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1. Introduction

Planning new road systems or changes to existing ones, is not as straightforward as it might seem. Drawing straight roads on a map might be easy, but on location it creates conflicts as the lines intersect with various local actors. Changes to road systems affect not only car drivers, but a wide range of actors. Planning such changes involves difficult decisions and prioritizations. The presentation of such plans involves pointing at important problems and solutions, while leaving other concerns unresolved. As different solutions have different consequences for actors in the area, multiple interpretations of the adequacy of the solutions co-exist.

This thesis deals with a planning process where such conflicts become visible as plans are presented and commented on. The subject matter of this thesis is the rebuilding of the traffic system at Økern in Oslo. The central problems of the area, as defined by the planners, were high volumes of traffic, bottle-necks, poor local air quality and mixed local and transit traffic, and their main solution was to separate local and transit traffic and leading transit traffic underground in a new tunnel. However, in the wake of these larger changes, other actors are also affected. This thesis will therefore not study the tunnel, but focus on how the question of public transport was planned accommodated for, how private property intersects with plans, and the effect of the changes on green corridors in this area.

In his book “Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed” James Scott notes that there are limits to how effective a top down grid-like sense of planning is for social order and efficiency. Instead he emphasizes the “indispensable role of practical knowledge, informal processes, and improvisation in the face of unpredictability” (Scott 1998:6). Planning new road systems is also faced with such unpredictable situations as plans on a map are confronted with other actors. Even before the
actors are faced by any material changes to their surroundings they may enter the negotiation. For example, as we shall see in chapter 6, a property only represented as a marked area on a map might suddenly be defended by a strong owner. Planning road systems thus includes a large variety of human and non-human actors and their relations. Therefore the theoretical framework I have chosen to use in this study is anchored in actor-network theory. Especially I will make use of the concepts of framing, program & anti-program and good & bad passages. My motivation for choosing this framework was also my interest in testing its usefulness for understanding what goes on in the documents of a road planning process. Therefore I have constructed this primary research problem:

*How can actor-network theory in combination with document analysis be fruitful in explaining planning documents’ presentations, prioritizations and interventions?*

In order to study the chosen issues of the planning process in a structured and comparable manner, I have also formulated two more specific interconnected questions:

*How do different representations of the road planning process frame the problems and solutions of the project, and how do these frames order the social and environmental factors involved?*

*Considering how the planning has been framed, have some concerns been left out later on to accommodate for the priorities? What reasons, if any, are given for this?*

The empirical material I will make use of consists of planning documents and official responses to these. In studying this particular area this is somewhat essential as the constructions are yet to be completed. Rather than studying the chosen case as one large unit, I have chosen to focus on three restricted sub-cases in order to go more in detail and bring the chosen theoretical concepts to the test. The three stories will provide snapshots of three different sites of conflict over framing of concerns and how this affects accommodating for
priorities. These three stories involve negotiations and disagreements over the formulation of
problems and solutions as well as questions of the identity of places and the scale of actors.
Parallels will however also be drawn between the three sub-cases. The aim of this study is
thus to test how the chosen theoretical concepts can be used for studying planning documents
and interventions.

First I will present the methodology chosen (section 2), introduce my theoretical framework
(section 3) and give some necessary background information for the case of Økern (section
4). Then the sub-cases follow, which present three stories dealing with public transport
(section 5), private property (section 6) and green corridors (section 7) respectively. Each of
the sub-cases contains discussions of relevant theory, interpretation of the empirical material
and some preliminary conclusions. Finally, I present some conclusions regarding empirical
findings and the functionality of the theoretical concepts as well as point to some further
research questions (section 8).
2. Methodology

This study is designed as a case study with three sub-cases. There are several reasons for this. First of all this approach gives the possibility for deeper analysis. Secondly, the three sub-cases make it possible to customize the use of theoretical concepts for each case at the same time as the common context creates coherence and comparability. Furthermore, the three sub-cases also provide the thesis with a narrative structure; it tells three related stories. The empirical material further contributed to the design by providing some concrete cases which spurred my interest for looking into them more in detail, rather than handling the planning process as a single case.

2.1 Choosing the Right Method

Urban phenomena can be studied in multiple ways and with different focal points. The focus of these studies affects choice of method and empirical material. The formulation of research questions can give studies different directions even if the objects of study are the same. Others have studied urban renewal and road building, but used other methods and empirical material as the focal points of these studies were formulated differently. This can be illustrated by considering studies focusing on how citizens’ and planners’ views differ in respect to planning. An example of such a study is Mikkel Schønning Sørensen’s study “Projective Planning – An Inquiry into the Justifications for Urban Planning” (2007). This doctoral dissertation investigates the physical and symbolic construction of a new urban core in Stockholm and how cooperation between planning in public sector and private entrepreneurs represent a projective planning new to Sweden, increasingly focusing on consumerism and capitalism (ibid:17). In addition to studying planning documents, Sørensen spent long days observing in the streets, shopping malls and squares of the area and conducted interviews with planners and citizens (ibid:18ff). Sørensen’s study is similar to mine in that he sees planning
as a social activity happening in a network of relations (ibid:16). His focus is however on wider phenomena of planning like consumerism, capitalism and globalization and how the citizens and planners justify and evaluate these developments (ibid:14&22). My current study of the Økern area will also focus on different actors and networked relations, but in contrast to Sørensen’s study the focus will be how these networks come forth in official representations of the planning process. This takes shape as public exchanges of meanings on certain aspects of the physical elements presented in the plan. The planners propose and present, receive interventions and thereafter present their answers to these interventions. The comments often take the shape of defending the choices made without making changes, but occasionally also take the shape of changing plans by bringing in ideas from the interventions.

When designing a good case study the connection between research questions, empirical material and methods is of great importance. In studies seeking to capture the city dwellers’ experiences of the surrounding environment and planned changes to it, interviews and observations are a necessity. This study, however, seeks to capture how planning documents capture framing of problems and solutions, how social and environmental factors are ordered according to these frames, and whether or not something is left unsaid. For the purpose of this study document analysis is the natural choice. As the road system in question is yet to be completed, document analysis is also somewhat an essential choice as the material aspects are not yet present. Document analysis further provides the possibility to limit the scope of the thesis in order to complete it within the time provided.

2.2 Document Analysis

I have chosen to focus on the official planning documents and the public interventions to them in the form of letters from affected individuals, organizations and institutions, but I will also occasionally venture into broader strategic documents which consider the area as a
whole. The reason for this is that many of the broader strategic documents acted as vision statements and references when the central planning documents in my study were being worked out. The documents can be seen to be hierarchically ordered; the detailed plans actively work on the statements from the former strategic statements and use them as ideal models to aim towards. I have studied the documents by focusing on some chosen sub-cases and selecting the most relevant material and statements from the documents. The chosen theory has greatly affected my selection of cases and material. The focus on framing and actor-network theory led me to choose cases where conflicting interpretations on behalf of planners and affected parties were present and cases that showed the complexity of coordinating solutions providing for multiple actors and needs.

Considering that this study will focus on planning documents, it is worth noticing the potential importance of these documents in further planning. As planners navigate on the grounds of other plans when they make new ones, the representations of actors and networks in planning documents is important for this navigation and for future planning in this geographical area and in other planning processes in the future. It is worth noting that the order established in the documents is negotiable, but nevertheless has widespread influence on further planning documents as it creates clearly defined problems and fields of desired developments.

### 2.3 Some Comments on the Limitations of the Method

Even though studying documents can be a fruitful way of understanding some aspects of urban planning processes, it is by no means a way to understand all aspects of them. First and foremost it is worth making a note on representations and representability. Representations in planning documents possibly only offer the opinions of resourced members of the public who are able and willing to invest time and energy on (a) keeping themselves up to date on
planning and becoming aware of the contents of the plans in the first place (note that normal procedure is that directly affected parties are sent a letter informing them about the plans and encouraging them to give comments and critique, which was also the case in this case), and (b) writing a response letter within the one-month time limit (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:6). It is therefore likely that there exist aspects of the cases which are not visible in this analysis, as they are not represented in the documents. Relevant to this is the common criticism of actor-network theory that it focuses on strong actors as they are more visible in actor-networks (Sismondo 2004:71f). In this study certain actors will fall outside due both to the method (document analysis) and to the theory (actor-network theory), as both seem more suited to describe strong actors; visible ones. In a study seeking to understand how different social actors with different social traits and resources relate to such a planning process this would have been a major problem. However, my ambition is not to criticize or generalize around presentations and commenting practices in planning processes, but rather to provide some snapshots of disagreements as they are represented in planning documents, interventions and answers to interventions. The focus is not on arriving at quantifiable results, but rather on exploring some specific cases in a qualitative manner.

2.4 Empirical Materials and Individual Anonymity

One of the sub-cases of this study involves a property and its owner. I have chosen not to use this owner’s full name, but rather his initials. As this thesis will be available in its full length and searchable on the internet I found it necessary to anonymize this individual in the text. It is undesirable that this thesis comes up as the first hit on this individual’s name and that commenting on planning processes should involve a fear of being written about afterwards. However, for the sake of verifiability it is also preferable that the case can be identified correctly (Yin 2009:181f). For this reason I have used the owner’s initials both in the text and
in the references to his letters. Mentioning this individual only by the initials maintains
anonymity in a satisfactory manner, but at the same time makes it possible to review the data
by going to the online material, where the individual will be recognizable by using the
detailed references provided.
3. Theoretical Framework

This section will present an outline of the theoretical framework of the study, the thorough presentation and discussion of the theoretical concepts will however be found in the sub-case sections where the relevant theory is being used. The reason for my decision to present the theory along with the sub-cases is mainly that each sub-case has been appointed one main set of theoretical concepts, and that I wanted to present the relevant theory and the empirical material as unified entities. Here I will present the overall theoretical framework and provide a short presentation of the main theoretical concepts. In the course of the thesis, I will also occasionally venture into some relevant geography literature in relation to the cases, but this will be presented in the relevant context.

3.1 Actor-Network Theory

Sheila Jasanoff has stated that “Increasingly, the realities of human experience emerge as the joint achievements of scientific, technical and social enterprise: science and society, in a word, are co-produced, each underwriting the other’s existence” (Jasanoff 2004:17, italics in original). Road planning is an activity involving both the planning of material roads and judgments of the social impact of various solutions. Seeing planning of road systems as a sociotechnical enterprise is therefore an important aim of this thesis. In order to study these multifaceted connections actor-network theory (ANT) will provide my main theoretical framework. ANT is perhaps rather a loosely defined perspective with a set of concepts than a coherent theory. The theoretical framework was originally formed by Michel Callon, Bruno Latour and John Law in order to study how science and technology interact with other actors. Actors, which can be both human and non-human, form actor-networks where the actors’ interests find rivals and alliances in other actors (Sismondo 2004:65ff). A central idea is that actors do not have inherent qualities, but have qualities only in relation to other actors in the
network. Because of this ANT dismisses dualisms like human/non-human and micro/macro (Bruun Jensen & Gad 2007:95). Furthermore, actors and networks are not stable. When actors become part of new contexts they meet with other actors and the actors change. Latour calls this process translation, as networks are developed as the actors’ interactions change (ibid:94f). In this way ANT can provide the possibility to test concepts’ and artifacts’ flexibility as well as show how representations situate actors and interests (Latour 1995).

ANT also provides for a symmetrical analysis as it treats “both the social and material worlds as the products of networks” (Sismondo 2004:69). Usually ANT is used in studies dealing with empirical material based on direct interaction with the actors involved, like laboratory studies (ibid:66f). Making use of these concepts in a study purely based on written material in the form of official documents is a different approach which brings other questions and relations in the focal point of the analysis. This thesis is therefore no pure ANT analysis although it is inspired by concepts originating from ANT. An aim of this thesis is to explore how ANT concepts can be fruitful in studies using document analysis as the source of empirical material.

3.2 Framing, Program & Anti-Program and Good & Bad Passages

The three main concepts which will serve as the basis for analysis in this thesis are framing, program & anti-program and good & bad passages. The concepts will be more thoroughly discussed in connection with the cases, but I will provide a short presentation of them here as well as briefly point out how they will be applied.

