

CIVIC DISCOURSE AND SPACE ACTIVATION AS A COLLABORATIVE CITY-BUILDING PROCESS

EMILY KLOPPENBURG, BEATRIZ MARTINS, CINDY NACHAREUN,
REBECCA POSCHMANN & FABIAN NEUHAUS
School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, University of Calgary, Canada

ABSTRACT

With tactical urbanism, we utilize a method that involves citizens by taking a hands-on approach to the city-building process. The undertaken, short-term transformation through co-created projects builds on existing individual and collective identities. Applying tactical urbanism to the public realm will shift current perceptions of a space from a service to a collaborative venture that enables engagement for all persons. Together, a NEXT Calgary is created. The outreach for this project focuses on the public and civic discourse, specifically addressing the conversations about the built environment in Calgary, AB. This paper will provide examples on how tactical urbanism was implemented across Calgary whether through little surprises woven into the urban fabric or how the project allowed Calgarians to (re)connect with the everyday. There are two angles to this approach. One is the public perspective and how the public related to the work, and the other angle is the official perspective of how bodies and the city have grudgingly come along the journey.

Keywords: tactical urbanism, urban planning, civic discourse, public participation, accessibility, education.

1 INTRODUCTION

A city is an ever-evolving project. They are places where changes are discussed and made by governing authorities representing a diverse group of individuals with varying needs, wants, and desires. Developing the public realm benefits when there is a joint venture between decision-makers and residents because through these partnerships new developments become more reflective of those that are directly impacted by it. Cities that can reflect the needs, wants, and desires of their citizens ensure a sense of value, understanding, and inclusion is achieved. What happens when the public becomes impatient and wants to institute change without the support of the decision-makers? Tactical Urbanism (TU) allows citizens to intervene in existing physical and social structures in the built environment by enabling people to take ownership of the spaces they inhabit. This method of urban development brings communities together to discuss the merits of a space by acting upon the discussions and bringing about change. There is no requirement for the interventions to be grand or expensive as TU is intended to be an accessible form of community building and enhancement [1]–[3]. This form of revitalization highlights the grassroots, bottom-up approach, which emphasizes new perspectives and has the potential to transform the way individuals navigate and approach the city.

The way people typically use a space is determined by what is currently in place and often there are few opportunities for the user to appropriate the space to fit their needs. For instance, on playgrounds, users are provided with several play structures they can climb, hang on to, or slide down. In public parks, the spaces usually include a path, seating, water fountains, or garbage receptacles. What is common about these two scenarios are the fixtures secured to the ground can only be removed when major redevelopment takes place. But what can be done when a public space becomes derelict and disregarded due to a lack of interest, which can result to a lack of personal connection? Over the course of four months, the Tactical Urbanism Calgary (TUC) team implemented ten interventions through the City of Calgary



by collaborating with community members to encourage a better understanding of the value of using their voice to institute change in the forgotten spaces within their neighbourhoods. The interventions highlighted the desires community members have for the spaces around them, the actions made to implement or explore ideas, and the possibility of self-advocacy to communicate more powerful and planned concepts. The aim of the research conducted was to apply a variety of public engagement methods to gather feedback from participating communities to implement simple, yet impactful, strategies that could be recreated in other pockets around the city. Furthermore, the TUC team set out to determine whether TU interventions could provide incentive for the public to recreate these concepts or be inspired to take initiative on their own ideas in the spaces they frequent.

2 UNDERSTANDING TACTICAL URBANISM

For more than 60 years there has been a greater interest in public space activation through increased participatory approaches. Many of the initiations were started by grassroots organizations with a common goal of introducing temporary solutions that could highlight the potential of a space through small, yet impactful interventions. Although many may not have been well-versed in the concept, what they were doing is now recognized as Tactical Urbanism (TU). Mike Lydon and Anthony Garcia coined the term Tactical Urbanism as “an approach to neighbourhood building and activation using short-term, low-cost, and scalable interventions and policies” [3]. TU was born out of people appropriating their surroundings, creating unintended uses, outcomes, and events in particular spaces [2]. It responds directly to how a space can be perceived and recognizes that what may take place in one location in a city does not translate to another part due to cultural and social nuances within larger populations [3]. Many supporters of TU take the bottom-up approach to this process where they introduce unsanctioned concepts that are developed by reimagining a space [3]. TU aids in responding to outdated policies and processes related to planning and development. Rather than wait for decision-makers to step in and create the needed change, much of the time, TU can be achieved by community members or activists as they introduce changes that can benefit and activate the public realm.

