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Abstract. Public spaces constitute one of the main elements of the living cities. They stand out as places reflecting the social structure of the society and the past values. They appear as the places one can observe the changes and modernity of the society as well as socializing places. Following to private and semi-private spaces, public spaces such as streets, squares and parks provide people a chance to be together and contact with each other. In living and vibrant places with these random appointments they feel that they belong to social urban life. Therefore, well-designed living public spaces are important indicators of the quality of life and user satisfaction. In the scope of this paper the basic principles and design criteria that create living public spaces and their effects on user satisfaction are discussed. By analysing the spatial reflections of used design criteria it is aimed to relate the existing arrangements to user satisfaction. For these analysis, Yüksel Street located at Kızılay Square in Ankara centre and side streets of Karanfil and Konur (all car-free) were selected as case study area. This area is one of the most important and most densely used pedestrian zone of the capital with its green pattern, location and crossroads. At the beginning, basic design criteria and implementation methods are detailed with the literature survey. Then basic criteria and design principles are verified by using field studies including a survey with randomly asked 270 questionnaires. For defining the user satisfaction and bringing out the qualifications and failures in the case study area user surveys are analysed by field study observations and SPSS Statistics software. Finally, practical suggestions which are believed to be useful for this type of public places in developing and less developed countries are proposed.

1. Introduction
Urban public spaces are living spaces where urban activities are carried out, people come together to socialize, exchange ideas and make contact with each other. Site selection and spatial design of these areas have a direct effect on intensity of use of these areas and intensely used living urban spaces play a major role in strengthening the image of the city and increasing the quality of urban life.

Designs that allow people to spend time in and use public space transform cities into safer and more liveable settlements. Attractive public spaces, walkable distances and different urban uses increase the enthusiasm of people to have a walk in these areas and their potential to use these areas. All of these will provide effective use of urban centres, therefore urban sustainability through continuity of economic, social and cultural life in these centres.
2. Basic Principles and Application Tools in Public Space Design

Public spaces that reflect our social values, beliefs and ourselves are places where community life and culture develop and are expressed [1]. Public spaces are also defined as "open spaces with public access, where people can go alone or in groups, usually under public administration and ownership, and sometimes under private administration" [2]. They also have a socio-cultural meaning as identity spaces where people are connected and communicate with each other, which revive the cities, and reveal the feelings of a community [3].

Although there are many definitions for the concept of public space in the literature, it is essential for a public space to be accessible for all, to provide freedom of action, provisional rights and ownership (partnership) [4]. In the discipline of urban planning, physical and social dynamics of public spaces are believed to have an important place in creation of a society and social culture. Streets, squares and other common areas of a city symbolise common prosperity and possibilities, social culture, community meeting areas, success of city leaders and city vision [5]. Public spaces where people can meet with their friends and observe daily life play an important role in their lives [6].

As stated by William Whyte, Clare Cooper Marcus and Carolyn Francis, Kevin Lynch, Jan Gehl, Loise Mozingo, Lyn Lofland, who worked in different periods on public spaces and how these places could become more used living spaces, as well as many social scientists and designers; the basic condition of a good public space is its being used [7-12]. One of the most important tools in creating widely used public spaces is a diversity of usage purposes and users. Carmona et al. listed the benefits of diverse public spaces as follows: they provide opportunity for social interaction, allow socially different communities to exist together, give a sense of security, allow opportunity for different lifestyles and consumer preferences, offer a lively city and street life, enhance vitality of urban facilities and support small businesses [13].

The human behaviours that are carried out in public spaces can be grouped basically as: walking, standing, sitting, seeing, hearing and talking. The primary actions among the most visible basic actions in a public space are waiting/standing and sitting. According to the "edge effect" in open spaces, which was described by German sociologist Derk De Jong, if people are to choose a place in a place, they usually choose places outside the centre of the area, i.e. edges of trees, buildings or other open spaces are preferred areas to wait/stop [14]. In his book "A Pattern Language", Christopher Alexander summarizes his experiences of "edge effect" in public spaces with the statement "if the edges fail in a space, that space will never turn into a living space" [15].

