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Abstract: Space and society are related in certain ways. It is hard to study space without considering its social context or to study society without considering its space. This relation is a two process in which people and society form and change spaces, while they are affected by these spaces in various ways. In this regard, the issues discussed by experts from various approaches are studied in this research. Research results suggest that public space is a space for interaction and forming relations. The physical and social effects of public space on creating civil societies and institutions are increasing.
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Quiddity of Public Places:

Space is a set of relations between objects. As Aristotle has claimed, space does not need to be restricted in all aspects nor needs to have an end. There is a relation between observer and space and an organized ratio relates these two to each other. This ratio is not a fixed and predetermined ratio, but it is the individual’s location which defines the space. The simpler the spatial structure of this relation, the easier its understanding as a totality and the complexity in this order leads to pursue for more details, conversely. This space is a center upon which all spatial relations are formed. (Grutter, 1987) Fields are expandable while spreading and they define a position or environment in physical and psychological aspects. Generally, forms, colors and movements are formed by relations and they are sometimes empty or negative and sometimes they determine the distance between elements, whether this distance is on the surface or in depth which are visualized by perspectives rules. Two dimensional spaces attain length and width and decorative space is restricted in length and width. (Sadr, 2001).

Bruno Zevi introduces architecture as space art and introduces space as the essence of architecture. However, he doesn’t specify the nature of the discussed space. His grasp from space is realistic. In his opinion, no matter how pretty walls or view of a house or a church, they are containers which form the box. Entity and containees is the inner space. Nature of architecture to Zevi is meaningful organization of space through restriction process. Hence, according to this point of view, space is a material with a uniform expansion which could be formed by determining its restrictions thorough various methods. Bruno Zevi defines a new space as urban space by generalizing architecture space concept. He believes that architecture space experience is sustained in city, streets, squares, alleys, parks, stadiums, yards and any place which is determined by human through restricting its gaps to provide enclosed spaces. (Zevi, 1957) If space is enclosed in a building in six surfaces (floor, ceiling and four walls) it does not necessarily mean that the space enclosed in five surfaces (like yard or a square) instead of six surfaces, is not considered as a space. However, could a straight highway which is expanded for a long distance in an uninhabited plain considered as a spatial experience? Obviously, anything which is restricted by a surface – such as building a wall, planting a tree or any element which specifies architectural spaces – is considered as urban space. Based on the above explanations, Zevi concludes that each building forms two spaces simultaneously: internal space which is determined by the architecture and the external space or urban space which is formed by architectural spaces close to it. (Zevi, 1957) Space could be categorized in three categories of geography, life and architecture. Geographical space is a subjective space since it could not be perceived directly. Life space is a semi-subjective space since some of its features could be directly perceived and some of its other features could be identified through information. The third space, which is objectively perceived, is sensed directly through its defining elements and it is a space which workers built based on the plan as a three dimensional and material space. (Grutter, 1987) There is a fundamental difference between the space on the plan – or the mathematical space – and real and tangible space. They could not be considered as equal. Bolinow defines this relation as the following: If all live perceivable space relations are neglected and degrade life concept as an intelligible concept, mathematical space is formed. All points are
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comfortable. On American society description, Eldenburg claims that since institutions could not meet working other spaces are located at the center of the neighborhood. The main idea is to satisfy people and make them democratic and to some extent reassuring. (Goodsell, 2001) Coffee shops, bookstores, bars, barber shops and high culture, and objects related or associated with people. As a result, visitors find this temple horrific, yet impressive and open – a daily symbol of absolute power, a symbol of elected government, a furniture showcase of transparency, order, immortality and predictability considering the power of the government. Yet, Adelman notes that the meaning and significance which promote architecture is a subjective matter. Spaces like legislating halls and courts are symbols of legitimacy and equality for some people, while they are considered as government oppression and domination of elite class. (Adelman, 1995) Leon Carrier published an article under the title of “The Only Solution of Architecture” with the help of his old friend Morris Loco and he introduced that as a charter from people, which threatens modern architecture. According to this article, the only solution of architecture to survive modern eclecticism and dispersal is returning to European urban traditions. The main objection of Carrier and Loco is to capitalism in architecture which, according to them, is a conspiracy from a group of arrogant and greedy architects in building industry. (Newmeyer, 2002) While emphasizing on the essence of providing services for public interests seem easy, determining and defining these interests in each situation is hard. Participants in development processes hold different and often conflicting interests, while the imagination of built environment experts on public interests mostly based on limited professional factors. Determining these public interests often involves negotiations between rival parties. (Lang, 1994).

