# Designing age-integrated cities
# A framework for design exemplified with tweens

Author: Rasmus Frisk
Architect MAA + Urban Designer
CEO and Partner of arki_lab
Assoc. Prof. at DIS, Architecture & Design
arki_lab ApS – Designing Cities WITH People
Copenhagen, DK / rf@arkilab.dk / www.arkilab.dk

Architect MAA and Urban Designer Jeanette Frisk
Founding Partner of arki_lab
arki_lab ApS – Designing Cities WITH People
Copenhagen, DK / jf@arkilab.dk / www.arkilab.dk

Co-author: Thomas Aarup Due
Stud. Cand. Soc.
University of Copenhagen
arki_lab ApS – Designing Cities WITH People
Copenhagen, DK / tad@arkilab.dk / www.arkilab.dk

# Designing age-integrated cities
## A framework for design exemplified with tweens

Making cities livable 2016 – cities for everyone, child and age-friendly cities.

**Abstract**

*One of the greatest challenges to our cities today is increasing segregation of all domains by age. According to Norwegian gerontologist and sociologist Gunhild Hagestad & Peter Uhlenberg, our society is divided by age in three different ways: Firstly, by a governmental or institutionalized use of chronological age using a person's birthday to determine their status in legislation. This secondly entails a spatial segregation between people in different age groups from kindergartens to retirement homes. The spatial divide thirdly creates a cultural segregation between different age groups present in different lifestyles, tastes and experiences of our world [and material surroundings], which leads to stereotypes and ageism. From our birth to our death, society keeps us well within spaces occupied by peers to the degree that other age groups seem alien and unapproachable. We wish to discuss several ways of countering age segregation in our cities, based on a research project for the Danish Ministry of Housing. First, we address ways of countering institutionalized age segregation with the need for interdisciplinary and cross-departmental projects in municipalities. Second, we discuss the creation of age-integrated public spaces that facilitate interaction between age groups, as well as the difference between applying so-called universal design and integrating age-specific designs. To this end, we also wish to remark on the important difference between designing for age groups and generations. We also discuss how to open up 'age-ghettos' like retirement homes with the development of adjacent or integrated areas of age-heterogeneous activities. Third and last, we will explore the existing challenge of the cultural segregation of age, as well as the different degrees of age integration that are possible, from peaceful coexistence to fully fledged friendships. We point to the different ways that interdisciplinary collaboration is necessary in an overall effort to create environments where people can meet and interact across the span of years.*

**Keywords:** *Age integration & segregation, urban planning, life phases, urban design strategies, tweens, young people*

**A Society Divided by Age**

Today Western societies in particular (and the rest of the world generally) is divided by age. This insubstantial phenomenon transcends all lived life, and though it is often relatively invisible, it guides our everyday action more than we know. As an urban design office, we see firsthand the degree to which our cities are divided into age-specific areas, and we hear the difficulties that people of different ages have in interacting with each other. We therefore have an ongoing interest in the dynamics of age and how these shape our society. The work of Norwegian gerontologists and sociologists Gunhild Hagestad & Peter Uhlenberg has been important in bringing light to issues related to age. According to Hagestad and Uhlenberg, age segregation permeates society in 3 ways. First, we have *institutionalized* age segregation, where legislation and formal attributes of citizens in relation to the state are assigned on the basis of their chronological age (Hagestad & Uhlenberg 2005:345). This has developed from the increasing complexity in modern state bureaucracy where age plays a central role in managing citizens (Gubrium et al. 1994:5). Another consequence of this is *spatial* age segregation, where people are divided into kindergartens, schools, workplaces and retirement homes over the course of their entire lives.  A consequence of age segregation in society is the widespread notion that people are in different stages of life, and these stages become imbued with a certain meaning. This creates a discourse of age segregation, which marks different age groups and assigns them specific age identities, thus creating a *cultural* age segregation, where people in other age groups seem alien (Hagestad & Uhlenberg 2005). Working with children every day, we experience this divide firsthand in our attempts to involve them in the foreign grown-up world of urban design. But we stress the importance of overcoming this gap of understanding as the only way to create age-integrated livable cities.

