning and the dominant power, in planning practice this kind of model is still marginal (Maier 2011).

1.3. Participation Of Citizens
Another question is how to deal with the representation of citizens. Although the process is complicated, it does not mean that participatory design should not be practiced (Worm-Peterson 2013), as it has a potential for creating integrated framework among stakeholders (Crescenzi, Rodríguez-Pose 2011). The participation of stakeholders in planning and decision-making process is the most important element for the success of planning (Antrop 1998). Participation increases the level of acceptance of planning decisions by local residents. Also it gives
researchers and planners access to community expertise and knowledge, which enables them to produce better plans and designs. Participation increases user satisfaction and builds trust (Luz 2000, Antrop 1998). Table 1 gives an overview of the benefits of citizen participation to citizens and to government.

Table 1. Advantages of citizen participation in government decision making (Irvin, Stansbury 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision process</th>
<th>Advantages to citizen participants</th>
<th>Advantages to government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education (learn from and inform government representatives)</td>
<td>Education (learn from and inform citizens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persuade and enlighten government</td>
<td>Persuade citizens; build trust and allay anxiety or hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain skills for activist citizenship</td>
<td>Build strategic alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break gridlock; achieve outcomes</td>
<td>Break gridlock; achieve outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain some control over policy process</td>
<td>Avoid litigation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better policy and implementation decisions</td>
<td>Better policy and implementation decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a comprehensive collection of strategies for building up efficient participatory practices in urban planning. According to Renee A. Irvin and John Stansbury (2004) participatory strategies involve the following:

- the careful selection of a representative group of stakeholders,
- a transparent decision-making process to build trust among the participants,
- clear authority in decision making,
- competent and unbiased group facilitators,
- regular meetings,
- adequate financial resources to support the group process during the potentially long learning and decision-making process.
The same authors (Irvin, Stansbury 2004) describe the “ideal conditions” for implementation of enhanced citizen participation in decision-making process:

- The issue is gridlocked and a citizen mandate is needed to break the gridlock.
- Hostility toward government entities is high, and the agency seeks validation from community members to successfully implement policy.
- Community representatives with particularly strong influence are willing to serve as representatives.
- The group facilitator has credibility with all representatives.
- The issue is of high interest to stakeholders and may even be considered at “crisis stage” if actions are not changed.
- Citizens readily volunteer for projects that benefit the entire community.
- Key stakeholders are not too geographically dispersed; participants can easily reach meetings.
- Citizens have enough income to attend meetings without harming their ability to provide for their families.
- The community is homogenous, so the group requires fewer representatives of interest groups; smaller groups speed decision-making.
- The topic does not require representatives to master complex technical information quickly.

1.4. Communities In Estonia

The issue of top-down and bottom-up and participatory approach resonates with the term “community”, as it is seen as the key stakeholder from bottom-up perspective. The interest for civil society has risen in Estonia during the past 10 years. Therefore the term “community” has been in the centre of interest as being a resource and tool for democracy and also the executer of national tasks and functions. Problems are often caused by the fact that different stakeholders (top-downers: ministries, local governments and bottom-uppers: communities) do not have a clear understanding about the division of responsibilities and services (Kogukonnauuring 2014).

In the survey, the term “community” was defined as local activism, in other words as geographically located and meaningful action, which is more of a process than a goal. For further details about the essence and functioning of community look appendix 1. A key issue that has become relevant is that of the relation of local power
and the community, as depending on inner structural mechanisms and sphere of action. These relations have different forms and are manifested in various ways. For example, a supportive local power might help to improve the activeness of a local community. A strong community, on the other hand, helps to improve local power by taking care of some of the public services. A coherent developed social infrastructure and common values of local decision-makers and local residents improves the functioning of local power. To increase coherent social infrastructure is not possible without a basic capital, which is money and knowledge. Local power has an important role for making conditions for creating this. The main method how a local municipality can do this is to involve civil movement organizations in the decision-making process (Kogukonnauuring 2014).

In Estonia there are 191 parishes; out of within 51 there are collaboration bodies for communities. The models of collaboration (appendix 1, figure 2) show different types of interaction between local municipality and communities. Although there are several ways how local municipalities and communities interact, only 23% of the communities are involved in decision-making process, which indicates that this is the type of collaboration communities and decision-makers should thrive for (figure 2). The main problem is that local municipality often considers informing people and organizing events for community as collaboration. Although funding projects and informing people are necessary tools for building up a relationship, this is not the needed collaboration type, because the communities are not involved in decision-making process (Kogukonnauuring 2014).

Figure 2. Different collaboration models between local municipality and a community, according to Community Study 2014 (involving author’s comment)
1.5. Neighboring Associations In Tallinn
The Community Study (2014) included both, communities in the countryside and neighborhood associations in towns. Neighboring associations are NGOs operating in one geographical location and promote local life by pursuing their interests, discussing public issues, and participating in decision-making processes. In Tallinn there are currently 24 neighboring associations, mainly formed in the City Centre, Northern Tallinn, Pirita and Nõmme districts (Ait 2014).

The map of Tallinn Neighborhood Associations (appendix 2) reveals large empty areas in panel housing areas such in Haabersti, Lasnamäe and Mustamäe districts, which imply to poor community activity in those places. It has been identified that housing cooperatives operate there. As housing cooperatives are formed from top-down and their operation follows the Law of Housing Cooperatives, these are not identified as bottom-up initiative. Therefore, it is necessary to take a closer look at panel housing areas and observe on the one hand if the nature of housing cooperative resonates as a community, but also, on the other, if housing cooperatives have capabilities for being partners for decision-makers in the planning process.

1.6. Panel Housing Areas
In post-socialist countries, housing estates or panel housing areas were the typical form of housing after the Second World War and are one of the best examples of top-down planning. These areas were managed by centralized state management companies (Hegedüs 2012) as panel housing areas were the outcomes of modernist urban planning during the Soviet era. Planning at the time reflected socialism in its content and the result of planning follows a standardized reality: central planning, state monopoly over means of production and the absence of private property. Although such features of socialism were not always intended by planners, modernist planning often resulted in zones of mono-functionality, as the space was used fully, but only at specific times. The lack of mixed use in space during socialist urban planning is one of the aspects often criticized by urban planners (Robinson 2009).
After the transition of state policy at the end of 1980s, urban housing estates were sold off, with 90% of the urban housing stock becoming privately owned in most contexts. The state management of panel housing areas was gradually transferred to different forms of homeowner associations, such as condominiums, housing cooperatives, etc. However, this transition has generated a number of social and management problems (Hegedüs 2012).

In Estonia panel housing areas have been in the centre of attention in the past 10 years. The topic is discussed in different offices of City Government, in public media, in several conferences, (Tallinn Architecture Biennale 2013, XI Urbanism and Landscape Days 2014), among urban planners, architects, sociologists and engineers (Välkloeng 2015), and it has been the focus of several students’ work (Kongo 2013, Viljasaar 2013, Tuvikene 2009).

Panel housing areas face a bad reputation and stigmatization as being centers of vandalism; they host socially less secured people and are the locations of conflicts between Estonians and Russians. When typing “Õismäe” or “Lasnamäe” to online newspapers’ search engines, there are a number of news how somebody was shot (Delfi Online 2013), how an apartment or a car was put on fire or how nesting birds were sealed into concrete (Randlaid 2014). The common problems in panel housing areas are aging buildings and population, lack of parking places, poor outdoor environment and low social interaction (Tiigisoon 2011).

1.7. Cities For People (Jan Gehl)

To the contrary of modernism and districts such as panel housing areas, built on “right” standards, Jan Gehl (2015) is proposing different scenario for future, which addresses the fundamental question about where the cities are thriving. With the extension of urban life in last century, urban planners started to design cities. Besides the traditions, the development has been based on theories, ideologies and political goals. Modernism and ruling politics created imagination of city as machine. Therefore traffic has been considered as an important issue for creating better solutions for cities and urban space and urban life has become secondary. Jan Gehl on the other hand has built his theory focusing on urban life and “human scale”, because by now it has become clear, how necessary it is to create lively, safe, sustainable and healthy cities (Gehl 2015).
Thus the focus for Gehl Architects bureau has been creating cities for people. People are the starting point in their work. People’s scale, senses, movements, interests, behavior, and engagement in their surroundings have become priority while analyzing a site. Throughout their projects, they spend time counting, measuring, and analyzing the spaces that are in need to being improved. Thereby recording the ‘life’ that occurs, as well as the qualities of the surrounding ‘space’ has become more crucial than gathering statistics about car-traffic (Gehl Architects Website 2010).

John Bela from Gehl Architects bureau in San Francisco stressed that it is extremely important for successful urban design, not only to work on spatial matter, but to include decision-makers to urban planning. The planning process is as relevant as the spatial output and therefore they work closely with stakeholders, to build a team of collaborators, grow partnership and trust, change perspectives, invite for broader, long-term thinking, test ideas via pilots, all while engaging the users of the city. It is important to stress that to take time for understanding people’s use of public space, more qualified decisions could be made (Gehl Architects Website 2015).
2. CASE STUDY: VÄIKE-ÕISMÄE MEETS PLANNING

2.1. Contrasting Scales

2.1.1. International Scale: Väike-Õismäe And Lazdynai

Last year I participated Winter-School: Mapping Post-Socialist Spaces in Vilnius, organized by Critical Urbanism. As the organizers were previously back in Väike-Õismäe for Tallinn Architecture Biennale (chap. 2.4), Lazdynai was obvious choice for comparison, as the deeper insights from both areas were collected, analyzed and discussed.

Lazdynai in Vilnius as Väike-Õismäe both origin from the common socialist ideas of „right“ standards and modernist prefabrication. Both districts gained Lenin prize (Lazdynai for unique architectural solutions (Cope et al 2013) and Väike-Õismäe for unique building structure). Lazdynai was built on woody and hilly terrain, what was carefully designed by the architects and it became a defining feature for the district (Boos et al 2014).

Outside the spatial logic of socialist planning, the current development of both districts is different, because of the cultural, political, economical and natural conditions. The difference is revealed while taking a look of the areas in multi-scalar dimensions. For example formerly used phone boots still stand in Lazdynai (Cope 2013), while in Väike-Õismäe phone boots have been removed as left unused. Another cultural aspect is the notice boards at the entrances to buildings, which in Lazdynai are intensively in use (Cope 2013), revealing bottom-up socialization and initiative, while in Väike-Õismäe these are used only for formal notices and lack the informal communication between residents. Although these are just minor details, they reflect important differences in Väike-Õismäe and Lazdynain in terms of management, decision-making and bottom-up initiative. Therefore it becomes clear, how top-down and bottom-up development policies coexist (Crescenzi, Rodríguez-Pose 2011) and how much affect they actually do have on development.
2.1.2. Local Scale: Tallinn

In the context of Tallinn one of the recent success stories of top-down and bottom-up development policies coexistence is the fact that a neighborhood association as bottom-up initiative was involved to urban planning process. It was process of reconstructing Soo Street in Kalamaja, where the original plan by developers suggested constructing 2-lane car street. As the local neighborhood association and it’s active leader (architect Toomas Paaver) contacted the developer in early stage of planning, the developer and Tallinn City Administration took his advice and a wide pedestrian and bike lane and 1 car lane was built instead (ERR 2014). This development reflects the principals of living city promoted by Jan Gehl (Gehl 2015). Therefore the participation of stakeholders in planning and decision-making is the most important element in the success of planning processes (Antrop 1998).

