This booklet is an integral part of the graduation project “Street Smart”. It contains the complete documentation of all the location analyses that were conducted as a part of this graduation project.
Figure 1: Location of Oud-Charlois in Rotterdam.

Figure 2: Location of Rotterdam in the Netherland.
ROTTERDAM

618,109 inhabitants
317,855 households

102,271 children up to 15 years
92,347 households with children
The city of Rotterdam is located on the west coast of the Netherlands, marking the southern edge of the Randstad; the densely populated urbanized region located in the mid-west part of the Netherlands. Rotterdam is one of the country’s larger cities, internationally recognized for its large industrial harbour. During WW2, a large part of the city was bombed and had to be rebuilt. Because of this, the city has a large amount of freedom when it comes to its urban design and architecture. This is mostly visible in the centre and around the harbours, where the city foregoes traditional Dutch architecture for large highrises. Rotterdam is divided in a north and a south bank, separated by the river the Maas. Charlois is one of the primary areas in the southern part of Rotterdam, which includes Oud-Charlois in the north-west corner.
OUD-CHARLOIS

13,094 inhabitants
6,701 households
2,378 children up to 15 years
2,011 households with children

18,2%
30,0%
The location analysis presented in this booklet consists of a number of separate analyses, which all look into the different aspects of Oud Charlois. The first analysis is the network analysis. This analysis looks at the network in which Oud-Charlois is positioned, instead of merely the neighbourhood of Oud-Charlois as defined by the municipality. This network is defined by combining the physical characteristics of Oud-Charlois and its surroundings, with interviews with residents, adults and young people alike. In doing so, this network analysis provides an integral view of how the residents of Oud-Charlois use their environments, as well as the physical characteristics of this environment.

The Network Perspective
According to Dupuy’s (2008) book on urban networks, there are three different scales (or operators) of importance within every network, which he described as a level-three network structure. The largest scale, the level-one operator, consists of the road networks, public transport networks and communication networks. This network thus consists of the larger networks that links all the smaller networks together. This is true within a city, but also between cities and even internationally. The middle scale, the level-two operator, consists of the production, consumptions and domestic networks. Here, Dupuy (2008) describes the production network to be a networks of supplies, subcontractors and customers; in other words, he described the network in which people work and earn a living (i.e. the labour market). The consumption network is, according to Dupuy (2008), the
network that links different types of facilities together that people use on a regular basis (e.g. shopping and leisure). The last network, the domestic network, is described by Dupuy (2008) as the network that links all the crucial points in a person’s life together such as family, friends, schools, work, etc. The smaller scale, the level-three operator, consists of networks and territory’s of the urban household. The size of this scale is thus dependent on the network size of each individual. However, it can be said that for most people this network will consist of their homes, their gardens, and all the local places they visit and make use of.

The Interviews
The most common way of performing a network analysis is by observing the physical characteristics of a certain location and then, through careful analysis, distill the different network operators from these characteristics. While such an analysis undoubtedly provides valuable insight into the networks as they exist on paper, it does not tell you whether the residents of the area actually use the network in that way. By combining a traditional network analysis with interview data detailing residents’ use of their environment, the network analysis provides a more accurate picture of the networks as they are used by the residents. For the purpose of this analysis, the interviews were conducted with adults, adolescents and children. The interviews were conducted in four separate locations in the neighbourhood (Figure 5).

All the residents that were interviewed were asked the same five questions, with three possible follow-up questions depending on their answer:

1. What is your age?
2. Do you live in the neighbourhood?
3. Do you come to this place often? And if so, what is the reason for your visits to this location.
4. Are there other places that you frequent often? And if so, which locations are they.
5. Are there places where you don’t like coming? And if so, which locations are they.

The combination of these questions were designed to create insight into people’s use of their environment. This use was combined with the physical characteristics of Oud-Charlois and its surroundings to create network maps of all three network operator for adults and children, separated into maps that show facilities (destinations, directly derived from interview data) and pathing (movement, discerned based on the present physical characteristics).

Figure 5: The four locations in which the interviews were conducted.
Oud-Charlois is located on the southern bank of Rotterdam. It connects to the north via the Maastunnel, which runs directly north from Oud-Charlois, or via the Erasmus bridge to the east. Furthermore, Oud-Charlois is located in the north part of Rotterdam-Zuid, which can be described as the area north of the large Zuiderpark which runs east to west across the area. The main hubs in the area are the centre of Rotterdam to the north, and the Zuidplein area to the east.
Adults generally name the same destinations on the level one operator. Most of these locations are obvious destinations; the centre of Rotterdam, Zuidplein and Ahoy and the Zuiderpark. The primary reason to travel to one of these destinations is either utility (i.e. grocery shopping, travel, work) or recreation (i.e. leisure shopping, culture, sports). Interesting enough, few people name the waterfront as a place they visit, even though it can be considered a primary feature of this level one operator.
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Figure 7: Adults’ Facilities
To move across the level one operator, adults will generally need access to a car or use the available public transportation. While cycling is a feasible means of transportation, many of the distances would be considered too far away by acceleradius standards. When travelling with a car, access to Rotterdam-Noord is slowed down by bottlenecks such as the Maastunnel or the Erasmus bridge. Furthermore, in order to reach Rotterdam-Noord, residents first have to travel to another hub, either to the Maashaven station or the Zuidplein, unless they are in walking distance of the one busline that takes a direct route to Rotterdam-Noord. To make matter even worse, access to the Zuidplein is complicated as well, with only one available busline and no direct connection with the tramline.
By integrating adults’ facilities (destinations, directly derived from interview data) and pathing (movement, discerned based on the available physical characteristics), a network map can be created portraying adults’ level one operator.