Public Space from Architectural Point of View:

Architectural view towards this category is due to public architecture political analyses. The common theme between these is the quality of design and skeletal space symbols which improve the political power. Castle-like buildings, like the Pentagon and FBI HQ in Washington, present themselves as a reassuring agent which will overcome threats such as war, crimes and terrorism to people. This greatness of public buildings induces a sense of transparency, order, immortality and predictability considering the power of the government. Yet, Adelman notes that the meaning and significance which promote architecture is a subjective matter. Spaces like legislating halls and courts are symbols of legitimacy and equality for some people, while they are considered as government oppression and domination of elite class. (Adelman, 1995) Leon Carrier published an article under the title of “The Only Solution of Architecture” with the help of his old friend Morris Loco and he introduced that as a charter from people, which threatens modern architecture. According to this article, the only solution of architecture to survive modern eclecticism and dispersal is returning to European urban traditions. The main objection of Carrier and Loco is to capitalism in architecture which, according to them, is a conspiracy from a group of arrogant and greedy architects in building industry. (Newmeyer, 2002) While emphasizing on the essence of providing services for public interests seem easy, determining and defining these interests in each situation is hard. Participants in development processes hold different and often conflicting interests, while the imagination of built environment experts on public interests mostly based on limited professional factors. Determining these public interests often involves negotiations between rival parties. (Lang, 1994).

In my studies on other building types, like Congress Building, I similarly figured out that, significant public buildings display government’s highpower to ordinary citizens and they provide a situation in which citizens think of themselves and the government as one. Another instance of dichotomy is the Congress which is both impressive and open – a daily symbol of absolute power, a symbol of elected government, a furniture showcase and high culture, and objects related or associated with people. As a result, visitors find this temple horrific, yet democratic and to some extent reassuring. (Goodsell, 2001) Coffee shops, bookstores, bars, barber shops and other spaces are located at the center of the neighborhood. The main idea is to satisfy people and make them comfortable. On American society description, Eldenburg claims that since institutions could not meet working
people’s needs and expectations, people need space and stimuli which could provide them with certain social territories. Although open spaces may seem formless and scattered, informal life is in progress in such spaces due to their nuclear arrangement. The “third location”, which he refers to, includes various public spaces which receive communities which happily gather together away from home and work and they are often casual and informal. (Eldenburg, 1989).

Public Space from Urban Planning Point of View:
Modern urbanization is an expression which is used about some patterns which appeared in second half of 1980s and early 1990 in the U.S. for the first time. The expression includes neo-traditionalist neighboring units or traditional neighboring units development. There was a convergence between these patterns which included user interaction, environment sensitivity, a compatible innate hierarchy of architectural varieties such as building and street edges and visible centers, being pedestrian compatible and relying on graphical guides. (Kelbaugh, 1997) w urbanizers, who became official by forming Congress for the New Urbanism in 1993 and issuing New Urbanism charter in Athens 1933’s Charter form, made themselves committed to link building art and forming communities through planning and designing by the participation if citizens. (CNU, 1999).

The contemporary considerations on urban planning are based on criticisms of various professions in one environment (Lang, 1994).

Streets, sidewalks, parks, plazas, malls, squares and beaches are all the essentials for sense of collective identity and providing a place for dialogue. In a significant text on this topic, public space is described as a scene which public life is appeared on. Such places are considered as social paste and past relation factor which are accumulated through personal memories and historical monuments. (Karr, Francis and Rivilin, 1992) The speed which automobiles have imposed on urban life has changed human perception to space. Space is considered as a context which must be coordinated with communication and transportation systems, more than ever. Building each building in the city could be named as a process of visible communication network in space. Space organization is an organization in mass scale. Tange believes that the main context of urban planning in the present time is thinking to a space organization as system of communication and as a live body with change and growth. (Tange, 1970).