In general Tallinn City Administration lacks the understanding of cooperation and developing the city in the interest for its residents and building it according to Jan Gehl’s suggestions for prioritizing urban life, instead they are focusing on car traffic. An example of Kalaranna development demonstrates it well. While Tallinn was the Cultural Capital, the Cultural Kilometer was opened for residents, connecting the museums and cultural places around seaside to Oldtown. The area has been actively used by pedestrians and urban life started to flourish in the area. But Tallinn City had different plans for the area. The reconstruction of building car lanes started recently and according to the detail plan of the area, there will be private houses on the seaside that will close the area for public urban life. This example of the policy of Tallinn City Administration reflects that power stays on decision-makers side and opinion of bottom-up and locals is not considered, if not convenient. Thus for creating sustainable spatial solutions in Tallinn, the question how top-down policy is conducted, must be addressed.
While the active neighborhood associations in Tallinn have managed to influence the decision-making process in some cases, in general the decisions are still done by top-down policy. Housing cooperatives in Väike-Õismäe are not considered as the voice of local community, but the problem does not derive only from the poor quality of housing cooperatives, but as operation of Tallinn City Administration shows, is depending on the top-down decision-making policy.

In the context of future developments of Tallinn, Väike-Õismäe as fully built residential area, locating in Haabersti district, is considered as effective, due to built infrastructure, while majority of recently built residential areas lack of it. Urban sprawl is considered as one of the struggles of Tallinn, as the people, who are educated and earning more salary, are moving to outskirts of the city (General Plan of Haaberst 2014). One of the future goals of the general plan is to develop the unattractive functions that are the reasons why people move out. For keeping people living in the city, the functionality of neighborhood must be attractive. According the general plan (2014) the built residential areas must not stay monofunctional. Also developing possibilities for services and trading, promoting small business, providing places for leisure for residents are all goals for future in Väike-Õismäe (General Plan of Haaberst 2014). Although the objectives are set, the general plan does not state to whom these goals are addressed and how to bring them into reality.

The General Plan of Haabersti District (2014) is currently in the state of being approved. The process followed the traditional top-down planning process. The document was compiled by Tallinn Urban Planning Department and none of the housing cooperatives from Väike-Õismäe were involved. As there were not any locals participated the public discussion about Lasnamäe general plan either (Tallinn UPD 2015), it reflects the methodological deficiency of involvement. Neither Haabresti District Administration or housing cooperatives in Väike-Õismäe were active in the planning process. Planners state that activism of district administration is depending on how active housing cooperatives are. But the mentality of planners “we cannot force them” (Tallinn UPD 2015), does not prove that they have used right methods for involvement.
2.1.3. Planning Scale

Looking Väike-Õismäe on a map, it is a very logical and functional district. Compared to other panel-housing areas, the site does not have microrayons, but has a circular layout, which makes the area unique (Haabersti DA politician 2015). The main principal that the planners considered while planning Väike-Õismäe was to make it as functional for residents as possible, meaning that a shop, a school, a kindergarten, a bus-station has to be in a 5-minute walking distance from every building (Klementi 2013).

There are three distinctive spheres (figure 3, page 25), which are divided by inner and outer ring roads. In a large scale the outer road act as a typical street - all the equal house numbers on one side and all the unequal numbers on the other. The heavy traffic and the bus-lanes are on the outer road. The inner road has less traffic, as originally it was meant mainly for pedestrians and for kids to have a safe trip to school or kindergarten. In recent years Haabersti DA has renovated the inner road and has created extra parking areas (Haabersti DA architect 2015).

The outer sphere of Väike-Õismäe is occupied with 5-floored apartment buildings. The placement of houses is functional as there are streets between houses, to have access by cars. The rest of the area is largely covered by grass and vegetation, combining pedestrian paths and children playgrounds. The central sphere consists 9-floored apartment buildings, being attached in corners and forming the pattern of courtyards. These are combined with 2-floored service centers and 16-floored high-rises. The inner circle is a social circle: a pond in the middle, 4 schools and 4 kindergartens scattered around it. This year one of the school-buildings (figure 5) was demolished leaving a gap in the original structure (Haabersti DA architect 2015).
2.1.3.1. Ownership Structure And Spatial Organization
The General Plan of Haabersti District (2014) shows that the ownership structure is fragmented (figure 4, pp. 26). Majority of the public spaces is owned by Tallinn City Administration and the ground under houses and couple of meters beside is owned by housing cooperatives. Also the organization of space is divided by several departments of Tallinn City Administration, housing cooperatives and managed by private stakeholders (figure 5, pp. 27). This means that there are many stakeholders involved and reflects that via top-down planning is not possible to solve the existing problems.
The division of services that institutions in the public sector should provide has systematic gaps. HCs have to face the common problem that the responsibilities of different institutions are strictly divided by state policy, thus causing obstructions to the comprehension of aspects that go cross-institution. This kind of policy-making creates a mentality among officials to push problems into some other institution's field without taking responsibility or solving it. For example, one of the streetlights on a city-owned space went out and HC faced a series of miscommunications and it took months to fix it, as the officials in Haabersti DA delegated the issue to HC, proposing that they should communicate with Haabersti DA's contractors instead (Housing Cooperatives 2015). These kinds of scenarios represent non-effective management of space and thus should be organized differently.
2.1.3.2. Parking: The Most Extensive Spatial Problem

When driving around the inner circle of Õismäe on a Saturday morning, one can notice it is rather complicated, as one of the lanes has been parked full and the driver needs to drive slalom between cars. People are ignoring the law and park wherever they prefer, as near as their door as possible.

The Head of Haabersti District Administration

Parking is the main spatial problem in Väike-Õismäe (Tammemäe 2015, Haabersti Postipoiss 2003, Skuin 2007, General Plan of Haabersti 2014) and has a multidimensional core. The problem derives from the fact that during Soviet times the parking normative was 0,5 parking places per apartment. Today in a suburban residential area the normative is 1,5 places per apartment and car-usage is rising continuously (Haabersti DA politician 2015). In society, a car is considered a sign of status and therefore owning a car is a luxury that people desire. Therefore parking is not only a spatial problem but reflects people’s lifestyles in general and also is connected to the comfort of public transportation and bicycle usage (Tallinn UPD 2015).
In recent years, the inner ring road of Väike-Õismäe has been reconstructed and over 100 extra parking places were created. One-third of the outer circle was renovated last year and the reconstruction will continue this year. There are some big parking areas, but these are not working on full capacity, as people prefer to park near their home. To the contrary of residents’ expectations, in the new general plan of Haabersti (2014) it is recommended to build multi-storey car parks on these sites instead. Also there are suggestions to build car parks in the corners of the 9-floored apartment area. In the 5-floored apartment area the parking is suggested to be solved by reconstructing the space between buildings (General Plan of Haabersti 2014).

Besides the recent reconstructions and future plans from top-down perspective, there is a growing trend that HCs are taking an initiative to create parking around their building. The project “Yards in Order!” (chap. 2.3.1) gives a possibility for more capable HCs to get some extra funding for creating projects. As the funds are limited, the parking areas are widened meter by meter, often using city-owned land (Housing Cooperatives 2015), without considering the long-term effect on this process. Housing cooperatives are the ones who have to deal with the problem daily and therefore are eager to solve it right away.

The recent attempts for relieving parking problem has not shown much improvement of the issue, as Väike-Õismäe is still considered to have bigger parking problem compared to other districts of Tallinn (Tammemäe 2015). A full survey about parking and traffic has been conducted in 2007 (Väike-Õismäe piirkonna parkimiskorralduse uuring 2007). During the survey a lot of data about parking was collected: the load of parking, the fluctuation of parking day and night, the load of traffic, the fulfillment of parking places, etc. The prognosis of needed parking places was created considering the possible rising of car-usage. The document (Väike Œismäe parkimiskorralduse uuring 2007) shows deep analysis of parking problem and its spatial locality and essence. The survey was used as base-study for the General Plan of Haabersti (2014).
Jan Gehl on the other hand suggests following the fundamental idea: “we focus on traffic, we study about traffic, we get more traffic. What about the people? Our cities should thrive from traffic focus to a people-oriented place!” Comparing to the study about parking in Väike-Õismäe, to the surveys conducted about people (figure 6), it becomes evident, that planners have not identified the importance of surveying it. As general plan only gives superficial data about green spaces, social infrastructure (meaning the social buildings) and the locations of playgrounds; the fundamental statistics and analysis on topic is missing. This means that already the input of general plan lacks the issues about people’s behavior in public spaces and the further results should be questioned.

Figure 6. Parking and traffic problems have been surveyed thoroughly, while there is not any studies about people’s behavior in public spaces (author’s compilation of “Väike-Õismäe piirkonna parkimiskorralduse uuring” 2007 and General Plan of Haabersti District 2014)
2.1.4. Human Scale

On the contrary of the top-down structure and logic, from a human scale perspective Väike-Õismäe lacks the quality. While walking around the massive panel blocks, it is difficult to follow the numbers of houses, as the logic of house addresses is not that clear while actually being in the space (TAB Urban Walk* chap. 3.1).

Although the general spatial structure over the years has almost stayed the same, the visual image has drastically been changed, because the houses have been renovated in different colors and patterns. During one of the urban walks (chap 3.1), it was pointed out that windows and balconies look really different and in the overall sense of the district as a harmonious plan is thus lost. The reason lies in the fact that houses are renovated by housing cooperatives and often people change windows or balconies on their own without considering the general layout (Haabersti DA architect 2015). Although architecturally this solution might not be the best, it reflects who is the decision maker - either a resident or a higher power.

The monofunctionality of green spaces, the invasion of cars, outdated urban furniture are the main problems in human scale in Väike-Õismäe (figures 7, 8). According to Jan Gehl (2015) these are the crucial indicators in need for improvement in order to increase the quality and livability of public spaces. As the general plan of Haaberst (2014) deals with too general scale, these problems are not addressed and none of the stakeholders are responsible for improving the situation. In recent years the residents have activated and created some flower-beds on housing cooperative owned land.
Figure 7. The monofunctionality of green spaces, the invasion of cars, outdated urban furniture are the main problems in human scale in Väike-Õismäe (Google photos)
Figure 8. The monofunctionality of green spaces, the invasion of cars, outdated urban furniture are the main problems in human scale in Väike-Õismäe vol 2 (Google photos)
2.2. Stakeholders

In a planning process and management of urban spaces, there are involved many stakeholders. In general those stakeholders could be divided into three groups: public sector, private sector and local communities. In Tallinn, the agents of public sector are Tallinn City Government, Tallinn City District Governments, Tallinn Urban Planning Department, The Environmental Board, Municipal Engineering Services Department, etc. The private sector involves real estate developers and several actors, such as such shop-chains as Maxima, Selver and Rimi. The third interest group is the locals. In official processes, these are often represented by NGOs, for example Tallinn Neighbourhood Associations, or by Housing Cooperatives (Tallinn UPD 2015).