Figure 9: Adults’ Network
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Not very surprisingly, children name most of the same destinations in the level one operator. While, for adults, there is a clear distinction between utility and recreation destinations, children do not make this distinction. Their primary motivation to visit a destination is recreational, with most children describing leisure shopping, culture, sports, or play activities as main activities. Because of the large distances in the level one operator, children oftentimes name the destinations in this operator as subject to parental supervision. Destinations such as the centre of Rotterdam or the Zuiderpark are the main destination that require adults to be present during their visit.
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Figure 10: Children's Facilities
Children will, for the most part, travel with adults in the level one operator. Therefore, it stands to reason that they use the same modes of transportation as adults do; cars and public transport. However, because of the isolated nature of Oud-Charlois and the relatively small level one operator, there are some destinations that older children could visit on their own (e.g., the Zuidplein or the sports fields in the Zuiderpark). In order to do so, they will most likely walk or cycle to get to where they want to go. Since Rotterdam-Zuid has very few bicycle paths or separate pedestrian routes, children will make use of the main car roads and the adjacent sidewalks.

Legend:

- Unattractive Routes
- Attractive Routes

Figure 11: Children’s Pathing
By integrating children’s facilities (destinations, directly derived from interview data) and pathing (movement, discerned based on the available physical characteristics), a network map can be created portraying children’s level one operator.

*Figure 12: Children’s Network*
When we put the level one operators for adults and children on top of each other we can clearly see that they are very similar. The places adults and children visit in this network are very similar, though adults use the network for both utility and recreation, whereas children only use it for recreation. For travel across the network, children are mainly dependent on adults in terms of car or public transportation use. However, for those facilities that are in walking or bicycling distance, older children can move independently from adults. In reaching these destinations by bike or by foot, children and adults use the same routes, which are comprised of the dominant roads in the area.
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Figure 13: Adult & Children's Networks
Oud-Charlois is framed by the Maas and its harbours to the west and the north, and the Zuiderpark to the south. Therefore, its main orientation on the level-one operator is east, towards the Zuidplein-Ahoy complex. This complex is the primary hub for Rotterdam-Zuid, providing public transportation to all important hubs in the area, as well as a diverse variety of shops, restaurants and businesses, the Ahoy event hall and a hospital.
Adults describe similar destinations on the level two operator, same as with the level one operator, which causes a very concentrated network to appear. Most of the travel in this operator is directed towards the Zuidplein area to the east. Furthermore, the shops and facilities which start in the Wolfaertsbocht to the west of Oud-Charlois and continue all the way to the Zuidplein area is also a destination, as well as the Zuiderpark and the other small parks in the area. The primary reason to travel is still either utility and recreation and, still, few people name the waterfront as a place they visit, even though it can be considered a primary feature of this level two operator.
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Figure 15: Adults’ Facilities
To move across the level two operator, adults use the same transportation methods as in the level one operator, though there is a larger emphasis on slow traffic (i.e. cycling and walking). To get to the Zuidplein in a direct fashion, residents will have to use either the busline, or personal modes of transportation such as driving, cycling or walking. The primary tramline that is accessible for the entire neighbourhood does not run to the Zuidplein directly, so in order to get there via public transportation people either have to walk to reach the busline or ride the tramline to the Maastunnel station and then transfer to the metro.
By integrating adults’ facilities (destinations, directly derived from interview data) and pathing (movement, discerned based on the available physical characteristics), a network map can be created portraying adults’ level two operator.

