URPL 6365: PARKS AND PUBLIC SPACES | 3 CREDITS | SPRING 2027

Wednesdays, 9:30 am - 12:15 pm | CU 480

Professor Jeremy Németh | jeremy.nemeth@ucdenver.edu



OVERVIEW

This seminar introduces students to the design, management, and maintenance of parks and public spaces. The course is particularly focused on how issues of race, class, and culture interact to shape access to, inclusion in, and exclusion from, parks and public spaces. We will examine the foundations of public space theory with a particular emphasis on how space is more than just a neutral container but is instead deeply revealing of how we think about notions of democracy, diversity, and equity. In this way, public spaces are mirrors of society, reflecting our biases and beliefs about who "belongs" and who does not. Throughout the course, we will move between discussions of public space issues and methods. Each week in this discussion-based, hands-on, interactive course, students will examine critical case studies, hear from guest lecturers, or conduct site visits to public spaces throughout the city.

FORMAT

This graduate-level seminar course relies heavily on your participation, which should be professional at all times. Our class sessions are equivalent to a professional meeting. This means that each student should attend every class, arrive on time, be prepared to engage the topic and other members of the class, respect fellow members of the class, and use professional and inclusive language. We will cover some key discussion norms in weeks 1 and 2.

COMMUNICATION

Unless otherwise noted, we will use Canvas for all official course communication and it is the responsibility of each student to use Canvas settings that enable reliable communication. For example, this may mean selecting a personal email address as the default in Canvas. I will use

Canvas for course announcements, changes to the schedule, turning in assignments, personal communication, and other course-related business. All assignments, unless otherwise noted, must be submitted on Canvas, so each student should be familiar with Canvas's assignment submission procedures.

ENGAGEMENT

In general, I am quite flexible with the level and type of participation with which you feel comfortable. Nevertheless, I do ask that you please try your best to arrive on time to our class meetings to avoid disrupting other students' attention and learning.

Class participation has traditionally meant demonstrating one's knowledge verbally and hiding any evidence of gaps in knowledge, doubts, and questions. I don't believe that these traditional expectations of class participation support learning in the classroom. They are particularly difficult for students who are less verbal. Instead, student participation in this course is evidenced by a student's readiness to summarize the materials, critique them, and engage effectively in class discussions and exercises.

Because this is a graduate class, your active participation is very important. Active participation means involving yourself in the discussion – particularly in small groups – by showing up on time, completing readings before class, listening intently to whomever is speaking, asking pertinent/pointed questions, exposing your own challenges, offering opinions respectfully, and otherwise being deeply "present" in class.

Importantly, listening is also participating. If you do not actively listen and share your questions and ideas with everyone, they can't benefit from what you have to offer. Each of you has important questions and ideas to share that we can all learn from, and I believe you have at least some responsibility to contribute to it. Be curious about what others have to say. If you share your thoughts, concerns and questions in an effort to explore the material in the spirit of intellectual curiosity, you will do well in the course.

In sum, the norms of participation in this course include, but are not limited to, the following aspects of engagement (adapted from A. Lathrop):

- Preparation: Demonstrate being prepared for class by arriving on time, taking notes, bringing notes and copies of the readings to our class meetings, researching unfamiliar or interesting topics found in the readings, and setting an intention for the class meeting.
- Engagement: Actively engage with other members of the class in respectful and inclusive discussion and active listening. It is important to engage with people who you perceive as different from you. This means being curious about, and open to, what other people think and experience (or have experienced).
- Initiative within a group: Ask questions during discussion that focus, clarify, and summarize what the group is talking about. Help others express themselves when they have trouble

communicating. Create space for shy people. Don't monopolize conversation. In general, try to have a positive effect on other people.

- Discussion: Discussion is about increasing collective understanding, not only individual understanding. Successful class discussion requires having compassionate and respectful relationships with peers, and these relationships reflect higher order intellectual and emotional skills (analysis, synthesis, compassion, etc.). In contrast to the traditional classroom, discussion in this class is not about showing other people how much you know.

In addition, in this course we are going to be talking about some difficult subjects such as inequality, racism, discrimination, corruption, poverty, environmental destruction, police brutality, and homelessness. One of the jobs of this course is to help students develop an individual and shared understanding of what problems exist that we can address as planners and city builders. Whatever your political, economic, cultural, or geographic background, your thoughts have a place in this classroom. We all have unique perspectives, and sharing these different perspectives is a hugely important component of all our learning processes.