In the context of Väike-Õismäe, this thesis takes a closer look on housing cooperatives (HCs), Haabersti District Administration (Haabersti DA) and Tallinn Urban Planning Department (Tallinn UPD), which are the main actors developing the outdoor space in Väike-Õismäe. Although in the thesis the stakeholders are referred by their general name, it has to be considered that actually the inner structure of each organization is more complex and the results should not be generalized.

2.2.1. Tallinn Urban Planning Department (Tallinn UPD)

The main function of Tallinn UPD is planning sustainable and harmonious development, considering the values of existing urban environment and creating prerequisites for cultural, social, economical and natural development which creates clean, safe and good quality of life for people (Tallinn Webpage 2015).

2.2.2. Haabersti District Administration (Haabersti DA)

Haabersti DA is the governing institution in the Haabersti district, including Väike-Õismäe, Astangu, Tiskre, Kakumäe, Pikaliiva, Veskimetsa and Mustjõe residential areas. The aim of Haabersti DA is to provide public services to residents and entrepreneurs, to develop residential areas and attraction centers and to provide a functioning infrastructure considering the needs and interests of residents, the character of district and the interests of Tallinn City (Tallinn Webpage 2015b).
2.2.3. Housing Cooperatives (HCs)

There are 210 HCs in Väike-Õismäe and Astangu districts. In general every HC owns a couple of meters of land around the building, as the rest of the space is city-owned. The topic of HCs in Väike-Õismäe is very complex, because management quality is very different, as it is dependent on the motivation of the head of board of the HC. There are only a few examples of how HCs have managed to renovate their whole building effectively and show qualitative management. The majority of HCs have not managed to renovate the houses effectively and face huge amounts of dept. The progressive ones are already looking for possibilities for cooperation with other HCs and Haabersti DA, while the others still struggle with getting primary aspects in the house fixed (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

The main focus of operation for HCs is on renovating a house and getting the heating, electricity-systems, windows, balconies, isolation and rooftop fixed. There are only a few HCs who have managed to do it effectively, so that the managing costs have not risen. In the last 10 years a lot of investments to housing has been done, but it also means that a lot of loans stand along the way to further investments, as residents’ payments are high already (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

There are several similarities between organizations such as HCs and NGOs specialized in developing people’s well-being, as their goal is to enhance quality of local life. On the other hand, they function differently as HCs follow the Law of Housing Cooperatives and NGOs follow the Law of NGO and the first is initiated by top-down and second is initiated from bottom-up (Kogukonnauuring 2014).

2.3. Collaboration

2.3.1. Projects „Yards In Order!“ And „Green Yard“

Mainly the cooperation between housing cooperatives, Haabersti District Administration and Tallinn Urban Planning Department works through projects such as “Yards in Order!” (”Hoovid korda”) and “Green Yard” ("Roheline õu"). Tallinn City Administration reflecting top-down approach initiates these projects (Haabersti DA politician 2015). Still those projects should not be considered as top-down planning, but rather a model of collaboration, as this is basically the only way that meetings between stakeholders is provoked, although the power stays clearly on decision-makers side.
Participation in the projects is not high, as in 2015 Haabersti DA received 6 applications from housing cooperatives to get funding for project “Yards in Order”, while there are 210 housing cooperatives in Väike-Õismäe and Astangu residential areas (Haabersti DA politician 2015). Although housing cooperatives are not considered as communities, but hypothetically comparing these aspects to Community Study (2014) it might be interpreted that there is no collaboration among those stakeholders (figure 9). The head of Haabersti DA addresses that the reasons why the participation is so low, lies in fact that HCs are not very active, as housing cooperatives are incapable to organize their inner collective opinion.

Figure 9. “Yards In Order” as a collaboration model
(author’s comments on Community Study 2014)

2.3.2. Roundtable Of Housing Cooperatives In Haabersti
Besides the top-down projects that provoke the basic information exchange, there is a bottom-up initiative started by the most active housing cooperatives named „The Roundtable of Housing Cooperatives in Haabersti“ . Actually there are two different such roundtables: one including Russian speaking heads of housing cooperatives and the other including the ones who are Estonian speaking. The main goal of the roundtables is to discuss among heads of housing cooperatives, their problems and exchange their experience. Often they invite officials from Haabersti DA and other relevant stakeholders for trying to find solutions for common problems among housing cooperatives. These meetings take place approximately once in two months. The future goal is to merge Estonian and Russian roundtables into one and create NGO that would be formal voice of local residents.
Comparing the essence of collaboration between the roundtable and Haabersti DA to Community Study (2014), it shows higher collaboration compared to projects described above (figure 10). Although the round-table is not project-based, but a long-term initiative, it has formal recognition and promising possibilities for increasing collaboration. Although the opinion of officials reflect the top-down mentality, by word they would be willing for more cooperation but the quality of housing cooperatives has to increase simultaneously.

Figure 10. “The Roundtable of Housing Cooperatives in Haabersti” as a collaboration model (author’s comments on Community Study 2014)
2.4. TALLINN ARCHITECTURE BIENNALE 2013 (TAB 2013)

One of the recent attempts for provoking the discussion about possible future in Väike-Õismäe was Tallinn Architecture Biennale (TAB), which was held in September 2013 with the theme of ‘Recycling Socialism’ and included the Vision Competition for Väike-Õismäe. The event was organized and curated by young female architects from the Tallinn-based b210 office (Krivý 2013). As the principals of participatory planning is emerging, the competition lacked to involve into organization other professionals besides architects, such as sociologists, geographers, urbanists and therefore the results were focusing on architecture rather than the socio-spatial dynamics of the area.

Maroš Krivý (2013) addresses another question by asking what is there to be recycled, either is it the architecture from the ‘era of socialism’ or is it the idea/ ideology that created this architecture. The brief of the competition was to ‘diversify Väike-Õismäe’s urban space and create an enjoyable living environment’. This characterizes Väike-Õismäe as a “sleeping district”, lifeless and boring neighborhood, a gray suburb where no action takes place (Krivý 2013). In this way the architects and urban planners missed the local „touch“ as an option for observing the site from bottom-up perspective and targeting their visions the other way. The missing insights from locals ended up by misperceiving the interaction of the place.

For example, the visitors participating Urban Walks* (chap. 3) have often expected the pond in the middle of Väike-Õismäe would be acting only as a rounded form, assuming it does not have a function and that the revitalization is necessary. The ones who participated the Vision Competition and were on the urban walk* (chap. 3) later, realized actually how the circular form has managed to keep the pedestrians continuously walking around it. The offered TAB brief with architectural map-based did not emphasize that the pond is an important community gathering place during district’s Spring and Autumn festivals and New Years Eve. Besides, the pond has interesting acoustic powers, which were tested during the intervention part of one of the tours (chap. 3).

The winning entry ‘The Assembled Ground: How to Wake Up the Sleeping District of Väike-Õismäe?’ was compiled by the international team Dynamo. The core of the proposal lies in improving public spaces. The work suggests to remove panels of the
first two floors and to relocate these at a distance (Krivý 2013). On the one hand the suggested activation of the ground floor, (for cafés, small businesses, services, studios, etc.), might be a useful way for boosting economy and urban-life. As a top-down approach, this scenario might create unpredictable economic and social transformations, which by its essence does not fit with the need of current residents. This approach rather creates new social and spatial dynamics rather than developing the existing. Still the idea of humanization and diversification is the goal to be targeted, but using different approach.

Vertical and horizontal cutting has become a popular strategy when addressing the ‘revitalization’ of socialist housing estates. This idea has been realized in several cities of eastern Germany. As there were many international participants, this kind of strategy was used in several submissions for the Vision Competition. These kinds of visions are confronted with a problem in reality as ignoring the ownership structure in Väike-Õismää (figure 4). To contrary to German cities' panel housing areas, the Estonian ones have been privatized at the beginning of 1990s and are managed by housing cooperatives (Krivý 2013). Therefore such strategy rises many questions as the top-town decision-making is not possible and more complex approach should be applied.

The Biennale opened up the topic of Väike-Õismää among urbanists, architects and landscape architects having minor reflection in public media. But there it stops. Although the event and the exhibition of the Vision Competition was public, it was not targeted to locals, as maps and graphics were presented in professional language, the message stayed distant. On the other hand the results triggered discussions among officials in Haabersti DA. Although they imply that many of the works are unrealistic, because of their revolutionary and destructive approach. For example one submission suggested to enlarge the pond and demolish all the schools and kindergartens. Haabersti DA picked up architectural ideas, like constructing elevators in front of the 5-floored buildings. Still the general ideas addressing social and spatial cohesion are not presumed to be feasible (Haabersti DA architect, politician 2015). Although it is unrealistic any of the visions being applied in future, the Vision Competition is promising input for further developments.
3. METHODOLOGY: RESEARCHER MEETS STAKEHOLDERS

3.1. Networking
The problems associated with the external spaces in Väike-Õismäe cannot be solved solely by spatial design since they result in large part from the inherited structure of Soviet times overlaid by modern pressures and poor social structures. Jaan Kilmä’s writing presented in Prologue gives an overview of those political, socio, spatial dimensions. The issues are exacerbated by poor connections and communications between the public bodies responsible for planning and management (top-downers) and a large, fragmented resident community (bottom-uppers) with poor capacity for involvement in planning and decision-making. This leads to power imbalances, a lack of strategic decision making which has the support of the community, lack of engagement by local people and persistent spatial problems due to an inability to solve the fundamental issues of what kind of external spaces should be created there.