Figure 17: Adults’ Network
The level two operator of children’s destinations shows a widely diverse range of facilities and other destination areas. Similar to the level one operator, an important reason for children to travel is recreation. However, in the level two operator, children also travel for utility purposes, specifically in order to go to school. This level two operator network has two distinct locations; one to the north, around the shopping mall of the Wolfeartsbocht and one to the south, where there is a large concentration of playground, schools and other sports or recreation facilities, stretching from Oud-Charlois all the way to the Zuidplein area.
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Figure 18: Children’s Facilities
In the level two operator, children have a larger, more independent, mobility as their destinations become closer to home. While older children will have independent mobility throughout the entire network, young children are still likely to be accompanied by parents. Because a large part of the level two operator for children is located in the south part of the area, children gain attractive routes that allow them to move across the network. Whereas the main roads are still used as important route, these roads are supplemented with secondary or even tertiary roads which see less car dominance, slower speeds and a green profile derived from adjacent public spaces.
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Figure 19: Children’s Pathing
By integrating children’s facilities (destinations, directly derived from interview data) and pathing (movement, discerned based on the available physical characteristics), a network map can be created portraying children’s level two operator.
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Figure 20: Children's Networks
While the level one operator network for children and adults were very similar, their level two operator network is very different. Adults mainly use the northern area of the network, travelling across the main west to east connection with its shops and other public facilities. Children, on the other hand, only use the a small part of this northern location, namely, the area directly around the Wolfaertsbocht shopping centre. For the most part, however, they move across the areas to the south of the network, which has a wide range of schools, playgrounds and sports and recreation facilities. The strongest common dominator in this network is the Zuidplein area with its diverse public facilities.
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Figure 21: Adult & Children’s Networks
Located in the north-west corner of Rotterdam-Zuid, the neighbourhood of Oud-Charlois directly connects to both the Waalhaven (to the west) and the Maashaven (to the north). Furthermore, it also directly connects to the Zuiderpark (to the south), and the adjacent, low density neighbourhood Wielewaal. Only in the east does Oud-Charlois connect to an urban environment; the neighbourhoods Carnisse and Tarwewijk. The centre of Oud-Charlois can be found in the north-west, around the church and historic village core. This centre extends in a linear fashion to the east, along the Wolfaertsbocht, which houses most of Oud-Charlois’ shops and other facilities.
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Figure 22: Level 3 Operator
The level three operator of adults is basically a zoomed in version of the level two operator. However, the reason to travel to these location turns from a split between utility and recreation travel to predominant utility travel. Adults use the shops and other public facilities in the Wolfaertsbocht for their daily shopping. For recreation, they use the parks in the north and the south, or the pedestrian route in the west of Charlois. However, adults mention these places very rarely. For recreation, they primarily use destinations that are a part of the level one and level two operator networks.
Travel through the level one operator will primarily rely on walking or cycling, since all locations are generally close to the homes of the residents. Cars and public transportation will generally be reserved for the destinations that are a little further away, require the carrying of goods or groceries, or for the elderly who have trouble cycling or walking.
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Figure 24: Adults’ Pathing
By integrating adults’ facilities (destinations, directly derived from interview data) and pathing (movement, discerned based on the available physical characteristics), a network map can be created portraying adults’ level three operator.
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*Figure 25: Adults’ Network*
Whereas adults have a rather small and compact level three operator network, children have a very large and widely spread network. Adults go outside their neighbourhood for recreation, but children, instead, primarily remain inside their neighbourhood. Young children use the playground or parks that are close to their homes, either independently or with parental supervision. Older children are allowed to travel a little further away from home, often visiting the larger, more central, places in the neighbourhood where they meet up with friends from other parts of Oud-Charloius. Because of its large selection of schools, many children also use the level three operator for utility travels (i.e. going to and from home to school).
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Figure 26: Children’s Facilities
Because the neighbourhood of Oud-Charlois has a lot of different public space pockets that are designed as park or playground, children use the roads in the area to travel to and from these places. Most of these public spaces are adjacent to the main arteries of the neighbourhood, and it are these arteries that children travel across. While there are some pedestrian friendly routes in this network, most of them are car dominant, either in terms of parking or in terms of travel.
By integrating children’s facilities (destinations, directly derived from interview data) and pathing (movement, discerned based on the available physical characteristics), a network map can be created portraying children’s level three operator.
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Figure 28: Children’s Network
When we put the level three operator network of both children and adults next to each other, we can clearly see that they are even more differentiated than the previous level one and two operator networks. Adults have a very small and compact level three operator network, which is located around the shops and facilities in the Wolfaertsbocht. Children, on the other hand, have a very large and diverse level three operator. While they do use some of the facilities in the Wolfaertsbocht shopping mall, they primarily make use of all the different parks, playgrounds, school yards and schools in the area, which are spread all throughout the neighbourhood.
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Figure 29: Adult & Children’s Networks
The network analysis provides us with insight into the places that residents use and visit in combination with the physical characteristics that support both these destinations, as well as the movement to and from these destination. This analysis has to be combined with a more specific spatial analysis, that looks into the physical and social characteristics of Oud-Charlois. This second spatial analysis will further develop our understanding of Oud-Charlois with more specific knowledge about the spatial characteristics of the neighbourhood and its social climate.

Figure 30: Impressions of Oud-Charlois.
Figure 31: Impressions of Oud-Chariois.
Oud-Charlois is a medium-density neighbourhood. The neighbourhood contains large areas dominated by ribbons with residential buildings. However, there is also a lot of public space, mostly around the north, west and south edges of the neighbourhood and in pockets within the neighbourhood. Almost all of the public space in Oud-Charlois is owned by the municipality. Only the area around the church in the historic centre and the empty field in the centre of Oud-Charlois is owned by separate corporations.
For a residential neighbourhood in a large city, Oud-Charlois is a very green neighbourhood. All around the north, west and south edges, the neighbourhood is enveloped by unpaved, green, public space. Furthermore, almost all of the neighbourhood pockets are unpaved, green areas. The remainder of the public space is paved, which mainly consists of the neighbourhood’s infrastructure and a few small, paved, squares.
While we can characterize Oud-Charlois as a green neighbourhood, most of this is non-quality green used to fill up empty spaces or as a buffer between the neighbourhood and the industrial harbour. When we subtract these green spaces, we can see that very few quality areas remain. The areas that do remain, however, are nicely spread out across the neighbourhood, with two parks to the north, two linear spaces that connect north and south together and two neighbourhood pockets.
Most of the paved public spaces in Oud-Charlois consist of infrastructure. This paved public space network is dominated by car roads. The network of pedestrian sidewalks in the area is very narrow, allowing little space for comfortable walking. Most of the paved public spaces that are not a part of the infrastructure network consist of paved school yards and basketball courts, with only two paved squares.
When we further define the infrastructure network in Oud-Charlois, we can see the reason behind the narrow sidewalks. When mapped, it becomes clearly visible that parking spaces take up most of the street profiles in almost all the streets. Moreover, when visiting the location, it became evident that even in streets that do not have assigned parking spaces, people find a way to park their cars in the streets.
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Figure 37: Parking Spaces
Oud-Charlois has almost no designated spaces for bicycle lanes. Only along the very busy Maastunnel areas do cyclists get their own lanes. In the rest of the neighbourhood, bicycle lanes are only there as a slow traffic shortcut between different streets. In all other instances, cyclists have to use share the roads with cars and other motorized traffic.