In my years of teaching, I have noticed that when sharing difficult thoughts, students are often confronted with feelings of anxiety, anger, guilt, shame, disgust, and confusion. This is, in fact, a very normal part of the learning process. Nevertheless, there is a common tendency when we confront difficult issues to withdraw or not to participate fully in discussions, or to feel if our view is an outlier then we do not deserve to speak or be heard. In fact, the opposite is true. Talking about personal experiences or perspectives is very difficult, but it is critically important. So, I want to move beyond the notion of this classroom as a safe space; instead, I hope to nurture a brave space.

Use of laptops, phones, or tablets is permitted during class, but do know that studies consistently show that such use compromises your and your peers' learning. We are constantly tied to our devices, so consider using this course period – just 2.75 hours each week – as a special and increasingly rare opportunity to disconnect from the virtual world and retrain our brains to connect with each other and with big ideas. Still, if you *must* use your device during class, please refrain from surfing the Internet, checking social media, or doing other work during our class meetings.

ASSIGNMENTS

The idea of the assignment list for this course is for you to experiment with creating (relatively) new forms of media with the goal of reaching new and different audiences, a critical skill for practicing professionals in 2027 and beyond.

Assignment	Weight	Due date
Engagement	10%	Weekly
Discussion Lead	15%	Varies
Op-ed	15%	March 8
Podcast	20%	April 5
Final Project	40%	February 8 | March 15 | May 12

Discussion lead

For this assignment, you will lead a group discussion of all the readings/multimedia assigned for a particular week. We will select our week on the first day of class here. The discussion leader will prepare and bring copies for all students of a one-sheet maximum handout (can be front/back) that provides a summary of the main point(s) of all materials assigned for that week as well as any other materials the leaders feel would help round out our understanding. As this is an advanced graduate-level course, you will be graded on both the content *and* delivery of the material.

The summary should, at the very least, outline the main arguments/crux/thesis of each of the materials as well as summarize the key supporting arguments and assumptions the authors make. It is essential that your summary is organized thematically, and not just a simple annotated bibliography of the readings. The goal is for you to synthesize the set of readings, not just list the main arguments of each.

Be sure to discuss how the readings are relevant to our broader discussions of public space, why they are helpful, and what they leave out. During class, you will be asked to spend some time going through your summary with the class, and then facilitating a discussion, which should last no longer than one hour total. The idea is for you to inspire everyone to explore the readings in insightful ways, so please try to be creative in your use of media and discussion techniques. In the past, successful discussion leaders have incorporated quizzes, contests, small-group breakouts, and more.

Good discussion questions can help guide the class. The best questions are usually “open-ended,” and have a complex answer and/or a range of possible answers. They are also genuine, meaning the questioner has not already made up their mind about the answer. A descriptive question might be: “Does the author mean to say…?” whereas a normative (i.e., more subjective) question might be: “Is the U.S. right to intervene in world affairs?” The latter type opens the issue of values, of what people think the world *should* be like. You can ask either descriptive or normative questions when facilitating discussion or, ideally, a combination of both.

Op-ed

For this assignment, you will write an op-ed/commentary to an existing media outlet of your choice. The op-ed should address an issue that is relevant to the city and that touches on something we have discussed in class, such as the privatization of public space, the criminalization of homelessness, increased demand on regional parks, green gentrification, the importance of cultural

diversity in urban parks, or the promises and pitfalls of DIY urbanism. Here is a recent and very good example of a planning/design-based op-ed in the Denver Post. And in Spring 2025, one of your peers had their op-ed from this very course published in the Colorado Sun!

In addition to working with the CU Denver Writing Center on this assignment – they are a fantastic resource and can help with this exact kind of assignment – here are two short guides for writing an op-ed from Duke University and the New York Times. Both show the importance of connecting your commentary to current events in a certain time and place; in addition, most publications will seek answers, or ways to address the problems you expose or critiques you raise. So you should track news throughout the semester to identify key issues that connect with contemporary concerns to readers of the outlet you select. Importantly, please indicate on your submission one or more intended outlets for your piece (e.g., Denver Post, Austin American-Statesman). The CU Denver Writing Center also developed a presentation specifically for this assignment. Access it here.