*But what is this age thing about anyway?*

You can understand age in several different ways. This first one is the most obvious, and the one we normally connect with age; the chronological age. This is tied to our measurement of time and is understood as the years a person has lived. When you ask a person's age, you would normally answer '(S)he's 10 years old' (Hagestad & Uhlenberg 2005:345). Though most commonly recognized, this is however not the only kind of age. You can perceive a person's biological age as the aging of the body – some clear signs are seen between a small child and the

white-haired elderly in a wheelchair (Lewinter 2008:189ff). Another age is the psychological age referring in great deal to a person's maturity. The phrase 'she was older than her years' is often used about people who have experienced a lot in their lifetime. Finally, we talk about a person's social age as their relation to the society around them. Have they reached the age of consent or are they allowed to vote? Are they married, do they have kids? Are they working? Hopefully all these relations to age, which are active when we try to categorize people every day, help to understand the complex nature of the phenomenon.

*Life phases and age groups*

A way to get around these different age relations is by combining them into what we call life phases (Bradley 1996:146). These are defined by different age criteria and are thus expressions of all the age categories in union. For example, the transition from teenager to young person is one of psychological maturity and social relations with regard to the legal age of consent. Being a grown-up is about whether you have kids, a job and a place to live. And a new differentiation between the young-old and the old-old are made according to your biological age and the degree to which you are able to take care of yourself. As we often see, chronological age is not a determinant. Instead we use chronological age intervals as a very rough estimate for a specific life phase [in some ways contradicting ourselves] in what we call age groups. The reason to return to a chronological age understanding is often a necessity to reintegrate the work with the institutions in society, which, as pointed out, are very age-segregated. When we work with schools, we need to know which grade we work with, and they are – despite research arguing for other forms – still divided by age. Therefore, in this article, we will refer to age groups as paraphrasing specific life phases.

*Examples of the new young*

As an office, we have for multiple reasons[1] primarily been interested in work with kids and young people (already here using two age categories). One is the increasing differentiation of what we used to call 'kids' into multiple segments like children, youngsters, tweens, teenagers, young people etc. These differentiations are largely a consequence of the KGOY dictum: Kids

---

[1] Other reasons are how kids are often neglected in urban design. How they can be seen having the same tendencies as tourist and therefore their behavior is interesting in analyzing space-use. Also a new reform of the Danish public school system have created a lot of potentials for architectural interference in recent years.

Grow Older Younger (Keller & Kalmus 2009:331). By looking at the kids, the problems and potentials of urban design in relation to age are also greatly intensified, as life phases change more and more rapidly and spatial needs can vary greatly in just a few years' time. We would like to propose this differentiation of kids and young people in current urban design and theory:

| Life phase | ~ Age group | Examples of demarcations |
|---|---|---|
| Babies and toddlers | 0-5 years | Not able to move around independently. |
| Kids | 6-9 years | Free from parents' immediate support. |
| Tweens | 10-12 years | Beginning to mimic older attitudes. |
| Teenagers | 13-19 years | Body in state of puberty. |
| Young people | 20-25 years | Independent from family e.g. live alone. |

But remember, when applying life phases, we paint with the broadest brush possible – if nothing else this article wants to argue for being open to exceptions and surprises and not squeezing our most valuable possessions – our kids – into pre-fabricated boxes. The important thing is also for the kids to be able to react *against* a certain categorization. But to exemplify why these understandings can be important, we will go further into depth with a new life phase: The Tweens.

*Tweens – countering myths of young people in urban design*
One of the great problems coming to light when viewing age critically is the great extent to which ageism, or age stereotypes, are prevalent in our everyday view of each other. This is extremely problematic, as most urban spaces created for kids and young people are made by a designer's hand, using these seldom challenged stereotypes as a background.

To examine some of these challenges, we can look at a 'new' life phase which is increasingly debated in contemporary literature: 'tweens,' who get their name from 'in-betweens' or 'pre-teens,' and are normally placed in an age group somewhere between 8-12 years (Keller &

Kalmus 2009:329). They are a category that has gotten a lot of attention, especially because of their role as consumers with easy access to their parents' wallets (Lundby 2011). The tweens have just started earning a bit of money or are getting a greater allowance, and what this money is used for is especially important. The possibility to shop for clothes or food is desired. Places relating to this will have a social function and appear as meeting points (Olsen 2011). Group dynamics are important. A lot is happening in these years at the very beginning of puberty when hormones start to shift and your identity is in flux. A lot of the tweens' self-identification work happens in their social interactions with their peers in and outside of school. Therefore, a lot of their activity in urban space is group-based. It is a constant fragile balance between being oneself and being part of the group: "Uniqueness, one's own style, is highly valued, although at the same time difference from others still has to fall within acceptable boundaries, because going to extremes could mean risking ending up alone" (Keller & Kalmus 2009:338). Many more interesting qualities can be examined in relation to this age group, but it's important that they are based on thorough research rather than unfounded stereotypes.