**Legend:**
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*Figure 38: Bicycle Lanes*
The neighbourhood of Oud-Charlois primarily consists of ribbons running from north to south. Most of these ribbons are made up of residential buildings, with a few public facilities, primarily schools, in between. In the north part of the neighbourhood, around the Wolfaertsbocht, the ribbons run east to west. These ribbons are made up of commercial buildings or mixed functions. The only exception to the ribbons can be found around the historic centre of Oud-Charlois in the north-west. Here, older buildings that predate the war remain which are oriented in a circle, with the church at its centre. These buildings see a mix of residential buildings and buildings with a mixed function. At the west edge of Oud-Charlois, there is a strip of industrial buildings, marking the border with the harbour.
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*Figure 39: Functions*
Oud-Charlois is a neighbourhood with a lot of privately owned residences. Roughly two thirds of the housing stock is privately owned, versus one third that is owned by corporations. Of the privately owned residences, a little more than half are owned by the residents, the rest is privately owned but rented out. Most of the housing stock that is owned by corporations is located in the north part of Oud-Charlois around the commercial and mixed functions area and in a pocket to the south-west.
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Figure 40: Ownerships
Most of the buildings in Oud-Charlois predate WW2. The southern part of Rotterdam did not see as much damage from the bombing as the north, leaving most of the buildings intact. Because of their age, these buildings are starting to dilapidate. Some efforts have been made to update them through renovation efforts or targeted demolishing and new development. Most of the other buildings are post-war expansion areas with row houses and a few modern apartment buildings around the southern edge with the Zuiderpark.
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Figure 41: Building Period
Oud-Charlois has a lot of multiple family residences without elevators. This skewed housing stock is a direct result of the large number of pre-WW2 buildings in the area. The newer, post war or renovated, buildings are either apartment buildings with elevators or single family residences.
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*Figure 42: Typology*
Another remnant of the pre-WW2 buildings is the low value of the housing stock. Most of the multi-family residences without elevators have a very low value, and so do a lot of the post-war expansion areas. The only high value residences are located in the north, around the renovated Wolfaerstsbocht and in the side, around the newly developed Zuiderpark edge.

Figure 43: Average WOZ Values
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Oud-Charlois is a very multi-cultural neighbourhood, where half the population has a nationality other than Dutch. The low values of the housing stock in the neighbourhood attracts a lot of people from the lower social classes to the area, which explains the low average household income within Oud-Charlois.
About one third of the household in Oud-Charlois has children, either with one or two parents living in the house. Half the population consists of single person household, who are attracted to the neighbourhood because of the small, cheap housing. The remainder of the population consists of couples without children.
To conclude the spatial analysis of Oud-Charlois, we can review the neighbourhood profile created by the municipality of Rotterdam. This profile shows a combined assessment of neighbour’s physical index, safety index and social index. For Oud-Charlois, we can see that the values are slightly above what they are in the rest of Charlois. However, on average, Oud-Charlois still scores below the Rotterdam average in terms of all three indexes.
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Figure 46: Neighbourhood profile for Charlois and Oud-Charlois.
For the purpose of this analysis, it is important to not only analyse which location in their neighbourhood adults, adolescents and children use and what the spatial and social characteristics of that neighbourhood are. Rather, it is also important to create insight into how adults, adolescents and children use these locations in their neighbourhood. The key element is to discern what the connection is between the public spaces that they use, and the public life that occurs within these spaces. In other words, to look at the relationship between the social and physical aspects of spaces. One of the ways in which to do this is through observational research.

While performing observational research is not in any way difficult or expensive, it is important to have a set system in place that helps the observer structure his or her observations (Gehl & Svarre, 2013). Without such a system, it is impossible to obtain consistent results, and without consistent result, one can not hope to draw meaningful conclusions. There are many different ways in which to study public life, developed over a period of several decades by many different researchers (Harteveld, 2014). For the purpose of this research, a method was chosen that records six different types of information pertaining to both the physical, social, and culture aspects of the observed setting (Figure 47). This method was design by Zeisel in his classic “Inquiry by Design” (1984). To be able to come to an impression of residents’ use of public spaces in Oud-Charlois, the choice was made to observe four of the main public spaces in Oud-Charlois from 8 in the morning to 8 in the evening, both
on a workday and on a weekend (or holiday). By doing so, we create as complete and thorough an impression as possible within the scope of this graduation project.

The second challenge in conducted observational research is not just the research itself, but also the documentation of the research. In order to document observational research, we have to find a way in which to accurately yet understandably document social-spatial information. For the documentation of the observational analysis conducted in this project, inspiration was drawn from the way in which Bosselman (2008) documented his observational research. By creating a simple representation of the location and assigning symbols and colours to different actors, the frequency and location of their use of the public space can be documented. The problem with this type of documentation is that it is incomplete. Therefore, in this project, these maps are supplemented with additional information providing insight into the location itself in the form of a map and sections, as well as its position in Oud-Charlois. Furthermore, each location comes with a list of usergroups that are characteristic for that public space, and a series of photos that portray not only its physical appearance, but also which elements of the space are most used by which usergroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Who is</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Doing what</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. With Whom</td>
<td>Significant other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In What Relationship</td>
<td>Aural, Vidual, Tactile, Olfactory, Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In What Context</td>
<td>Situation and/or Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. And Where</td>
<td>Physical Setting; Props and Spatial Relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 47: Important information to record while doing observational research, as described by Zeisel (1984).
One of the primary public spaces in Oud-Charlois is the Karel de Stoute park, located along the Wolfaertsbocht in the north of Oud-Charlois. This park attracts a wide range of people, both adults and children, either for recreation purposes or as a means of passing through on their travels.

**Figure 48:** Location, sections and characteristic usergroups of the Karel de Grote park in Oud-Charlois.
During the week, the Karel de Stoute park is primarily used as a place to walk the dog, jog, or walk through on the way to school and work. The recreational activities that do take place are located around the edges of the park, as people eat their lunches on their break. The only exception is between the time the schools go out and dinner is served, when a lot of children use the park to play.

*Figure 49: Documentation of a workday at the Karel de Stoute park.*
On a weekend, or during a holiday, the park is almost deserted in the morning as people sleep in. Around lunch time, the activity increases and children, parents with children, but also local residents use the park to play, sit, walk or talk and barbeque with neighbours.

*Figure 50: Documentation of a weekend at the Karel de Stoute park.*
The Karel de Stoute park is sparsely designed. Most of the elements that are used are the play objects, which are exclusively used by children and their parents, and the football field. Most of the other use is confined around areas that offer seating, either in the shade, in the sun, or close to areas where there is a lot to see (i.e. the road).