2.1 Tactical urbanism in Calgary

Located in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains of Alberta, the City of Calgary has a population surpassing 1.3 million citizens, and over the course of its history it has become a place where many communities experience a disconnect from their neighbours in adjoining communities. This is made evident in the dynamic transition from the commercial and residential towers in the downtown core to the single-family houses in suburbia. As new communities are regularly introduced, new concepts of urban planning, design, and architecture are placed into master plans to create the next “great” community. To spread the concept of TU, the goal of this research was to enact different methods of gaining community interest and increasing participation. This was achieved by a multitude of engagement tools, having spontaneous versus planned interventions, and educating community members and groups on how they could be part of the change. For this project, the TUC team focused on communities that are often overlooked by developers and the City of Calgary. The reach for participation included many communities outside of the immediate downtown area, resulting in an extensive examination of responses from a wider range of people who experience the city differently than those in the more urban centric communities. The intention for these projects and interventions was to create temporary changes that could lead to permanent



change, rather than jumping straight to permanent modifications, as this often requires more consideration, money, and time.

3 UNDERPINNING THEMES FOR THE RESEARCH

The research project was driven by three overarching themes: accessibility, participation, and education. This work was conducted in the summer of 2021 when COVID-19 was still rampant and the Province of Alberta as well as the City of Calgary experienced a fluctuation in restrictions related to the virus. While conducting the research, the TUC team ensured the safety of those participating was at the forefront and parameters were taken into consideration when handling shared surfaces and objects, and the proximity between people as they engaged with the interventions.

3.1 Accessibility

Considering accessibility within a space can ensure more people feel welcomed to spend time there. Feelings of belonging and connection to a place are imperative to a person's well-being and can profoundly impact their ability to connect with others. For these reasons, each project was designed with accessibility in mind by ensuring that they were adaptable to allow them to be recreated in other communities when the spaces differed in characteristics. To motivate community members becoming more involved with the TU interventions, the data collected was organized and communicated back to communities to assist in introducing concepts that were derived by the participants. The number and variety of responses from the initiatives are evident that TU can succeed in different conditions, contexts, and with people, providing tangible benefits to diverse groups [4].

3.2 Participation

Participation and engagement as a component of TU empowers users to respond to a particular issue. Participation is about encouraging people to be part of the decision-making process by influencing what takes place around them [5]. It is proven effective when participation includes more collaboration and involvement from citizens, the concepts that develop will be more accepted [6]. Through participation and engagement, those around us can talk about what matters and provide input on improving inhabited spaces because there is a better understanding of how the public realm is perceived by frequent users [7]. For this project, participation was encouraged to better understand how interventions can be developed to benefit the community group(s) impacted. The methods considered when creating the participatory plan aimed to showcase how communities can equalise power-relations, mutual learning between the TUC team and participants, and ensuring the interventions selected were done democratically to benefit the community [1]. From a tactical lens, it was important for the interventions to spark conversations between citizens regarding how spaces can be used as well as suggest alternate futures where these improvements can become permanent fixtures.

3.3 Education

Citizens can become accustomed to the status quo and can benefit from conversations about envisioning changes in a space while considering equitable development. What TU can do is educate people about the potential of a space by implementing physical planning concepts rather than providing information theoretically [3]. It can also breakdown barriers by allowing participants to share experiences, as well as have them understand why changing a



space is important to the development of the community [8]. Through workshops hosted by the TUC team and spontaneous application, citizens were educated on the tenets of TU and how they could apply them to influence change in their own communities.

4 METHODOLOGIES

The aim of the TUC team was to introduce ten interventions to be located throughout the City of Calgary within a four-month timeframe. To accomplish this, the team contacted 28 community associations (CAs) and community groups. Inspiration to the application of TU in the chosen communities was based on the work completed through the Co-Create Downtown Calgary “1000 Little Things” project. The project comprises of a list of 1,000 interventions that could be used to improve a space [9]. It was essential the interventions provide the team with flexibility to endeavour multiple approaches of TU to accomplish the target of implementing ten interventions. The research involved immersive field research and took into consideration the communities’ perspective as these views were great sources of information and possible responses to interventions. From the onset of the research, the TUC team saw how vital collaborating with the CAs was to successfully implement the interventions. The team did not want to take an authoritative approach by assuming what communities’ members felt was important. It was through the collaboration that the team was able to implement interventions that were reflective of those participating in the engagement. The strategy was to work directly with CAs to minimize interactions with The City of Calgary, also ensuring the community was privy to the projects that were being introduced to their area. This allowed for a better outcome of citizen acceptance where projects installed had a lesser chance of being removed. Involving the CAs gave them a sense of ownership over the projects as they were tailored to the communities unique needs and goals [4].