One stereotypes surrounding this life phase, which we have encountered multiple times, is the perception that tweens, just like the stereotype of kids, enjoy being in crowded environments filled with noise and play – such as a schoolyard during lunch hour. But when interviewing and talking with tweens, it becomes clear that at younger and younger ages are pushing themselves to perform in school and social contexts. This means that they have developed a need for quiet places where they can withdraw from the crowd and be alone and on the other hand often become stressed in noisy and hectic situations. Thus a way to create better learning and social environments for this group in schools is to allocate areas to be quiet and tranquil. Having defined a life phase we create some criteria for good space for this specific age-group. We also create a bar which the tweens can differ from - the age groups becomes like strings on a guitar which, when struck, vibrates slightly from their starting points. This becomes an important instrument in the designer's toolbox for fine tuning designs to specific life-phases and groups.

Having described a framework for how you can think about age in our society, we will now move on to look at how you can counter the different kinds of age segregation through the means of urban design processes.


**Countering institutionalized age-integration**

As a result of institutional age segregation, municipalities are often structured with age-like categories in their organization. This, as in any other organization, has a tendency to lead toward "silo thinking" and regimentation. When asking a municipality employee working in the sector for public schools to create a project combining school programs and the local senior institution, e.g. a shared garden space or budgets for joint excursions, things get complicated and the normal workflow is disturbed. This can create tension on the organizational level that can be large enough to inhibit the development of the project because of a lack of proper municipality ownership (Stentoft 2015).

Our suggestion for countering these tendencies is to first create an awareness of the problems generated by institutional age segregation and how this can reinforce age segregation in society. Secondly, as a consequence of this awareness, we suggest creating new cross-department hybrid projects, where municipality departments effectively cooperate within a project frame, creating a sense of ownership from both departments (Christensen 2011, The Danish Ministry of Housing 2016).

The Danish, and to some degree Scandinavian, use of 'Integrated Areal Renewals' are good examples of these kinds of hybrid projects. An Area Renewal is a group of municipality professionals of different backgrounds who set up office in the local neighbourhood, which they work with over a span of up to six years on improving. Though technically under the 'Technical and Environmental Administration,' the goal of these projects is to generate the physical renewal of a neighbourhood, in close collaboration with local actors and with a focus on the development of the neighbourhood's social and cultural profile. Thus the Integrated Area Renewal often becomes the driver of cross-departmental projects, creating links between all the municipality's other departments from within (Technical and Environmental Administration 2012).

In our recent work with the development of the Kulbanen neighbourhood, located in the suburbs of Copenhagen, a newly started Area Renewal was the main driver in kicking off the redevelopment of an old industrialized area around a discarded railroad. We were responsible for the initial workshop where over 300 students from the local school participated in describing and analyzing their neighborhood and its potentials. This is a project that certainly would never have been organized if it had not been for the workers in the Area Renewal clearing the way through the organizational patchwork of the Municipality of Copenhagen. This was a prerequisite for us

to start the work on how to facilitate a workshop across multiple life phases of kids, tweens and teenagers at the school.

The problem of institutionalized age segregation is immense and extremely important as it often creates the framework within which we must work with the other kinds of age segregation. We will however not treat it further in this paper, is it lies within the field of social sciences and thus departs from our focus on the spatial development of our cities. But let it be said that it is still a very important part of development projects for architects and urban designers to keep in mind and address.

We will instead move on to discuss the different ways you can counter spatial age segregation, by designing with life phases in mind.


**Spatial age segregation: Age ghettos and adjacent areas**

As initially discussed, a consequence of spatial age segregation is areas in our cities that are partly or wholly reserved for one specific age group, and where other age groups have strong social, legal or spatial parameters against them entering. As part of our research project for the Danish Ministry of Housing, we identified these as what we called age-homogeneous enclaves, or put in simpler terms: age ghettos. These are defined as physical spaces in the city that are occupied by one age group, and actively inhibit other age groups from entering through varying cultural, spatial and legal exclusion mechanisms. Examples of these are multiple and common, like Kindergartens, schools, institutions for higher education, student dormitories, workplaces, retirement homes, and so on. These are the most present examples of age segregation in our society.

