

In this section, I will reflect on the process and the results of the project. First, I will discuss what role I envision for the project with regard to the introduction of automated vehicles in cities. From there, I will discuss the sensitivities and pitfalls of the project.

In 1935, 'The Steadyflow Traffic System' was first published. In it, the authors hypothesized that a city where the street system permits vehicles to move around without obstructions would be a city in which pedestrians can move around freely and safely without any fear and danger from vehicular traffic (Malcher, Hubbard, & Hubbard, 1935). The manifesto was heavily influential, especially in many American cities. Cars have been given free rein and this has had its consequences. In cities that adapted to the ideology, pedestrian fatalities did decline (Viola, Roe, & Shin, 2010), but only because people stopped walking as cars annexed increasingly more space. With the introduction of automated vehicles, we find ourselves at a crossroads where we have to choose between facilitating vehicular traffic or facilitating slow moving traffic once again.

This project aims to steer the decision towards slow moving traffic by showing an inspiring possible future. To make people look at automated vehicles differently. To make people think about how automated vehicles can be used to improve the livability of urban areas rather than how urban areas need to be transformed to facilitate automated vehicles. Another objective of the project is to provide a set of tools that municipalities can use if they wish to make use of the possibilities that AVs offer with regard to livability, accessibility, and public space. I have chosen to show the possibilities specifically for the centre of Amsterdam, both because it has been experiencing problems concerning livability, public space, and accessibility at an increasing rate, and because I personally feel connected to and responsible for the heart of this city.

Taking into account these objectives, I will now reflect on the project. Before anything else, I will immediately point out a weakness in the project. While the project specifically aims at inspiring people within the municipality of Amsterdam and at providing them with tools, I did in no way cooperate with the municipality. This decision has been made because I prefer to present them a solid product that is thoroughly

researched. Cooperating with the municipality from an early stage however, would have opened up the possibility for interaction and integration of existing plans and visions. During the project I found out that Amsterdam is in transition more than I could have imagined. Every week, sometimes daily, new relevant developments would pop up in the city or with regard to automated vehicles. Many of these developments could in the end not be integrated into the project. Cooperation with the municipality could have led to a more integrated project.

The first objective of the project is to show an inspiring possible future. To achieve this, an unconventional methodology was created. Scenarios were used for the exploration of possible futures in which automated vehicles operated in different ways. This unconventional methodology yielded an array of instruments that have been combined and applied to show an inspiring and achievable possible future. Reflecting on the result, I am content with the outcome. The exploratory methodology has produced many original ways of dealing with automated vehicles. My main critique here would be that a larger amount of inspirational images could have been created. Images like photorealistic renderings or collages that can be understood by laymen and people from different disciplines can help communicate the presented future better. More of such images would thus have contributed to a more convincing vision for the future.

The second objective is to provide instruments that can be used by the municipality of Amsterdam in particular or as a starting point by other municipalities. Herein lies the most important weakness of the project. Because of the way the project has been structured, the catalogue exclusively contains instruments that were derived from the scenarios that were constructed earlier. During the design phase, additional instruments have been used that were obtained in the literature research phase but these are not present in the catalogue. The most important example of such an instrument is 'autonomous parking'. This weakness follows from the way in which the project has been structured and is thus not necessarily an error but an inconvenient side effect. To solve this, a compressed booklet of the project with just the information relevant for future development will be made, which explicitly includes these currently implicit instruments.

Finally, there is one more important possible pitfall for the project. The decision to create an inspiring vision for the future is both the strength and weakness of the project. An informed decision has been made to embrace the power of design to inspire, but the downside of this will be discussed nonetheless; showing a possible future through images can inspire but has the downside that the images might start to look implausible if just one aspect of the image becomes impossible at any point in the future. This makes the power of the images vulnerable to developments that divert from assumptions that were made while constructing the images.

The reason that I have chosen to work with inspiring imagery is that I believe that we as humans play a role in shaping our own future. This, however, requires us to set goals and act on them. If we are to take advantage of our technological advancements, we need to find out how we can use them for the benefit of mankind, and formulate common goals. I hope this project can contribute to the formulation of these goals and help create a bright future.