Public Space from Sociological Point of View:
Wallin defines the contemporary public spaces under the term of demystic space, a space of unknown and abstract relations which are in contradiction with proxemics space – a space which all relations are under control. In contrast with these two spaces, society includes strangers who live in one public space. Such society is a world of shopping centers, televisions and the Internet, a capitalistic culture in which society has a passive emotional, mental state and consumer-oriented state. (Wallin, 1998) Jurgen Habermas believes in the common idea of public space. Habermannin the encyclopedia part, defines the public arena as the dialogue domain for independent individuals on topics related to public interest. This dialogue includes a wide range of discussions from personal and close discussions to open discussions in publications. The main feature in public arena is its public access. Anyone must be able to enter them and relations in them are completely free from any kind of limitations. This arena has the capacity of providing independent referee and critics such as criticism of government’s plans and activities. Public arena has changed to a sort of semi-private semi-public domain in which logical discussion on significant topics is substituted by public opinions strategic modification. Wise criticism of government has been overwhelmed by personal interests for gaining economic privileges and social rights. (Habermas, 1974) Colin Rosees the public space in defining collective will and he claims the idea of modernism was a significant stance in its very first emergence. However, modernist architects must bear in mind that despite their tendency for modern stud, their main ideas are not only not modern but they are old and in need of review. Colin Rowe suggests that modernists’ ideas on the value of science date back to Francis Bacon and Newton and their beliefs on collective will is affected by Russo and Berk, in 18th century. He believes that the contemporary architecture is caught between the attractiveness of macro-science on the one hand and society’s unconscious self-regulation on the other hand. According to him, modernism is somehow trapped in social Darwinism and to justify itself, it needs to censor and collect between various natural objects. (Rowe, 1997).

According to Hannah Arendt, public space is a domain of public activities and it is necessary for democratic citizens. This domain is a place where citizens begin to deal with collective research and common actions for public interests. Arendt claims that modernism psychological and economic forces force citizens to personal world and economic demands and this ruins the difference between public space and private space. (Goodsell, 2003) She argues that estrangement in public world in accordance with two aspects must be reversed. One of these two aspects is the explanatory aspect which is called appearance space. Based on this, she considers actions and efforts of personal explanation in belief of public topics. It is in this aspect of public spaces which citizens present their identities and form a relation of retaliation or consensus. The second aspect of public space is the
common world and based on it she considers the artifacts, institutions and public activity environments which separate individuals from nature and provide fields for their social life. (Goodsell, 2003).

**Public Space and Three Theories:**
Comparing the past three discussions the following topics are discussed more in each discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Topics</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Urban Planners</th>
<th>Sociologists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Public monuments</td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>Government’s Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectiv Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Life</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By studying public space fields, it seems that discussing urban planning is of significance. The increasing interest of urban and public design is due to the following items: urban environment, development process and profession’s role in controlling its products. (Bentley, 1970) Meanwhile, urban environment includes a space which makes interactions between human, society and nature possible. Interactive space in public life could be studied considering the urban planners criteria. Hence, urban planners view is considered as the main view in this research so its various scales in design are studied.

**Urban Society:**
More studies are needed on public space and hypotheses related to people’s public life. The meaning of words public and private must be understood. Loukaitou, Sideris and Banerjee believe that public life includes relatively open and global social fields and stand in opposition with private life which is defined as close, familiar, sheltered, controlled by individuals and sharable with family members. Public space domain includes physical and social aspects. The physical domain of public spaces refers to spaces which are possessed by private or public, ease public life flow and social interactions and provide them. Activities and events which happen in these spaces and fields are called the social-cultural domain of public spaces. (Loukaitou, Sideris and Banerjee, 1998) Public space domain which is defined as a field for people’s life includes public space. This domain is ideally considered as a place for political protests and reunions and it is a neutral place for social interaction personal growth and information exchange. Although these activities seldom take place in public space domain, providing definitions related to ideal conditions brings about criteria which could help in determining the distance between the real situation and ideal one. From the political point of view, public space domain (which is usually called democratic public domain) includes performances which are presented in relation with individuals’ citizenship and their existence in urban society. Political public domain theory without public space has been taken into consideration by many authors. (Loukaitou, Sideris and Banerjee, 1998).