Figure 51: Documentation of the spatial elements of the Karel de Stoute park.
The Wolfaertsbocht is the only area in Oud-Charlois that offers shops and other public facilities. As such, it is the primary location for people to travel to for their shopping needs. However, there is very little activity other than coming to and from in this area because the adjacent square is not a part of the shopping area, but rather, a school yard which is closed during the holidays and outside school hours.

Figure 52: Location, sections and characteristic usergroups of the Wolfaertsbocht in Oud-Charlois.
On a workday, the Wolfaertsbocht primarily sees a lot of travel in the morning. Once the shops start to open, the area gets busier until, roughly, around dinner time, when the activity decreases and shops start to close. While the Wolfaertsbocht is a very busy area, there are very few people actually using the public space around the shops. Most people go in, shop, come out, and leave. The people that do use the space around the shops are primarily elder people or people with children, who sit or play around the central area, or people on a break from work taking a smoke while leaning against the building. The only space that can be identified as a meeting area is around the side of the structure near the bicycle stands, where people create their own informal space to stand, talk, smoke or eat a snack.

Figure 53: Documentation of a workday at the Wolfaertsbocht.
During a weekend, the use of the Wolfaertsbocht is very comparable with the use during a workday. The most notable difference is the intensity of the traffic, which is not as high as during a workday. Furthermore, during the weekend, people go about their business less hurried, taking more time to shop and taking more time when do they in fact use the public spaces around the shops.

*Figure 54: Documentation of a weekend at the Wolfaertsbocht.*
The Wolfaertsbocht has very little quality space for people to use. The square towards to back of the area (which is open in the picture) is in fact a schoolyard and used as such during the week, while it is closed during the weekend. The only elements people make use of are the two benches in the central area, while the children sometimes play in the planter. Other than that, people use the space in front of the store to browse the storefronts, and the space to the side of the structure to park their bikes or to use as an informal meeting space.

*Figure 55: Documentation of the spatial elements of the Wolfaertsbocht.*
The park in front of the OSG Hugo de Groot is the largest neighbourhood pocket of Oud-Charlois. While primarily used by children and adolescents, it is designed (and designated) as a park and does see some adult activity, though this is mostly people jogging, walking their dog, or taking a shortcut.

Figure 56: Location, sections and characteristic usergroups of the OSG Hugo de Groot area in Oud-Charlois.
During workdays, the park in front of the OSG Hugo de Groot is predominantly used by the adolescents who attend the secondary school. Adults use the park to job, walk the dog, or as a shortcut, but it is mainly used as a place to hang out or play sports during school breaks or after school hours. Interesting to note is that, after school, younger children from the elementary schools in the area will also travel to this park to hang out together or even hang out with older friends of siblings.

*Figure 57: Documentation of a workday at the OSG Hugo de Groot.*
On a weekend, the OSG Hugo de Groot is pretty much deserted for a large part of the morning when parents, children and adolescents either sleep in or attend sports activities. In the afternoon, more children and adolescents travel to the park to meet each other and play football or basketball together. Interesting is that, during the weekend, adults use the park more often as a means of recreation, either by themselves or with children that are still too young to travel throughout the neighbourhood unattended.

*Figure 58: Documentation of a weekend at the OSG Hugo de Groot.*
While the OSG Hugo de Groot is designed and designated as a park, it is primarily used by children and adolescents. They use the basketball court or the football field in the area, or hang out on the benches that are placed throughout the area. Few adults use this park but when they do, they oftentimes use the benches in the area to rest from their walk, to just sit and relax, or watch their dog or child(ren) play.

*Figure 59: Documentation of the spatial elements of the OSG Hugo de Groot.*
The southern edge of Oud-Charlois is a transition area between the neighbourhood and the Zuiderpark. However, because of its design, it is not really used as an entrance into the Zuiderpark. Rather, it is primarily used by the people who live around the area, most notably the children who live directly adjacent to it and can play there unsupervised (or, rather, supervised by parents from the comfort of their own home).

Figure 60: Location, sections and characteristic usergroups of the OSG Hugo de Groot area in Oud-Charlois.
The entrance to the Zuiderpark is primarily used by the children going to school at the nearby MBO, the children who live closeby and their parents. Other use is very limited, and mostly confined to people walking through the area or using the singel to fish in. On a workday, the area is very empty. Most of the activity happens between the time the schools end and dinner time, when children use the area to play.

*Figure 61: Documentation of a workday at the Zuiderpark entry.*
On a weekend, the entry to the Zuiderpark sees a lot more activity. While slow to start in the morning, similar to the other public spaces in the area, children start to come outside to play around lunctime. Most of the children playing here live closeby and maintain their play for a large portion of the day. In the evening, a lot of the local residents come outside to either sit with their children in the park or in their front yards, overlooking the park. They sit together, talk, sip wine and eat snacks, extending their homes out into the streets.

Figure 62: Documentation of a weekend at the Zuiderpark entry.
The entrance to the Zuiderpark is not really designed as such. While there is a continuous connection with the Zuiderpark framed by the singel and benches to sit on, the area itself is shaped as a playground for children, with play objects and a football field.