Podcast

Working with a partner of your choice, you will produce a short podcast episode for our Planners Planners of Tomorrow, Planning for Tomorrow series. The episode should last 20 minutes or less and have a thought-provoking and concise topic and title, which could be a question, theme, or can involve weighing in on a recent project, controversy, or news story. You are required to interview an expert – however you define that term – as part of your podcast. The topic does not need to be about something happening in the Denver metro area. There are numerous online guides for producing podcasts, and most of you have all the equipment you need to record an episode using your phones, headphones, microphones, and free apps. Several students and alumni have created successful podcast series in the past (example, example), so feel free to reach out to anyone you know about tips and tricks and best practices. Episodes should be as well produced and professional as possible. As always, edit, edit, and edit some more!

Final project

Working in pairs, you will act as a consultant team that has been asked by the City and County of Denver (CCD), DRCOG, and a coalition of community-based organizations and local non-profits, to analyze an existing park, plaza, or public space in the Denver metro area and develop a forward-looking proposal for it that addresses design quality, governance, social equity, and ecological performance. You can choose a downtown park or plaza, such as Civic Center Park, Commons Park, Skyline Park or Wynkoop Plaza; a neighborhood park, such as Cheesman Park, Sloan's Lake Park or Washington Park; or a regional or suburban park.

The goals of this assignment are to synthesize theoretical, historical, and practical insights from our course; apply theory to real-world context; critically evaluate a public space using criteria of your own creation; integrate design and planning/policy thinking; and communicate ideas clearly to an audience of your peers. The final products should demonstrate both critical rigor and creative thinking and should be grounded in course readings and external research.

Deliverable 1: Group Report

Submit a single 20-page (or so) PDF, including visuals and references, with professional formatting, clear section headings, and proper MLA-style citations. The report should have four main sections. You do not need to include these exact titles/headings, but the information outlined below should be addressed in your report. I encourage you to take a look at how existing professional park/public space plans and proposals are organized: some work better than others!

Executive Summary: Here is a presentation from the Writing Center that might be helpful in writing yours.

Context and Analysis: Analyze your selected park or public space using course concepts. Use maps, photos, diagrams, and citations where appropriate. Be sure to cover:

- Location, size, history, and intended purpose
- Governance and ownership structure (public, public–private, nonprofit, etc.)
- Users and non-users (who benefits, who is excluded, and why)
- Design and spatial qualities (access, programming, safety, flexibility)
- Equity, justice, and accessibility considerations
- Ecological and environmental performance

Make multiple visits to your space on different times of the day, days of the week, during events and non-events, and during different kinds of weather. Spend a good amount of time in your space and conduct some site reconnaissance as well as some participant observation. Learn to look at these spaces analytically and empathetically. Observe behaviors, uses, users, physical features, and even your own perceptions of how you feel in the space. Who is using the space currently, and how might that be a function of the location, rules, or the sociocultural norms and expectations of the site? Why are certain areas of the space likely used by some people while other areas are used by different people? How does the design of the space seem to shape how the space is used and, in turn, by whom? Try to engage as deeply as possible with some of the controversies, challenges, and difficult questions we discuss in class this semester. There are many resources in our readings and from groups such as Project for Public Spaces.

Comparative Case Insight: Select one comparable park or public space that offers a useful contrast or lesson. Discuss:

- Key similarities and differences
- What this comparison reveals about design, governance, equity, ecological value
- Transferable lessons relevant to your selected space

Future Vision Proposal: Develop a realistic but aspirational proposal for improving, reimagining, and/or adapting your selected space. This is not a full design studio project, but ideas should be concrete, justified, and well-argued. In general, that means including:

- A clear problem statement
- A well-considered conceptual vision (accompanied by goals)
- A discussion of feasibility, stakeholders, maintenance, and planning/design process
- Brief outline of budget and phasing
- Supporting visual material

As you develop your future vision for the site, try to engage with questions we cover regularly in this course, such as: What makes a public space genuinely *public*? How might power, governance, and design interact in your space, now and in the future? Who decides how public spaces evolve over time? How can/should parks address climate, equity, and social change simultaneously?