Hannah Arendt sees city as an autonomous unit or society, politically, in which citizens deal with their own discussions and problems. She believes that to protect public space domain three regulations must be met: By protecting people lives, society is preserved and a sense of history is transferred to it. (Ford, 2000) City is a space in which various groups of people engage in discussions and it is an environment which is available to all people. (Ellin, 1996) Habermas’s theory on public space arena is alignment of this space between government space and personal and family space. He believes that public space refers to a space in which relations between people are formed. His ideas are based on developing various spaces such as coffee shops and saloons which were formed by newspapers and magazines in Europe in eighteenth century and formed new form of discussions in the current societies. (Habermas, 1962) Boyer believes that any reference which is made to the word public nowadays is naturally referring to a society, while public is referred to separate groups of people who don’t have a voice for themselves and don’t participate in public space domain. (Boyer, 1993) Most theorists have been observing the decrease in public space domain meaning which is partly due to the public life and public space meanings. Ellin claims that many social activities have been moved to private spaces, entertainment activities, information gathering, and consumption are mostly done at home via television and the Internet. Activities which were done in groups are now done in private by individuals and spaces are affected by certain improvements such as people mobility by automobiles and the Internet. Social relations in today’s public spaces are affected by the conflicts between the demand for creating social spaces and the need for moving around by automobiles. Automobiles ease the public space controlling. Lack of engagement in public spaces and services related to them lead to the tendency for privatization. (Ellin, 1996).

**Public Space:**
Generally speaking, public space domain refers to the spaces which are available to people which include the followings:

External public spaces: Pieces of land which are located between private properties. In urban spaces squares, streets, highways, parks and parking lots and in rural regions coastline, jungles, lakes and rivers are
considered as external public places. These spaces, which are available to the public, display themselves in the purest shapes. (Carmona, 2003).

Internal public spaces: Internal public spaces include libraries, museums, theaters, transportation facilities such as trains, bus stops and airports.

![Fig. 1: External public space.](image1)

![Fig. 2: Semi-public internal and external space.](image2)

Semi-public internal and external spaces: Although spaces such as campuses, sports fields, restaurants, cinemas and shopping centers are legally considered as private, they are parts of public spaces domain. Since all owners and executers of these spaces have the rights related to access control and behavior in such environments, such urban spaces are named as public private space (Carmona, 2003) These spaces are namely public; Sorkin calls these spaces as fake public spaces. (Sorkin, 1992).

Clearly, a range of publicity could be observed in public space domain. In addition to principles related to space creation, the access and the neutrality of the space must be studied. Although, accessing space means the space capacity of entry and usage of space in urban planning, most of open public spaces are not available to public, while public space, semi-public space and determining limitations and restrictions between these two spaces are hard to define. (Carmona, 2003).

Benregi claims that urban planners have a broader definition of life in open public space, instead of the limited definition of these spaces which include physical body of these spaces. He believes that although most public life is formed in public spaces, this public life flow in privates paces such as amusement parks, small business spaces, coffee shops, bookstores and other third locations. Benregi believes that urban planning focuses in creating social space regardless of the fact if the natural public or private spaces are available to public. (Banerjee, 2001).

Life in public spaces could be generally divided into two related varieties: formal and informal. The life style which is mostly considered in urban planning is the informal lifestyle which is formed above the formal framework of space and includes freedom of choice. Public space usually requires a management to balance the personal interests and public interests. Clearly, this includes finding a balance between freedom and control. Considering the issue of access as in the space being open, he believes that this openness means free choice and sudden emergence of public movements. He, on the other hand, believes that although free usage of public space may lead to problems and endanger people or the power factor in the environment, it is considered as one of the main values. We value the fact that anyone has the right to speak or act freely. When individuals act more comfortable in space, it is easier to deal with them. (Lynch, 1972) The space openness feature which is used by freedom leads to displaying certain ways of using the space and forming exciting social interactions. Having the sense of freedom of choice in public spaces is a critical factor. According to Karr et al., this issue includes determining activities which a person likes to perform in public space, considering the fact that public space is a common space. (Lynch and Karr, 1979).