*Figure 63: Documentation of the spatial elements of the Zuiderpark entry.*
As a conclusion to the observational analysis, we can state that while all areas (apart from the Wolfaertsbocht) seemed similar in nature in advance, they have a very varied use and functionality. Naturally, the Wolfaertsbocht is the primary centre of Oud-Charlois with a lot of activity in terms of daily shopping, but very little other activity. This activity, instead, seems to occur in the Karel de Stoute park, which is used by adults, parents with children, and children by themselves alike and sees a high turn-over rate of people using the area. The OSG Hugo de Groot park, on the other hand, is more isolated inside the neighbourhood. Because of its large size and facilities (i.e. the school itself, the basketball court and the football field), it is mainly used by children and adolescents who meet up to either play sports or just hang out together. This use is again different from the entry to the Zuiderpark. While this entry is used as such, the intensity of this use is rather low. Instead, the area is primarily used as small playground by the children who live nearby. In all of the spaces however, both adults and children seem to gravitate towards spatial elements such as benches, play objects and art sculptures, which provides interest. Furthermore, people often group together, near elements such as trees or walls that provide protections from the sun, wind or raid. All these findings support the hypothesis that there are conditions that increase the quality of social life within public spaces, as first documented by Whyte (2008).
One of the conclusions from the research conducted in this project was that, to understand how children and adolescents perceive and use their environment, it is important to actually ask them this question. Furthermore, in designing spaces for them, it is important to again ask them what their wishes are for their neighbourhood. A lot of the environments that are created for children and adolescents are created by adults’ opinion of what children spaces should look like. In order to create more insight into how the children and adolescents in Oud-Charlois perceive their neighbourhood, a series of workshops were conducted with school children ages 8 and 9 and ages 13 and 14, both classes from the “superschool” OSG Hugo de Groot. The appendix contains the full documentation of the didactic clarification behind the workshop setup.

This series of workshops started with an analysis workshop. In this workshop, children were handed a throw-away camera in pairs of two. The assignment was to make 16 pictures of things they liked and 16 pictures of things they didn’t like (i.e. positive and negative aspects of their environment). Furthermore, they were asked to sketch the most noticeable positive and negative aspects of their environment in a small booklet.

Figure 65: Impression of the workshops, left the elementary school and right the highschool.
Figure 66: “Analysis” provided by children ages 7 & 8.
1. Maak een tekeningen van de LEEREN dingan die hekt gedden op weg van school naar hela.

2. Maak een tekeningen van de HET LEEREN dingan die hekt gedden op weg van school naar hela.
Figure 67: "Analysis" provided by children ages 7 & 8.
Figure 68: "Analysis" provided by children ages 7 & 8.
1. Maak een tekening van de LEERLING die lacht gezien op weg van school naar壳.

2. Maak een tekening van de MEEST LEERLING die lacht gezien op weg van school naar壳.

1. Maak een tekening van de LEERLING die lacht gezien op weg van school naar壳.

2. Maak een tekening van de MEEST LEERLING die lacht gezien op weg van school naar壳.
Visible from the pictures of these elementary school children is that they have a very direct relationship with their environment. They see what is immediately in front of them without filter, whether that is dog poop or litter on the street or something funny in someone’s front yard or behind their windows. Their attention is automatically drawn towards objects they can play with; benches, play objects, sports fields or school yards. However, even outside these play areas they seek playfulness in their environment by searching for colours or funny objects, may they be art sculptures, abandoned plushie animals or mushrooms. It also seems that children are able to perceive beauty and actively search for it. They often photograph parks, green areas, flowers, water elements or old buildings. Simultaneously, they also recognize ugliness in the form of dilapidated, ugly and empty facades, construction work and trashcans.

Figure 69: Conclusions from the analysis of children ages 7 & 8, sorted by theme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyke</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice Weather</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singel / Water</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Elements</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportfield</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places to Sit or Relax</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground / Play Elements</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated Buildings</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossings</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful Buildings</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Garden</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trashcan</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special, Eye-Catching Elements</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Works</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poop</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park / Green</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGES 13 & 14

Figure 70: “Analysis” provided by children ages 13 & 14.
1. Maak een schets van de POSITIEVE dingen die bent tegen gekomen op weg van school naar huis.

2. Maak een schets van de NEGATIEVE dingen die bent tegen gekomen op weg van school naar huis.

![Image]
Figure 71: “Analysis” provided by children ages 13 & 14.
2. Maak een schets van de POSITIEVE dingen die het beter maken op weg van school naar huis.

1. Geef een schets van een open rugzak.
2. Nu o.a. een rubber opvouwbaar.
3. Vreemd gemeende een zak met een beker.

2. Maak een schets van de NEGATIEVE dingen die het beter maken op weg van school naar huis.

1. Ruim
2. Riem
3. Slecht poes
4. Vreemd
Figure 72: “Analysis” provided by children ages 13 & 14.
1. Maak een schets van de POSTIEVE dingen die betaal tegen gekomen op weg van school naar huis.

2. Maak een schets van de NEGATIEVE dingen die betaal tegen gekomen op weg van school naar huis.
In contrast to the younger children, these highschool children observe their environment more censored. They do still recognize dog poop, litter, graffiti, unkempt property and dilapidated buildings as negative aspect of their environment. However, in searching for positive aspects, they realize that plushes and mushrooms are merely objects in the environment. Instead, they often photograph parks, art sculptures, wall murals, water elements and other green or well maintained environments as positive elements. Furthermore, while young children actively try to peek into front yards and inside windows, these older children look at objects from further away. Instead of funny elements in yards or behind windows, they photograph beautiful yards or nice buildings as one entity.

Figure 73: Conclusions from the analysis of children ages 13 & 14, sorted by theme.
For the future, Rotterdam-Zuid has a vision called national program Rotterdam-Zuid. This program aims to improve Rotterdam-Zuid while focusing on three main subjects, namely, education, employment and housing. Each neighbourhood in Rotterdam-Zuid has its own action perspectives, derived from this national program. For Oud-Charlois, the aim is to support the large amount of schools and transform it into a neighbourhood for children. The municipality aims to do this by focusing on improving the housing stock, maintaining the parks and playground and transforming the industrial ribbon in the west into a zone for industrial education. While some parts of the harbour will be transformed in the coming years, the areas in which this will happen are limited and are mostly those that are already abandoned or close to the neighbourhoods. The other large projects planned in Charlois is the redevelopment of the Zuidplein and Ahoy area into the “Hart van Zuid”, or, in other words, the heart of Rotterdam-Zuid by bringing more facilities out of the neighbourhoods into the Zuidplein area and redeveloping the adjacent public spaces.

Figure 74: Plans for the future developments inside Oud-Charlois and around the Zuidplein area.