The concept of framing is used throughout the thesis and provides the possibility to point at how the formulation of problems and solutions in the documents constructs a frame for decisions and actions. Basically framing consist of defining individual agents in a network in order to decide which should be taken into consideration and which can be left out when
making a decision. It thus creates an inside and an outside of what actors take into consideration when making decisions (Callon 1999:187f). In this study the concept of framing will be applied in order to study various framings of basic problems and concerns in the planning of roads and how this can lead to disagreements.

Latour’s concept of *program & anti-program* provides the possibility to test the flexibility of actors. Every actor has a program of interests which are challenged by other actors’ programs. An anti-program is thus a program of one actor which forms a threat to another actor’s program. Actors can be negotiated in order to compromise and provide for other actors’ programs. As actors are negotiated, i.e. the reinvention of an actor, for example a technological artifact, it affects other actors of the network in different ways and conflicting interpretations occur (Latour 1995). Latour’s concept provides the possibility to study how actors’ interests differ and come into conflicts over how specific roads should be planned, as well as how solutions are evaluated differently.

*Good and bad passages* is a concept developed by Ingunn Moser and John Law. In short this concept seeks to describe and evaluate actors’ movements between different specificities. Specificities consist of networks which are made up of various other actors. According to Moser and Law passages can be of various qualities. Good passages provide smooth channels for actors to move in between the specificities, while bad passages provide obstacles which make it harder or even impossible to make the passage. Originally the concept was developed as a means of studying everyday life for people with physical dis/ability (Moser & Law 2007). However, the question of how some passages provide ability to do something, while others provide dis/ability can also be brought in as a useful concept in order to investigate the passages provided by urban planning, i.e. a pedestrian passing a road.
One last note on the choice of theory must be made as there are some very relevant theoretical concepts of Latour I have chosen not to make use of. Latour has done some work on urban planning and urban experience. An example is a webpage called “Ville Invisible” which features images of Paris and Latour’s contemplations on traversing the city, the city’s scales and the distribution of elements in the city (Latour, undated). Another relevant theoretical concept of Latour is inscription devices. These are devices which can translate material things into images or diagrams and thus provide a visual representation in a different context. Maps are an example of such an inscription device (Kroustrup & Olesen 2007:68f). My choice not to make use of these relevant thoughts results from my aim of wanting to test how my selected concepts could work for studying urban planning documents.
4. Background for the Case – Building Site Oslo

Before discussing the chosen aspects of the case of Økern I will present some background information on the place of Økern and the planning process. This section will provide relevant information that can function as the backdrop for the discussion of the three selected sub-cases. The more general information in this section will also assist the understanding of the motivation behind the planned changes to the area in question. First I will provide an overview of the Økern area and the planned changes, make some general comments on planning processes and finally present the chosen sub-cases.

4.1 Økern – Traffic Machine or Hidden Treasure?

Oslo is a city in transformation. The central part of the city resides on the inner tip of the Oslofjord and has lately been provided with a new opera house. Furthermore, numerous plans of museums, residential units, a fjord promenade and changes to the road system in this bay area are in progress. These developments all support the idea of Oslo as the “Fjord City”, an image attempted constructed in planning as well as marketing of Oslo as a tourist attraction (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2009 and Oslo Kommune, undated). However, in the shadow of these developments in the city centre, another area is also in the process of transformation, which will be the topic of this thesis. The Økern area is situated north of the city centre and many heavily trafficked roads run through the area, which support both local and transit traffic. It is mainly a retail/industrial area and many of the businesses require large storage and parking spaces. There are, however, also office buildings in the area and 15 000 people work there (2003 numbers). The Økern Centre, a shopping mall, also functions as a node for public transport, with a metro station which additionally is supported by many bus lines. The area’s road system has a fragmented structure with a barrier effect. Many traffic accidents
have been reported and in the rush hour it is a bottle neck for traffic (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:16ff).

The main problems at Økern, as defined by the relevant authorities, are congested roads, traffic safety, local air pollution, noise and lack of local identity. In order to deal with these problems the Norwegian Public Roads Administration (Statens Vegvesen) suggested a number of changes to the road system and the zoning plan. This first detailed plan was published in 2003. The main elements of the plan consist of leading the third ring road of Oslo, Rv. 150 - Store Ringvei, underground in a 1,2 km long new tunnel and constructing a new local main street through the area. According to the planners this will separate local and transit traffic, provide a more coherent road system, improve traffic safety and air quality, and provide the basis for new residential developments (ibid:1-4). In 2007 a complementing plan was worked out with some minor changes in order to deal with financing problems (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007). In the same year a detailed plan of the new local main street was published in order to respond to a complaint from a property owner (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B).

4.2 The Planning Process

In general, all of the planning documents I have studied go through the same planning procedure. The Norwegian Public Roads Administration works out a suggested plan and the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo (Plan- og bygningsetaten) notify the parties directly affected and official institutions, which have the opportunity to give preliminary comments. Then the plan is published for an open hearing, often with the preliminary comments included. Within a one-month time limit from the publication of the plan, anyone with interests or interventions may submit complaints or comments. Then the comments are considered and responses to them are occasionally published. In the end, the
revised plan is sent to the city council for hearing and approval. Often the interventions from the public lead to none or only minor changes in the plans, but as one of the sub-cases will demonstrate, they may even lead to the development of new planning documents where the process is repeated (see for example Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:2).

Because the planning documents are commented, answered for and occasionally modified, they are not static entities. As commenting and responding provide multiple levels of understandings, the planning process takes shape of an official discussion or negotiation about how problems and solutions should be defined. It is this landscape of documents, comments and complaints this thesis will explore.

4.3 Chosen Sub-Cases

John Law notes that ANT is hard to summarize, but appears as “stories about noise. Actor-network noise” (Law 1999:1). He further claims that ANT not necessarily is about finding patterns, but more about “questions of similarity and difference” (ibid:9). Finally he states that “we may need to give up single narratives in favour of many small stories” (ibid). The planning of the changes at Økern has created a lot of actor-network noise. In order to be able to study some of this noise this thesis does not intend to study all the aspects of the changes at Økern, but three small stories. The three stories bring light to three sites of conflict which emerge when plans meet with comments and complaints. Even though interesting plans for the area are still being published (for example a new shopping mall, see Plan- og bygningsetaten 08.06.09) I have chosen cases which are not too recent, in order to be able to follow the whole process with plans, comments and decisions in city council.

The first sub-case (section 5) deals with how public transport is accommodated for in the planning process. Conflicting framings of problems and solutions as well as the habit of planning for cars will be central themes in this sub-case. Furthermore this sub-case discusses
how the relative importance of concerns are shaped by the order they are taken into the frame. Sub-case number two (section 6) tells a story of a property and its owner. The plan prescribed demolition of buildings on the property and the owner sent in numerous complaints and even provided alternate plans in order to prevent demolition. This story attempts at establishing plans and counter-plans as programs and anti-programs, as well as it demonstrates the difficulty of satisfying all actors and illustrates the necessity of prioritization in road planning projects. The last sub-case (section 7) studies a chosen green corridor (walk path) of the Økern area and its representation in the planning documents. This section also investigates the opening of the landscape provided by the building of the tunnel and the planners’ construction of a rather large and rhetorical passage from the city centre and through the Økern area. This story deals with good and bad green passages, but also problematizes the question of scale in this context.
5. Public Transport

This first sub-case will discuss the plans’ accommodation for public transport and their framing of problems and solutions. Creating plans for multi-faceted areas like Økern is a challenge because many considerations and priorities have to be made, and various actors judge the problems and solutions differently as they see the situation from different angles and within different contexts. The sub-case will focus on how two large institutions find it hard to cooperate because of their different framings of transport problems and solutions, and how this finds expression in the planning documents. A second aim is to introduce the complexity of balancing different priorities in such a vast project, which will be a recurring theme over the next two sub-cases as well.

I will start by introducing the sub-case and its most relevant actors and documents, further I will present the theoretical concept of framing. Then I will look into a dispute over the first detailed plan and investigate two central actors’ framings of public transport, before looking at the connection between framing and interests. Before making some preliminary conclusions I will consider the framings of public transport and car traffic in the light of John Urry’s concept of the system of automobility.

5.1 Overview: Planning and Public Transport

In the city council’s strategy documents covering the whole Økern area, several visions are proposed in order to develop the area for commercial and residential purposes. One of these is the development of Økern as a public transport node. The fact that many people work at Økern (15 000 in 2004) and that the area is undergoing great developments both considering work places and housing, makes it important to accommodate for public transport (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2004:6). It is pointed to the need of improving the public transport system in general and improving the transit between bus and metro in particular. However, the same
document also points to the importance of the new tunnel for car traffic as an important means of improving the local environment and accommodating for residential developments (ibid:9). These two modes of transport (personal car traffic and public transport by rail or bus) are not mutually exclusive; however, the way the detailed planning documents deal with this balance and the objections to them show that this is a site of conflict. The public transport company of the city of Oslo, *Oslo Sporveier* (now renamed *Ruter*), pointed at the lack of attention public transport was given in the first detailed plan suggested by the Norwegian Public Roads Administration in 2003 (AS Oslo Sporveier 27.03.03). The initial plan of 2003 (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003), the objections from Oslo Sporveier (AS Oslo Sporveier 27.03.03) and the response from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration (Statens Vegvesen 22.04.03) will provide the central material for this sub-case. In 2006 it became clear that cost reductions were necessary, and in the beginning of 2007 a new complementary planning document was worked out and released, where public transport was given more attention (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007). The documented discussion and relationship between the Norwegian Public Roads Administration and Oslo Sporveier will serve as the main subject of this sub-case, because it effectively demonstrates the dispute over framing of problems and solutions for public transport. A further example of investors’ framings will however also be covered as it shows how public transport is of importance to investors on the market of residential and commercial developments.

5.2 Framing

Framing is about boundaries of objects and relationships; about creating insides and outsides. As boundaries are set up they provide guides to what is taken into consideration, what questions are asked and what answers are given. Michel Callon (1999) developed a concept of framing inspired by economic theory and the concepts of positive and negative externalities.
He gives the example of a factory which causes pollution and thereby negative externalities as the costs of the pollution is not part of the costs of the company. Such arguments are often used to demand green tax and economic incentives. In this case the boundaries between the inside (the factory) and the outside (the environment) are on stake as they are “created, challenged and renegotiated” (Asdal et al. 2007:44f). Actor-network theory has often been criticized for its concept of the actor; one of the main arguments has been that ANT fails to provide a theory of the actor and at the same time provides non-humans with agency. This criticism is addressed in Callon's article “Actor-Network Theory – the Market Test” (1999). He claims that in order for calculating agents to be able to transact goods measured in prices on a market, the goods and the agents involved must be disentangled and framed;

“In short, a clear and precise boundary must be drawn between the relations which the agents will take into account and which will serve in their calculations, on the one hand, and the multitude of relations which will be ignored by the calculation as such, on the other.”

(Callon 1999:186f)

He further states that “Framing is an operation used to define individual agents which are clearly distinct and dissociated from one another” (ibid:188). In this process the products are disentangled from their producers and made available on the market for a price. However, Callon notes that it is impossible to bring framing to a conclusion; there will always be externalities which escape the frame and cause what he calls overflowing. These externalities are by-products which escape the control of the companies; they are outside the frame. This can be pollution as well as knowledge made available to others. Actors can however choose to reframe the situation and bring the externalities into their frame (ibid).

The dispute over boundaries of objects and relationships is often seen in connection with environmental protection. In order to illustrate how the framing of public issues can be a difficult process with many angles I will review an example brought up by Brian Wynne; the
1994 Brent Spar oil platform controversy. Shell had been allowed by the UK government to dump the oil platform on the floor of the North Atlantic Ocean and was towing it out as it was taken over by Greenpeace activists. Greenpeace claimed that the environmental risk of that one platform alone was not the salient risk, the precedence it could cause for dumping other wastes at sea in the future was. The UK government and Shell on the other hand were pointing to the low risk of dumping that one platform. The UK government and Shell in this case operated with a narrow framing of the risk (one platform only) while Greenpeace operated with a wider framing of the risk (precedence for further dumping in the future). Thus framings can be wider or narrower (Wynne 2003:407). In other words precedence for future dumping at sea was outside the frame of the UK government and Shell. This dispute also illustrates how important statements and framing can be in bringing attention to a situation and enrolling the public. Greenpeace pointed at a wider framing, at the possible consequences in the future, and won public support (ibid:405ff).