4.1 Community outreach

Calgary comprises of distinct and unique communities, and as such, the needs of all members are equally diverse. The facilitated and unfacilitated engagement, as described below, involved collaborating with community associations (CAs) throughout Calgary to introduce the concept of TU to their community members. CAs were selected as they are volunteer run, not-for-profit organizations comprising of a motivated group of residents who champion their community [10]. CAs are usually responsible for providing social programming and amenities, supporting safety initiatives, and acting as a local planning advisory committee by attempting to foster public engagement with their community members [10]–[12]. The TUC team recognized that working with volunteer-run organizations could hinder a project’s success due to the availability of those that are able to dedicate time to the project and there was a reliance on the team to complete most of the work. The CAs selected for the research were based on the location of the community (having at least one CA from each quadrant), demographic breakdown, age of the community, online accessibility, and local knowledge. The distinct qualities of the CAs involved helped the TUC team gain a better understanding of how creative ideas are constructed, questioned, and resisted by different demographics within specific contexts.

4.2 Facilitated engagement

The facilitated projects involved direct consultation with community members and were actively attended by at least one member of the research team. These engagement projects allowed for the collection of real time data and direct engagement with citizens to understand



and appreciate their perspectives on how a TU project could impact their space. The goal of the conversations was to collect a variety of ideas that the citizens would like to see implemented either throughout their community or Calgary as a whole. These projects were temporary and were in place for upwards of four hours.

4.2.1 MEE and urban theory presentations

In June and July, the TUC team was provided with the opportunity to educate school aged children and university students on the concept of TU through the Mayor's Environmental Expo (MEE) and a senior architecture studio at the University of Calgary. The presentations featured information on low cost, fast alternatives that can be applied to changing the built environment. The students were encouraged to participate in the presentations by developing personal mental maps highlighting areas within their communities that would benefit from TU interventions. Through these presentations, the team engaged with over 40 elementary, high school and graduate classes.

4.2.2 Confluence pop-up

Sustainable Calgary created a series of events over the summer aptly called Confluence. This event took over a portion of the parking lot at the Heritage light rail transit station with the goal of showcasing alternative uses for parking lots and the surrounding land [13]. The TUC team saw the pop-up as a great opportunity to engage directly with citizens, as the previous engagement had been done virtually or unfacilitated. By being in-person, the team was able to engage in conversation on the topic of TU but also introduce simple, yet impactful concepts that the participants could take home with and implement themselves.

While this event did not attract many people, many individuals who approached the table expressed to the team that they did not feel empowered to provide ideas on improving the public realm in Calgary. This reinforced the rhetoric that city-building is only for an elite, educated group. While these assumptions are pervasive, our team challenged participants throughout the summer to show them that the city-building process is meant for everyone that interacts with the cityscape. In allowing citizens and communities to become aware of their capacity in shaping their surroundings creates endless, open, and adaptable possibilities for change in the urban environment [4].

4.2.3 Coming soon signs, QR code and the digital platform

Any sort of coming soon sign, when placed in a public space, can bring a sense of excitement and anticipation. For this project, the TUC team placed several Coming Soon Signs in public locations throughout Calgary to highlight that facilitated and unfacilitated engagements or a planned intervention would be coming. The signs sparked curiosity for what was coming and included a QR code that would bring participants to the project's online engagement platform hosted by Bang the Table Engagement HQ. When a participant accessed the engagement platform they were provided with information on TU as well as opportunities to provide feedback through quick polls, forums, mapping, and short answer questionnaires. The online option allows for flexibility amongst participants as this option was available for the entirety of the project, even after the in-person engagement was completed. It also helps to strengthen opportunities for citizens to contribute to the changes of an urban space [14]. Through this project, more than 340 people engaged with the platform.