For understanding those fundamental issues, empirical qualitative method was chosen for this research to go deeper on the topic. As the political, sociological and spatial dimensions intertwine to each other, it was necessary for the researcher to gain knowledge from several fields of studies relating to landscape architecture, such as urbanism, sociology, human geography, environmental psychology, urban governance, architecture, etc. The initial networking to get to know different experts, participating several events and discussions started already in 2013. Networking was an important methodology for reaching the current topic and for gaining sociological researching skills and interdisciplinary knowledge about panel housing areas (figure 11). Networking as an independent method, does not manifest in research results, but it is a practical tool, that led to being involved producing basis for the current work, described in “Theoretical Framework” (chap. 1.4, 1.5) “Case-Study: Väike-Õismäe” (chap. 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.4) and presented in appendix 1, 2.
**Figure 11.** Timeline of networking process (chap. 3.1) for reaching the current topic and methodology (author’s drawing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Spaces in Väike-Õismäe: organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable + Network Meeting: presentation of thesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Art in Panel building: organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Walk*: organizer and guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of Sleeping Districts (Critical Urbanism): associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Spaces in Väike-Õismäe: organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Art in Panel building: organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Walk*: organizer and guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable + Network Meeting: presentation of thesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOPIC**

**TOP-DOWN MEETS BOTTOM-UP:**
Planning Futures in Väike-Õismäe in Tallinn

**METHODOLOGY**

- Face-to-face interviews
- Focus group

- Community Study (Kogukonnauuring 2014)
  analyst, organiser and assistant of focus groups, infographer

- Idea Camp (European Cultural Foundation)
  author of an idea-project about empowering former school-building in Väike-Õismäe

- LasnaIdea
  volunteer for activating residents in Lasnamäe

- Urbanism and Landscape Days XI: Post-socialist Urbanizations
  participant, organizer and guide for Urban Walk*

- Children at Risk (Lasnamäe)
  project writing about crime prevention through environmental design

- Mapping Post-Socialist Spaces in Vilnius (Critical Urbanism)
  participant, associate compiling article “From Top-Down to Bottle-up: Trash Transformations in Lazdynai” (Boos et al 2014)

- Saue Centre Project (scenario planning)
  volunteer for guiding scenario planning workshop

- Linnaldee: Mapping Neighborhood Associations (Ait 2014)
  infographer

- Tallinn Architecture Biennale 2013: Recycling Socialism
  participant, organizer and guide for Urban Walk*

---

* Urban Walk is not a common tourist excursion, but a conception, created by Estonian Urban Lab, that brings people to undiscovered places, where local enthusiasts organize meetings with locals and visitors are given a chance to see local reality. Each tour lasted about 2 hours and there were approximately 30 participants. Besides the outdoor areas, the tours have taken participants to several rooftops, to authentic apartments, to cellars and to a retirement home in Väike-Õismäe. The organized tours were orientated for different experts - architects and urban planners.
Figure 11 represents the process of networking, and how participating in different projects and events have influenced reaching the current topic and what are the possibilities for continuation. The most relevant projects influencing the methodology of the current thesis were Community Study (2014) and Saue Centre Project. Being involved in Community Study (2014) increased the experience of formulating interview questions (appendixes 3, 4) and organizing and carrying through interviews. Saue Centre Project raised awareness about scenario planning and increased practical experience of participatory approach.

As the objective of this thesis is to look for new approaches to break the present deadlock, the current thesis by its methodology manifests as the beginning of building up participatory approach. Thus the methods used for qualitative data collection were face-to-face interviews and focus-group including scenario planning.

3.2. Face-To-Face Interviews

In February and March 2015 three face-to-face interviews were conducted (chap. Literature), involving officials from Haabersti DA and Tallinn UPD. Interview questions included 4 thematic categories: organization, cooperation, the problems of Väike-Õismäe and future solutions for Väike-Õismäe (appendix 3). The last category included scenario planning (chap. 3.4). The example of full list of questions is presented in appendix 4. Formulation of the interview questions was previously discussed with community expert Madle Lippus.

Conducted interviews were following semi-structured strategy, meaning that the interviewer developed a list topics that needed to be covered during the conversation, but gave possibilities to stray from the topics, as felt appropriate (Flick 2007). Semi-structured strategy was necessary to collect in-depth data, which was needed for establishing the research objective.

Interviews were recorded with dictaphone. The interviewees were asked to sign a paper consenting the taping, which is needed for documentation. Later on, the interviews were transcribed according to qualitative methodology. Interviews were analyzed in two stages: individually and comparing to each other. For individual
analysis nVivo-coding method was used, but executed in Microsoft Excel. For collective analysis a matrix table was created in Excel.

3.3. Focus-Group
The objective of the current thesis was presented in the Roundtable meeting of housing cooperatives in Haabersti (chap. 2.3.2) in February 2015. As the researcher did not have much experience with housing cooperatives, the focus-group was formed voluntarily, thus it might be argued that the housing cooperatives analyzed in the research, are the most active ones. The focus-group contained the leader of roundtable, 2 active leaders from Väike-Õismäe and one leader from Kakumäe residential area. The interview was assisted by Tauri Tuvikene and lasted 2 hours. Rest of the technical details followed same procedures as face-to-face interviews.

3.4. Scenario Planning
Both, the face-to-face interviews (chap. 3.2) and focus-group (chap. 3.3) included the idea of scenario planning. Planners who practice citizen engagement often use scenario planning as visioning exercises for long-range planning for cities. Scenario planning involves developing case scenarios and using those as a base of comparison for a number of alternatives. Indicators and benchmarks are used to compare and assess alternatives. Goal is to discuss different aspects among stakeholders and the task for the planner is to create a balance between these (Waddell 2011).

As the goal of this research is to gain in-depth data about the essence of public spaces, 3 scenarios (Park & Play, Developer’s Dream, Community Garden) were used during interviews (appendix 5) and questions about future solutions were asked (appendix 4). The idea of using scenarios during interviews was not to propose solutions, but to trigger the discussion about spatial indicators. Accordingly the interviewees were not asked to choose their favorite scenario, but to analyze different aspects shown on pictures. The indicators of space discussed: parking, vegetation, security, playgrounds and community gardening. To demonstrate the importance of human scale (chap. 2.1.4) and cities of people (par 1.7), the scenarios display a human-scale view. All the scenarios reflect the current trends of urban spaces.
4. RESULTS: SPATIAL PROBLEMS MEETS ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS

4.1. Character And Origin Of Present Spatial Problems

4.1.1. Parking

Parking is considered as a substantial spatial problem deriving from organizational issues and that the stakeholders propose solutions that are contrary to each other (figure 12) (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA architect, politician, Housing Cooperatives 2015). As parking spaces in reality are constructed by Haabersti DA (Haabersti DA politician) and also by housing cooperatives via project „Yards in Order!” (chap. 2.3.1) (Housing Cooperatives 2015), the coherent understanding is missing. Even if there would be money for constructing parking-houses as suggested by the general plan of Haabersti (2014), it would not be satisfying result for residents (Housing Cooperatives 2014), unless they are involved in decision-making process and understand the need for it (Antrop 1998).

Figure 12. Suggested solutions for parking according to surveyed stakeholders (authors drawing)
Opinion of Housing Cooperatives

HCs do not identify building parking places meter by meter as currently done will result with having large parking areas inside the courtyards (Housing Cooperatives 2015) and decreasing the quality of the living environment (Gehl 2015). Confronting them with possible large parking areas inside courtyards, on the one hand they are terrified, but also they do not recognize any other possibility, as they all have cars and promote the lifestyle of car owners (Housing Cooperatives 2015). In contrary from a top-town perspective, the inner courtyards should stay greener and parking should be placed on the street side (Tallinn UPD 2015).

HCs state they have to take the initiative for solving the issue, as Haabersti DA is not willing to create extra parking. The officials often use the argument that there are empty parking places in other areas and indicate that people should use those, which is not satisfying answer for residents (Housing Cooperatives 2015). Actually this is just an impression, as Haabersti DA identifies the problem, but simply does not have know-how or funds for solving properly the core of the issue (Haabersti DA politician, architect 2015).

Although practice indicates that HCs lack thinking about the long-term vision and issues concerning wider areas, they still identify the need for solving the core of the problem. They strongly point out that it would be cheaper to construct new parking areas in a more organized level in cooperation with several housing cooperatives, Haabersti DA and other agents. They also stress that hiring an architect or a study group would be useful, but it must be sure that this would not be one who does what he personally wants, but would be capable of considering the residents’ opinions (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

Both the HCs themselves and Haabersti DA identifies the disagreements inside HC as causing problems and decreasing possible cooperation between HCs and Haabersti DA for finding better solutions for parking, as it is HCs who collect money from residents for funding parking. For example, elderly people, who do not own a car, are not willing to invest in creating parking areas (HC, Haabersti DA architect, politician 2015).
Opinion of Haabersti District Administration

Haabersti DA has an interesting standpoint, as they think that HCs do not want to cooperate for finding solutions for parking. Haabersti DA initiated solving the parking problem by trying to cooperate with HCs in one courtyard, but the housing cooperatives did not find agreement among themselves and therefore the plan was cancelled. Now they have come to the conclusion that cooperation is not possible and criticize HCs for not having enough willpower (Haabersti DA architect, politician 2015). Actually it is the way that the process was conducted rather than the will of HCs that is responsible for this failure (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

Although a possible scenario is to construct parking-houses in Väike-Õismäe, the main concern is who will pay for this. Haabersti DA asserts that the issue should be solved either on City Administration or state policy level. Although they identify that the funding should come from top-down, they lack the understanding that even if there would be investment, parking-houses would not be a satisfying outcome for residents (Haabersti DA politician, architect 2015). Another similar solution would be solving parking underground. On the one hand also the funding issue is relevant, but officials are skeptical, as there exists communications infrastructure and bad soil underneath (Haabersti DA architect).

As the dilemma between parking and green-spaces is another concern, Haabersti DA is very keen on keeping all the existing greenery: “if there is a single tree in front of the house, we cannot take this away” (Haabersti DA politician). Somehow Haabersti DA misses the understanding that a possible mixed used of parking and green spaces could be one alternative for the issue.

To the contrary of the opinion of HCs, Haabersti DA state that parking and children's playgrounds are functions in space that do not belong together and should not only be divided by fences, but are supposed to be totally excluded from one another. The idea to solve parking outside courtyards and make courtyards greener and functional would improve the quality of space and the life of residents (Haabersti DA politician 2015).
A useful way of dealing with the topic, Haabersti DA recently applied in a small-scale, are the restrictions for new developments. Although there are not many possible places for new developments, there is a detailed planning process going near Sinilille bus-station where the main idea is to build high-rises. The first detailed plan suggested creating 1 parking place per one new apartment. First of all, it was not in coherence with the existing parking normative and secondly this was not a satisfying result for the area. Haabersti DA confronted the developer, stating that if they want to get the plan approved, they also need to solve parking for existing surrounding panel houses (Haabersti DA politician 2015).

**Opinion of Tallinn Urban Planning Department**

To the contrary of the opinion of HCs, Tallinn UPD assert that big areas for parking inside the courtyards is not a good solution, as the result will be huge monofunctional areas. Still they miss the perspective of residents and as the general plan of Haabersti (2014) proposes to have parking rather on the street side than inside the courtyards (Tallinn UPD 2015). They are not approaching the topic in complex enough way as the entrances are sometimes located on the inner side of houses and having parking on the other side would not be practical for residents.

Compared to all the surveyed stakeholders, Tallinn UPD has the most complex point of view to the parking topic, emphasizing that sustainable long-term solutions should be aimed for. Addressing the question of cross-usage and shared space as a future solution reflects their wider understanding of the processes taking place in society (Tallinn UPD 2015). As these kinds of approaches are based on trust, equality and acceptance in society, to reach kind of planning takes into consideration much more than just spatial planning.

A common practice in Estonia for trying to find solutions for spatial problems is that there is gaps of responsibilities and different stakeholders push the finding solutions to other institutions. An example of that is Tallinn UPD suggests that Haabersti DA should be the ‘critical eye’ on parking problems and should moderate more the problems occurring in communication aspects, rather than addressing the question to themselves and asking what their department could do to solve the problems (Tallinn UPD 2015).
Apart of all the other stakeholders surveyed, Tallinn UPD reflected that parking problem is actually connected to a range of issues - parking is strongly connected to general transportation policy in Tallinn and habits and lifestyle choices by the residents. Tallinn UPD also stressed that our society has to develop further from individualism and common practice for orientating our cities for car-centered usage. The connectivity and transportation network is already good in Väike-Õismäe, but the mentality of people has to change as well (Tallinn UPD 2015).