Considering the inside versus the outside of frames it can be noted that John Law has stated that “a network depends on its Other, or Others” (Law1999:7). He further states that in this fashion networks also create others, as constructing certain things as homogenous (inside the frame) at the same time creates the heterogeneous (outside the frame) (ibid:8). In this way borders are drawn around similar things inside a frame and keeping dissimilar/irrelevant things outside it. Framing additionally can be associated with the term black box. Black box is an engineers’ term denoting a device which can be used without the user understanding what is on the inside that makes it work. The term is used in ANT about devices or facts that are taken for granted, where the history of how the fact/device came to be successful is seen as of no importance in the use of them (Sismondo 2004:97). Theoretical models and standardized technological solutions are black boxes which lead further developments and thinking (ibid:112). As facts or devices are taken for granted and used they control what questions can
be asked and what answers can be given, in a similar fashion as seen with the inside and the outside of frames. However, the boundaries of the black boxes are not sealed, like frames they can be contested, opened up and redefined by new knowledge or new inventions. The process of black-boxing is often studied by investigating controversies prior to the black box was established and taken for granted (ibid:98ff).

5.3 Priorities and Framing

In order to deal with limited resources and prioritizations, actors try to disentangle actors and relationships and construct a frame around essential problems and solutions. Also in planning processes of transport systems such processes are evident. The decision to build a tunnel, a road or a system of rails is grounded in an understanding of existing problems and possible solutions. As various actors inhabit various points of view in a network, different opinions on the prioritizations are not uncommon. Planned changes to a traffic system are therefore faced with criticism from other actors with another framing than the planner. The following part will explore how various actors involved at Økern frame the problems in the current situation, how they would like to see them solved and the interests and disputes that are found in the arguments.

5.3.1 Framing Public Transport

In the strategy document for the Økern area it was noted that accommodating for public transport is important in order to limit car use, and that developing a public transport node at Økern should be given attention (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2004:5f). This document was approved in city council in 2004, but was available to the planners as it had been under development since 1997, it is also cited by the planners in the first detailed plan coming out in 2003 (ibid:5, Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:24). This first detailed plan from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration stated that: “The Økern area offers a relatively good public
transport arrangement with several bus routes and a metro station. The share of public transport is nevertheless assumed to be low, because of very good accessibility for cars” (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:20, my translation). They also point to the fact that the road system has congested traffic, especially in the rush hour. In order to solve the problem with congested traffic and local air pollution they suggest parting local and transit traffic in two separate systems and leading the transit traffic through a new tunnel (ibid:3f). The Norwegian Public Roads Administration thus disentangles public transport from congested roads. They conclude that the problem lies in the congested road system and that the solution is to change it in order to increase road capacity and accommodate for increased car traffic. The question of public transport lies outside the frame and therefore needs not to be taken into initial consideration. Oslo Sporveier on the other hand provides a conflicting framing. In a letter commenting on the plan they cite state policy for coherent area- and transport planning, which states that: “When capacity problems in the road system appear, other alternatives than increasing road capacity shall be evaluated equally, like regulating car traffic or improving public transport” (AS Oslo Sporveier 27.03.03, my translation). Oslo Sporveier challenges the framing of the Norwegian Public Roads Administration; the main problem is not necessarily road capacity, but the overall analysis of the traffic situation and a lack of accommodating for the use of public transport. A parallel can be drawn to Wynne’s example of the dumping of the oil platform cited earlier. Comparing the framings of the Norwegian Public Roads Administration and Oslo Sporveier, the framing of the tunnel as the centre represents the narrower framing (congested roads and local air pollution) and the framing of accommodating for use of public transport represents the wider framing (coherent transport strategies and local & global pollution).

As the two actors’ framings of the current situation diverge, they also draw diverging conclusions about suggested solutions. The planners state that; “In order to be flexible
considering various solutions, the plan shows few bus stop bays and bus stops…it is also planned to accommodate for a node with bus stops in Ulvenveien by the metro station at Økern” (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:30, my translation). In general this first plan does not give very many specific solutions or details about accommodating for public transport other than these loose promises of a public transport node and future bus stops. This is also a point made by Oslo Sporveier. They further claim that the plan shows very little intention of planning for a coherency between use of land and analysis of the main transport system. For example they pointed out that not a single bus lane was regulated in the plan. As the coherent transport strategy for the area was not yet ready at this point, they also recommended that plans like this one, “only safeguarding car traffic”, should wait until this strategy was ready (AS Oslo Sporveier 27.03.03, my translation). Following the diverging framings of the problem, the two actors also disagree on the role public transport should play in the planning process. Oslo Sporveier wants public transport to be a central part of the analysis and planning process from the very beginning, while the Norwegian Public Roads Administration focus on the car traffic and seem to see public transport as something that can be planned in a more flexible way.

In the section covering the expected consequences of the presented solution for traffic in the area, the planners stated that;

“Increased capacity in the road system will accommodate better for bus traffic and improve regularity and provide for higher average speed. The busses will be able to follow a coherent local road net, which will improve local availability.”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:37, my translation)

Oslo Sporveier points to the fact that the road capacity in the area has been increased strongly the previous ten years and that out of experience they “strongly disagree that increased road capacity gives better conditions for public transport, it is rather the opposite” (AS Oslo
Sporveier 27.03.03, my translation). Oslo Sporveier was indeed so critical to the suggested plan that they suggested it “not be treated politically until it ensures also public transport in a satisfying way” (ibid, my translation). The Norwegian Public Roads Administration’s reply to Oslo Sporveier’s comments acknowledges the need to look more closely into the situation for public transport in the area, at the same time it is claimed that the tunnel will provide clear space over ground for developing the public transport node. In this letter it is also noted that the two actors came to an agreement on making more detailed analyses of the situation for public transport in the area and working together on a sketch for the public transport node and bus lanes in the area (Statens Vegvesen 22.04.03).

On the background of reducing costs some changes were made to the initial plan and a second complementing plan was brought out in 2007 (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007). This plan includes a new section on the planned public transport node at Økern. It includes a suggested plan for bus routes in the new road system, plans of new platforms and stairs at the Økern metro station and that the bus stop and the metro should be connected by new ramps to improve transit (see image on the following page) (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007:37ff [appendix p. 21ff]). I would not conclude that the only reason for this change is the communication with Oslo Sporveier or that the planners have radically reframed the situation and the solutions. What is clear, however, is that public transport was given a much more incorporated role and more attention in the plan of 2007, than it was in the plan of 2003. Whether this reflects real changes to the plan considering framing of problems and solutions on behalf of the planners or just a natural progression in the planning process as more of the strategic documents were ready at this point, I will leave as an open question. I have only studied the documents of this dispute. However it does seem like Oslo Sporveier’s complaints were taken into consideration and that understanding for their framing of public transport as a central part of any planning process was acknowledged.
5.3.2 Framing and Interests

Different positions of various actors in a network provide different framings of problems and solutions. Organizations working at different levels may find working together difficult because they frame the situation differently. In this part I will therefore consider whether there are interests and work routines which could encourage these conflicting framings.

The Norwegian Public Roads Administration frame congested traffic and road capacity as the main problems and building a tunnel as the suited solution. The framing of the tunnel as central contributes to the diverging framing by giving much emphasis on this specific part of the plan. They claim that “Store Ringvei in tunnel and a new cohering local road system is an important prerequisite” for realizing the intentions of the wider strategies for the Økern area.
The planned tunnel also incorporates what many people in the area wished for; better local air quality, less noise, fewer accidents, no mixing of local and transit traffic and less congested traffic (ibid:4). This framing therefore found support in the local population and helped enroll public support for the plan. In fact an action committee in favor of the tunnel was formed by a school and people residing in the Økern area. In their letters they were positive to the tunnel and hoped that it could be realized as soon as possible (Tunnel Sinsen-Økern Aksjonskomiteen 20.03.03).

Oslo Sporveier don’t necessarily disagree about the building of the tunnel, they did however miss a sufficient covering of public transport in the first plan and stated that public transport at Økern “has to be given just as much emphasis as car traffic” (AS Oslo Sporveier 27.03.03, my translation). Furthermore the Agency for Planning and building Services of Oslo pointed out that their impression was that; “the cooperation between Oslo Sporveier and the Norwegian Public Roads Administration in this case has been difficult because of work on different planning levels” (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:52, my translation). They assume that there is a conflict between Oslo Sporveier’s long time frame of planning a new system of bus routes and the work of the Norwegian Public Roads Administration on a detailed road plan which should be realized in a shorter time (ibid:52f). In this case it seems like the diverging framings of the two actors arise from different work routines, focus and time frames.

The developments at Økern are also of interest to investors. As the plan of a new road system with less congested traffic and the hope of a public transport node step forth, investors’ opportunities in the area are reframed. Especially the new road system provides an improved infrastructure and an important asset for investors. In an interview an investor of business properties, Alf Ulven, claims that “Økern will become an entirely new city centre…” and that ”The Økern/Ulven area has a much better infrastructure than other areas, you don’t find
anything like it in Oslo, apart from in the city centre” (Alf Ulven in interview by Revfem 2009:44ff, my translations). Ulven also points to the improved road system and public transport situation as making Økern a “communication node” (ibid:46, my translation).

Investors finding ways to make profit out of the changes at Økern is not really a question of overflowing the planners’ frame in the sense Callon described. Making the area interesting for investors brings assets for developing the area further and it is stated in one of the wider strategy documents that one of the important goals is to contribute to residential developments in the area (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2004:5f). Accommodating for investments in the area is in this case in the interest of the planners and the community in general. It is interesting to note that the investors seem to frame accessibility as a mix of good public transport and good car accessibility, without making much judgment on which to value higher. It is, however, worth to note that other large investors are planning the development of residential buildings and a large shopping mall central at Økern. These plans are currently up for public hearing, but the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo are critical because they present a larger share of business areas and less residential units than regulated (Plan- og bygningsetaten 08.06.09). The balance between residential developments and business developments can be seen as a further area of conflicting framings and dispute.

5.4 Planning for the System of Automobility?

“Prioritizing car traffic has been set as the highest priority. Oslo Sporveier finds that only car traffic has been given priority in this plan, this counts for the analysis effort as well as for the suggested plan. Comments seeking to ensure public transport have not been taken into consideration in a satisfying way.”

(AS Oslo Sporveier 27.03.03, my translation)

This quote is to be found in Oslo Sporveier’s letter considering the first detailed plans of the changes to the road system at Økern. Prioritizing car traffic over other forms of mobility has to do with planners’ framing of problems and solutions, but also the characteristics of this
specific type of mobility should be noted. John Urry has pointed out that the emphasis on planning for cars can be seen in the context of the system it is part of. Urry has studied what he calls the system of automobility, which he claims is exerting a systemic domination (Urry 2004:25). He claims that the system appeared with “the steel-and-petroleum car” which created path-dependency and locked in societies and economies (ibid:27). According to Urry, the six components which generate and reproduce the domination of this system are; the manufactured object (the car and the branding), individual consumption, links to other industries (i.e. parts and accessories), “quasi-private” mobility, dominant culture (car as a symbol of wealth) and environmental resource-use (ibid:25f). Kingsley Dennis and John Urry point out that the fact that the car is personal and incorporates “a way of life” has reinforced the naturalization of the car as the main means of transport (Dennis & Urry 2009:35). John Urry and Mimi Sheller have gone as far as calling automobility a “Frankenstein-created monster” because it structures the time and lives of not only the users, but also the non-users (Sheller & Urry 2000:744f). They further claim that the car enjoys a privileged position in policy and planning processes:

“Not only do car-drivers gain the comparative benefits of relative mobility and seamless travel, making older ways of travel seem slow and inflexible, but also the matrix of automobility undermines other forms of mobility. The predominance of the car in government policy and planning afforded seamless car journeys while breaking down those linkages that once made other forms of transport possible.”

(ibid:745f)

The opening quote from Oslo Sporveier accuses the planners of prioritizing car traffic over public transport in a similar fashion. They pointed out that the focus on the tunnel left the question of public transport in the dark. Focusing on specific elements in an environment with various transportation systems might lead to solutions better for one way of travelling and worse solutions for other types of mobility. As one system (i.e. automobility) is inside the frame and others are outside it and neglected, the preferred solution may become self evident
and lead the planning of other elements to accommodate for it. In this way the system creates a natural order over time; the focus on planning for personal car traffic over other forms of mobility. In this context the tradition of planning for cars can be seen as a black box; it has become a taken for granted way of planning road transport systems. Balancing public transport, personal car traffic and other forms of mobility in planning processes can therefore be a challenge. Finally the “seamless travel” of the car versus the more difficult situation for other ways of mobility mentioned by Urry and Sheller can be associated with the concept of good and bad passages (Moser & Law 2007), this concept will however be the topic of the third sub-case (see section 7).