Deliverable 2: Group Presentation

- 15-minute in-class presentation
- Compelling visuals (e.g., maps, videos, diagrams, images)
- All group members should speak in this presentation

Deliverable 3: Individual Reflection

- Single PDF for each student
- 750 words maximum
- Reflect on your contribution, your achievement of the project's learning outcomes, the group process, and any revelations that came to you during the process

In order to make sure you are making good progress on this project, I offer two interim check-ins. Neither of these interim submissions will be graded but they provide you an important opportunity to get valuable feedback on what will ultimately become your final graded submissions.

Week 3: Submit a two-page overview of your project that lists your project team and includes some general details of your chosen space (name, size, year built, neighborhood/context, etc.). Outline a few techniques you plan to use to study your space (e.g., SWOC). List two to three spaces that you might consider for your Comparative Case Insight. Develop a schedule of the various tasks required of the assignment and note who and when you will complete these.

Week 9: Submit a "first-half draft" that should demonstrate nearly complete progress on both the Context and Analysis and Comparative Case Insight sections.

GRADING

Grading for assignments will be based primarily on the quality and depth of the work presented. Here is the rubric I use as a basic starting point for all my assignments. Any work submitted after the assignment deadline but within one week of the due date will receive 75% of the points earned.

Assignments submitted between one and two weeks late will receive 50% of the points earned. Assignments submitted more than two weeks late will receive no credit.

Grading scale

A range: Exceptional scholarship and superior work products that significantly exceed stated requirements in scope and/or quality
B range: Commendable scholarship and accomplished work products that somewhat exceed stated requirements in scope and/or quality
C range: Satisfactory scholarship and work products that meet or almost meet stated requirements in scope and/or quality
D range: Inadequate scholarship and inferior work products that clearly fail to meet stated requirements in scope and/or quality
F range: Unacceptable scholarship and work product

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, PLAGIARISM, CHATGPT/AI

Education at the University of Colorado Denver and in the College of Architecture and Planning (CAP) depends on honesty and integrity, as well as appropriate conduct. CAP students are required to follow the Student Code of Conduct, Honor Code, and all other college and university policies. Please refer to the campus policy on Academic Integrity for more details.

Plagiarism is a serious offense. Any work submitted by a student in this course for academic credit will be the student's own work. Electronic submission of work will be required, and detection software will be used as an aid in determining originality of student work. Plagiarism and cheating are not tolerated and will be handled through the University's official process. If you have any questions about how to avoid plagiarism, including how to use paraphrasing, indented block quotations, or framed direct quotes to appropriately credit interesting passages from others' work that inform your own), consult the Writing Center here. When working in a group, it is the responsibility of everyone in the group to maintain the norms of academic integrity. Students may do joint work with other courses only with the permission of all instructors and when the work is suitable for the topic and the course.

My policy on the use of ChatGPT or other AI platforms/tools in this course is somewhat nuanced. First, I think it's my responsibility to let you know why you might want to reconsider using such platforms in a course like ours. Here I am inspired by the thinking of Olivia Stowell, a PhD Candidate at the University of Michigan. Below I have copied or paraphrased her writing on the various reasons why you might want to consider if/when using these platforms:

REASON 1: Our Parks and Public Spaces course is designed to improve your writing skills. If you're not writing, you're not improving.

REASON 2: Using AI opens up academic honesty issues, both because it raises the question of whether the work is actually "your" work, and also because tools like ChatGPT

rely on uncompensated labor by lifting material from work produced by scholars (like me or my dear colleagues!).

REASON 3: Using AI does not produce reliably accurate results. In fact, it can often be downright incorrect.

REASON 4: ChatGPT has serious negative environmental impacts, particularly in relation to water usage (see here, here, and here).

REASON 5: OpenAI has exploited thousands and thousands of workers from the Global South, especially folks in prisons and refugee camps and workers in Kenya, the Philippines, Colombia, and elsewhere (see here, here, here, here, here, and here).

To put it more bluntly, there are thousands of people in the world who would love to be in your position: getting to be a student at a U.S. research university with relatively small class sizes and prestigious faculty. Education like this is not available to everyone. Furthermore, someone is paying for you to be here (whether that's yourself, parents/relatives, scholarships/grants, loans, etc.). If you choose to spend this incredible – and incredibly expensive – opportunity to learn by trying to avoid doing the work and learning through the use of AI tools, you are only cheating yourself, all while knowingly contributing to deep environmental harms and labor exploitation in the process.