4.1.2. Green Spaces

The issue of parking relates closely to green spaces identified by all the surveyed stakeholders (Housing Cooperatives, Haabersti DA architect, politician, Tallinn UPD 2015). The problem of green spaces origins from two aspects: firstly the pressure for rebuilding green spaces as parking areas is easily justified and secondly green spaces as monofunctional areas are currently used only as „dog-pee area“ and therefore no other scenario is acknowledged (Haabersti DA politician, architect, Housing Cooperatives 2015).

All the stakeholders, except the politician of Haabersti DA hold a position that creating new functions for green spaces is not possible, because of vandalism threat (figure 13). They all agree on scenario that constructing something in public space, the criminals will either steal it, brake it, or start to gather and drink around and will disturb residents (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA architect, Housing Cooperatives 2015). But according to the general plan of Haabersti (2014) functionality of neighborhood must be attractive and places for leisure for residents must be provided to attract new residents to the area. This means that the issue is gridlocked to achieve that goal.

On the other hand the several surveyed stakeholders identify that the picture presented in interview (appendix 5c) might be nice, but there is a long way for society to develop, as this kind of space is depending on trust, citizen responsibilities and well-behavior (Tallinn UPD, Housing Cooperatives 2015). None of the stakeholders on the other hand address the question, how to achieve this kind of public space and do not consider urban gardening, for example, as a method for achieving it.
Figure 13. All the stakeholders identified that constructing something in public space, would end up with vandalism (author’s drawing)

Figure 14. Suggested solutions for increasing safety in opinion of surveyed stakeholders (author’s drawing)
4.1.3. Safety

By all the interviewed stakeholders safety is the second biggest problem in Väike-Õismäe (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA architect, politician, Housing Cooperatives 2015). To increase safety in Väike-Õismäe stakeholders identified spatial aspects shown on figure 14. Housing cooperatives suggest that safety can be increased mainly by placing cameras to the site, but also acknowledge that community-feeling and neighborhood watch would increase it. On the other hand they lack the understanding that safety is connected to wider spatial aspects, like lighting and quality of public spaces (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

Tallinn UPD on the other hand stressed that a surveillance camera only gives the feeling of safety, but does not prevent vandalism. The planners suggest that placing cameras to site might be a tool for improvement, but not the solution. Planners identified rather that good lighting, attractive public space and a lot of people create safety (Tallinn UPD 2015). Although Haabersti DA identified that cameras does not create safety, they missed the understanding that via attractive public space is possible to increase it (Haabersti DA architect, politician 2015).

As the stakeholders hold different information, knowledge and experience about creating safety, providing a ‘deliberative space’ for stakeholders in which all forms of knowing, valuing and giving meaning are recognized and accepted as legitimate (Maier 2011).

4.2. Organizational Problems

4.2.1. Top-Down: Misperceptions, Lacking Knowledge

Tallinn UPD has an opinion that people do not care about planning decisions, unless it affects locals directly and thus the activeness of HCs in planning process is low. Actually the problem is that the info just does not reach to locals and different kind of collaboration model should be used, to increase the acceptance of decision-making by the locals (Kogukonnauuring 2014). The projects “Yards in Order!” and “Green Yard” initiated by Tallinn Administration is the main trigger for cooperation between Haabersti DA and HCs, but participation is low (in 2015 6 HCs/210 HCs participated). Haabersti DA speculates that the reason for low activity is funding, and HCs do not have money for that, because HC has to cover 30% of the costs of the project (Haabersti DA politician 2015). HCs stress on the other hand, that although money is
an issue, but getting together the right documents and filling in the paperwork is much more problematic, as there is not much know-how provided by Haabersti DA (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

The officials from Haabersti DA suggest that there should be more such projects promoted from top-down and the City Government or state policy should work out programs for financing different projects (for example constructing parking houses) via KredEx. The officials do not identify the bottom-up resources, as there was a failure with initiating involving several heads of HCs to a pilot project about parking (chap. 4.1.1). Therefore DA generalizes the issue, stating that the HCs do not want to cooperate (Haabersti DA politician 2015).

HCs on the other hand stress that for a lot of heads of HCs it is complicated to get the permission from all the residents and also to get several heads of HCs to talk to each other is rather complicated. They are willing to cooperate with Haabersti DA, but lack the inner coherence for doing it. Although the top-down finances would also be useful, Haabersti DA lacks the understanding of essentials needed for improving HCs. Therefore there is a current need for supportive power to increase the quality of housing cooperatives. By doing so it would increase the public services as housing cooperatives could manage the public services and this way the quality of local power would increase (Kogukonnauuring 2014).

4.2.2. Bottom-Up: Bureaucracy, Lack Of Know-How

As mentioned above, the cooperation between stakeholders is mainly taking place as part of the “Yards in Order” project. To get funding for projects is dependent on the communication skills of heads of HCs, because one has to be capable to follow complicated bureaucratic procedures, which often are authorized by specific officials. For example, there is a good experience with cooperation with Haabersti DA as the specific HC has a good contact person. On the other hand, the same HC had a complicated procedure in Tallinn UPD in the Department of Permissions of Construction and Usage, where HC was asked to get permissions for projects in an uncoordinated way. HCs stress that it is useful to have personal contacts in higher positions, as then they get know-how and can work more effectively (Housing Cooperatives 2015).
Tallinn City Government using populist slogans claiming to have well-organized cooperation with HCs is criticized by HCs. Although cooperation is developing, bureaucracy causes stress and decreases the reputation of decision-makers among HCs. To get a project approved, HCs have to get several agreements from different institutions sometimes ending on 3-page paper (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

HCs often operate on city-owned land and having to get permissions and agreements from Haabersti DA and other institutions to create parking spaces. Therefore they are involved in bureaucratic procedures often causing frustration and disappointment. This triggers two kinds of action: for the ones who are open-minded want to share their experience with others easing the process in future; for not so enthusiastic ones causes decreasing motivation and anger against the decision-makers. Often the problem is not really the “no” answer, but the way of communication by officials (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

4.2.3. What Is Collaboration?
Housing cooperatives recognize that collaboration among housing cooperatives is not working jet effectively, because the leadership quality among majority of housing cooperatives is not high enough and the leaders of housing cooperatives are not motivated for improving the situation. But the advanced ones see that collaboration would be a way for improvement (e.g. giving out the guidelines for leadership and how to bring people together). This is a useful tool, as the housing cooperatives face similar problems (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

Haabersti DA organizes several events in the area. E.g. they organize a birthday event, for over 65 year olds. The event takes place once a month and there are approximately 60-100 people. Also the DA organizes social events such as Haabersti Spring and Haabersti Autumn and fireworks for New Year's Eve (Haabersti DA politician, archicect 2015). Organizing these events, even though having rather populist motivations, are necessary for some social groups, but do not improve the quality of HCs, neither does it develop the community systematically, nor help to improve providing public services (Kogukonnauuring 2014). Although Haabersti DA considers organizing these kinds of events as collaboration (Haabersti DA politician, archicect 2015), but according to Community Study (2014) these methods
do not qualify as collaboration, but is just informing and organizing, without any consideration of involving residents to decision-making process.

The lack of cooperation between HCs and Haabersti DA is reflected by not functional services. For example, Haabersti DA organizes street cleaning only from city-owned land; sometimes irrationally leaving HC owned space not cleaned. Residents have to take care of cleaning among themselves, usually meaning that old ladies have to do it by hand. That is in contrary to living standards in the 21st century and is not economically and socially effective, as machines could be used instead (Housing Cooperatives 2015). Spatial and management issues clearly is a manifestation of chaotic organization of planning and decision-making processes, that lack the needed outcome.

Fundamentally it is the concern of collaboration, as the stakeholders do not identify the meaning of collaboration in terms of Community Survey (2014). Although housing cooperatives do not identify their role and capabilities for collaboration in decision-making process, they recognize the need for it and the real essence of collaboration, as the roundtable of housing cooperatives in Haabersti (chap. 2.3.2) initiated bottom-up is evolving towards this idea. Although at the moment the roundtable as a model of collaboration qualifies as “project based” collaboration, it has a goal to become “very active” (figure 10) (Kogukonnauring 2014). Reaching this goal is depending on both aspects – the development of housing cooperatives as bottom-uppers and the changes of top-down decision-making process.

4.2.4. Potential In Housing Cooperatives
According to the top-downers (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA 2015) it is often thought that a unified housing cooperative is not possible, because of 4 reasons:

- too many residents
- a lot of unmotivated elderly people;
- conflicts between different nationalities;
- rentals, who live there briefly and not willing to invest to their surrounding.
Haabersti DA stresses that the community-feeling and the quality of leadership of HCs has been improved in last years, but believe that a single person in a HC can ruin everything, as this might trigger a conflict. The way Haabersti DA positions themselves, as being incapable of putting community together and expecting “community” to appear from bottom-up (Haabersti DA architect 2015), disregarding DA’s capabilities for providing conditions for creating social capital (chap 1.4) (Kogukonnauuring 2014). Top-downers miss out the importance of the leader of housing cooperative and the fact that a capable leader would increase the acceptance by residents (Housing Cooperatives 2015)

Although in theory Haabersti DA is willing to help HCs with know-how and rooms for community development, they are limited by the restrictions coming from policy-making by Tallinn Government. DA’s operation is regulated by top-down policy, which sets framework for DA’s action (Haabersti DA architect 2015). As, from the DA perspective, the issue has two sides - on the one hand that HCs should take more initiative, but on the other that the city should take a more prominent role in organizing it (Haabersti DA politician 2015), thus it becomes clear that further involvement and discussion between the stakeholders is necessary.

The head of HC is the leader in a house, if the head is lazy and crucifying all the initiative, then there is no hope for activism.

The leader of housing cooperative

The insights of the most active HCs in Väike-Õismäe share common idea: Väike-Õismäe has to grow from bottom-up. The leaders see their mission is to bring people together and to bring the quality of leadership higher. Although today the HCs face the problem that residents don’t feel the cooperative initiative as theirs, community-feeling has increased during past years. The mentality “everything out of my apartment is not my problem” has started to change (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

The internal cooperation of an HC depends on trust, as residents are skeptical of any kind of action and ideas that the heads of HCs might have. Firstly the board of a HC has to prove themselves and convince people that changes are possible. The heads
of HCs agreed that continuous intercommunication is very important for building trust. Such approaches as giving out house news (paper and online, in two languages), getting people involved in decision-making processes, organizing working events and carrying through a satisfactory survey are all important tools for effective management of a HC (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

To give further color to this argument and to demonstrate that the fact that a huge number of residents is not an argument for low community activism in panel housing areas, it is useful at this stage to present a good example of how it is possible to achieve a well-functioning cooperative (figure 15). The board of a HC started to invite people to meet with them on two floors of a 9-floored apartment building at a time and discussed the ideas the board had for future. Then people started to trust the board, got to know each other, started to notice each other while walking in corridors and started to partake in developing the house. This increased active participation in board meetings that led the way for organizing security issues, renovating the heating and façade and also getting the common rooms fixed. They even have a plan to build a common sauna in the house (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

**Figure 15. The concept of existing unified housing cooperative in Väike-Õismäe (author’s drawing)**
Getting the inner structure of a HC in order is fundamental step in the process to become a partner for Haabersti DA. As the interviewed leaders see their goal is to provide public services, enhance quality of housing cooperatives and solve general managing issues in Väike-Õismäe, housing cooperatives can be considered as a “community”, because the function of “community” by definition means operating for the general neighbourhood well-being and providing public services (Kogukonnauuring 2014).