5.5 Sub-Case Conclusions
Conflicting framings over the role and emphasis of public transport lead to conflicting understandings about problems and solutions. The documents and the comments have further showed how framings are connected to interests and different levels of planning and responsibility. How can these insights bring light to how documents show orderings and accommodation for priorities?

5.5.1 Representations’ Framings and Orderings
One of the questions posed at the beginning of the thesis was how various representations frame problems and solutions and how these frames order social and environmental factors. First it is interesting to note that various actors (i.e. the planners, Oslo Sporveier and investors) with their various framings order the various ways of mobility differently. The Norwegian Public Roads Administration focus (mostly) on good solutions for personal car traffic, Oslo Sporveier emphasis the need of functional public transport and the investors appreciate a good accessibility with a balance of the two.
The Norwegian Public Roads Administration’s emphasis on the building of the tunnel gave it a central place in the planning process; the tunnel was of highest priority in order to solve a number of problems with congested traffic, noise, air quality and accidents. Oslo Sporveier pointed out that accommodating for cars had been placed in the centre of the plans at the cost of leaving public transport unresolved. The conflicting framings and planning routines of the two actors led them into disagreement on how a sound balance of personal car traffic and public transport could be accommodated for in the planning of the area. Basically the disagreements are about boundaries; what should be inside the planning’s frame and what should be outside. Leaving public transport outside the frame in the start of the planning process for flexibility later on is not an acceptable solution to Oslo Sporveier. The priority of planning for personal car traffic orders this way of mobility over other forms of mobility. Furthermore, framing personal car traffic as the central form of mobility creates a black box of planning for cars as it over time becomes the natural order. The system of automobility thus becomes a frame which sets the agenda and guides problems and solutions, questions and answers towards accommodating for personal car traffic.

5.5.2 Accommodating for Priorities

The second question considers whether or not some concerns have been left out later on in order to accommodate for priorities and what reasons are given for this. This is also a question of what falls inside and outside of the frame at various times and whether or not a reframing has been made. The plan of 2007 shows an increased emphasis on public transport compared with the 2003 plan. Even if the tunnel is still central, the document gives the impression of a more balanced and coherent plan where both car traffic and public transport has been given attention in the planning process. In this case it might be less a question of concerns left out in order to accommodate for priorities and more a question of
accommodating for a balance of car traffic and public transport in the presented plan. The reason for this might simply be that the planners were seeking to improve the cooperation with Oslo Sporveier, or it might be a natural progression as more of the transport strategies were ready at this point. However, the fact that public transport was left mostly outside the frame in the initial planning process can be pointed out. Bringing it inside on a later stage in the planning process might provide useful flexibility in planning bus stops, but it does not change the point Oslo Sporveier makes about the importance of coherent transport strategies and considering other alternatives than increasing road capacity when roads get congested. It thus becomes a dispute over when public transport should be brought inside the frame. Bringing it in on an earlier stage might have led to different conclusions.

5.5.3 Limitations

It is not probable that any of the actors actively oppose public transport. Even if the Norwegian Public Roads Administration focused more on the tunnel and the road system than on accommodating for public transport, this is only to be expected. After all the main element of this specific plan was the road system. However, as road systems connect with public transport in a very direct way as it i.e. provides roads for busses and public transport nodes, one can discuss the initial role that public transport was given in the plans and how this was decisive for the questions asked and the answers found. Therefore the plans’ handling of car traffic versus public transport has been the subject of this sub-case. The fact that various companies and organizations have various framings and work on different levels is to be expected, what has been the goal is to show how various framings and focus can lead to conflicts that are difficult to resolve especially because of these diverging framings and interests. As this thesis is based on document analysis it only covers the conflicts which come
forth in the relevant documents. This sub-case thus covers only a limited number of actors and
their framings, other views of problems and solutions are presumably also present.
6. Private Interests

Making grand changes to already tightly used areas in urban areas is a challenge. Conflicts arise around locations, solutions, costs, complications, efficiency and effects. When the changes interfere with private property by ordering demolition or craving land, conflicts arise which might lead individuals to take action to protect their property against the changes. In planning documents, response letters and comments to these, such conflicts are evident. This section’s sub-case will provide a story of such a conflict and how it is treated in the official planning documents. In this case a whole secondary planning document aimed at solving the conflict. The conflict includes a large variety of actors: privately owned property and buildings used for retailing cars, the owner of this property, some large vehicles used for large scale transport, a more or less curved road, a roundabout, a bicycle trail, the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo and the Norwegian Public Roads Administration.

Initially the planners (the Norwegian Public Roads Administration) stated some general goals like improving logistics and air quality and reconstructing identity in the area (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:3). How to translate these concerns into material solutions is the site of conflict.

To accommodate for as many as possible parties’ desires in planning this specific area some sacrifices were deemed necessary as will be discussed later. However, already at this point it is possible to point out that making and changing plans can be seen as a way to “put to the test that which is possible and that which is not” to quote Bruno Latour (1995:278). That is why this section will draw on actor-network theory and Latour’s quite technical theory of program and anti-program as presented in his story of Gaston, the office worker who tries to make his boss, the cat and the seagull happy by modifying a door (Latour 1995). This section will start with an overview of the basics of this sub-case and a presentation of Latour’s theory of
program and anti-program. Then I will investigate how this theory can bring light to this sub-case, before drawing some sub-case conclusions.

6.1 Overview: Plans, Private Interests and Protest

In the centre of this conflict is a property located in the centre of Økern and owned by GTS, an individual I have chosen not to mention by his full name for reasons earlier mentioned. On the property there are several buildings occupied by automobile retailers and repair workshops, together forming a car centre. The car centre consists of retail of automobile parts and new and used cars, various repair workshops, storage room and customer and office spaces (GTS 18.03.03). According to GTS, the nature of the business on the property makes it important with enough space for large scale transport vehicles to enter and exit the property for deliveries of large goods, and it is also important that the space around the buildings provide enough parking possibilities (ibid). On the south side of the property runs a railway; Alnabanen, which is only used for cargo transport (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:19). Not far to the west lies the Økern metro station and the metro line runs over ground through this area as well as several roads with congested traffic (the closest ones are Østre Aker road and Ring3/Store Ringvei).

As the first detailed plans for the area were issued in 2003, it became clear that the new “local main street” just north-east of the property was planned as a broad street with trees planted in between traffic and sidewalks (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:30 and 2007B). This would cut off quite a lot of parking space in front of the buildings on the property and according to GTS make it necessary to make changes to the property and the buildings in order to provide for inside parking (GTS 18.03.03). Furthermore the access to the property was planned through a new roundabout, which would make it necessary to remove a corner of a building in order for large vehicles to enter and exit the property (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:4). Secondly the
railway was to be temporarily moved northwards in the construction period to accommodate for the construction of the crossing of the railway and the new local main street. This would make it necessary to demolish a building on GTS’ property (Banepartner, undated). GTS sent several letters and hired various companies to work out alternate plans to the area around the property in order to save buildings from demolition and hinder intervention on the property (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003B:13ff).

Several planning documents consider this area more or less in detail and several letters of concern on behalf of the owner and the replies to these can illustrate the conflict points. Additionally the detailed plan of Ulvenveien (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B) stand out as a central document. It lines up the different considerations and solutions in the specific area in detail and even brings in a suggested solution from a company hired by GTS as one of three variations for the city council to decide between. As this case consists of planning documents and statements from both sides of the conflict I find it suitable to see the exchange of plans and statements between the parties as a negotiation. By using Latour’s program & anti-program concept I seek to explore how the plans can be seen as programs – as manifestations of the individuals’ interests. Another interesting feature of this case has to do with visibility; at the start GTS is just an owner of a property which happens to lie in the planning area. As the case unfolds and he engages in the planning process with protests and alternative plans he becomes a very visible actor.

6.2 Planning and Protest – Program and Anti-Program

Bruno Latour starts his article “A Door must be either Open or Shut - A little Philosophy of Techniques” by stating that “the essence of a technique is the mediation of the relations between people on the one hand and things and animals on the other” (Latour 1995:272). The article cites a cartoon strip where the office worker Gaston tries to accommodate for all his
co-workers and animals. In the beginning he lets the cat in and out through the door to allow
the cat to be free and his boss to be spared of drafts from a constantly open door. He soon gets
tired of being a doorman for the cat, so he cuts a cat-flap into the bottom of the door to
accommodate for the cat to move in and out as it pleases. As a seagull sees the cat moving
freely in and out of the door, it gets jealous and Gaston makes a gap at the top of the door for
the seagull. In Gaston’s eyes everyone are happy; the cat and the seagull can move in and out
as they please, he is himself no longer a doorman of cats and the door is closed as the boss
demanded. The boss however sees the door as ruined. Latour uses this cartoon strip as an
example of how technical artifacts can be modified or negotiated by inventors to fit diverse
actors’ programs, but also how artifacts can be interpreted differently by different actors. A
perfect solution from one actor’s point of view might be a bad solution for another actor, and
when modifications are done to accommodate for more and more actors, the artifact might no
longer satisfy the initial actors’ programs (Latour 1995). Latour suggests that because it is
impossible to see a technique (in this case a door) or a human separately from their
surroundings, we must look at the “crises, disputes, inventions, compromises, substitutions,
translations and orderings that get more and more complicated and engage more and more
elements” (ibid:277). This is also a statement that points back to the opening remark of his
article; techniques have no real inherent essence, apart from their relations with other actors
like people, other things and in this case animals (ibid:272f). Further Latour conceptualizes
actors’ interests and experiences in networks as programs and anti-programs. To take the cat
from the cartoon as an example, Latour states that the cat’s main program is to be free. If the
door is closed the cat is not free and therefore not happy, therefore the closed door acts as an
anti-program. When the doorman Gaston is substituted by the cat-flap, the cat-flap becomes a
new alliance of the cat as the cat-flap translates into an open door and free circulation for the
cat (ibid:277). Gaston has a more complex program to fulfill; he wants to “make everyone
happy without having to choose between them” (ibid:278). Gaston’s program is not very unlike the program (and problem) of urban planners; they have to plan environments in a way that satisfies many different actors and involves many different elements (all which can be referred to as actors).

**6.2.1 Plans as Programs – Considering Various Framings**

My goal with this sub-case is to explore how Latour’s concepts of programs can be used in thinking about statements in planning documents. In the same way that Gaston operates as a re-inventor of the door to accommodate for all reasonable desires of humans and animals in Latour’s chosen cartoon strip, planners of new roads act as re-inventors of areas and have many considerations to make. They may also have to rethink plans as new considerations appear, or as Latour stated: as the dispute “engage more and more elements” (Latour 1995:277). In the same way as it makes no sense to think about the essence of the door itself, thinking of the road as a technology must involve looking at the disputes over it. The essence is to be found where the road meets with other actors – where programs and anti-programs become visible.

The core of this problem can be understood by thinking about the different framings of the situation before any change has been made and how the different actors interpret the planned changes. These framings incorporate actors’ goals, possible gain and loss and how they perceive other actors as possible alliances or possible rivals. Looking at the area of GTS’ property there are several spatial formations which are occupied by different actors in different ways and in different stretches of time; there are roads for automobiles and their drivers, sidewalks for pedestrians, bicycle paths, bicycles and their riders, routes for public transport, parking lots and buildings with diverse businesses and needs. Planning changes to this area therefore should seek to provide the best solution possible for all relevant actors and
activities, which is not easy as some of the programs of these diverse actors are hard to integrate into one spatial solution. Furthermore, as new considerations appear with every change that is made, this becomes increasingly challenging. The Norwegian Public Roads Administration also express that the issue is not only satisfying the immediate needs of the actors in the area. They also set up wide goals for the planning process in order to create solutions which can;

“Provide a coherent road net in balance and without capacity problems…, …provide good conditions for public transport, …are coordinated with principal plans for bicycle- and pedestrian routes, …improve traffic safety, …adjust to the landscape in a satisfying way.”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:24, my translation)

In addition they wish to minimize costs, improve air quality and protect nature, recreational areas and existing cultural heritage (ibid:24f). However, as seen in the previous sub-case, although The Norwegian Public Roads Administration seeks to plan for a wide variety of mobilities, they focus mainly on personal road traffic in their initial planning. The way the planning documents describe the plan’s solutions thus reads as a crystallization of The Norwegian Public Roads Administration’s interpretation of the various programs of different actors and how they are intended compromised and combined. This is also a matter of translating these concerns into material solutions. For example it is stated that the aim is to create a “city like business area” in central Økern:

“Improved traffic capacity and better internal connections will make the area more attractive to investments and will open up for many areas to be taken into more effective use than today… Furthermore the building of the road system will provide the area with a more ordered, understandable and coherent city structure. In the long run this will open up for development of urban qualities like good urban spaces and a varied offering of shops, services and jobs.”