4.3 Learned outcomes

Education is about going where the people are and engaging with strangers to discuss the merits behind a concept. It was felt that those that did engage with the team did not feel empowered to provide ideas on improving the public realm in Calgary. This reinforces the rhetoric that city-building is perceived to be only for an elite, specially educated group. While these assumptions are pervasive, the TUC team challenged participants throughout the engagement to showcase that city-building is in fact a process for everyone. By allowing citizens and communities to embrace their capacity in shaping their surroundings creates endless, open and adaptable, opportunities for change in the urban environment [2].

5 UNFACILITATED ENGAGEMENT

The unfacilitated engagement projects involved consulting with CAs; however, the projects were available for citizens to participate at their own leisure over a two-week period. The intention of the projects was to spark conversation amongst community members rather than involve external researchers to facilitate the discussion. Citizens were tasked with providing feedback related to improvements that could take place within the public realm in their community. The locations for each of the unfacilitated projects were predetermined through consultation with the CA. This ensured the projects were placed in high traffic locations for the most effective engagement. The benefit to this approach is the TUC team was able to continue working on the facilitated and spontaneous interventions simultaneously. Throughout the project's duration, a team member was able to check in on the projects to ensure that any inappropriate language or graffiti was removed and ensure that the provided materials remained in place.

5.1 Wishing walls

Tactical Urbanism is about making small changes to a space that are recognized as unorthodox or non-traditional because of the bottom-up approach that takes place [3]. Prior to introducing a TU project to a community, a Wishing Wall was installed in high trafficked, public space. These walls allowed passers-by to provide genuine ideas that reflected what they wanted. Something that the team reiterated on these boards was that no idea was too big or too small. In total, six wishing walls were erected. To increase accessibility, the wishing walls were also available digitally through the Bang the Table Engagement HQ platform. Each wall was in place for a two-week period, where after this, the team compiled the feedback and used the data to determine what type of intervention could be introduced to the community.

The Wishing Walls presented an opportunity for a space of conflict, collaboration, and creation, binding different stakeholders with opposite views at the same time and space by creating a visual representation of democracy and resilience in the communities [2], [15]. Many of the responses were wishes that were out of the scope for this research. The team saw a great turnout from this engagement as the walls produced 210 physical and digital wishes where the wishes were themed by programming, private amenities, public amenities, and miscellaneous. Common responses from all the wishing walls were the desires for food programming, programs for children, coffee shops, improvements to public parks, and the introduction of swimming pools or dog parks, to name a few. This data highlights what is important to community members and what is missing. Despite the scope of the outcomes, the feedback provided the CAs with impetus to move forward with some of the wishes by engaging in conversations with city officials.



5.2 Table and chairs

The introduction of TU is often sparked by conversations between people. To achieve this, the team placed a dining table and chairs in a public space where a map of the community was applied to the table and participants were able to provide comments on their favourite places in that neighbourhood. This concept was developed in collaboration with the CA as they were looking to implement a permanent wayfinding map that citizens could add to on an ongoing basis. The location in which the table and chairs was placed was near an entrance to a busy recreational area and near an area slated for improvement. The goal of this project was to entice passers-by to question why brightly coloured dining furniture was strategically placed in a public space and have them sit at the table and provide comments based on the prompts that were provided with the map.

5.3 Learned outcomes

One of the challenges that presented itself with the wishing walls and table was graffiti. The team identified graffiti as damaging language and drawings. As with any public asset, the Wishing Walls were prone to graffiti and the responses to lewd images and text varied between the communities. Many wishes written prior to graffiti incidents were lost, and unfortunately, unaccounted for. In other instances, some participants drew certain genitalia; surprisingly, this was a common occurrence across the boards. When the boards had increased monitoring by the participating CAs, the lewd comments and drawings decreased significantly, resulting in more meaningful engagement. A fine line exists between graffiti and TU. Created as a purely expressive form of intervention in urban environments, many still consider graffiti as a negative form of vandalism [14]. Rather than spreading the negative connotation that graffiti has, how can we use this tool as a form of visual struggle in public spaces? How can designers and users take advantage of these unforeseen appropriations, be inspired by, and improve upon these actions? [14].

Weather was another element of surprise. Although the team did take rain into consideration, the effects from the sun were not considered. This impact resulted in the sun causing some feedback to fade away making that content illegible. To implement this project in the future, it is suggested that the table and chairs selected are designed to withstand the outdoor elements, and the placement has shade surrounding it.