4.3. Conditions For Participatory Planning In Väike-Õismäe

Analysing the ideal conditions for participatory planning (Irvin, Stansbury 2004) as possible alternative for practiced top-down planning in Väike-Õismäe, it becomes obvious that although the conditions are not perfect, the majority of ideal conditions match with the conditions in Väike-Õismäe (table 2).

The main argument favoring the participatory approach is the fact that the issue of parking, safety and not functional green spaces is gridlocked, as the ownership structure in Väike-Õismäe is fragmented (General Plan 2014) and spatial organization is divided by several agents (Tallinn UPD 2015). Housing cooperatives being the stakeholders trying to solve the situation on their own, but lack the understanding of larger scale and do not recognize their outlook for having affect to the decision-makers and possible changes in decision-making process. On the other hand they identify that the collaboration with top-downers would improve the situation and would be economically more reasonable (Housing Cooperatives 2015). The problem manifests rather in the opinion of top-downers who seek for solutions, but not from collaboration nor bottom-uppers, but from other top-down agents (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA politician 2015).
Table 2. Ideal conditions for participatory planning in comparison to conditions in Väike-Õismäe (author’s scheme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEAL CONDITIONS</th>
<th>CONDITIONS IN VÄIKE-ÕISMÄE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The issue is gridlocked and a citizen mandate is needed to break the gridlock.</td>
<td>Parking and safety are issues in Väike-Õismäe that cannot be solved without collaboration, because of fragmented ownership structure and division of organizational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility toward government entities is high, and the agency seeks validation from community members to successfully implement policy.</td>
<td>Hostility by the surveyed housing cooperatives is not high, but they identify the need for collaboration to solve the existing issues. Haabersti DA identifies also that strong community has potential for improving the current situation, but states that HCs do not have capabilities for doing that. Therefore HCs have to grow from bottom-up first, but agents lack understanding that they could provoke it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community representatives with particularly strong influence are willing to serve as representatives.</td>
<td>The most active HCs has a clear mission for serving as representatives of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group facilitator has credibility with all representatives.</td>
<td>The head of the roundtable of HCs in Haabersti has a strong credibility among all representatives as he was elected to the position by them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issue is of high interest to stakeholders and may even be considered at “crisis stage” if actions are not changed.</td>
<td>Housing cooperatives as bottom-uppers face the spatial and management issues daily and therefore are eager to solve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens readily volunteer for projects that benefit the entire community.</td>
<td>Although the most active citizens are willing to do so, but the majority of them are not. There has not been much initiated projects neither from top-down nor bottom-up. Lack of experience causes lack of activism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholders are not too geographically dispersed; participants can easily reach meetings.</td>
<td>The majority of stakeholders locate in Väike-Õismäe, some in Tallinn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens have enough income to attend meetings without harming their ability to provide for their families.</td>
<td>This issue has not been surveyed in the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community is homogenous, so the group requires fewer representatives of interest groups; smaller groups speed decision-making.</td>
<td>The community of Väike-Õismäe in not homogenous, as the quality of HCs is varying and the number of residents is huge (27 000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The topic does not require representatives to master complex technical information quickly.</td>
<td>As the possible topic of the further development is not set, it cannot be analyzed whether it is an issue or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. DISCUSSION: Spatial And Organizational Capital Meets Participatory Approach

5.1. Spatial Capital For Participatory Approach

According to the surveyed stakeholders in Väike-Õismäe there are three main spatial problems: lack of parking places, monofunctionality of green spaces and safety (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA policitian, architect, Housing Cooperatives 2015). Although these are all spatial problems, they intertwine to each other and originate from organizational problems, because the ownership structure in Väike-Õismäe is fragmented (General Plan of Haabersti 2014). These issues are exacerbated by poor connections and communications between the public bodies responsible for planning and management (top-downers) and a large, fragmented resident community (bottom uppers) with poor capacity for involvement in planning and decision-making.

Vision Competition of Väike-Õismäe (chap. 2.4) has proven that it is not possible to create solutions merely via design, as the spatial management is depending on several top-down and bottom-up stakeholders (figure 5). Therefore it has become evident that the issue of spatial problems is gridlocked and considered at “crisis stage” (table 2), thus a citizen mandate is needed to break the gridlock. According to Irvin and Stansbury (2004), this is considered as an ideal condition for establishing participatory approach. Participatory planning (chap. 2.3) has potential for creating integrated framework among stakeholders (Crescenzi, Rodríguez-Pose 2011) for breaking the gridlock, as participation of stakeholders in planning and decision-making processes is the most important element for success (Antrop 1998). Therefore I suggest to conceptualize the present spatial problems in Väike-Õismäe as spatial capital for triggering cooperation.
5.1.1. Character And Origin Of Present Spatial Problems

5.1.1.1. Parking

Parking problem derives from organizational issues, because different stakeholders propose solutions that are contrary to each other (figure 12). Even if there would be money for constructing new parking places as suggested by the general plan of Haabersti (2014), it would not be a satisfying result for the residents (Housing Cooperatives 2014), unless they are involved in decision-making process and understand this solution (Antrop 1998).

Another crucial aspect is to address the question, what should be the primary focus, while proposing solutions for spatial development of Väike-Õismäe. All the surveyed stakeholders identify the dominant intention is solving the parking problem, but do not comprehend the concept cities for people (chap. 1.7). Jan Gehl (2015) observes the dilemma fundamentally, as while surveying and researching about traffic and parking problems, the solutions will be generated accordingly. As traffic will be provoked, car-usage would also increase and the problem will extend continuously. The comprehensive study about parking and traffic issues in Väike-Õismäe (Väike-Õismäe parkimiskorralduse uuring 2007) manifests that parking and traffic are the subjects to focus on while creating solutions Väike-Õismäe (figure 6). Is that really what society needs for sustainable development and for improving the quality of living?

Inspired by Jan Gehl (2015), it must be emphasized that it is fundamental to study about people and their behaviour in order to create places for their activities and not cover the majority of the area with cars. Providing places for people’s activities shapes healthier, sustainable, lively and safer cities (Jan Gehl 2015). The unfortunate situation with planning process of Haabersti district revealed that none of the groundwork was done about people, their behavior and social life in public spaces, as the planners did not identify the need for it (Tallinn UPD 2015). The unbalanced approach to research subject (cars beyond people), has activated an unintentional car-focused mind-set. Therefore it is essential to identify the mind-sets of both, top-down and bottom-up stakeholders, and provoke the discussion whether the “cars beyond people” mentality is actually an approach for creating healthy, sustainable, lively and safe residential area in Väike-Õismäe.
5.1.1.2. Green Spaces

The problem of green spaces origins from two aspects: firstly green spaces as monofunctional areas are currently used only as „dog-peeing area“ and secondly the pressure for rebuilding green spaces as parking areas is easily justified, hence no other scenario is acknowledged (Haabersti DA politician, architect, Housing Cooperatives 2015). Stakeholders hold a position that creating new functions for green spaces is not possible, because of vandalism threat (figure 14).

The paradigm, that constructing something in public space, provokes vandalism, as the criminals will either steal it, brake it, or start to gather and drink around and will disturb residents (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA architect, Housing Cooperatives 2015) is in contradiction with the goal of the General Plan of Haabersti (2014). The general plan states that functionality of neighborhood of Väike-Õismäe must be attractive and provide places for leisure for residents. It is an important aspect for attracting new residents coming to live in the area for decreasing urban sprawl in Tallinn. This contradiction addresses the question of efficiency of the general plan and its process. Although this goal is superior, it is another example of the gridlocked situation in Väike-Õismäe.

As the monofunctional green spaces of Väike-Õismäe are the result of modernist planning, it is essential to consider Jan Gehl’s statement, that modernists did not reckon the understanding „First we form the cities, then cities form us“, which indicates that built environment has considerable role in people’s behaviour and lifestyles. Therefore the sarcastic ideology of modernist planning „We thought that people will be happier, the more grass they got“, is outdated.

By now it has been understood and confirmed that creating functionality for green- and public spaces is important factor for people’s happiness and lifestyles (Jan Gehl 2015). Therefore the paradigm, “building constructions in public spaces, will provoke vandalism,” stated by several surveyed stakeholders (Haabersti DA architect, Housing Cooperatives 2015) is a mind-set, being built up by modernist planning. The planners, interviewed in the research, identified the concept that usage of green spaces by people is depending on the quality of green spaces. If the quality is not good, people don’t have there anything to do and start to vandalize. But
if green spaces provide activities for several social and age groups, it increases appropriate usage and behavior (Tallinn UPD 2015). **Thus further collaboration and sharing knowledge among stakeholders is critical for dealing with mind-sets of people and for generating comprehensive resolutions**, while dealing with monofunctional green spaces in Väike-Õismäe.

5.1.1.3. Safety

According to all the interviewed stakeholders safety is another important concern in Väike-Õismäe (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA architect, politician, Housing Cooperatives 2015). **People throwing cigarette buds from their windows, stealing benches and plants, making graffiti and vandalizing, are the main concerns in relation to public spaces** housing cooperatives and district administration have to deal with (Haabersti DA architect, Housing Cooperatives 2015). The safety issue is considered to be the cause of huge amount of residents (27 000) that creates anonymity feeling. The fact that people don't know each other causes the mentality that public spaces is not their responsibility (Tallinn UPD). In that terms, safety issues are closely related to the quality of green spaces (chap. 5.1.1.3), as providing activities for several social and age groups, the residents would use green spaces more and it would build up mental connection. **Thus it is essential to involve residents to „designing“ and maintaining their surrounding, to increase mental connection to public spaces.**

The spatial indicators for creating safety (Scenario 1: Play & Park) mentioned by different stakeholders during interviews revealed a confrontation for creating possible solutions. Housing cooperatives suggest placing cameras to the site is the main solution for increasing safety (figure 14). Planners, on the other hand, suggest that placing cameras to site might be a tool for improvement, but not the solution. Planners identified rather that good lighting, attractive public space and a lot of people outdoors create safety (figure 14) (Tallinn UPD 2015). **As the stakeholders hold different information, knowledge and experience about creating safety, providing a ‘deliberative space’ for stakeholders (Maier 2011) is necessary.**
5.2. Organizational Capital For Participatory Approach

As all the stakeholders identified the major spatial problems discussed in previous paragraph and are interested finding solutions, I propose to consider the spatial problems as spatial capital. The gridlocked spatial situation is originating from imbalanced organizational functioning and for breaking the gridlock, it is fundamental to observe also the issues occurring in organizational dimensions.