(ibid:36, my translation)

There are however other ideas and visions for the area. GTS for example finds the Økern centre shopping mall to be the natural focal point of Økern and questions especially the plans
of the new local main street (GTS 19.03.03). Different general ideas and perspectives can result in diverging framings, ideas and visions. Quite often it is not possible to provide good solutions without sacrifice and prioritization, i.e. not all programs can be fulfilled. The following section will explore the colliding programs of the planning authority and GTS as it became clear that the planned changes to the road system would mean great changes to the property of GTS.

6.3 Colliding Programs

This section will deal with the initial phase of the conflict; the first detailed plans of the changes to the area and GTS’ general response to these plans, while section 6.4 will deal with the later developments and an attempt at compromise.

As earlier mentioned the main focus of the plan was the construction of a 1,2 km long tunnel between Sinsen and Økern and the reconstruction of a more coherent net of local roads in the area of Økern (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:1). The plans of the local road net also contained the suggestion to construct a new “local main street from Østre Aker Church to the Sinsen crossing” by piecing together Ulvenveien and Store Ringvei (ibid:4, my translation). The map on the next page illustrates the first detailed plan of this road and will accompany the discussion of how it intersects with the property in question.
Illustration 6.1: New Ulvenveien.

Map of the first detailed plans. I have indicated GTS’ property with the number 122/29 on the map as well as the position of the railway and the planned “local main street”. (Crossed over buildings mark buildings that have to be demolished, streaked over areas indicate temporary construction sites, later to be returned to the owners, and the stapled lines indicate the boundaries of the planning zone.)

(Source: Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003C, detailed excerpt.)

That some roads of the area were going to be changed had already been made clear in earlier documents and statements from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration and the city council around 1999. These were however more general goals and were framed as plans with a wider scope and less attention to detailed solutions. For example the focus was on which alternative routes and solutions could best provide for redirecting traffic, rather than on details around the size and implementation of the streets and which properties these routes would trespass and to what extent (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2004:5ff). As the more detailed plans
were laid out for public hearing on February 17th 2003, the consequences of the changes became more apparent (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:44). GTS also experienced this. In a letter to the planning authorities he states that the earlier plans pictured a much narrower road next to his property “which would only affect the driveway.” He further states that “In the end of the year we become aware of plans of a road over twice as broad and that the intervention on the property is wide ranging and demand demolition of the buildings” (GTS 18.03.03, my translations). The planned “local main street” affects GTS’ property in two ways. First the construction of this road makes it necessary to demolish buildings on the property nr. 122/29 (GTS’ property) because the railway (Alnabanen) crossing the planned road by a bridge in the east corner of GTS’ property, is planned to be temporarily moved northwards in the building phase (Banepartner, undated). Temporary moving the railway northwards means moving it onto GTS’ property, making demolition inevitable. Second, the planned local main street was planned as a broad street with bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths on both sides. Pedestrian paths were to be separated from the rest of the traffic by a planting zone (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:26, 30). This broad street intersects with the front (north-east) part of GTS’ property. He stated that “the planned road removes most of the parking space and makes essential transport with lorries difficult” and that grand changes to his property will be necessary as a result of these plans (GTS 18.03.03, my translation). GTS sent several letters and had several meetings with the planners to bring light to the real consequences of the plans for his property and to try to find alternative solutions. He also provided alternative plans for the area, worked out by companies he hired (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003B:13ff).

6.3.1 Forming Programs and Plans

How can this be understood in the light of Latour’s concepts? First of all it might be useful to think about the basic programs of the actors and how they developed as the planning
progressed and provided anti-programs. GTS’ stated in a letter to the Agency for Planning
and Building Services of Oslo concerning the demolition on his property that;

“The building on the property makes up 4000 m2 of very good quality… without carrying walls and few
pillars which makes it an excellent business space…This is no coincidence, but a result of conscious
planning on my behalf when the building was restored in the sixties.”

(GTS 18.03.03, my translation)

In a report from a meeting with the Norwegian Public Roads Administration it also becomes
apparent that one of his renters has left due to the insecure future of the building, and GTS
fears further loss of rental income (Broch 22.01.03). It is clear that GTS’ program is a matter
of making money on renting his property and buildings to automobile related businesses, and
anything that might harm this interest is an anti-program. It is also clear that GTS has invested
time, money and concern in his property over decades. The plans of the new road extending
onto the property making parking and deliveries hard and even deeming buildings to be
demolished is therefore a strong anti-program. The way GTS invests further energy, time and
money in the planning process shows his enduring engagement to keeping and developing his
property.

The Norwegian Public Roads Administration and the Agency for Planning and Building
Services on the other hand have the program of wanting to provide the best possible
environment for a number of actors. The goal was to provide a plan that could provide a better
traffic solution for many different versions of mobility; local car traffic, transfer car traffic,
public transport, bicycle traffic and pedestrian mobility. At the same time it should solve
some important problems with local air pollution and traffic noise, and reconstruct the identity
of the area (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:3). Obviously the planning authorities’ program is a
more complex one and as earlier mentioned it resembles that of Gaston in Latour’s cartoon
strip; “make everyone happy without having to choose between them” (Latour 1995:278).
Problems coming to agreement with land owners can in itself be seen as an anti-program to their program; it is however interesting to investigate these disagreements further to point out exactly where the programs collide.

As earlier established a planning document can be read as a program attempting at comprising the programs of diverse actors acting in the area. It is also possible to see the counter-plan presented by GTS as a response and an anti-program. GTS hired the company Interconsult to develop an alternative plan to that of the Norwegian Public Roads Administration. In short this is a principal plan, meaning that it goes beyond details, and suggests that by moving the tunnel opening further south the local main street can be established as the planning authorities wish, and at the same time providing a cheaper, less complicated and better solution. This plan is also in less conflict with GTS’ property (GTS 19.03.03). Furthermore, GTS hired BanePartner to make out an alternative plan for temporary moving the railway southwards rather than northwards during the building phase, and in this way avoiding demolishing buildings on GTS’ property (Banepartner, undated). This response in the form of counter-plans reads as an official statement of GTS’ program (hinder demolition of buildings and loss of rental income) and as an explicit anti-program to the program of the planning authorities’ planning document.

Furthermore a more direct collision of programs appeared which would become central in the conflict. In 2001 GTS had been allowed extending constructions to a building on the property in question. This was however not caught up in the planning process and these new constructions combined with how the new road was planned would make entering and exiting the property with large vehicles difficult. Possibly the time frame was partly to blame as the changes to the building were made after the initial planning of the road on the part of the Norwegian Public Roads Administration had started (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:10). Here it is quite clear how plans/programs can collide and form each other’s anti-programs;
GTS extends buildings on his property, while the planners want to demolish buildings. On the background of these incoherent planning cases handled by the Agency for Planning and Building Services in Oslo, GTS sent in a complaint to higher authorities and they made the part of the plan considering the area around the property invalid (ibid). This was also the background for the new planning document covering this area, where the original plan faces yet another suggested plan from GTS and a compromise plan developed by the Norwegian Public Roads Administration (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B). This is however the subject of section 6.4.

**6.3.2 Framing of Problems and Diverging Interpretations of Solutions**

When Gaston’s boss interpreted the re-invented door accommodating for cats and seagulls as ruined he is not pointing to the drafts, but rather to the price paid by the door which has been modified and therefore redefined (Latour 1995:273ff). Judgments of artifacts depend on the eyes that see. The framings of the different actors are therefore important. As we have seen GTS wants to save his property and buildings for further rental income, making sure that there is enough space in front of buildings to maneuver large transport vehicles, and of course hinder demolition. Interestingly, the planning authority questions the very grounds of the use of the property in the later planning documents. They comment that they find the property inappropriate for the type of business that resides on it. They state that “the property is too small and unsuitable for transport with large lorries. Today there is not enough space to turn around on the property itself” (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:11, my translation). The property and its use is thus in itself a topic of conflicting framings. The statement from the planning authority can be read as an attempt at reframing the problem; the question is not how to accommodate for the business on the property, but whether this property is appropriate for
this kind of business in the first place. This statement also questions the competence and expertise of GTS.

Also regarding the planning procedure and progression there are diverging framings. The Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo point to the time frame of the planning and implementation and consider the suggested principal plan from GTS (moving the tunnel opening) as coming too late. They state that;

“It takes a long time to develop principal and detailed plans to build a wide-ranging road system like this one in an already resident urban area. The evaluation of different principal solutions must be considered sufficient in the process that has been going on since 1995…”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:50, my translation)

In a newspaper interview, the lawyer Audun Engh states that it is not unusual that people who are affected by urban planning projects take action too late, as they lack knowledge about such large scale planning and building processes and their time frames (Engh in interview by Brøyn 2008).

As the framings of the problem vary among actors, so do the interpretations of the solutions. The Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo state that they are “content with having found a solution on which the state and the township agree after a long planning process” (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:51, my translation). However, just like when Gaston made the cat, the seagull and himself happy and the boss ended up unhappy about the door, there are alternative interpretations. GTS feels overrun and states that “one has planned as if there were no buildings on the property and made construction sites thereafter” (GTS 18.03.03, my translation). GTS also doubts the efficiency of creating a new local main street for recreating identity, and states in a letter to the city council that;

“The main point at Økern is the Økern centre [shopping mall] and this is in its nature as a centre inward-oriented. This does not contribute to the experience of life in the street and will probably also outcompete most other sales oriented businesses in a street without parking. The so called new Ulvenveien is in these
plans doomed to be quite lifeless except of car traffic… any centre-feeling to this part of the city it cannot provide.”

(GTS 19.03.03, my translation)

Considering GTS’ alternative solution to a principal plan of the area the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo stated that GTS’ plan did not offer satisfactory solutions considering traffic execution and all in all did not offer a better solution than the original plan (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:50f). This shows furthermore how this exchange of opinions and plans are constant attempts at defining central concerns and translating them into adequate solutions.

It is worth noting that the place Økern is an actor negotiated by the other actors. Especially how the aim of retaining or recreating local identity at Økern can be translated into a material solution is a site of conflict. Both The Norwegian Public Roads Administration and GTS claim the role as spokesperson on behalf of the identity of Økern. The planners suggested the new main street in order to provide Økern with local identity. GTS on the other hand questions the plans as he declares that the real identity of Økern is to be found in the Økern centre shopping mall. Identity is translated into a new main street in the planners’ eyes, while GTS questions this translation because he finds identity to be grounded in the shopping mall.

In this context a last remark can be made on the effectivity of GTS’ alternate plans and the factor of scale. As GTS starts making alternate plans he enrolls the Økern area and becomes its spokesperson. Furthermore the plans also represent a translation of his ideas and opinions into the planners’ language. By taking this role as a protester and alternate planner GTS’ scale changes. Latour notes in his article on Pasteur and his laboratory that by changing the scale of actors, the power relations also change (Latour 1983:163). In the beginning GTS’ property was only a property indicated on a planner’s map. When GTS started sending comments, objections and alternate plans, however, he grew in scale as he and his property became more
visible in the planning process. This even resulted in an additional planning document, which is the subject of the following section.

6.4 An Attempt at Compromise

This section will deal with the later parts of the case, where an attempt at compromise is made. The most relevant document for this part of the case is a detailed plan of the new Ulvenveien that was worked out after the inconsistency between GTS’ allowance in 2001 and the first plan was unveiled, and this part of the plan was rendered invalid. The document presents three alternate solutions: the original solution from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration, a new alternative solution suggested by GTS (this time a more detailed one) and a compromise alternative from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration. As it was hard to come to an agreement, the planning authorities decided that they would send all three suggestions to the city council and let them decide. The Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo did however recommend the compromise alternative as they found this to be the best one with the least conflict (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B).