Human behaviours and activities in public spaces are shaped in a way to complement each other. The "sitting" activity carried out in these areas allows spending time in the space for a certain period of time and this action can be considered as a state of intersection in terms of voluntary and social activities (and sometimes even compulsory activities). Comfortable seating areas offered to users play an important role also in increasing diversity of activities in the area as they provide opportunity for many activities including reading, eating, playing a game, sunbathing, watching people, talking and so on. According to Jan Gehl, if there is a need to improve the quality and use of open spaces, a greater number of and more qualified seating areas should be offered to people. Sitting is an action that is usually performed when climate conditions, spatial qualities and other necessary conditions are appropriate. For this reason, it is necessary to make spatial site selection of seating areas more carefully than standing and waiting areas [14]. Observations revealed that people prefer seating areas with a good field of view and comfortable microclimatic qualities that can meet individual needs. Places that psychologically give a sense of confidence to people (niches, corners etc. where they can protect their backs) are seen as more popular areas, and it is known that seating areas on the routes where pedestrian flow takes place are usually more preferred [13]. In spatial arrangements, benches or chairs as well as large staircases may fulfil this function for seating areas [16]. Also, living spaces arranged along facades and spatial boundaries, sitting points by well-defined walls are among the areas of preference by users [14] (Table 1).
Table 1. Relationships between user behaviours and spatial designs

| Human Behaviours          | Spatial Design Details                                                                 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Walking                   | Suitability for the “wheeled” walking traffic (like the baby carriage, the wheelchair, the shopping cart, and so forth) |
|                           | Paving materials and street surface conditions (not wet and slippery pavements)         |
|                           | Differences in level                                                                    |
|                           | Shortcuts                                                                               |
| Standing                  | Edge effect for standing                                                                |
|                           | Microclimatic conditions (zones for staying half shade)                                 |
| Sitting                   | Edge effect for sitting                                                                  |
|                           | Along facades and spatial boundaries, steps                                             |
|                           | Microclimatic conditions                                                                |
|                           | Viewing opportunities                                                                   |
| Seeing, hearing and talking| Distance between observer and object                                                   |
|                           | Field of vision and overview                                                           |
|                           | Adequate lighting                                                                      |
|                           | Noise levels                                                                            |

Successful public spaces are described as easily accessible places by all individuals in society, such as young people, elderly people, disabled people, users of baby carriages and cyclists. One of the most important design priorities in public spaces is a safety factor that directly affects the use of space. Properly designed and well-managed spaces are seen to be safer and people use these areas more often. Aesthetic quality, diversity of facade layouts in the area, diversity in spatial usage and user groups can make the space more enjoyable for users by enriching space experience of people. Another situation that enriches space experiences can be defined as sloping structure of the land and arrangement of the slope in streets and open spaces in different forms [17] (Table 2).

Table 2. Approaches in designing living public spaces and spatial arrangements that increase user satisfaction [2, 17, 18]

| Design approaches    | Spatial arrangements that increase user satisfaction                                      |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Accessibility        | Spatial accessibility (barrier free)                                                     |
|                      | Openness                                                                                |
|                      | Circulation continuity                                                                  |
|                      | Parking facilities                                                                      |
| Safe space           | Pedestrian and bicycle privileged arrangements                                           |
|                      | Effective and correct lighting                                                          |
|                      | Eyes on the Street                                                                       |
|                      | Promote use at all hours of the day                                                      |
| Aesthetic quality    | Regular and well-maintained pavements                                                    |
|                      | Qualified landscape arrangements (green texture, grass areas, front garden arrangements, etc.) |
|                      | Presence of public art                                                                  |
|                      | Street furniture and use of vandal-proof materials                                       |
| Façade variety       | Differences, repetitions, contrasts                                                     |
| Usage diversity      | Coexistence of different activities                                                     |
| User diversity       | Arrangements that address the whole city and bring together users from different social and cultural backgrounds |
| Topography           | Use of spatial arrangements as an enriching tool (spatial arrangements on different elevations) |
|                      | Structuring to reduce the feeling of psychological discomfort of users                  |
|                      | (connections with devices such as ramps, elevators, etc.)                               |
Although right design is one of the most important criteria in public spaces, it is not enough in terms of use and vitality of the space. Maintenance and sustainability of the created areas are at least as important as their design. High standard maintenance and cleaning make the environment look nice to people [19].