Gemeente Rotterdam © Action perspectives.
The location analysis documented in this booklet described several different analyses that looked at different aspects of the social and spatial situation in Oud-Charlois. While each analysis consisted of its own conclusions, it will be necessary to combine all these conclusions into a single direction that can provide the basis for the design. To do so, the network analysis, spatial analysis, observational analysis, children’s analysis and future context have been combined into a series of three conclusion maps. These conclusion maps are a spatial representations of the different problems, qualities and opportunities that can be identified in the neighbourhood of Oud-Charlois. It are these spatial drawings that can, afterwards, be used as the basis with which to create the design intervention.
Oud-Charlois has a number of different problems, pertaining to both the internal and external situation and structure of the neighbourhood and its surroundings. In the north of Oud-Charlois, its connection to Rotterdam-Noord creates a number of different problems. First, the connection itself is rather old and no longer supports today’s intense commute, causing a bottleneck in reaching Rotterdam-Zuid. Furthermore, the car overload causes the adjacent public spaces to lose their qualities and creates a sharp divide between Oud-Charlois and the harbour around the Maashaven, making the waterfront inaccessible. The same thing happens in the west part of the Oud-Charlois, where the industrial buildings, the train rails and the car road blocks access to the Waalhaven. Similarly, both the singel and the road separating Oud-Charlois from Carnisse act as a barrier between the different parts of Oud-Charlois and the surrounding neighbourhoods. The one public space that is designed to support a connection with the rest of Rotterdam-Zuid, the Wolfaertsbocht, is so overloaded with car traffic that it decreases the quality of what could be a high-quality public environment. Furthermore, there are a number of public spaces that are hardly used (if at all) because they are made inaccessible. Lastly, the street profiles of Oud-Charlois are dominated by poorly maintained housing, excessive car parking and extremely narrow sidewalks, with three areas where the situation is so bad they are an immediate assignment.
Next to problems, the neighbourhood of Oud-Charlois also has a lot of qualities. Ironically, a lot of areas that are currently problematic have qualities that could potentially be used to transform them into high quality public environments. This is most notably the case for the singel, which acts as a barrier between east and west Oud-Charlois but has a lot of quality as green-blue connection. This connection does not only have to run north to south, but could also extend into the neighbourhood towards the east and west. Similarly, the Wolfaertsbocht has a lot of recently renovated or newly developed buildings that supports very diverse public facilities in its plinth. While currently a car dominated access road, its wide profile has the potential to support more slow, pedestrian-oriented traffic. Furthermore, Oud-Charlois has a lot of qualities as connection between north and south. While the north part of Oud-Charlois is currently dominated with the traffic going through the Maastunnel, there are a lot of qualities to be had there. Both on the, currently underdeveloped, Dokpark in the northern most part of Oud-Charlois, as well as a little more to the east, where Oud-Charlois could have a direct connecton to the Maashaven and Katendrecht and, with that, Rotterdam-Noord. In the south, Oud-Charlois directly borders the Zuiderpark, which can create a flow of slow traffic through Oud-Charlois. Lastly, the neighbourhood has a lot of different green pockets, all of which can be designed as high quality public spaces.
In combining Oud-Charlois’ problems with its qualities and the possibilities of the future context, we can create a map that shows the neighbourhood’s opportunities. Again, a lot of these opportunities are about connecting the neighbourhood of Oud-Charlois to its surrounding and, by designing these connections as high quality space, creating slow, pedestrian, traffic through the neighbourhood. These connections run both north to south, in which the singel could support a high quality green-blue connections that simultaneously provides a high quality public space for the residents of Oud-Charlois. Another north-south connection opportunity is the possibility of a third bridge between Rotterdam-Noord and Rotterdam-Zuid. While there are multiple locations in which this bridge could be constructed, it is often drawn as reaching Rotterdam-Zuid directly west of Oud-Charlois. As such, it could connect Rotterdam-Noord to Oud-Charlois and, after that, to the rest of Rotterdam-Zuid. The last connection runs east-west, making use of the Wolfaertsbochts which could connect the Dokpark at the head of Oud-Charlois to the Zuiderplein area to the east by means of an attractive, diverse public environment aimed at slow, pedestrian traffic. The other opportunities of Oud-Charlois are more localized in nature, with both the green pockets and dilapidated areas in the middle that could be redeveloped. And, lastly, the most important opportunity for this project remains the OSG Hugo de Groot area as location to be redeveloped.


Figure 1: Didactic accounting structure and setup workshops (Dutch).
Workshops PO & VO OSG Hugo de Groot
Onderdeel van de afstudeerthesis “Street Smart”
Iren Koomen, Msc Urbanism, TU Delft

Korte achtergrond van het onderzoek Street Smart
Rotterdam-Zuid wordt vaak in één adem genoemd met termen als probleemwijk, achterstandswijk, en recent zelfs krachtwijk. De problematiek op Zuid is uitermate complex door de interactie van sociale, economische, en fysieke factoren die gezamenlijk bijdragen aan de situatie op Zuid. Momenteel ligt er het Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid, een gezamenlijk initiatief om de achterstanden van de bewoners en het leven op zuid te verbeteren. Hierbij wordt er voornamelijk ingezet op drie kernpunten: school, werk en wonen.

In het verlengde van dit programma is een afstudeeronderzoek gestart met de naam Street Smart. In dit onderzoek wordt er gekeken naar de relatie tussen de sociale problemen van probleemwijken en de fysieke context waarin deze problemen voorkomen. Gesteld wordt dat deze onlosmakelijk met elkaar verbonden zijn en dus ook gezamenlijk moeten worden opgelost. In dit onderzoek wordt de focus gelegd op de relatie tussen de buurt en de school, en hoe de wisselwerking tussen deze twee kan bijdragen aan een beter wijkmilieu. Hierbij is de primaire doelgroep schoolgaande kinderen van 0 tot 18 jaar en hun ouders. De gekozen praktijkcasus omvat de OSG Hugo de Groot in de wijk Oud-Charlois.