6.4.1 Three Competing Programs

To ease comparison I have included maps in the same scale representing all of the three competing plans, as they show quite effectively how the property of GTS is affected by the various plans in different ways. Suggestion number one (see illustration on the following page) is the original suggestion which has been the subject of the previous discussions. It consisted of establishing the new Ulvenveien as a broad main street with a straight axis and a planting zone in between pedestrian paths and other traffic, and leading Alnabanen over it, with all the consequences for GTS’ property previously discussed (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:4).
The second suggestion of this planning document was worked out by GTS’ hired planning company, Asplan Viak AS, and presents a couple of important changes to the first (see illustration on the following page). First of all the axis of the new Ulvenveien is broken, creating a slight bend around the property of GTS. Second the roundabout (upper left corner on the map) is moved 9 meters further away from the property, which solves the inconsistency of the prior plans with the building permit allowed GTS on his property and the access of large vehicles. However, the pedestrian and bicycle path crossing underneath the roundabout gets a sharper curve as a result of the new position of the roundabout (ibid:2&5). This plan can be seen as an anti-program to the plans of the planning authority considering GTS’ property. Changes have been made to the positions of roads, roundabouts and pedestrian/bicycle route in such a fashion as to spare GTS’ property for changes. In this way
the new positioning of the road and the roundabout becomes an alliance of GTS as it saves his buildings from demolition, but at the same time it rivals the quality of the bicycle/pedestrian path by giving it a sharper curve; and the road by breaking its axis.

Illustration 6.3: Suggestion 2; Alternative Plan Suggested by GTS.  
(Source: Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:20.)

The Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo evaluated this plan as no good solution. In addition to the sharpened curve of the pedestrian path they stated that:

“Moving the roundabout in Ulvenveien northwards is potentially in conflict…with the public transport node at Økern, i.e. the ramps between tracks on the metro station with transit to busses in Ulvenveien” and that moving the main street “results in a seemingly unmotivated bend in an otherwise straight axis-street…visible from the tall building at Økern centre and other future tall buildings at Økern.”

(ibid:12, my translation)
As a result of the two unsatisfactory solutions and the disagreement between the parties, a new solution was sought (ibid:5). The third suggestion forms the *compromise alternative* (see illustration below). The main change in this suggestion is that the green planting zone between the pedestrian path and the rest of the traffic is taken out and the pedestrian lanes have been slimmed down. This makes the road much narrower and it is no longer necessary to demolish the building on GTS’ property closest to the Alnabanen as the railroad bridge will be narrower too (ibid:6).

Illustration 6.4: Suggestion 3; Compromise Alternative.

Suggested by the Norwegian Public Roads Administration and recommended by the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo.

(Source: Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:24.)

The Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo recommended this third alternative and concluded that;
“[Alternative 3] gives a poorer standard for Ulvenveien than alternative 1, because of reduced sidewalks and removed planting zone. Alternative 3 does however keep the key city plan with the straight axis of Ulvenveien, seems to satisfy the requested functional needs for the property 122/29 [GTS’ property], and avoids the disadvantages of moving the roundabout by the property.”

(ibid:14, my translation)

As the door was the actor that had to pay the highest price in Latour’s story, the planting zone was eliminated in this suggestion and paid the highest price to accommodate for the other actors. As the width of the road was negotiated in order to accommodate for GTS’ property it was found that the planting zone was the only actor that could be sacrificed in the full in order to make the road narrow enough while still keeping a satisfying road quality. Interestingly, the planning authority states of this third suggestion that “The purpose was to reach a compromise alternative” (ibid:6, my translation). Framing the third alternative explicitly as a compromise is of course a leading statement in order to advise the council’s decision. 14th of November 2007 the city council indeed took this advice and decided in favour of the compromise plan suggested by the Norwegian Public Roads Administration (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:27, Statens Vegvesen 15.01.09). GTS submitted a complaint to higher authorities, but this time it was refused (Statens Vegvesen 15.01.09).

The continued modifications of the system of roads, roundabout and pedestrian/bicycle route seen in these three versions is in many ways similar to the modifications of the door in Latour’s story. Latour states at the end of his essay that “One can add actors and substitute certain of them by including others in a routine, but it is impossible to diminish the number: the door gets more complicated…the number of actors accumulates” (Latour 1995:280). In the same way new elements is sought introduced in the traffic system of Økern in order to solve problems, and the number of actors and possible conflicts accumulates. In the case of GTS’ property, the attempt at resolving the conflict involved attempts at modification of roundabouts, the angle of roads, bicycle/pedestrian paths and planted zones. Accommodating
for various actors and interests is difficult and involves a lot of work in a planning process as changes involve more and more actors as the plans get more detailed.

6.5 Sub-Case Conclusions

Before moving on to the last sub-case, some short sub-case conclusions will be drawn. Here I will also point to possible rival explanations and discuss some criticisms of ANT and document analysis that might bias my conclusions.

6.5.1 Representations’ Framings and Orderings

One central question of this thesis is how different representations frame problems and solutions and how these frames order the social and environmental factors involved. First of all, the conflicting framings of GTS and the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo regarding the use of GTS’ property for business in need of large scale transport contribute to the conflicting interpretations of the solutions. As the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo states that the use of the property is questionable as they find it too small for the use it is being put to, they question the grounds of complaint from GTS, and attempts a reframing of the problem. GTS on the other hand states his right to be taken into consideration and invests considerable resources in order to be heard. He finds it inappropriate that the temporary relocation of the railway in the building phase seems to have been planned as if there were no buildings on his property. In addition, he questions the ability of the new local street to provide identity to the area. How local identity can be translated into a material form at Økern is thus an additional site of disagreement. GTS’ rises as a self-appointed spokesperson for local identity at Økern and gains visibility and importance in the planning process by commenting and providing alternate plans. The planning documents, the letters from GTS and the replies to these from the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo thus read as a competition to frame the problem and order the environment through
statements, and gain understanding for decisions and complaints by enrolling other actors. Throughout the process both parties question the other party’s assumptions and way of conduct. The planning process becomes a fight over the right to define relevant problems and adequate solutions where every actor seeks to find alliances for their programs in order to fight off rivals. Like in the first sub-case it is a question of defining what should fall inside the frame and what should fall outside it.

6.5.2 Accommodating for Priorities

Given the framed priorities it is further interesting to consider whether some concerns have been left out later on in order to accommodate for these priorities and what reasons are given for this. The way roads, roundabouts and other road elements can be modified in different ways (or even removed) to accommodate for other actors make them either allies or rivals of GTS property and the planners’ vision for an optimal solution. The most striking aspect of this case is in this respect the green zone taken out in the chosen compromise alternative. The new local “main street” was an emphasized part of the planners’ vision, but was modified in order to make the road less broad and thus less in conflict with GTS’ property and his earlier building allowance. Taking out the green zone and making the sidewalks narrower is considered giving the road a poorer standard, but still considered a necessary negotiation. It compromises GTS’ complaints, but still provides Ulvenveien with a straight axis. In this respect it is possible to conclude that the straight axis of Ulvenveien was a higher priority than the green zone and broad sidewalks. Considering this planning process as a test of “that which is possible and that which is not” (Latour 1995:278) it proved impossible to accomplish a planting zone on the new road next to GTS’ property. The planting zone had to go in order for the other actors to settle their negotiations.
6.5.3 Limitations

Even though Latour’s concept of program and anti-program proved useful in studying the planning documents in this section, some modesty considering the findings is demanded. As earlier mentioned the focus on resourced individuals is a bias both in ANT and in document analysis, as these actors are more visible than others in both the theory and the method. By investing resources, time and energy in comments, complaints and alternate plans GTS becomes a very visible actor in the planning of this restricted area. It can be argued with strength that GTS is a resourced and interested individual and that his case only shows how one individual can act rather than how the norm would react. There is no doubt that differences in resources is important to how people react to planning processes that affect them, many individuals would probably react with fear, apathy and helplessness. However, as this study focuses on planning documents and written official responses from actors and not on statistical facts of society, the main point is how such a response as GTS’ is treated as a part of the planning process in the documents. It is for example interesting that the proposals from GTS are taken into consideration and even included in a planning document as one of three alternatives, rather than being ignored.
7. Green Corridors and the Common Good

Parks and green paths are pointed at as an important way to improve the quality of life in the city and as a common good. Also in Oslo this concern has gained interest and emphasis in planning and priorities since the 1980’s (Haavie 2000:19). The planning and coordination of these green elements can, however, conflict with other concerns and priorities. As seen in the previous sub-case the green zone along a new road was taken out because other concerns were judged more important. In the following I will look specifically into the connection of two parks situated on each side of Økern and the connection of two wide landscapes, how non-green elements are seen as barriers to these connections and how this is presented in the planning documents. For the sake of exploring how the various elements connect and create better or worse passages between the parks and the landscapes I will draw on Ingunn Moser and John Law’s concept of good and bad passages (Moser & Law 2007).

I will start by providing an overview of this sub-case and then move on to a presentation of Moser and Law’s concept of good and bad passages. Then I will explore how this concept can bring light to the connection between the two parks and the barriers in between them. Before making some sub-case conclusions I will also look into the connection of two wider landscapes.

7.1 Overview: Improving the Green Corridor

In an early planning document the green structure of the area is described in the following way (see also illustration on the next page):

“The Økern-area is situated in between to larger green areas. In the south is Valle-Hovin with large green spaces and various sports facilities and in the north the Løren park with Løren sports ground…The system of trails in the area binds these green areas together…”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:22, my translation)
The green trails/paths also provide connections to further green areas to the north, to the east and to the south of the planning area (ibid). Further the planners state concern about the connections that the green trails provide by noting that “The coherence of the system of trails can be improved, especially the crossing of Østre Aker road” (ibid, my translation). Østre Aker road runs north of GTS’ property and is marked by “Ø. Aker vei” on the map below.

Illustration 7.1: Green Structure in the Planning Area.

Østre Aker road is marked as “Ø. Aker vei” on the map and “Økernsenteret” notes the Økern centre shopping mall. The trail “Turveg D3” leads further into Groruddalen and the trail “Turveg D2” runs from the centre of Oslo in the south and all the way into the northern city forest. The Løren park and Valle Hovin is also positioned. For the sake of coherence I have also noted the location of GTS’ property on the map.

(Source: Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007:21[appendix p.5])

Considering the connection of larger landscapes the planning authority noted that;
“Økern has developed as a natural node of the connections from the city centre… This makes Økern easily available from most parts of the city, both by car and by public transport. Økern is situated on the transition between two main landscapes; the large ‘Oslo Amfi’ and the ‘Goruddalen space’.”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:16f, my translation)

The connection between the “Oslo Amfi” and Groruddalen provides yet another connection where passages can be found, but over a wider area than the passage between the two parks earlier mentioned.

The framing of the trails as a system with the purpose of connecting different green areas in a wide area and the focus on coherence makes it interesting to investigate this in the light of the concept of good and bad passages.

7.2 Bad, Better and Good Passages

In their article “Good Passages, Bad Passages” Ingunn Moser and John Law (2007) explore actor-networks and the material specificities of dis/ability. In the article we meet Liv, a woman who has been disabled since birth, and who controls her environment through a lever on her electrical wheelchair operated by her chin. The article explores some aspects of living with dis/ability; being disabled while still being able to complete everyday task like opening doors, answering the telephone, operating the TV-set or moving around. These various activities include material specificities which are connected by passages of different qualities (Moser & Law 2007:160).

Moser and Law emphasize that in the same way as Liv’s dis/ability has specificities, so has her environment and the apparatuses she operates. For example, Liv tells the story of a train journey she wanted to make. She was able to order the train tickets and was told that there was a lift (a hoist) at every station and that her wheelchair would be no problem. However, when she arrived at the train station the hoist was missing and the railway sent her to her destination by taxi instead. On the return trip the hoist was at the station, but the only place
where Liv’s wheelchair would fit in was among the luggage (ibid:160f). Moser and Law state that these are passages of different qualities. Passages are “movement between specificities”, i.e. between the train station’s platform and the train, and between her home and her destination. There is a gap between the platform and the train, and between her home and her destination that can be filled by different specificities, i.e. a hoist or a taxi. That is why Moser and Law state that “the movement between specificities is also a specificity in its own right” (ibid:161). Further they claim that the passages come into focus as one attends to specificities and that some of these are easy and others difficult. For example opening the door is easy for Liv, while the first train ride was difficult, if not impossible, and the return trip provided a better passage, but not a good one as Liv had to travel with the luggage (ibid). Moser and Law state that “good passages have to do with moving smoothly between different specificities and their materialities. Bad passages are about awkward displacements, movements that are difficult or impossible” (ibid:165). They also note that good passages can hide bad passages. For example Liv is able to write on her own with the help of a special computer program and some special controls. She can write two page letters to her friends, but it does however take her two days because the computer program is built up of a hierarchy of commands which is laborious to operate. The fact that she can write on her own, opposed to not being able to write at all without help, provides a good passage which is visible to her friends when receiving private letters from her, but it does however conceal other passages i.e. all the hard work and time it takes her to write these letters (ibid:165ff).