Although public spaces might be regulated by issuing regulations, applying certain controls on behaviors and activities are clearer in semi-public spaces. Active control, which private security guards apply, surveillance cameras and planned regulations, could prevent some activities. (Karr et al., 1992).

**Public Interactive Space:**

Based on combining research results and ideas which are used in public spaces, Karr et al. claim that, in addition to being meaningful, urban public spaces must be responsible, as well. Urban public spaces must be responsible in the sense that they have to be planned and managed so they can meet users’ needs. They must meet the first five needs of convenience, comfort, passive engagement with the environment, active engagement with the environment and the possibility of exploring the environment. Good places usually meet more than one need. (Karr et al., 1992).
Convenience: Convenience is prerequisite of a successful public space. The time period people spend in a public space is considered as its performance and convenience. The sense of convenience includes various environmental, physical and social factors. Karr et al. claimed that the need for mental continence is deep and extensive which is associated with individual’s experiences in public spaces. The sense of security in which an individual feels themselves and whatever belongs to them are not in danger. The sense of convenience could be improved by physical design of space or management strategies. (Karr et al., 1992).

Comfort: Mental comfort could be considered as the prerequisite of comfort. Comfort is a more advanced state of body and soul. (Karr et al., 1992) The position of elements such as trees, vegetation, fountains and separation form roadway traffic in urban sites, could help to increase the contrast with the surrounding space and help with the space calmness. Elements which hide the space and prevent the visual access, lead to security issues and encourage not using the space. (Carmona, 2003).

Passive engagement with the environment: Although passive engagement with environment may lead to a sense of comfort, it includes engagement with environment without engaging with its performances. (Karr et al., 1992) Maybe the first form of passive engagement is people visiting an environment. To put it another way, what attracts people is other people, life and the performance they bring along. (White, 1980).

Active engagement with the environment: Active engagement with the environment is a more direct experience of the space for the users. Although some people might be satisfied by watching others in their social relations, some people need more direct contact with their friends, acquaintances and strangers. Successful public spaces create various opportunities for various levels of engagement, and also not engaging with others. Designing public space domain could provide opportunities for creating contacts. Uncommon elements and/or certain events could create a triangle: a process in which a relation is formed between people and strangers by the help of external stimuli. (Carmona, 2003).

Exploration: There is a high tendency to participate in new shows and enjoyable experiences which are dependent on the changes in the environment. These cases might be formed simply through the time and by the change in seasons or they could be formed by another form of environment management or public spaces shows. Exploration motivation could be formed by breaking the old predictable habits and routines. (Carmona, 2003).

Understand the relation between society and environment is among the key issues in designing. The first idea which must be considered is the certainty principle of the effect of architecture which expresses that the physical environment has a determining effect on human behavior. By rejecting the fact that human is a factor, the relation between human and its environment is considered as a one-way process. Humans are not passive.
People affect their environment and they change it the same way the space affect and change them. Hence, this is a two-way process. Although the physical factor is not the only effective factor or the dominant effective factor on human behavior, the opportunities which environment creates could affect what people want or don’t want to perform. A window in a wall could provide an opportunity for a human to look outside, but a solid wall could not provide such opportunity. Hence, human behavior is innately dependent on the situation and related to the physical, social and cultural form and the amount of human understanding. Anything that happens in a space is dependent on its users. (Carmona, 2003).

On this account, Gans differentiates between environments which have the potential which provide a range of opportunities and environments which are created due to the people’s usage and performance. (Gans, 1968) Choices which are formed environment are related to the condition and characteristics of each user. (Personal ideals, characteristics, objectives and values, available resources, past experiences, life level) In case of computers, these features are like the hardware. Despite the complexity and belonging to personal values, individuals’ objectives and ideas are referred to as a hierarchy in human needs by many authors. (Carmona, 2008) There has been lot of efforts made to create positive collective space in many cities during recent decades. Using the up-to-date technology has had a great role on attracting people to public spaces. Using the public spaces and people’s participation, an interactive space between people and defined place are formed. One of the uses of technology and mixing it with public spaces are the installations. Installation is using various elements for expressing artists experience from a certain space. Using installations are growing since the beginning of this century. Elements which are used in installations include a wide range of elements: from regular daily materials and nature to media, computer and the Internet shows. Installations try to redefine the public space and remove the weakness points of certain spaces. Meanwhile, active engagement with the space is the main characteristics of them and they create a passive engagement in people in a collective relation through attracting people. (Bishop, 2005).