6 SPONTANEOUS INTERVENTIONS

The spontaneous interventions occurred concurrently with the planned ones. The concepts that the TUC team developed were unstructured as the team did not engage with or seek permission from the public when introducing an element of TU to a community. These projects were smaller in scale and were not intended to be highly recognized by passers-by as the goal was to add a sense of whimsy as well as anticipation for what could be coming. As these projects were intended to be applied to surfaces or not monitored by the team, it was imperative that the materials used were sustainable or could be repurposed. The intention was to have little to no impact on the environment or cause any damage to the assets.

6.1 Seed paper and pinecone birdfeeders

Inspired by Ron Finley's project [16], the TUC team saw the value of having more engaging greenspaces throughout Calgary while also questioning whether interventions should only benefit people or other forms of life as well. By using TU, the aim was to have community members start thinking about ways they could enhance a greenspace in their neighbourhoods.



This was achieved by creating seed paper flowers and pinecone birdfeeders. The seed paper was made using recycled paper and wildflower seeds appropriate for the Calgary climate. The birdfeeders were composed of all natural and biodegradable products that were meant for the outdoors. These interventions show TU in its simplest and most sustainable form. It communicates the basic message of a more diverse and sustainable biome while simultaneously filling that need and inviting users to do the same. Through a simple DIY activity, the pinecones and seed paper invite users to confront fundamental questions of how we should shape the public realm [14].

6.2 Googly eyes/#EyeYC

Playing on the phenomenon of face pareidolia, where people see faces in inanimate objects, and activating synergies from the “1000 Little Things” project, this intervention heightened the experience of pareidolia and was meant to bring a sense of humour and fun to often overlooked assets [17]. The TUC contributed to this by applying self-adhesive googly eyes to public assets, such as signs, utility boxes, and benches to animate them and create faces. The goal for this intervention was to have people pause and interact with their surroundings. In a disconnected society, one in which the digital life is an ever growing aspect to everyone’s daily routine, the googly eyes represent a unique counterforce for passers-by to be present in the moment and appreciate these everyday forms of resistance [2], [14].

6.3 Wandering chairs

Throughout the research, the TUC team observed many public parks in Calgary devoid of seating. To improve this, the team introduced a set of Adirondack chairs to these spaces. The painted pink chairs acted as contrasts to their surroundings and conveyed their spontaneous nature and non-affiliation with the City of Calgary. The chairs not only created a new common space in what would otherwise be a dull or forgotten area by inviting all to open up new ways of modifying a space but they were also used as a way to engage with users [14].

6.4 Learned outcomes

At the start of the project there was a level of scepticism that was felt amongst the team. Prior to beginning this endeavour, a previous experience saw the interventions applied to a popular area in Calgary quickly removed from sight and never enjoyed by the public. From this experience, the team was prepared for negative outcomes, but were pleasantly surprised that each intervention remained in place accruing little to no damage. The intent for the spontaneous interventions was to bring a level of whimsy and appreciation for what a space can become, encouraging the public to take part and educate themselves about their democratic voice in public spaces, while also respecting all the ecosystems interacting with the space. When an intervention is spontaneous, there must be a level of respect given to those that may be impacted by this, and it is felt that the TUC team achieved this for these projects.

7 PLANNED INTERVENTIONS

Planned interventions took place following the unfacilitated engagement. Once the data was collected and organized into themes, the team presented the findings to the participating CAs and discussed projects that could be achieved. Many of the responses that were provided from the communities included wishes that were out of scope for the project, however, the ideas shed light on what citizens value when it comes to amenities and through the



observations the team recognized that most communities want the same amenities. The material used varied depending on the project. For some projects, there was a need to purchase new materials, however, the research team ensured that any leftover material would be re-used for other projects.

7.1 Painted planters

Many communities in Calgary have a variety of planters located on main streets. In many communities, these objects have become overlooked and do not bring the beauty of their intended use. The TUC team was approached by a CA with the idea of refurbishing the planters to brighten and highlight the community. Through common actions, the planters were used as everyday forms of resistance on how urban spaces are used and how, by simple acts, meanings are modified and constructed in urban spaces [2]. Many of the community members appreciated the work and offered their gratitude through the CAs social media platforms. However, beauty is subjective, and utilizing public spaces for creativity can be controversial as discussed with the Wishing Walls [14]. Some people believed the colours selected were too bright or too colourful. Nonetheless, the updated planters founded vibrancy in the space between the community and it has resulted in community members taking the initiative to clean the planters and plant native perennials [14].