Important to note is that specificities are specific and so are the specificities that provide (or not) the passages in between the specificities. For example the specific train station, the specific train, her specific wheelchair, her specific handicap and the specific day of her travel. As Moser and Law note “Specificities…are specific because they come in the form of networks of heterogeneous materials…if networks are in place, if the prostheses are working,
then there is ability. If they are not…there is dis/ability” (ibid:161). These good and bad passages make and are made by individuals, providing partial connections different at every place and in every time (ibid:174).

7.3 Good and Bad Green Passages

Although the focus of Moser and Law’s article is on living with dis/ability, the concepts of good and bad passages can provide insight to passages in the city just as well. Moser and Law emphasize the material specificities and how these make some things easy to do for specific actors and other things harder to do, i.e. there can be ability and dis/ability. Ability or dis/ability is therefore no inherent quality of the actors, but the result of actors meeting in networks and creating good or bad passages (Moser & Law 2007:158&161). How easy it is to i.e. cross a road has to do with how the road is planned and built, as well as the abilities of the actors passing it. Therefore the concepts of Moser and Law can readily be applied to the planning of roads, just as well as the dis/abilities of the actors crossing them. In order to discuss the passages between these green areas and their qualities, the specificities of both the human and the non-human actors must be noted as they meet in networks. The road might for example provide a good passage for cars and car drivers, but at the same time create a barrier to the passage of pedestrians along the green path in between the two larger green areas.

Dealing with passages makes it natural to focus on a central actor in order to see the specific passages and the specificities of other actors which provide good or bad passages. Here it seems natural to walk mostly in the footsteps of pedestrians (and bicyclers) as the green paths are supposed to provide for these. As roads and other non-green elements might provide obstacles to smooth passages for these actors it will be of importance to look at areas where these meet and come in conflict.
There are however multiple passages in the area; one consist of the immediate passage of the green path over the Østre Aker road, while another one concerns the wide ranging passage between the centre, or the “Oslo Amfi” as it is called, and Groruddalen. First I will point at the importance of the specificities of the actors, before investigating the passage over the Østre Aker road and the passages between the larger landscapes. I will discuss how the problems of passages are presented in the documents and how this can be understood by the concept of good and bad passages. Questions of scale and identity will play an additional role in discussing the connection between the landscapes.

7.3.1 Specificities

As seen in the previous sub-case with GTS, specificities matter; for example how two alternative placements of a roundabout interfere with diverse actors in different ways and how the width of a road can cause a building to be demolished or not. This is yet another example of how actor-networks are flexible and momentary, and how actors have no inherent qualities but those we can see where actors meet. It is therefore also in this sub-case important to take note of the included actors visible in conflicts and taken note of in the documents. In this sub-case I can start by noting that there are two green recreational areas connected by a green path, and a highly trafficked road which works as a barrier on this path. The crossing of the road of the green path consists of yet another specificity; a pedestrian underpass under the highly trafficked road. The area immediately south of the road consists mostly of space intensive businesses (among others the property of GTS) and after walking under the road northwards the path follows a heavily trafficked road for some hundred meters as well as passing over a bridge over the metro rails, which run over ground through the area. These non-human actors provide passages for both human actors like pedestrians and non-human ones like cars, but these passages are not of the same specificity or quality. The Østre Aker
road provides a smooth passage for cars and their drivers on this specific spot; they need not notice the green path as it passes underneath the road. The green path is however interrupted by the roads and the cars and therefore the road provides an obstacle to pedestrians along the green path. In addition the Økern area is mainly a business area, with many space intensive businesses like car retailers, as seen in the previous sub-case (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:3). The industrial flair to the area might therefore also contribute to the interruption of the green path.

In the case of the wider passage between the two landscapes earlier mentioned (the “Oslo Amfi” and Groruddalen) there are more actors and more specificities involved. The passage of Østre Aker road is just one of many places where actors meet and create better or worse passages for each other. The system of roads, rails and metro in this area provide obstacles for the connection between larger landscapes as they run across the landscapes’ natural axis (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007:20[appendix p.4]). Furthermore it is worth noting that the building phase creates yet other networks involving further actors active at the construction sites creating other passages (often worse ones) for pedestrians as well as for cars and their drivers. This shows how important it is to remember that passages are not set once and for all; as soon as more actors are added or actors are modified the passages earlier present change as well, for better or for worse. The time factor is therefore also important as various actors meet in different networks at different times. Different actors create good and bad passages for other actors and a good passage for one actor might be accompanied by a bad one for another.

7.3.2 Bad, Better and Good Green Passages – Østre Aker Road Passage

As earlier noted, the plan mentions that the passage of the Østre Aker road by the green path can be improved. The mentioned specificities of the actors in the area should have made it clear that there is a good reason for this. Whether the planned changes in the area will provide
a better passage for the green path in this area is however to be questioned. The new “main street” of Økern (new Ulvenveien) dealt with in the previous sub-case, provides the green path with yet another pedestrian underpass under a new roundabout just south of Østre Aker road (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007B:4&23). This new actor adds to the network and modifies the passage. The argument of the new Ulvenveien providing a green impact was also lost after the planting zone was taken out (ibid). It is however mentioned that the traffic islands in the area provide green spots, that the existing green paths will be kept mostly as today and also that there will be done some additional planting along the paths (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:22&31 and Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007:40[appendix p.24). In general the information from the planning documents does not make it possible to conclude that the passage through the area where the green path meets with Østre Aker road will be improved radically. The changes might however provide the pedestrians with better connections to i.e. the planned “public transport node” and public transport in general (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007:37[appendix p.21]).

The emphasis on the possibility of improving the coherence of the green path passing Østre Aker road points to a further related question: why is it seen as important to provide a coherent system of green paths and good outdoor areas? One answer can be found in the wider strategy document covering the Økern area as a whole. At the start of the work with the strategy for the Økern area the focus was on developing good business/industry areas, but then the focus was drawn towards transforming areas for residential development as the lack of residential housing in Oslo was found to be increasing (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2004:5f).

In this context it is stated that;

“The most important measure for developing the green profile is to accommodate for the transformation to residential developments – with good public and private outdoor areas.”

(ibid:10, my translation)
Thus the development of good outdoor areas and the connection between these are seen as an important component to the creation of good residential areas. In this context one can also point to the focus on recreational areas as a way of encouraging the transformation of the Økern area from a pure retail/industry district into a mixed district with both industry and residential developments. In connection to this the first detailed planning document of the area also state that;

“With the main road system in tunnels much of the barrier effect for pedestrians and bicyclers will disappear. It provides a better local communication and improves the possibility for mobility in the community without the use of a car.”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:40)

Considering the size, shape and coherence of green areas Siri Haavie investigated the green structure of Oslo and discussed the impact on ecology and recreation (Haavie 2000). General ecological principles prescribe that larger areas are better than small, coherent better than separate areas and less distance in between areas is better than more (ibid:29). Considering the question whether green corridors, like the green paths in this case, have any effect on getting people out in the nature or improving ecological diversity the answers are diverging. It was for example found that green paths had little effect on bringing people over long distances into the city forests. The people who live closer to these recreational areas however, were found to use them more (ibid:63f). It is however noted that “barriers like densely trafficked roads or long distances can limit the use of the green areas and lead to increased use of cars in connection with recreation” (ibid:64, my translation). Considering the natural environment and the biological diversity of the Økern area the planners themselves state that;

“The new road system will have small consequences for the local natural environment. It will neither reduce or improve the connection of the large green areas or give an opportunity for natural contact. The measures will therefore not promote the biological diversity in Økern, but conserve the state of today.”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:39, my translation)
In this context it should however be mentioned that the Agency for Planning and Building Services of Oslo have recently suggested a fresh plan for the green structure of the city in order to preserve and protect green areas and green paths from the pressure of residential developments (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2009 and Byblikk 2009:4f).

7.3.3 Landscapes, Passages and Entries – “Oslo Amfi” and Groruddalen

As earlier noted the area of Økern is today an area with congested traffic, multiple rails and space intensive businesses, but it was not always this way. The history of the Økern area is described as follows in one of the planning documents:

“Ulvenveien was built in the 1850’s…[It] described the circle of the large amfi around the city. By the building of Alnabanen [railway]…a barrier was introduced to the area, which contributed to splitting the city structure. This was later amplified by large road systems and the metro (to Økern station in 1966).”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:18, my translation)

Considering the current situation and the connections of the various landscapes it is further stated that;

“Groruddalen has a clear direction from north-east to southwest, and runs out into the large amfi which makes up the city with its densely built area. The outskirts of the ‘Oslo Amfi’ give the other direction of the landscape against north-west and south-east. These main directions are today less evident in the Økern area. Intense building, road- and rail systems reduce the contact with the superior landscape and break with the main directions.”

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007:20 [appendix p.4], my translation)

Thus the area has been locked in by barriers, as railway, metro and roads were built. The “main directions” have been given obstacles by these traffic elements running along the east-west axis (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:17). The passage between the “Oslo Amfi”, i.e. the fjord, in the south and Groruddalen and the Løren area in the north has thus been made worse with every new traffic element that has been introduced. The planning of the “new Ulvenveien” discussed in the last sub-case, together with the focus on placing the congested
road system in tunnels underground and so out of sight, can in such be seen as a modest attempt at turning back the hands of time and opening up the landscape again.

Illustration 7.2: Landscapes of the Oslo Area.

“Oslo Amfi” is indicated by “Amfiet” and Groruddalen by “Dalen”.

(Source: Plan- og bygningsetaten 2009:27)

Much of the reason for the focus on opening up the passage between these two landscapes can be found in the idea of the “Fjord City”. A planning document cites a strategy document for Oslo as a whole where it is stated that “In Oslo the focus shall be on developing the Fjord City…Oslo’s identity, distinctions and diversity shall be conserved and further developed” (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2007:27 [appendix p.11], my translation). In this context the opening of the landscape by constructing tunnels, the focus on the axes of the landscapes and the notes on the green corridor all contribute to creating a vision of an entrance running from the Oslofjord and north-eastwards up through Groruddalen. In connection with Moser and Law’s concept of good and bad passages one does however depend on an actor able to
experience this passage. In this case one could possibly claim that the focus on this wide entrance is mostly rhetorical as its scale is so large. However, taking the specificities into consideration; like for example the immediate area where the tunnels will take the traffic underground and provide space for other actors than cars and drivers, it is clear that the open space and reduction of barriers might contribute to better passages in the area. The scale of actors is not an inherent quality in the eyes of ANT, Latour for example note that “the difference of scale between ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ levels, is precisely what laboratories are built to destabilize or undo” (Latour 1983:143). In the same way landscapes are seen as larger relations, while passages are seen one at a time, as if in a microscope. As seen in the last sub-case with GTS and his increased visibility, scale is not given or unchangeable, but appears from the connections of actors in networks. The scale of things in planning documents such can be an expression of their importance in the planning process. This creates a tension between real size and importance, where importance rates over real size, i.e. the new tunnel is restricted in size, but amplified in importance in the planning documents. Focusing on the larger passage between the two landscapes is however not very practical. The tension between the scales of passages that can’t be experienced (landscapes) and those which can (passing a road) are evident. The focus on opening up the connection between the wider landscapes presents a problem as the larger relations can’t be experienced by actors in a non-rhetorical sense. In addition, the construction of this vast rhetorical entrance might even contribute to hiding other passages; for example hide the less good passage for pedestrians along the green path crossing the Østre Aker road. The planners’ use of large maps and illustrations in the beginning of the planning process thus might lead to a top-down perspective and initial decisions favoring large rhetorical connections, as these are dealt with before the detailed solutions.
The feeling of place and identity is also of importance in the context of this attempt at city repair. The description of Økern as one gigantic intersection is not uncommon:

"The Økern area appears as fragmented and confusing, with an ineffective use of areal. It consists of a very mixed development, temporary plants and businesses with untidy outdoor areas. Large asphalt surfaces are dominant many places. Økern probably appears to many people as a large intersection with a lacking identity, and it stands in strong contrast to many coherent and tidy residential areas around it. The need of city repair is great."

(Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:19, my translation)

The Økern area is in this way described as a problem zone for the passage between the two landscapes as it consists of mixed landscapes, large asphalt surfaces and traffic systems with barrier effects. In other words the whole area is experienced as a bad passage. In this quote this is directly connected to a lack of identity. In this context it is worth to mention Marc Augé’s notion of non-places. Merriman states that:

"Augé sees places as occupied, familiar, partially rooted, organic and associated with a sense of history, home and dwelling, while he suggests that spaces such as airports, motorways and shopping malls are frequently experienced as non-places: spaces of travel, consumption and exchange where solitary users interact with their environment and other people through texts and screens."

(Merriman 2004:146f)

Augé claims that individuals travelling through such non-places experience a detachment to the space (ibid:148). It is possible to think of the passage between the “Oslo Amfi” and Groruddalen as two landscapes with identities, i.e. two places and that the Økern area by its non-place qualities and lacking identity provide a barrier to the coherence and identity of the city as a whole. In this way the non-place Økern is a barrier to the passage between the two landscapes both rhetorically and spatially. However, the description of the Økern area as a place with no history and no identity is awkward. Augé has also been criticized for seeing non-places as an aspect new of “supermodernity” and for the notion of the existence of pure non-places (ibid:148f). Merriman claims that Augé “overstates the newness and differences of
experiences associated with non-places” (ibid:150). Augé also later adjusted his statements in such a way that “transit spaces may be simultaneously constructed as places and non-places” (ibid, italics in original). Merriman notes that “Place and non-place are always relational, contingent and continually folded into one another” and that “Augé fails to address the relations between the material and social construction of places and non-places” (ibid:149&151). In this way place and non-place are constituted as two polarities, unobtainable in pure form. Qualities of space are in such only found by comparing spaces, which are created and used by many actors in various ways (ibid:149). The aspect of comparison is seen in the quote above: “Økern probably appears to many people as a large intersection with a lacking identity, and it stands in strong contrast to many coherent and tidy residential areas around it” (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2003:19, my translation and italics). The planned changes to the Økern area, i.e. the improvement of the passage between the landscapes and creating an entrance to the “Fjord City”, can in this way be seen as an attempt at giving Økern more space-like qualities and greater coherence with the areas around it. The reopening of Ulvenveien (the new local main street) is also described as “an important historical connection to be reestablished” (ibid:5, my translation).

7.4 Sub-Case conclusions

Before moving on to the concluding chapter, some sub-case conclusions as well as some modest notes on the findings will be provided.

7.4.1 Representations’ Framings and Orderings

A central theme in this thesis is how different representations frame problems and solutions and how these frames order the social and environmental factors involved. First, the green areas and paths are ordered as important for residential developments. Furthermore the focus on developing the “Fjord City” orders the tunnel as central in order to open up the landscape.
By constructing this macro-view of the planning area and its goals, the definition of problems and possible solutions are also affected. Problems are constructed around questions of accommodating for large scale passages and solutions are judged on the background of how it accommodates for the “Fjord City” vision, obscuring the question of the green path’s passage of the Østre Aker road. Finally the vision of the “Fjord City” points to a further concern which is seen as important: the reconstruction of identity in the Økern area. In the previous sub-case GTS claims the Økern centre shopping mall to be the real centre of Økern, here too the discussion of the identity of Økern is a debate over what makes up a place. The identity is sought constructed by connecting the fragmented area to the vision of the “Fjord City”. Økern is not only an entrance to the “Fjord City”; it is also a place in its own right. Balancing the place in its own right and the focus on connecting the larger landscapes provides a challenge as it is hard to keep both visions in sight at the same time.

7.4.2 Accommodating for Priorities

A second central question is whether some concerns have been left out later in the planning process in order to accommodate for priorities and what reasons are given for this. Accommodating for good green areas has generally gained importance since the 1980s (Haavie 2000:19). In this specific case however, it is explicitly noted that the changes will neither improve nor deteriorate the green paths and areas in the planning zone. The tunnel is a priority of the plans with the aim of accommodating for good residential areas as it brings transit traffic underground and decreases some barrier effect in the area. Considering green impact, the focus is rather on how the tunnel can help realize the vision of the “Fjord City” and the connections between the larger landscapes, than on improving green impact at the specific passages. It might be argued that the prioritization of the wider landscapes in this respect leaves out and conceals bad green passages like the green path’s crossing of Østre
Aker road. Focusing on the larger landscapes and the connections between them means focusing on passages that can’t be experienced by actors in a non-rhetorical sense. Furthermore this hides passages that can be experienced, i.e. the passage of a specific road. This is not really a question of elements taken out in order to accommodate for priorities. It is rather a question of how concerns like accommodating for personal car traffic (as seen in the first sub-case) or connecting landscapes on a wider scale is amplified at the cost of obscuring passages on a smaller scale.

7.4.3 Limitations

The planning documents providing the main material in this case have a focus on the building of a new road system, not mainly on improving green paths or creating recreational areas. This does however not mean that this is not a priority of the Agency for Planning and building Services of Oslo. As mentioned, they recently released a plan for the green structure of Oslo (Plan- og bygningsetaten 2009). What however has been discussed here is how the green structure is presented and accommodated for in the relevant planning documents for the planned changes in this restricted area. One final note is worth making considering the discussion of the scales of landscapes and passages. Making the planners’ focus on opening the wider landscapes an issue in this sub-case does not mean that the planners ignore making detailed plans for i.e. pedestrians passing roads. What has been the goal is to show how the focus on wider landscapes can conceal and interrupt the focus on green passages which can be experienced in a non-rhetorical sense by actors in the area.
8. Conclusions

In this final section I will review the preliminary conclusions and consider how the results can bring light to the questions posed at the beginning of the thesis. I will also discuss the usefulness and limitations of the theoretical concepts, and finally I will point to some further research questions which could prove fruitful to investigate in this context.

8.1 Findings: Framing and Ordering

One of the questions I asked at the beginning of this thesis was how representations in the documents frame problems and solutions and how these frames order social and environmental factors. The three sub-cases have shown that the conflicting framings over the role and emphasis of concerns in the planning process lead to conflicting definitions of problems and solutions. When certain problems or actors are framed in the centre, other concerns may be left unresolved as the frames set the agenda and lead the formulation of questions and solutions. It is a question of which factors are inside and outside the frame of planning, but also a question of when they enter the frame as the planning proceeds. The frames create an order, where the social and environmental factors involved are given different focus and priority. This can be observed in all three sub-cases.

In the public transport case planning for cars is revealed as a naturalized way of planning urban areas. The black box of planning for cars led to public transport entering the planning process late. The framing of public transport as something that can be planned in a flexible way later on orders it as less important in the start of the planning process. This orders personal car traffic over other forms of mobility as car traffic is inside the frame from the very beginning and leads the definition of central problems and solutions. Instead of seeing public transport as a possible solution to the problem of congested roads, the problem is framed as low road capacity and the solution is found in improving this capacity. This sub-case also
shows the importance of the temporal order in which concerns are brought into the frame. Concerns taken into the main frame from the beginning are given more importance, and become less mutable. It is also important to note that planning processes which focus on planning for cars affect not only car drivers. Sheller and Urry note that planning for cars shapes the lives of non-car drivers too (Sheller & Urry 2000:744f).

In the second sub-case conflicting framings over the use of GTS’ property for large scale business contributes to conflicting interpretations of the building of the new road next to the property. The discussion reads as a competition to order the environment where plans and rival plans are formed as programs and anti-programs. The programs and anti-programs seek to define and redefine relevant problems and solutions, and become means in order to find alliances for fighting off rivals. It is again a question of what should fall inside and outside the frame. It is however also a question of the identity of the actor that is Økern and how it should be translated into a material form. GTS’ ideas about the Økern centre shopping mall as the centre of Økern are very different from the planners’ visions of the new local main street as a new focal point. The material solutions at Økern, actors’ opinions of the identity of Økern and Økern as an actor are thus co-produced throughout these negotiations.

Finally the green corridors case points out how framing connects to scale. Framing the connections of the landscapes as important and creating a rhetorical entrance to the “Fjord City” has importance for the planning of passages on a smaller scale. Focusing on the big picture; the connection of the landscapes, obscures the detailed passages of the area like the passing of Østre Aker road. In this way the focus on good large passages (which can’t be experienced by actors) can contribute to hiding worse smaller passages (which can be experienced). This is also a negotiation over identity; a debate over what makes up a place. Finally the “Fjord City” becomes the frame which Økern has to be transformed to fit into by providing this large passage.
8.2 Findings: Accommodating for Priorities

The second question of this thesis considered whether or not some concerns had been left out of the plans later on in order to accommodate for higher prioritized concerns. First of all the sub-cases show that the time of when various concerns are brought into the frame is of importance. Leaving out concerns to deal with them at a later stage may present a problem in planning processes, as bringing in concerns at a late stage when decisions about basic problems and solutions are already made provides less room for posing basic questions and defining wide problems and solutions. An example of this is found in the public transport case. Bringing public transport inside the frame at a later stage hindered the possibility of planning coherent transport strategies and considering other alternatives than increasing road capacity. Bringing public transport in earlier might have brought other questions into the center of the discussion of how to deal with the congested road system, and resulted in different solutions.

Secondly, taking out an actor at a later stage in order to accommodate for other actors reflects the need to prioritize for some actors which are seen as more central, or better entrenched in the network than others. This also reflects an ordering of the environment and its actors. A good example of this is found in the private property case where the green zone was taken out from the plans of the new main street in order to accommodate for the straight axis of the new main street and hindering demolition of the property of GTS. The straight axis was thus considered a higher priority than the green zone.

8.3 Conclusions Considering Theoretical Concepts

Framing proved to be a fruitful concept in order to specify and bring out the opinions and positions of the various actors. With this concept it is possible to draw lines around prioritized concerns and left out concerns, and how various programs come into conflict caused by
framing the problems and solutions differently at different stages of the process. In combination with document analysis it does however seem to construct quite uniform categories without much room for nuances. This conceals grey areas, uncertainty and ambivalence in the planning process which might have been found by conducting interviews and observations. In studies using these methods processes of overflowing would probably be more evident and provide a more nuanced picture of how the planning documents are produced.

Considering Latours concept of program & anti-program it proved interesting to look at different documents as statements in a negotiation over defining central concerns and adequate solutions. Seeing plans as programs and rivaling plans as anti-programs made it possible to study where plans and interests collide. In combination with framing it provided a means to study a conflict where the definition of how a property is used and how changes would interfere was central. It must however be noted that the critique of ANT over the representability of strong actors is relevant here. The visibility of strong actors affects the results. Especially because this study uses document analysis in companion with ANT resourced actors are more visible. However, this might reflect a problem in the way commenting practices are arranged on behalf of the planning authorities, rather than a general problem of the theory.

Interestingly the concept of good and bad passages proved a fruitful way of studying how plans accommodate for pedestrians routes passing trafficked roads and how these passages can be of varying quality. It did however reveal a question considering large scale passages and the lack of actors to experience these.
8.4 Questions for Further Research

The last sub-case and the use of good and bad passages especially presented a question which could be interesting for a further study. This considers the planners’ creation of a rhetorical image of a passage between two large landscapes, where it is unclear who are supposed to experience this passage. It would be interesting to study in more detail how such passages are presented / created in planning documents, which actors are intended to experience them and of what nature this experience is. This construction of a large scale passages is challenged by the concept of good and bad passages as it is unclear whether or not it is possible to draw a line where a passage cannot be experienced by any actor and therefore is no real passage. It could also be interesting to connect these questions of scale with Latour’s concept of inscription devices. Looking at the construction of rhetorical large scale passages and the use of maps in planning documents would be an interesting departure for a further study.

Studying the way scale is an important factor in planning processes in general, and how large scale planning collide with real life experiences could also be interesting. The act of planning with maps of various scales and making sure new roads have straight axes is after all very different from the lived experience of having your building knocked down because of a new road.
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