While the spatial problems were clearly identified by interviewed stakeholders, the organizational concerns are much complex, as each stakeholder recognizes the problems from their standpoint, which is limited by their institutional responsibilities. It is common paradigm among stakeholders to blame other stakeholders for inefficient operation (Housing Cooperatives, Haabersti DA architect, Tallinn UPD 2015). As there is no dominant power in democratic situation and none of the stakeholders have the authority in decision-making process (Pissourios 2014), thus it might be argued that the former top-down planning model is currently in tranformation. This transformation manifests in three distinctive aspects: a) poor planning process, b) inadequate participation by local people and c) malfunctioning communications between top-down and bottom-up stakeholders.

On the one hand housing cooperatives accuse top-downers for causing bureaucracy and restricting their operation (Housing Cooperatives 2015). Therefore the hostility toward top-downers might be considered high. On the other hand both surveyed top-downers (Tallinn UPD and Haaberstti DA) are considering housing cooperatives passive and inadequate for being involved in decision-making process. Still they identified that without housing cooperatives, they do not have power for changing the situation (Tallinn UPD 2015, Haaberstti DA politician, architect 2015). As top-downers at least identify the gridlocked situation, the criteria of “ideal conditions” (tables 1, 2) (Irvin, Stansbury 2004) for participatory approach is concluded. Thus I suggest conceptualizing the three organizational issues (a, b, c) as organizational capital for participatory approach.

a) poor planning process,
b) inadequate participation by local people and
c) malfunctioning communications between top-down and bottom-up stakeholders.
5.2.1. Decision-Makers In The Area, Their Responsibilities

In Väike-Õismäe are 3 main stakeholders, who plan and manage the outdoor space:

- **Housing Cooperatives** are responsible for management and development of houses and small areas around the building, representing bottom-up approach;
- **Haabersti District Administration** manages majority of public space in Väike-Õismäe, is responsible for providing public services (e.g. cleaning snow, maintaining trees) and coordinating proposed projects, representing top-down approach;
- **Tallinn Urban Planning Department** is responsible for planning procedures, compiling general plan, setting general spatial strategies for the area and coordinating proposed projects, representing top-down approach,

5.2.2. Poor Planning Process

Comparing the results of the research (chap. 4) to description of the casestudy (chap. 2), it is possible to interpretate 3 reasons, why the output of current planning does not solve the gridlocked situation and is the outcome of poor planning-process:

- ownership structure is ignored;
- the general scale (land-use, building structure, streets and infrastructure etc.) is emphasized (chap. 2.1.3.1) and human scale neglected (chap 2.1.4);
- the output of planning process fails to produce preconditions for reaching the set goals (chap. 2.1.2).

5.2.3. Inadequate Participation By Local People

In Tallinn, the Neighboring Associations are considered as bottom-up initiatives, representing local residents in planning process (Ait 2014). The map of Tallinn Neighborhood Associations (appendix 2) reveals large empty areas in panel housing areas, including Haabersti district, which implies to poor community activity and lack of interest by residents in planning processes in Väike-Õismäe. Surveyed top-downers share this understanding, because they consider residents of Väike-Õismäe being inactive, there is lack of community feeling and malfunctioning housing cooperatives. These aspects deriver from a huge amount of residents (27 000 inhabitants) (Tallinn UPD, Haabersti DA politician, architect).

Housing cooperatives are not considered being capable to represent the community of Väike-Õismäe (Haabersti DA architect, politician, Tallinn UPD). In Estonia
“community” has become a resource and tool for democracy and the executor of national tasks and functions (Kogukonnauuring 2014) and thus it is necessary to look for further potential in housing cooperatives acting as a community.

The most active leaders of housing cooperatives have well-proofed experience how to raise community-feeling in Väike-Õismäe and they have proved that a coherent housing cooperative is possible (figure 15). Thus I suggest an alternative conceptualization for the community structure in Väike-Õismäe (figure 16), which could serve as bottom-up structure taking care of public services, that would improve the functioning local power (Kogukonnauuring 2014).

**Figure 16. Conceptualization of possible community structure in Väike-Õismäe (author’s drawing)**

Comparing a housing cooperative to a neighborhood association, the fundamental difference is that joining a neighborhood association is voluntary (Ait 2014), but belonging to a housing cooperative is obligatory. For example in Kalamaja residential area are living 6000 residents and 200 of them are involved in Telliskivi Neighbourhood Association, while in a housing cooperative are living approximately 150 residents and all of them must be involved in decision-making in terms of developing the house. As the number of residents is much higher in Väike-Õismäe than in Kalamaja, therefore it is not possible to consider Väike-Õismäe as a coherent community, but it has to be contextualized in multi-scalar dimensions (figure 16).
If a single housing cooperative is conceptualized as a community, these communities could form a non-governmental organization, which could operate as neighboring association in other districts of Tallinn (figure 16). Basically the current Roundtable of the Leaders of Housing Cooperatives in Haabersti (chap. 2.3.2) has this role, but as it is not registered as NGO, it lacks official power. Although it must be acknowledged that the general quality of leadership of housing cooperatives in Väike-Õismäe is not yet high enough to achieve this coherent structure. Therefore increasing the quality of leadership of housing cooperative is primary. As local power (district administration) has an important role for making conditions for increasing the quality of leadership of housing cooperatives (Kogukonnauuring 2014), it is fundamental to acknowledge the potential in social capital of Väike-Õismäe.

5.2.4. Malfunctioning Communications Between Top-Down And Bottom-Up Stakeholders

Mainly the cooperation between housing cooperatives, Haabersti District Administration and Tallinn Urban Planning Department works through top-down initiated projects “Yards in Order!” and “Green Yard” (chap. 2.3.1) and bottom-up initiative „The Roundtable of the Leaders of Housing Cooperatives in Haabersti“ (chap. 2.3.2) (Housing Cooperatives 2015). The mentioned projects are fundamental step for activating housing cooperatives by top-downers, but these models do not reach „very active“ collaboration model (figure 9) presented in Community Study (2014), because housing cooperatives are not involved in decision-making process. On the other hand the bottom-up initiative, „The Roundtable of the Leaders of Housing Cooperatives in Haabersti“ (chap. 2.3.2), represents at least some basic collaboration with top-downers. At the moment it might rather be observed as „project-based“ collaboration model (figure 10), but it has potential for becoming „very active“. Reaching this goal is depending on both aspects – the development of housing cooperatives from bottom-up and the changes of top-down decision-making process.
Misperceptions of stakeholders, lack of knowledge, bureaucracy and lack of know-how (chap. 4.2), characterize malfunctioning communication between stakeholders. The origin of the malfunctioning communication is the misunderstanding of “collaboration” (chap. 4.2.3). Both top-downers, Haabersti District Administration and Tallinn Urban Planning Department are considering “collaboration” as informing people and organizing events for residents. According to Community Study (2014) these methods do not qualify as collaboration, as it is just informing and organizing, without involving residents to decision-making processes. Housing Cooperatives, on the other hand, acknowledge the real need for further collaboration, as they have to face occurring problems under malfunctioning communication circumstances (Housing Cooperatives 2015).

5.3. Participatory Approach As An Alternative
According to table 2 many of the criterias of “ideal conditions” for implementing citizen participation in decision-making process are filled. The advantages of participatory approach (chap. 1.3) would provide solutions for described spatial and organizational problems (chap. 4.1, 4.2) in Väike-Õismäe. Conceptualizing these problems as spatial and organizational capital for participatory approach (chap. 5.1, 5.2), the integrated framework among stakeholders would solve the deadlocked situation (Crescenzi, Rodríguez-Pose 2011). The participation of stakeholders in planning and decision-making is the most important element in the success of planning processes (Antrop 1998), which could generate future planning, intertwining different hierarchical levels managing Väike-Õismäe.

5.3.1. Top-Down
It has become clear that the current planning model is not effective in Väike-Õismäe, because the quality of leadership of housing cooperatives is not high enough, and the opinion of leaders of housing cooperatives confronts with decision-makers. Thus participatory approach would improve the situation, as the process itself gives possibilities for: educating (learn from and inform citizens), persuade citizens; build trust and allay anxiety or hostility, build strategic alliances and gain legitimacy of decisions. The outcome of the process is: to break gridlock (issues of parking, safety, monofunctinal green spaces), achieve outcomes (not only on paper, but in reality), better policy and implementation decisions (Irvin, Stansbury 2004).
5.3.2. **Bottom-Up**

There should be more cooperation between housing cooperatives and the city, because we have to operate on city-owned space, but better quality of life in Väike-Õismäe starts from a housing cooperative.

The leader of housing cooperative

The bottom-uppers (housing cooperatives) fail to scope with the larger scale, because their land ownership is limited, which is delivered by their incapability of affecting the decision-making. Thus participatory approach would improve the situation, as the process itself gives possibilities for: educate (learn from and inform decision-makers), persuade and enlighten district administration and gain skills for activist citizenship. The outcome of the process is: breaking gridlock (that they only recognize spatial issues on privately owned space), gain some control over policy process, better policy and implementation decisions (Irvin, Stansbury 2004).

5.3.3. **Manifest Of Urban Walks**

(detailed info about urban walks in appendix 6)

5.3.3.1. **Common Experience, Common Understanding**

The initial Urban Walk (TAB Urban Walk 2013) took a visit to a rooftop of a 9-floored panel building. Two groups of participants were there. As the first group was about to leave, and second group started to enter the house (both groups were about 20 people) - a police-car, ambulance and three fire-trucks arrived to the site. After the initial panic, it was realized that „we“ were the reason for the emergency: a dutiful resident had noticed suspicious activity around the neighborhood and called for help. Explaining policemen, what was actually going on and that an attempt for mass suicide is not our agenda, a discussion started. This happening triggered a discussion among participants of Urban Walk (architects, planners), couple of residents from the building, (who had came out to see the action), the leader of a housing cooperative and policemen. Commonly we realized that suspicious activity in Väike-Õismäe does not go unnoticed and this happening was considered as a good sign for braking the paradigm that people actually do care about their neighborhood in panel housing areas.
This happening reflects the importance of providing “common stage”, which derives from common experience and common understanding among different people and different perspectives (Antrop 1998). The concept of urban walks provides informal stage, for how people see things together, they end up coming up with same solution. Although the parallel to decision-making and planning process is metaphoric and planning process is obviously more complex, the importance of providing a “common stage” for stakeholders is evident.

5.3.3.2. Sharing Knowledge

The last walk took a city architect from Tartu City Administration, a Gehl Architect to Väike-Õismäe Urban Walk. Along the way the best example of housing cooperative was visited and architects met the leader of the housing cooperative. The result of the meeting was that Gehl Architect shared his ideas how to improve the spatial quality via creating semi-private spaces. He was confronted with the opinion of the leader of housing cooperative, as the housing cooperatives are not capable of doing so, because of the top-down restrictions, as the problem derive of spatial organizational division and fragmented land-ownership. Thus the Gehl Architect explained how vital is to change mind-sets and the whole system, including top-down policy-making. The crucial question asked by the architect of Tartu City Administration “what could we do in Tartu, via top-down approach, for helping to develop housing cooperatives in Annelinn to reach this level of management?” represent the understanding of possible paradigm change by top-downers.