3. Case Study: An Evaluation on Qualities of Public Spaces; Cases of Ankara Konur Street, Karanfil Street and Yüksel Street

The study area was determined as Yüksel Street, a pedestrian area in Kızılay, the city centre of the capital Ankara, and Karanfil and Konur streets connected to this street (Figure 1). The area is one of the most important pedestrian areas of the capital as it is one of the most intensely used regions of the city centre, a passage between different regions due to its location with its green texture. As demonstrated by the literature, urban centres are areas that should be considered as pedestrian-oriented areas and should be designed with pedestrian priorities due to their functions and intense use. On the other hand, the Kızılay city centre is a centre with a busy vehicle traffic. In terms of its general structure, it is not very possible to talk about an uninterrupted and comfortable pedestrian circulation for this area (Figure 1). In addition, it is a matter of discussion whether usage possibilities of pedestrianized areas (ease of use, attractiveness, accessibility for everyone, comfort, etc.) are facilitating for users. Based on these negativities, to what extent streets as public spaces, particularly the streets in the central business district serving all the citizens, conform with the generally accepted basic qualities within the context of design criteria were questioned. Precautions to minimize these negative effects and spatial arrangements that could be made were discussed.

![Figure 1. Location of the case study area in the country and in the region and its relationship with its immediate surroundings.](image)

The streets in the study area are connected to each other in the same region. Yüksel Street is the only pedestrian-privileged connection between Atatürk Boulevard and Mithatpaşa Street and is a backbone that connects Karanfil Street and Konur Street. Karanfil Street is one of the most heavily used streets because it is an alternative point of connection between Meşrutiyet Street and Gazi Mustafa Kemal (GMK) Boulevard, parallel to Atatürk Boulevard, arranged as a pedestrian place, and away from adverse effects of the traffic (Figure 1).

3.1. Method

Examination and evaluation of the study area basically consists of two stages; in the first stage, spatial arrangements were tried to be determined by field studies on the basic criteria of creating public spaces in the literature and in the second stage a questionnaire was applied to the users in order to determine user satisfaction in the area. In the study, these two stages were evaluated together; spatial arrangements and their effects on user satisfaction were discussed in association with each other.
The study area is a mixed community region, which is used by different groups of the city as one of the most important pedestrian zones in the city centre, where users of different demographic, social and economic structures come together. A total of 270 surveys were conducted in different days of the week and during different hours of use with random sampling method in order to determine this mixed quality of the area and to inquire expectations of different groups from the area. The fact that the middle-age and older age group users (45 years and older) did not want to participate in the survey constituted one of the basic limitations of the study at this stage. Another limitation was that female users participated in the survey more than male users. While the proportion of male and female users in the survey distribution was targeted to be close to each other, the rate of female users was higher in the conducted survey. These limitations were tried to be overcome by conversations with users who did not directly participate in the survey but wanted to be involved in the work and by their feedbacks, and some of the opinions of these users were mentioned in the comments section. When the questionnaires were evaluated, necessary analyses were made with the SPSS Statistics program. While some questions were analysed with percentage values, cross-questioning was performed on required questions and tables that demonstrated meaningful relationships were interpreted.

3.2. Analysis of the Study Area According to Public Space Design Criteria and Its Relationship with User Satisfaction

Ankara Konur Street, Karanfil Street and Yüksel Street, which are the case areas in the first stage of the study, were evaluated according to public space design criteria obtained from the literature and the data obtained by field studies were grouped according to user behaviours included in Table 1 (Table 3).

Table 3. Relationships between user behaviours and spatial design in the case area.

| Human Behaviours | Spatial Design Details                           | Karanfil Street | Konur Street | Yüksel Street |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Walking          | Suitability for the “wheeled” walking traffic (like the baby carriage, the wheelchair, the shopping cart, and so forth) | Particularly suitable | Suitable | Particularly suitable |
|                  | Paving materials and street surface conditions (not wet and slippery pavements) | Irregular and rugged pavements | Irregular pavements | Patchy and bumpy |
|                  | Differences in level                             | High            | Low          | Medium        |
| Standing         | Edge effect for standing                        | Rare            | Rare         | Rare          |
|                  | Microclimatic conditions (zones for staying half shade) | Average         | Low          | High          |
| Sitting          | Edge effect for sitting                         | Exist           | Exist        | Exist         |
|                  | Along facades and spatial boundaries, steps     | Exist           | Exist        | Exist         |
|                  | Microclimatic conditions                        | Exist           | Average      | Exist         |
|                  | Viewing opportunities                            | Exist           | Exist        | Exist         |
| Seeing, hearing and talking | Distance between observer and object | Suitable | Suitable | Suitable |
|                  | Field of vision and overview                    | Suitable | Suitable | Suitable |
|                  | Adequate lighting                               | Suitable | Suitable | Suitable |
|                  | Noise levels                                    | High            | Average      | High          |