We suggest the creation of adjacent age-heterogeneous places as a way of softening up these age ghettos. The idea is simply to think of institutions like these in connection with other age groups, and make a place for them to be at home within the age ghetto. It could be the establishment of child zones in the workplace that will make it easier to bring children to work. It could be shared sleeping facilities in student dorms to allow families to visit. There are many different ways of creating these places. The idea is to include multiple age groups in the design of places from the beginning. When we design for one age group exclusively, we isolate.

In our research project, we worked toward creating a family friendly sensory park adjacent to a nursing home. We identified that the elderly felt envious of all the activities that families were

able to participate in that they could not be a part of. Additionally, when families visited, it was often for short stays, as the facilities were not well-suited for children. By creating the sensory park in the vicinity of the nursing home, the elderly and their families were able to meet on common ground for longer and better family gatherings.

This is one way to approach age ghettos caused by spatial age segregation. There are others, like combining institutions, spreading out institutions, and creating mixed institutions instead of age-homogeneous spaces – but as you might notice, these solutions refer back to institutional segregation. The institutions of our society need re-thinking, but until that happens, we must look at how shared public space between age ghettos can be used as a way to create age integration.

*Universal design or integrating age-specific designs*
When we identify specific life phases, one of the interesting parameters is their specific needs in urban space. Looking at multiple age groups at once, we can see a matrix of needs, which put all kinds of demands on our public spaces. Facing this challenge, there are three design strategies to approach the problem. The first is to make age-group-specific urban spaces. A clear example of this is the normal playground for kids. The second strategy is to make urban space that tries to accommodate the needs of everyone – or so-called universal design (Wolfgang & Korydon 2011). This is often a criterion for praised and well-working public areas. Between these two points, there exists the third possibility to create urban space for *some* age groups, meeting their needs while neglecting others. All these design strategies are valid and must be used site-specifically in relation to the area and the policies of intervention (The Danish Ministry of Housing 2016). If there is a high presence of kids and seniors in an area, you might want to facilitate areas that meet these groups' needs. If you have a problem with teenagers ravaging the streets in another area, you might want to create a place for them to be. In central spaces frequented by a wide range of people you want to make them as inclusive as possible. Interestingly, to create age integration, the third strategy of creating areas which try to integrate and create connections between a few age groups seems to be the best solution.

The differences in design approaches can be seen in our project at Vesterbro Ungdomsgård, a youth club in central Copenhagen, where we were asked to design the open space in front of the main building. In a co-design process with the kids and professionals using the space, we came up with an idea of implementing a range of 80*80*40 tree boxes that were able to interlock like

large LEGO-pieces. By introducing the boxes, we made a flexible design where the content of the design and its functions were open for interpretation. This is an example of a universal design approach that leaves room for interesting urban space. Everyone [within our focus on kids and young people – you could argue that elderly might not be able to move the boxes around that easily] are able to use the boxes in a way that fit their needs and the dynamics can change over the years. When the kids change life phases, their use of the boxes will change as well. If ever they grow tired of playing football and become teenagers who just want to 'hang out,' they can be made into seating arrangements. What is most important is that the space is not pre-programmed by us as architects trying to decide what the future holds, but that it is open for continuous redevelopment.

**The difference between life phases based on age and a generation's historical context**

We can depart on a little correction on our behalf: we've come to use the word 'generation' and 'age' interchangeably, though they really are two different concepts. Age relates to different kinds of time passing as described in the introduction and our life phase models. On the other hand, we have generations. A generation refers to a person being born at a certain time and because of this lives through a certain historical period, which will influence this person in certain ways (Mannheim 1998:168). We talk of the postwar generation, the baby-boomers, generation X, Y, Z and so on. You could say that life phases are concerned with personal time, whereas generations are concerned with general time, or as it is also called, history. In these years, the last people who were adults during the Second World War will be elderly and will soon not be among us anymore. This way, you change life phase through the life course [though not always in a completely linear fashion], but your generation will always stay the same. Why the confusion then? Well, life phases and generations overlap. People of Generation Zero will be teenagers right now, while the '68 Generation will mostly be seniors now. When you divide by life phase, you thereby also automatically divide by generation.

*Design based on generations versus design based on life phases*

So why does this matter? It matters because when we design urban space, we want it to last longer than just a single generation. Imagine the generation of tweens who were obsessed with the small digital animal devices known as tamagotchis (most of you probably will not have heard

of this, because it was a very time-limited and therefore generational trend). Now think of a park being designed exclusively to interact with and promote tamagotchis, or that uses their design as a basis for the aesthetic expression of the park. Only one generation would ever understand this cultural reference properly, and they would soon grow up. This would be a very limited space which, like many cultural trends, would only matter to the selected few. So when we speak of generational integration or intergenerationality, we actually speak of people interacting despite their historical luggage and period-specific culture. We talk about people who grew up without computers, learning to use Google.