Case Study, Interactive Public Space:

The most recent and highly successful interactive installation in the Italian courtyard of the V&A, as a museum built in 1909, designed by UVA with sound by the band Massive Attack: 46 2.5-metre (8.2-foot) high columns that are in fact a grid of LED lights that form an ‘orchestra’ with modulated colour to match the changing mood of the overall piece. A digital camera with its own image-processing computer, placed high up in the courtyard, analyses the installation and figures out where people are. Walking up to a column increases the volume of its sound; walking away decreases it. If a visitor stopped moving for long enough, he or she became invisible and the column deactivated until they moved again. (AD Magazine, 2007).

Case Study, Interactive Public Space:

In under scan, Relational Architecture 11 (2005–06), commissioned by the East Midlands Development Agency in the UK, a set of portraits became the principal focus for interaction. Thousands of ‘video portraits’ taken in Derby, Leicester, Lincoln, Northampton and Nottingham, of ordinary people chosen at random in the street, were projected on to the ground of the main squares and pedestrian thoroughfares of these cities with the permission of the individuals involved. (AD Magazine, 2007).
As it was mentioned before, using technology could be effective in attracting people to public space. Such projects induce a sense of social life by attracting people to public spaces. On the other hand, using such installations is carried out well while considering the five principles of forming a desirable public space. The importance of this issue is due the significance which a view adds to people’s life. (Shoemaker and Taylor, 1983) It also provides the grounds for exploring qualities and features which make it lovable. Although identifying the choices which might lead to success in one perspective does not guarantee creating a lovable space, considering its features and qualities could help with the objective of forming a space which brings about comfort. It also provides a familiarity with cities and turns the perspective for forming the public life. Attachment is a significant part of a person’s life and attachment to the environment is important to humans. (Ryan, 2005).

To put it another way, the two-way sense of interaction is formed in two-way conversation and interaction of human and perspective. On the one hand, human with its needs, expectations, and spatial backgrounds and on the other hand, perspective with its capacities and dynamic physical features form this relation. Public space is a place which is lived and perceived and it is the context for social events and interactions.

Time, addressee’s flow moments and spatial differentiating events in one perspective could give it various faces and effects. Sometimes, what attaches addressees are higher than the physical elements and space and event, suppositions and feelings patterns of addressees have a fundamental role. (Carmona, 2008).

Conclusion:

As it was mentioned before, the general definition of public space as an integrated space-time structure is for plain people and affects its social aspect. In addition to that, the role of public space in reaching social objectives is special and inevitably limited. Considering the context is significant factor in introducing the space to public, since the public space does not tolerate a special style or idea. The main issue for designing space is understanding the effects of time on that certain location. Time could bring about effects which could return in intervals or have and evolution irreversible effect. As it was claimed earlier, topics such as urban location and urban life have significance in urban planners’ views. The other aspect to this topic is on considering the urban locations which includes the effect of public locations on human’s collective memory during the time that may lead to creating opportunities and limitations. On the other hand, technologies have had a great role in defining public spaces. These effects give tidings of redefinition of public spaces. The experience of urban environment is a dynamic activity in which movement and times have meaning. Hence, if the time dimension is added to the graphical introduction, the perception of space is more complete. Various technologies have come to existence to record and transfer the experience of three dimensional and four dimensional spaces in consecutive time. Due to the attachment people have formed with televisions, they can simply perceive projects which are introduced through this method. Four dimensional presenting methods utilized in introducing urban environments and designing suggestions could be of significance in forming relations and satisfying addressees. New techniques have made it possible for the addressees to move through a public space and use the various experiences.
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