Relationship between spatial arrangement sub-headings and satisfaction shown in Table 2 is directly related to users of the area. For this reason, the design approaches demonstrated in Table 2 were analysed based on the questionnaire evaluations for user satisfaction, and each approach in the table was considered as a sub-heading.

When user profile in the area was determined, the age, gender, occupation and educational status of the users were asked. According to the observations made during field work, it can be said that female and male user numbers were close to each other and that there were users of all age groups in the area. 37% of the surveyed users were male and 63% were female. According to the distribution of users by age, the densest user group was the 25 - 44 age group (57%), followed by the 15 - 24 age group (36%) and the 45 - 65 age group (17%). According to the frequency distribution of users by occupation, it was seen that students (38%), civil servants (academicians and teachers were also evaluated under this group)
(32%) and private sector employees (14%) took the first three places. However, the presence of users in the area from other sectors also supports the quality of being a city centre of the area. When education status of the users was examined, it can be said that most users were people who have received college and university education (68%). This result can be associated with the users’ age groups and being a student.

3.2.1. Accessibility. Accessibility, as discussed in the literature, is one of the most important features of public spaces. The study area is one of the most accessible places in the entire city, where different types of transportation intersect and people from different social and economic income groups can reach equal conditions (Figure 2, Figure 3). It is possible to reach the area by public transport from all districts of the city. The region in which the area is located is a transfer hub that allows people to switch between different types of transportation or on different routes while traveling in the city (Figure 4a). When the types of transportation that people use in entering the area are examined, access via metro/Ankaray takes the first place (28%), followed by access by bus (25%) and pedestrian access (23%) (Figure 3). There are 5 different entrances for pedestrian access to the area (Figure 4b, Figure 4c). However, arrangements in the northern entrance of Karanfil Street and the western entrance of Yüksel Street are inadequate for the access of disabled to the area. These inadequacies are also occasionally encountered within the field.

3.2.2. Safe spaces. One of the most important criteria affecting the use of public spaces is the sense of security in the area. Especially in terms of disadvantaged groups (people with disabilities, women, elderly people, children, etc.), safety affects user preferences in using an area on the primary level. Use of an area at all hours of the day, visual viability of all aspects of uses in the area and entrances facing the street support security and vitality in the area. Closed and defined areas created by constructions and density created by commercial activities also constitute a sense of security. Although street stands occasionally make movement difficult, they support vitality and safety. Use of the area by women as much as men and presence of single users in the area create a perception of safety. Sufficient lighting at
night is also an important factor in terms of security. The place is used for demonstrations and protests from time to time and potential dangers due to absence of audible and visual arrangements suitable for disabled people are negative factors for security perception of the area.

When the study area was examined in terms of time zones of daily use, it was observed that it was used intensively in the afternoons during weekdays and in late afternoons during weekdays and weekends due to its nature as a transit region, its direct connection with business areas and its being a transfer point for users as well as its being a city centre. When we look at intensity of use according to the seasons, it can be said that the same features attract users to the area in all seasons. However, the least use is seen in winter and autumn seasons (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Daily and seasonal visitor distribution of the area.

The sense of security in the study area was questioned both in terms of sex and hours of use. According to the results obtained, it was seen that 73% of all users felt themselves safe during daytime (Figure 6). However, the proportion of female users who did not feel safe at night increased more (84%), while the ratio between male users who felt safe (41%) and did not feel safe (59%) demonstrated a closer distribution. In this analysis, according to the distribution of change in the sense of security, it can be said that the area creates a sense of security during daytime and a sense of danger at night (Figure 7).

Figure 6. Sense of security (Daytime).

Figure 7. Sense of security (Night).