7.2 Park benches

Through the engagement that took place with the Wishing Walls and through conversation with CAs, one of the common wishes was increasing seating options in public spaces. In response to this request, the team constructed three benches using found and repurposed wood, some coming from the Wishing Walls. The bench highlights that the seating importance is not about planning or design, but about the everyday practice of transforming materials and space and creating various possibilities in the public realm [2]. The creative use of underused materials and spaces can “create adaptation, which in turn enhances both democratic and ecological resilience” [14]. The benches bring light to a space’s potential and will hopefully spark further conversation between community members to assist in bringing in permanent seating options in these overlooked spaces.

7.3 Workout circuit

Movement and creating a healthy community were a common wish by participants. In one community, participants identified the desire to have outdoor workout equipment within the neighbourhood. Although the project’s scope could not provide this, the tactical solution presented was a workout circuit located along a popular pathway. By designing a response that considered the existing benches and pathways, this intervention provides residents with an option to welcome this change into their everyday lives [15]. The circuit included six stations, each with different exercises that showcased how a park bench could be used as exercise equipment or more generally as a prop for physical activity.

7.4 Learned outcomes

One of the biggest challenges to implementing change that is unsanctioned is establishing a strong volunteer network. Through the Bang the Table engagement platform participants were asked whether they would be willing to volunteer on a TU project. In addition to the low response rate, those that did respond expressed an unwillingness to volunteer. Many



people today seem uninspired when it comes to engaging in community development where there is a level of expectation that certain things will be completed for them by others and many individuals are not interested in assisting others to bring ideas to life. The challenge often felt in Calgary, especially when working directly with CAs, is that most people are uninterested in initiating change in their communities. It does not require many people to instigate change through TU strategies; however, the research team found that even when the change is being supported by an organization there is hesitancy about asking for participation from others.

8 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The following table (Fig. 1) provides a brief description of the projects, materials that were used to create them, the time it took to build them, and the approximate cost. As noted previously, using found objects was a priority as these reduced costs, however, the team did want to ensure that they were using the correct material on projects, leading to more spending on certain projects over others.

	Project	Description	Material	Time	Cost
Unfacilitated Engagement	Wishing Walls Tags	Tags were attached to a chain link fence where residents could leave wishes so small things they would like to see in their community.	Twine, tags, tape, flagging tape, markers, sheet protector, instructions	3 hours +	< \$100
	Wishing Walls	Free standing chalkboard inviting residents to leave wishes for things they would like to see in their community.	Wood, screws, paint, chalkboard paint, chalk, tools	3 hours +	\$100-300
	Table & Chairs	A painted table and set of chairs with a hand drawn map of the community affixed inviting residents to identify spaces of importance in their community.	Table, chairs, vinyl fabric, markers, paint brushes, trays adhesive spray	3 hours +	< \$100
Spontaneous Interventions	Coming Soon Signs & Stickers	Lawn signs and stickers with "coming soon" and QR codes to highlight what's coming and take interested participants to the project website.	Lawn signs, stickers, QR Code, website	1-3 Hours	> \$300
	Seed Paper	Variation on the see bomb using native wildflower seeds turned into paper that are formed into paper flowers to be planted in gardens or public spaces.	Felt, seeds, mesh frame, paper, paper straws, zip-ties, containers	3+ Hours	< \$100
	Pinecone Birdfeeders	Sustainable birdfeeders made by dipping pinecones in syrup and then followed by birdseed.	Pinecones, twine, syrup, birdfeed	1-3 Hours	< \$100
	Googly Eyes	Self-adhesive googly eyes stuck to outdoor objects to turn them into faces	Self-adhesive googly eyes	3+ Hours	< \$100
	Wandering Chairs	Painting discarded chairs pink and placing them in underutilized park spaces.	Chairs, paint brushes, paint trays, email	3+ Hours	< \$100
Planned Interventions	Painted Planters	Upgrading the planters along a busy street by painting them vibrant colours.	Paint, rollers, paint trays	3+ Hours	\$100-300
	Park Benches	Upcycling discarded wood to create colourful seating to be placed in public spaces	Wood, paint, screws, tools	3+ Hours	< \$100
	Workout Circuit	A series of signs with different exercises using park benches and pathways to create an outdoor workout circuit.	Lawn signs, benches	1-3 Hours	\$100-300

Figure 1: Information on the interventions, material, time required, and costs.