If after reading this, you nevertheless decide to use ChatGPT or other AI platforms/tools in your work, I am simply requiring you to cite its use both in the sources/reference list and in the text itself. (An in-text reference could say something like: "This paragraph/section was generated with the use of ChatGPT on October 7, 2025.")

Prior to Week 1, I will also have you read this article/argument about the use of AI from Patrick Lin, a Professor of Philosophy at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. We will then discuss it in class.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Any student who needs, or who may need, accommodations due to a disability should speak with the instructors as soon as possible and should contact the Disability Resources and Services Office on campus to arrange accommodations. See here for more details.

SCHEDULE

All required materials are drawn from peer-reviewed research and popular media. All can be accessed on Canvas or are hyperlinked for direct access. There are any number of guides for reading efficiently and effectively in graduate school courses: please consult these! Here is a very short but helpful primer on the topic. And here is a video produced by yours truly that walks you through me reading and annotating a full article.

Week	Date	Topic	In-class activity
1	Jan 20	Introduction	Class discussion
FOUNDATIONS			
2	Jan 27	Why parks and public spaces matter	Film: Bogotá/Peñalosa
3	Feb 3	History and classification of parks and public spaces	Guest: Anna Bierbrauer
THEORIES			
4	Feb 10	The decline of public space	Film: Love Park
5	Feb 17	Democracy and public space	Guest: Amirah Shahid
6	Feb 24	Diversity and public space	Guest: Gus Wendel
7	Mar 3	Disorder and public space	Guest: Shanasia Sylman
METHODS			
8	Mar 10	Design and placemaking	Guest: J. Newsome (field)
9	Mar 17	Observing public space and public life	Film: Social Life (Whyte)
10	Mar 24	NO CLASS	NA
11	Mar 31	NO CLASS	NA
12	Apr 7	Regulation, management, programming	Guest: Andrew Iltis (field)
APPLICATIONS			
13	Apr 14	Urban, regional, and national park master plans	Guest: Deryn Wagner
14	Apr 21	Environmental justice and privilege	Guest: Alessandro Rigolon
15	Apr 28	Urban trails, greenways, and linear parks	Guest: Denver Park Trust
16	May 5	Open space, recreation, resilience, ecosystem services	Guest: Cinceré Eades
17	May 12	Final presentations	Presentations

READINGS

NOTE: readings/media should be read/viewed by the week under which they are listed. Please try to read/view all of these, but aim to complete at least three of these if you're pressed for time.

Week 1 | January 21: Introduction

Lin, P. (2025). Why we're not using AI in this course, despite its obvious benefits. *Patrick Lin's Substack.*

Week 2 | January 28: Why parks and public spaces matter

Carmona, M., de Magalhães, C., & Hammond, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Public space: The management dimension*. New York, NY: Routledge. Ch. 2.

https://issuu.com/gehlarchitects/docs/ipkxgehl_social_infrastructure_is_essential_infras

Klinenberg, E. (2018). Introduction: The social infrastructure. In *Palaces for the people: How social infrastructure can help fight inequality, polarization, and the decline of civic life* (1-24)*.* New York: Crown.

Jacobs, J. (1961). *Death and life of great American cities*. New York, NY: Vintage Books. Excerpts.

Levitz, D. (2014). The role of parks in shaping successful cities. National Recreation and Park Association/American Planning Association.

Neal, Z. (2010). Locating public space. In A. Orum & Z. Neal (Eds.). *Common ground? Readings and reflections on public space* (1-10). New York, NY: Routledge.

Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place: Cafes, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day*. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House Publishers. Excerpts.

Week 3 | February 4: History and classification of parks and public spaces

Carmona, M., de Magalhães, C., & Hammond, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Public space: The management dimension*. New York, NY: Routledge. Ch. 1, 3.

Harnik, P. (2003). The excellent city park system: What makes it great and how to get there. Washington, DC: The Trust for Public Land.

Kohn, M. (2011). Public space in the Progressive Era. In C. Hayward and T. Swanstrom (Eds.). *Justice and the American metropolis* (81-101). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lewis, M., ed. (2008). From recreation to re-creation. Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Report 551. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association.

Low, S., Taplin, D., & Scheld, S. (2005). *Rethinking public parks: Public space and cultural diversity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. Ch. 2.