3.2.3. Aesthetic quality. While seating areas are generally located on pedestrian flow, they do not vary and are not arranged to provide protection from climatic influences (rain, sun, wind, etc.). In addition to benches, there are also seats by the walls. However, apart from the commercial activity of the area, it is possible to talk about a lack of free seating areas. In terms of green texture, the tree texture of Yüksel Street makes this street more special than other streets. In terms of suitability for climate conditions, although green texture helps to reduce adverse effects of the sun, the number of people who spend time in the area in rainy weather is only very little, if any (Figure 8).
While music events provide vitality in the area, the presence of sculptures is aesthetically important. Floor coverings are damaged in some areas and present an obstacle to walkability. Cleaning of the area is done by cleaning vehicles at certain times of the day and the points that the vehicles cannot reach are cleaned by cleaning workers. However, when users were asked about cleanliness and noise situation of the area, it was seen that the area did not meet expectations of users in terms of user satisfaction and were found both dirty and noisy (Figure 9). The high level of noise in the area is an expected result when associated with the quality of being a city centre, but it should be remembered that level of noise can be reduced by necessary spatial arrangements. Uncleanliness is a problem that can be easily solved by an accurate management process.

When we tried to determine deficiencies in the area, the general viewpoints were similar according to age groups, and different age groups pointed out similar problems. The most important problems addressed by users in the area were inadequacy of seating units/seating areas, inadequacy of trash cans

|                | Karanfil Street | Yüksel Street | Konur Street |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Sitting areas (sitting units) | ![Image](image1.png) | ![Image](image2.png) | ![Image](image3.png) |
| There are no benches on Konur Street |
| Status of sunbathing | ![Image](image4.png) | ![Image](image5.png) | ![Image](image6.png) |
| ![Image](image7.png) | ![Image](image8.png) | ![Image](image9.png) |

**Figure 8.** Green texture, urban furnishings and status of sunbathing in the study area.

**Figure 9.** Cleanness and quietness.

Do you find the area clean enough?

- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%

Are you troubled by the noise in the area?

- Yes: 38%
- No: 62%
and lack/inadequacy of landscape elements. The most noteworthy difference in this regard was the approach of young people of the 15 - 24 age group on activities in the area. This group of users complained that the variety of activities offered in the area was low (Figure 10).

![Figure 10. Deficiencies and problems felt and observed by different age groups.](image)

3.2.4. Façade variety. Karanfil, Konur and Yüksel Streets which were examined in the study are also located in the central area of central business district. This strategic position is one of the main factors in diversity of activities in the area and presence of different services together. In addition to commercial buildings such as gastronomy units, bakery, clothing shops, shoe stores, accessory shops, beauty shops, electronic stores, bookstores, stationery stores, jewellery stores, medical device sales units, photo studio, hotel, bank, tourism agency, hairdresser, there are also public utilities in the area such as Turkish Red Crescent, the Chamber of Architects, the Tax Office, and the Association of Political Science Graduates. Considering the space needs of these activities, the buildings they occupy and the relations they established with the streets, it can be said that these uses created diversity in terms of façade qualities. However, when this diversity is not controlled and rises above a certain level, its positive effect on users is lost, it causes confusion and creates visual pollution. A similar situation is observed in the study area and façade arrangements, advertising and publicity boards, and business signboards cause confusion in the area (Figure 11).

![Figure 11. Façade arrangements, advertising and publicity boards, and business signboards.](image)

3.2.5. Usage and user diversity. One of the most important features of a public space is diversity of usage and user Kızılay is a centre that keeps different functions together by its very nature and sustains its “urban centre” quality in many regions of the area. Karanfil, Konur and Yüksel Streets, which were examined in the study, are also located in the central area of central business district according to their location. This strategic position is one of the main factors in diversification of activities and coexistence of different services in the area. In terms of the land use; Karanfil Street and Yüksel Street have a more mixed use, while Yüksel Street hosts mainly eating and drinking units and bookstores (Figure 12). Especially private teaching institution, bookstores, cafe uses draw young people to the area. The presence of eating and drinking unit in the area also allows use of the area in the evening as well as in
daylight hours. However, there are no other functions supporting the night use in the area than several pubs and hotels in Konur Street and a few hotels in Karanfil Street.