Doel van de workshops
Een integraal onderdeel van dit onderzoek zijn de ervaringen die kinderen en tieners op straat meemaken en de manier waarop zij hun wijk beleven en gebruiken. Ondanks dat er een overweldigende hoeveelheid literatuur bestaat die antwoord tracht te geven op deze vragen in relatie tot de achterliggende ontwikkelingsfasen voert eenzelfde conclusie veelal de boventoon. Deze conclusie stelt dat het bovenal belangrijk ik om de jeugd te betrekken in het ontwerpproces. Het is deze betrokkenheid die ontwerpers inzicht verschaf aan de behoefte die kinderen en tiencers stellen aan hun omgeving. Daarnaast is het ook deze kans om bij te dragen aan de inrichting van hun eigen omgeving die kinderen uiteindelijk voldoening geeft in het gebruik hiervan. Het doel van de workshops op de OSG Hugo de Groot is dan ook om met een kleine selectie leerlingen deze interactie tussen ontwerper (de onderzoeker) en gebruiker (de jeugd) tot stand te brengen.

Opzet van de workshops
De workshops zijn opgezet volgens de door Amerikaanse Doreen Nelson (een award-winnende onderwijzeres) ontwikkelde lesmethode “Design-Based Learning”, oftewel, leren door ontwerpen. In deze lesmethode staat het reconstrueren van complexe informatie centraal, waarbij kinderen door middel van gesimplificeerde technieken uit de ontwerp professie leren plannen, experimenteren, ontdekken, interpreteren, onderscheiden, herzien en hun keuzes te verantwoorden (voor meer informatie, zie http://www.csupomona.edu/~dnelson/). In de loop van twee workshops is het natuurlijk onmogelijk om deze gehele lesmethode te introduceren. Daarom is de keuze gemaakt om een verkorte, aangepaste, variatie op één van Nelson’s lessen te maken. In dit geval is dat het lesblok getiteld “Transformations”, oftewel, Metamorfoses.

Workshop 1: Bewust worden van ruimtelijke aspecten (~15 minuten)
In deze korte kennismakingworkshop wordt eerst een introductie gegeven van de onderzoeker, als ook de achtergrond van het onderzoek en het doel van de workshops. Vervolgens wordt de eerste opdracht uitgelegd. Dit is een opdracht die kinderen in hun eigen tijd uit moeten voeren. De kinderen krijgen per tweetaal een wegwerpcamera, en per persoon een klein aantekeningenboekje. De opdracht is om eens heel goed op te letten wat ze allemaal tegenkomen op weg van school naar huis. Het maakt niet uit of ze altijd lopen, of ze altijd lopen op de fiets gaan, of met de auto komen, het idee is dat kinderen bewust naar hun omgeving kijken. Vervolgens wordt ze gevraagd om foto’s te nemen van dingen die ze opvallen in hun wijk, zowel in positieve als in negatieve zin. Afhankelijk van het aantal beelden op de camera heeft elke kind ongeveer 5 foto’s voor dingen die hen aanspreken, en 5 foto’s voor dingen die hen niet aanspreken. Het gaat dus ook om keuzes maken, wat vinden ze wel of niet belangrijk genoeg om ook écht vast te leggen. Het boekje dat ze meekrijgen is om extra aantekeningen in te maken. Hier kunnen ze in tekeningen en opschrijven wat ze tevens vastleggen met hun camera.

Workshop 2: Identificeren van negatieve ruimtelijke aspecten en deze omvormen tot positieve aspecten (~50 minuten)
Deze tweede workshop wordt opgezet als praktische ontwerp workshop. Na een korte terugkoppeling van de ervaringen die kinderen hadden tijdens het observeren van hun route van huis naar school wordt de tweede opdracht uitgelegd. De opdracht hier is om de negatieve ruimtelijke aspecten die ze hebben vastgelegd op camera en getekend hebben in hun boekje te transformeren. De vraag is om deze negatieve aspecten een metamorfose te geven zodat het uiteindelijk positieve aspect worden. Hierbij hebben ze de door hun geïdentificeerde positieve ruimtelijke aspecten als bouwvast, welke als inspiratie of referentie kunnen dienen in deze ontwerppogave. Afhankelijk van de tijd die elke kind nodig transformeren ze één of meerdere aspecten. De hoeveelheid is in principe niet belangrijk, de focus ligt op het toepassen en moduleren van hun eigen observaties. Bij elk aspect wat het kind weet te transformeren wordt ze tevens gevraagd een korte reden te geven waarom juist deze transformatie tot iets positiefs bijdraagt. Aan het einde van de workshop worden alle camera’s, boekjes, en ontwerptekeningen ingenomen door de onderzoeker.

Voor beide workshops geldt dat ze op niveau zullen worden gegeven. Dit betekent dat de kinderen uit PO 5 met een veel simpelere terminologie en definities in de handen krijgen per tweetaal een wegwerpcamera, en per persoon een klein aantekeningenboekje. De oudere kinderen uit VO 2 wordt daarentegen op iets abstractere wijze uitleg gegeven.

Terugkoppeling van de workshops
Indien daar interesse voor is, is het mogelijk om eind november / begin december een derde workshop te houden. In deze workshop zou het mogelijk zijn om een kort overzicht te presenteren van de eerdere twee workshops. Ook kan het uiteindelijke ontwerp worden gepresenteerd en in een interactieve workshop inzicht gecreeerd worden in hoe de kinderen tegen dit nieuwe ontwerp voor hun buurt aankijken en hoe ze deze denken te gaan gebruiken. Deze terugkoppeling is echter niet noodzakelijk voor het didactische programma, maar zou wel (ook voor de kinderen) een leuke afsluiting van het project zijn.