Week 4 | February 11: The decline of public space

Banerjee, T. (2001). The future of public space: beyond invented streets and reinvented places*. Journal of the American Planning Association*, 67(1), 9-24

Boddy, T. (1992). Underground and overhead: building the analogous city. *Variations on a theme park*, 53, 123-153.

Davis, M. (1990). Fortress L.A. *Cities and Society*, 267-283.

Németh, J. (2009). Defining a public: The management of privately owned public space. *Urban Studies*, 46(11), 2463-2490.

Németh, J. (2010). Security in public space: an empirical assessment of three US cities. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(10), 2487-2507.

Zukin, S. (1996). *The cultures of cities*. Wiley-Blackwell. Excerpts.

Week 5 | February 18: Democracy and public space

Brill, M. (2001). Mistaking community life for public life. *Places*, 14(2), 48-55.

Coyles, D., Hamber, B., & A. Grant. (2023). Hidden barriers and divisive architecture: The role of "everyday space" in conflict and peacebuilding in Belfast. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 45(6), 1057-1080.

Dovey, R. (2017). Winning S.F. plaza design creates a public space for protest. *Next City*, 1 November.

Franck, K., & Huang, T. (2012). Occupying public space. In R. Shiffman et al. (Eds.). *Beyond Zuccotti Park: Freedom of assembly and the occupation of public space* (3-20). Oakland, CA: New Village Press.

Hou, J. (2020). Public space as a space of resistance and democratic resilience. In V. Mehta and D. Palazzo (Eds.). *Companion to public space*. New York: Routledge, 335-345.

Németh, J. (2012). Controlling the commons: How public is public space? *Urban Affairs Review*, 48(6): 814-838.

Pyatok, M. (2012). When domestic space meets civic space: A case for design populism. In R. Shiffman et al. (Eds.). *Beyond Zuccotti Park: Freedom of assembly and the occupation of public space* (309-326). Oakland, CA: New Village Press.

Week 6 | February 25: Diversity and public space

Allen, A. (1995). Claiming open spaces (film). Accessed at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UOjPYbnAutk.

Day, K. (2011). Feminist approaches to urban design. In T. Banerjee and A. Loukaitou-Sideris (eds.) *Companion to Urban Design* (72-77). New York: Routledge.

Floyd, Myron F. (1998). Getting beyond marginality and ethnicity: The challenge for race and ethnic studies in leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research* 30(1), 3-22.

Hammett, K. Sidewalk living rooms: Creating a better neighborhood for the same neighbors. (2007). *Designer/Builder: A Journal of the Human Environment*, January, 31-36.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (1995). Urban form and social context: cultural differentiation in the uses of urban parks. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(2), 89-102.

Rios, M. (2010). Claiming Latino space: Cultural insurgency in the public realm. In J. Hou (Ed.). *Insurgent public space: Guerilla urbanism and the remaking of contemporary cities* (99-110). London: Routledge.

Ruddick, S. (1996). Constructing difference in public spaces: race, class, and gender as interlocking systems. *Urban Geography*, 17(2), 132-151.

Sene-Harper, Aby, Rasul A. Mowatt, and Myron F. Floyd. 2022. A people's future of leisure studies: Political cultural Black outdoors experiences. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* 40(1), 9-23.

Trust for Public Land. (2023). Denver ParkScore. Accessed at: https://www.tpl.org/city/denver-colorado.

Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3), 323-337.

Week 7 | March 4: Disorder and public space

Beaty, K. and K. Harris. (2021). We spent eighteen hours at Union Station. Here's everything we saw and heard. *Denverite,* 21 December.

Correal, A. (2018). In deepest cold, a subway car becomes the shelter of last resort. *New York Times*, 8 January.

Denver Revised Municipal Code. (2016). § 38-86.2.

Langegger, S., & Koester, S. (2016). Invisible homelessness: anonymity, exposure, and the right to the city. *Urban Geography*, 37(7), 1030-1048.

Mitchell, D. (2003). *The right to the city: Social justice & the fight for public space*. Guilford Press. Ch. 1.

Németh, J. (2006). Conflict, exclusion, relocation: Skateboarding and public space. *Journal of Urban Design*, 11(3), 297-318.

Robinson, T. (2017). No right to rest: Police enforcement patterns and quality of life consequences of the criminalization of homelessness. *Urban Affairs Review*, 55(1), 41-73.