**Figure 12.** Land use of the case study area.

In urban centres places which are designed for pedestrians and which are away from the influence of heavy traffic are more preferred by users. The priority preferences among these areas are determined by the functions that the fields offer. It was tried to determine priority and density of use of the streets that were arranged as pedestrian spaces in the study area. When the streets that constitute the case study area were examined in terms of use of density; Karanfil Street takes the 1st place, Yüksel Street takes the 2nd place and Konur Street takes the 3rd place (Figure 13). When the study area was evaluated in relation with its immediate surroundings, Karanfil Street can be considered as one of the most preferred streets as it binds Meşrutiyet Street and GMK Boulevard, which are urban collector arteries, it has a direct link with a metro station and is an alternate connection point that is away from the influence of traffic density. In terms of land use, it can be said that Karanfil Street is also more preferred than the other two streets because it has denser and diverse use and functions. As it was said before Yüksel Street is the only pedestrian oriented link between Atatürk Boulevard and Mithatpaşa Street. However, when the street’s entrance to Atatürk Boulevard is evaluated in terms of pedestrian use and accessibility, it does not meet expectations in terms of spatial quality and access of the disabled; it particularly serves as a connection place for the users of Karanfil Street and Konur Street. On the other hand, considering green texture of the street, it seems possible to increase the number of users and amount of time that is spent in the area and to transform this region into an attractive focal point by performing appropriate arrangements. When use of Konur Street is evaluated, it can be said that this street is usually preferred by users who use the street for its available functions, and the street does not have a binding quality due to its location in the area. The functions included in the street are mainly bookstores and eating/drinking units and unlike
other streets it does not have a mixed use. Thus, it can be said that this street has less priority for use than the other two streets (Figure 14).

![Figure 13. Distribution of user numbers of the streets](image)

**Figure 13.** Distribution of user numbers of the streets

![Figure 14. Priority in preference for the streets](image)

**Figure 14.** Priority in preference for the streets

3.2.6. Topography. The study area consists of regions with different inclination structures topographically. Especially, there are important elevation differences at Karanfil Street’s entrance to GMK Boulevard and at the point where Yüksel Street connects with Ataturk Boulevard. This topography can be seen as a means of enriching spatial arrangements but in practice it prevents accessibility and creates a sense of psychological barrier for users because it has not been organized properly. Especially, the criterion of accessibility for everyone (disabled people, elderly, parents with baby carriage etc.), which is one of the basic qualifications in the use of public space does not apply in this area at two points (Figure 15).

![Figure 15. Topography, spatial circulation and arrangements for disabled users](image)

**Figure 15.** Topography, spatial circulation and arrangements for disabled users
4. Evaluation and Conclusion

According to the results obtained from the field and survey studies, factors such as commercial diversity in the area, its being a pedestrianized area, its accessibility, appeal to different age groups, intensive use by young people, liveliness, social diversity and hosting street music make it attractive for users. There are users who come to this area only because these streets are lively. Some users said that they felt young when they were with young people and again some users over 65 years old who had movement limitations due to their age said they could continue their routine life by coming to the area and meet all their needs within the area. On the other hand, adverse effects such as crowd, noise, pollution, spatial inefficiencies, security problems and maintenance-free pedestrian paths in the area also negatively affect user satisfaction. Conversations with users during field studies revealed the verbal conclusion that the area would be used more effectively and for longer hours in case of removal of such adversities and people would feel more secure in the area.

As a result of the analyses, the main reasons that reduced user satisfaction in the area were insufficient and/or inaccurate physical arrangements in the area and the irregular and unsatisfactory maintenance of the area. It is clear that negative effects such as insufficiency of the urban equipment, lack of cleanliness, unrepaired damaged flooring and insufficient space for pedestrians due to uncontrolled street use can be solved with an effective local management approach.

Public spaces that are located in the central business districts are areas that need to be handled and regulated with priority as they serve the entire city. Determining current needs and improving insufficiencies/failures by performing user satisfaction surveys in these areas from time to time and carrying out regular area maintenance will provide more effective use of these spaces by people. Identification of priorities and making pedestrian-vehicle separation in the process of planning and design, taking human scale into account, carrying out all open space and public space arrangements without forgetting public and user priority, and integration of participants’ understanding with the process will increase success rate in creating living spaces. Living public spaces will strengthen social and cultural relations, pave the way for healthy societies and will be a catalyst for creating highly sustainable cities with high quality of life. As Jan Gehl said; "We shape cities and cities shape us".
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