Thus sharing knowledge between top-downers and bottom-uppers is vital for developing the decision-making process for improving the quality of power and also to help developing Väike-Õismäe from bottom-up and brake the gridlock considering the advantages of participatory planning (chap. 1.3).
SUMMARY

The thesis here first looked the way the urban space is produced - intertwining power and urban planning in terms of raising interest for civil society. Top-down urban planning and decision-making process acknowledged during Socialist are in transformation towards complex division of power, empowering bottom-up initiatives and emerging participatory approaches. In those conditions community has become important term for being the executer of national tasks and functions.

Panel housing areas such as Väike-Õismäe have been considered being an unwanted sign of former Soviet Union, where no social interaction takes place and no communities exist, as the number of residents is huge. The thesis has found a contradiction here. It is possible to create a coherent housing cooperative, it is possible to talk to the neighbor, it is possible to think “everything out of my apartment is my concern”. This is a fundamental finding, as it gives possibilities for starting to develop Väike-Õismäe from bottom-up.

My greatest concern is that while talking about good residential area, no-one seems to identify people, there are only cars, o.n.l.y c.a.r.s, except parking, there are also parking problems, and more parking problems, aaand some more parking problems. As the modernist planning designed vast grass areas without functions, those areas have been turned into dog-peeing areas, where besides dog-peeing activities, lawn-mowing is the most popular activity from May til October. Nothing else is possible, because we like to cut the lawn, and vandals would either steal or break everything else. period.

All the good stuff going on with urban gardening, ping-pong tables and other chaotic hipster inventions are happening in Kalamaja or in Telliskivi. Here in Väike-Õismäe nothing is possible, here we are too many people, too many too old people. Here we have modernist architecture, and it has to stay modernist, with all the grass it got, we are happier if we got more grass, or more parking places, even better.
Okay, so these were the spatial issues, originating from people’s mind-sets, from modernist heritage and most of all, from organizational issues. The main reason is the fact that You have the hammer, I have the nails and in a meanwhile not talking to each other, we are trying to build a house, You with a hammer, me with nails. Collaboration is not an invitation to the party, it is not informing about the party. It is organizing the party together, You bring balloons, I bring music. Simple as that! Ooh, here I made a big mistake, in terms of collaboration, we have to decide it together. So do You want to bring the music or balloons or something else? I guess we could practice that and this way generate better future and better party.

For further work I suggest You to map Väike-Õismäe in terms of Power Cube, as it will give possibilities to understand how power works, because I do not. But I know that understanding it, is crucial for future movement, mobilization and change. So tell me, if You will figure it out! Another thing I suggest You to do is to find a way, how to do participatory planning. Keep in mind that You carefully select the stakeholders, make the process transparent, clarify the authority, have competent group facilitators, regular meetings and lots of money, lots of money (ps. do not steal it!).
RESÜMEE

LINNAVÕIM JA KOORDINEERITUD ISETEGEVUS:
Väike-Õismäe tuleviku planeerimise võimalused

Väike-Õismäe on kodu 27 000 elanikule ja üks kolmest Tallinna paneelelamualast. Piirkond ehitati Nõukogude perioodil lähtudes tolleaegsetest idealistlikest seisukohtadest. Väike ööte mägi, nagu nimi viitab, seisab praegu silmitsi hääletu taandarenguga, mida võimendab piirkonna negatiivne kuvand ja meediakajastus.


Mis on praeguste linnaruumi probleemide tekkepõhjused Väike-Õismäel? Kuidas on ruumilised probleemid seotud ebaselge koostöö mudeliga linnavõimu ja elanike omaalgatuste vahel? Millised seisukohad jäävad linnaplaneerimises käsitlemata demokraatlikus ühiskonnas? Tuginedes Jan Gehli linnaplaneerimise teooriale ja kaasava planeerimise printsipidele, on võimalik neile küsimustele vastused leida. Lahendused peituvad erinevate ruumiliste ja institutsionaalsete tasandite vahelises integratsioonis, mille kaudu saab luua eeldused ruumilise arengu planeerimiseks.

Märksõnad: Väike-Õismäe, paneelelamualad, linnaplaneerimine, linnad inimestele, linnavõim, koordineeritud omaalgatus, kogukond, kaasav planeerimine, koostöö
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APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1: Leaflet Of Community Study (2014)
**APPENDIX 1b: Leaflet Of Community Study (Kägu 2014)**

### WHAT is a community?
- community forms of activity
  - formally unorganised: 10%
  - based on association: 7%
  - contract: 7%
  - under the leadership of the village leader: 7%
  - registered as an NGO: 76%

### WHY is a community active?
**Reasons for forming a community**
- cultural development: 52%
- solving problems: 32%
- no specific reason: 16%

**Current basis of activity**
- cultural development: 35%
- solving problems: 26%
- opposition to a project: 26%
- specific reason: 11%

### WHO is a community?
- structure of the average community
  - 6-20 participants
  - 10 active members
  - 3-5 leaders

### WHAT are the communities striving for?
- common interests and goals through continuous interaction
- common values, history and traditions
- open to new ideas and members

### WHAT decreases/increases community activity?
- opposition of municipality
- leaders leaving
- lack of new members
- completion of a building
- opposition, protest
- successful event

### HOW does co-operation with local municipality work?
- **Very active (23%)**
  - drafting development plans
  - providing services
  - formal recognition
- **Active (12%)**
  - providing services
  - formal recognition
- **Project-based (23%)**
  - project funding
  - organizing events
  - formal recognition
- **Non-recognized (20%)**
  - project funding
- **Defined (22%)**
  - lack of single and permanent reason for cooperation

11% of communities have no relations with their local government.
APPENDIX 2: TALLINN NEIGHBORING ASSOCIATIONS

(Kägu 2014)
APPENDIX 3: THEMATIC BLOCKS OF INTERVIEWS

1. **Organization** - structure, responsibilities, restrictions in operation, role in planning process

2. **Cooperation** - examples of past cooperation, activeness of other stakeholders

3. **The Problems of Väike-Õismäe** - parking, greenery, safety, common spaces, community, ageing buildings

4. **Future Solutions in Väike-Õismäe** – good living environment, spatial components, socio-spatial relations
APPENDIX 4: EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
(for Tallinn Urban Planning Department)

1. Organization

- what is your role as planners?
- how was planning process organized?
- which kinds of base-studies did you order for generating the general plan?
- have you ordered any research about people, their behavior in public spaces?
- what is your role in city’s decision-making?

2. Cooperation

- how were involved other stakeholders (housing cooperatives, local people, district administration) to the process?
- what is the role of district administration in urban planning?
- did district administration initiate some new topics?
- compared to other district administrations, would you consider Haabersti District Administration rather active or passive?
- could you bring examples what you mean by collaboration, is it a meeting, phone-calls etc, what were the topics discussed?
- what is your opinion about participatory planning?
- could participatory planning be possible in future?
- how should top-down urban planning and bottom-up initiatives be integrated?
- do you consider there is need for cross-institutional approach?
APPENDIX 4b: Example Of Interview Questions
(For Tallinn Urban Planning Department)

3. Problems of Väike-Õismäe

• what are the current spatial problems in Väike-Õismäe?
• ... while explaining a management problem concerning parking, How to find solutions for those kinds of problems? Who should solve those issues, is it district administration, a housing cooperative or transportation office?
• how is possible to decrease car-usage in panel housing areas?
• how to create semi-private spaces in Väike-Õismäe, is there a way to define it in general plan?

4. Future Solutions in Väike-Õismäe
(questions about scenarios shown in appendix 5)

• is this the environment you would approve? what are its pros and cons?
• would you personally like to live in this kind of environment?
• does cameras provide safety?
• is camera a tool for crime prevetion?
• are grass areas attractive for people and provide activities?
• how is it possible to give out guidelines in general plan that would lead to this result?
• how to make the area attractive for young families?
• how to deal with aging population?
• why is Väike-Õismäe not attractive residential area? is it the matter of stigmatization?
• would urban gardening be suitable in panel housing area?
• why would urban gardening not work in Väike-Õismäe?
• who should coordinate bottom-up initiative (e.g. building flower-beds)?
• would urban gardening be a way for increasing social coherence?
APPENDIX 5: SCENARIOS USED DURING INTERVIEWS

Scenario 1: Park & Play (author’s drawing)
The scenario indicates the continuation of the current processes: the renovation and fencing children playgrounds and enlarging of parking areas. The video cameras are placed to the area to provide safety. The spatial layout lacks functions for outdoor recreation and is monofunctional.
APPENDIX 5B: Scenarios used during interviews

Scenario 2: Developer’s Dream (author’s drawing)

The scenario is based on the interests of developers, who have bought city-owned land and built new apartment buildings between existing ones. This also means that the green-spaces and parking areas are renewed. The spatial design is a typical developer’s solution with some basic paths and playgrounds for children.
APPENDIX 5C: Scenarios used during interviews

Scenario 3: Community Garden (author’s drawing)

The scenario manifests that the local community is activated and has built their community garden into the courtyard. It is a protest against modernist planning with chaos and unplanned structures. In the garden there is no parking as residents use bicycles and public transportation. Some small businesses and grilling areas are opened. The space is semi-private and managed by its users.
APPENDIX 6: INFO ABOUT URBAN WALKS

The list of organized urban walks in Väike-Õismäe:
(in collaboration with Estonian Urban Lab)

1. Tallinn Architecture Biennale 2013
2. European Humanities University (Critical Urbanism)
3. French architects
4. Urbanism and Landscape Days XI
5. private tour for John Bela (Gehl Architects) and Elo Kiivet (Tartu City Administration)

As the spatial and organizational problems create gridlocked situation, an alternative researching method was tested during the research for starting to break this gridlock.

It must be acknowledged that „Urban Walk“ as an intervention is not equal to planning process, but it might be considered as initial step for:

• gathering in-depth data about spatial conditions, that is usually not available for planners or decision-makers;
• building up the network between local residents, architects, politicians, planners;
• providing a „common stage“ for stakeholders to come up with same understanding and solutions

During the past two years, I have organized and been the tour-guide for several urban walks in Väike-Õismäe in cooperation with the Estonian Urban Lab. Guiding tours does not function as a common scientific methodology, but rather is addressed in this thesis as a action-based research method for collecting empirical bottom-up data. Organizing tours has been a way to deal with the negative paradigms as it has been my personal mission to promote the area. Organizing the tours was necessary for me to build up my expertise and knowledge about Väike-Õismäe from different perspectives and also helped to build up a professional and local network. Urban walks manifest as providing a stage for stakeholders: it is an informal meeting or an intervention. The goal is to bring people together and proving a common conceptual room for both top-down and bottom-up representatives (Crescenzi, Rodríguez-Pose 2011). It is a starting-point for testing out for how different people see things together, come up with same solutions.