Westbrook, M. and T. Robinson. (2021). Unhealthy by design: health & safety consequences of the criminalization of homelessness. *Journal of Social Distress and Homelessness*, 30(2), 107-115.

Wolfe, C. (2013). Why the "sit-table city" is the next big idea. *MyUrbanist Blog*.

Week 8 | March 11: Design and placemaking

Bausells, M. (2016). Superblocks to the rescue: Barcelona's plan to give streets back to residents. *The Guardian*, 17 May.

Carmona, M., Heath, T., Oc, T., & Tiesdell, S. (2010). *Public places, urban spaces: the dimensions of urban design*. New York, NY: Routledge. Ch. 7.

Cherry, N., & Nagle, K. (2017). *Grid/street/place: essential elements of sustainable urban districts*. New York, NY: Routledge. Section 3.

Collins, B. (2010). Guidelines for a quality built environment. Washington, DC: Bureau of Land Management.

Finn, D. (2014). DIY urbanism: Implications for cities. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 7(4), 381-398.

Lennard, S. (2017). Planning a neighborhood square. *Western Planner*, 21 November.

Norberg-Schulz, C. (1976). The phenomenon of place. *Architectural Association Quarterly*, 8(4), 3-10.

Week 9 | March 18: Observing public space and public life

Dandekar, H. (2001). Field methods for collecting information. In H. Dandekar (Ed.). *The planner's use of information* (24-48). Chicago, IL: Planners Press, The American Planning Association.

Finlay, J. & Bowman, J. (2017). Geographies on the move: A practical and theoretical approach to the mobile interview. *The Professional Geographer*, 69(2), 263–274.

Gehl, J. (2011). *Life between buildings: Using public space*. Washington, DC: Island Press. Excerpts.

Gehl, J. & Svarre, B. (2013). *How to study public life*. Washington, DC: Island Press. Excerpts.

Low, S. (2010). *On the plaza: The politics of public space and culture*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. Ch. 1.

Low, S., Taplin, D., & Scheld, S. (2005). *Rethinking public parks: Public space and cultural diversity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. Ch. 8.

Project for Public Spaces. (n.d.) What makes a great place? Accessed at: https://www.pps.org/article/grplacefeat.

Wolfe, C. (2013). Why the sittable city is the next big idea. *Huffington Post*, 9 October.

Week 10 | March 25: NO CLASS

Week 11 | April 1: NO CLASS

Week 12 | April 8: Regulation, management, and programming

Carmona, M., de Magalhães, C., & Hammond, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Public space: The management dimension*. New York, NY: Routledge. Ch. 4.

Dent, M. (2018). Kansas City privatizes sidewalks in rowdy entertainment district. *Next City*, 17 January.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A., Blumenberg, E., & Ehrenfeucht, R. (2005). Sidewalk democracy: municipalities and the regulation of public space. *Regulating place* (141-166). New York, NY: Routledge.

Langstraat, F. and R. Van Melik. (2013). Challenging the 'end of public space': A comparative analysis of publicness in British and Dutch urban spaces. *Journal of Urban Design*, 18(3), 429-448.

Miller, K. (2007). *Designs on the public: The private lives of New York's public spaces*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. Ch. 2.

Németh, J., & Schmidt, S. (2011). The privatization of public space: modeling and measuring publicness. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 38(1), 5-23.

Wilson, J., & Kelling, G. (1982). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3), 29-38.

Week 13 | April 15: Urban, regional, and national park master/comprehensive plans

Chawla, L. (2020). Childhood nature connection and constructive hope: A review of research on connecting with nature and coping with environmental loss. *People and Nature, 2(3),* 619-642.

City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks. (2019). Open Space and Mountain Parks Master Plan.

Denver Parks and Recreation. (2008). Denver Mountain Parks Master Plan.

Denver Parks and Recreation. (2021). Sunken Gardens Park Master Plan.

Project for Public Spaces. (2000). The benefits and drawbacks of masterplanning. Excerpt from *Public Parks, Private Partners*.

National Recreation and Park Association. n.d. Creating equity-based system master plans.

Week 14 | April 22: Environmental justice and privilege *(read any three articles below)*

Anguelovski, I. (2016). From toxic sites to parks as (green) LULUs? New challenges of inequity, privilege, gentrification, and exclusion for urban environmental justice. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 31(1), 23-36.