9 MOVING FORWARD

Just as each community was unique, so too were the approaches each participating CA takes. One of the overarching goals was to avoid working with the city as much as possible. Although this was not always the case due to the benefits an administration could bring in developing TU projects in certain communities, the CA that did involve The City in the projects faced little to no pushback. One of the challenges with this approach is that it can

create added hurdles for those wanting to implement an intervention, with extra steps and need for permission making the process more daunting and discouraging for the CA's. For communities to continue with introducing TU to their neighbourhoods, it is imperative to create a network that is interested in applying TU across the City rather than relying on those residing in the community to apply change.

“Tactical urbanism doesn't propose one-size-fits-all *solutions* but intentional and flexible *responses*” [3]. TU concepts respond directly to a specific space and how it is perceived. Due to its specificity, what may work in one part of the city may not be as well received or as beneficial in another; even when the projects are the same. TU aids in responding to outdated policies and processes related to planning and development [3]. Rather than sit idle, waiting for administration to step in and create the needed change, TU is achieved by community members who are eager to introduce change that can benefit and activate their neighbourhoods. Upon completing the planned and spontaneous interventions, the research team will leave these projects in the hands of the community members that took part in the process. There is a hope that the participating CAs will be able to move forward in establishing permanent structures that the community can benefit from for years to come. Tactical Urbanism is a great strategy of incremental change leading to permanent solutions but to make an idea take shape requires citizen support.

REFERENCES

- [1] Luck, R., What is it that makes participation in design participatory design? *Design Studies*, pp. 1–8, 2018. DOI: 10.1016/j.destud.2018.10.002.
- [2] Hou, J., Guerrilla urbanism: Urban design and the practices of resistance. *Urban Design International*, **25**, pp. 117–125, 2020.
- [3] Lydon, M. & Garcia, A., *Tactical Urbanism: Short-Term Action for Long-Term Change*, Island Press: United States, 2015.
- [4] Sandler, D., Grassroots urbanism in contemporary Sao Paulo. *Urban Design International*, pp. 77–91, 2020. DOI: 10.1057/s41289-020-00108-8.
- [5] Saxena, N.C., What is meant by people's participation? *The Participation Reader*. Zed Books, pp. 31–33, 2011.
- [6] Richards, L. & Dalbey, M., Creating great places: The role of citizen participation. *Community Development*, pp. 18–32, 2006.
- [7] Burby, R.J., Making plans that matter: Citizen involvement and government action. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, pp. 33–49, 2003.
- [8] Tritter, J.Q. & McCallum, A., The snakes and ladders of use involvement: Moving beyond Arnstein. *Health Policy*, pp. 156–168, 2006.
- [9] Neuhaus, F., Kohlschmidt, S., Verma, R. & de Salvatierra, A., *Co-Create Downtown Calgary 1,000 Little Things*, 2021.
- [10] City of Calgary Community Associations, Community associations. <https://www.calgary.ca/csps/cns/community-associations.html>. Accessed on: 16 Mar. 2021.
- [11] Federation of Calgary Communities, Community organizations. <https://calgarycommunities.com/about-communities/>. Accessed on: 16 Mar. 2021.
- [12] Conger, B.W., Goodbrand, P. & Gondek, J., *On the Role and Future of Calgary's Community Associations*, University of Calgary: The School of Public Policy, pp. 1–22, 2016.
- [13] Sustainable Calgary, Confluence, Sustainable Calgary. <http://www.sustainablecalgary.org/confluence>.



- [14] Pagano, C., DIY Urbanism: Property and process in grassroots city building. *Marquette Law Review*. pp. 335–389, 2013.
- [15] Bjögvinsson, E., Ehn, P. & Hillgren, P.-A., Design things and design thinking: Contemporary participatory design challenges. *DesignIssues*, pp. 101–116, 2012.
- [16] The Ron Finley Project, Culture + Community, 2021. <https://ronfinley.com/pages/about>.
- [17] Lu, D., So happy to see you: Our brains respond emotionally to faces we find in inanimate objects, study reveals. *The Guardian*, 2021. <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2021/jul/07/so-happy-to-see-you-our-brains-respond-emotionally-to-faces-we-find-in-inanimate-objects-study-reveals>.