Barcelona Lab for Urban Environmental Justice (2021). *Policy and planning tools for urban green justice*.

Boone, C., Buckley, G., Grove, J., & Sister, C. (2009). Parks and people: An environmental justice inquiry in Baltimore, Maryland. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(4), 767-787.

Gould, K. & Lewis, T. (2012). The environmental injustice of green gentrification. In T. Shortell & J. DeSena. *The world in Brooklyn: Gentrification, immigration, and ethnic politics in a global city* (113-146). Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Kennedy, S. (2008). The garden (film). Accessed at: https://go.exlibris.link/TgtZqJ2S.

Penney, V. (2020). Denver wants to fix a legacy of environmental racism. *The New York Times*, 30 September.

Quinton, J., L. Nesbitt, J.T. Connolly, & E. Wyly. (2023). How common is greening in gentrifying areas?, *Urban Geography*, DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2023.2258687.

Quinton, J., L. Nesbitt, D. Sax, & L. Harris. (2024). Greening the gentrification process: Insights and engagements from practitioners. *EPE: Nature and Space,* DOI: 10.1177/25148486241236281.

Rigolon, A. (2016). A complex landscape of inequity in access to urban parks: A literature review. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 153, 160-169.

Rigolon, A. (2017). Parks and young people: An environmental justice study of park proximity, acreage, and quality in Denver, Colorado. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 165, 73-83.

Rigolon, A. (2023). The green gentrification cycle. *Urban Studies*, 60, 770-785.

Rigolon, A. (2024). *Great parks should not uproot communities: Green gentrification risk factors and anti-displacement options*. San Francisco: Trust for Public Land.

Rigolon, A. et al. (2024). Advancing green space equity via policy change: A scoping review and research agenda. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 157.

Rigolon, A., & J. Németh. (2018). What shapes uneven access to urban amenities? Thick injustice and the legacy of racial discrimination in Denver's parks. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 41, 312-325.

Rigolon, A., & J. Németh. (2018). What shapes uneven access to urban amenities? Thick injustice and the legacy of racial discrimination in Denver's parks. *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 41, 312-325.

Week 15 | April 29: Urban trails, greenways, and linear parks

Building Bridges Across the River. (n.d.). 11th Street Bridge Park. (Browse website).

Fehr & Peers. (2019). Denver Moves: Pedestrians & Trails. (Read especially p. 50 onward).

Highline Canal Conservancy. (2019). The plan for the Highline Canal.

Jefferson County Open Space. (2020). JeffcoTrails Plan.

Lacy Consulting Services. (2023). Community engagement for High Line Canal improvements. Prepared for High Line Canal Conservancy.

Rigolon, A. & J. Németh. (2018). Why certain parks gentrify surrounding neighborhoods and what we can do about it. *Science Trends, 29 November.*

Rigolon, A. & J. Németh. (2020). Green gentrification or "just green enough": Do park location, size, and function affect whether a place gentrifies or not? *Urban Studies*, 57, 402-420.

Week 16 | May 6: Open space, recreation, resilience, and ecosystem services

Chapman, R. et al., (2021). The power of parks to address climate change. Washington, DC: Trust for Public Land.

Denver Parks and Recreation. (2019). Game Plan for a Healthy City.

Duerksen, C. et al. (1997). Habitat protection planning: Where the wild things are. Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Report 470/471. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association, Chapters 2-4.

Garvin, A. (2000). Parks, recreation, and open space: A 21st century agenda. Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Report 497/498. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association.

Then choose 2-3 of these readings on ecosystem services…

Elderbrock, E. et al. (2020). A guide to public green space planning for urban ecosystem services. *Land,* 9, 391.

Ibes, D. (2016) Integrating ecosystem services into urban park planning and design.*Cities and the Environment (CATE)*, 9.

McPhearson, T., Z. Hamstead and P. Kremer. 2014. Urban ecosystem services for resilience planning and management in New York City. *AMBIO*, 43, 502–515.

McPhearson, T. et al. (2015). Resilience of and through urban ecosystem services. *Ecosystem Services*, 12, 152–156.

Mexia, T. et al. (2018). Ecosystem services:Urban parks under a magnifying glass. *Environmental Research,* 160, 469–478.

Sutton, P. and S. Anderson. (2016). Holistic valuation of urban ecosystem services in New York City's Central Park. *Ecosystem Services*, 19, 87-91.