What do we then talk about when we say age integration? This becomes much trickier, but is in its main sense integration between the needs of different life phases. Remember life phases are an expression of complex relations between different ages. When we talk about life phase, we actually refer to something more universal, which depends on the criteria of why different people belong to a certain life phase in the first place. Designing for the elderly is based on the criteria that the elderly's health is weaker or somehow compromised, or that they have a greater biological age, and it therefore focuses on, for example, access ramps for wheelchairs. Design for children could be based on a fundamental curiosity about the world, inherent from a young psychological age, which stimulates the need for play. Therefore, you would focus on making playgrounds when designing for kids. In these examples, a universal need is uncovered that is tied to the different kinds of ages, which will apply to all generations, whether they experienced the Second World War or not. Life phases become timeless stereotypes, or as one says: "Kids are kids".

But does this thesis really hold water? Do children today play the same way that children did during World War II? No, probably not. But the element of play is universal – or is it? Could one imagine a grim future where children didn't have a need for play? Yes, one could… this is exactly the point of life phases; they also vary according to the different combination of age criteria applied to define them. New life phases arise, like the tweens or the 'young-old,' as consequences of new kinds of social age – new kinds of relations to society in one's social status. What this means is that life phases are never static categories, and design based on life phases needs to be attuned to new developments in how we live our lives. But still, life phases are much broader and much more resilient to change than the whimsical historical events that form a generation or the brief cultural trends that we remember from our youth. Parents from different

generations will still face the same problems as far into the future as we can see, the new tweens will be caught between childhood and teenage problems, and the elderly will be less agile than the rest of us while navigating through urban space. In the end, solutions built on integrating different life phase needs will be more permanent solutions in urban design.

*The paradox of design from an age perspective*

The catch is this: the more universal your design, the less particularly interesting it is for a certain group. The generation of tamagotchi owners would have loved the tamagotchi themed park. The next would not. A park with a memorial to the lives lost in World War II will please the generation of elderly and be insignificant to the next. Whenever you put emphasis on one group's particular culture, you will alienate others, but when you contain yourself to universals, the attachment falters.

   A few solutions to this paradox of design can be suggested. One could look at whether there exist universal solutions to life phase problems which are interesting and important across every generation. One could look at whether you can create universal design, with the possibility for every generation to inscribe it with their particular generation's cultural luggage. One could make temporary generational designs. One could look at how different generations' cultural luggage could be made interesting for other generations, and thus accomplishing the point of departure: generational integration or intergenerationality.

*The example of school interior*

In our project at Sortedam Public School in central Copenhagen, we were asked to create a new interior for the central corridors. As the work in arki_lab is traditionally made, we had a focus on user involvement, making workshops and interviews with pupils, teachers, and the administration, and a cultural evaluation of the space and the school's history. It became clear to us that though the school is interesting as the first Danish mixed-gender city school and other important historical facts, this was not something the children were particularly aware or proud of. So we decided to tell the school's history in relation to requested learning points from the teachers of different subjects, thus e.g. connecting a story about when the school founder brought a cow into the classroom, with learning points for Home Economics about where meat comes from. This way, we related the design to something that would be interesting across the different

'generations' of school pupils, and didn't base the design on some specific cultural trend the kids liked at the moment like 'Harry Potter' (though some would argue that Harry Potter has become universal design for all ages). But the components of our design still reflected the need for something playful but professionally made that is relevant for the age groups in question.

**Age stereotypes and ageism**

At the end of this paper we would like to address *why* age integration is important. When approaching the topic of age integration, which seems like a natural way of the world, it is important to address the question of why? Why is it important that we are able to interact and create friendships and share understandings across the span of years? This is strongly related to the third type of segregation – the cultural divide.

A consequence of age segregation in society is the widespread notion that people are in different stages of life, and these stages become imbued with a certain meaning. A discourse of age segregation is created, which marks the different age groups and assigns to them specific age identities. Through the cultural contrasts, segregation is reproduced and an us/them distinction is built, which becomes apparent in different lifestyles and use of language. Through this us/them distinction, stereotypical images of how other age groups behave arise, as well as an implication of how you should behave towards them. As Bill Bytheway informs us: 'It is widely assumed that categories are constructs that are unavoidably homogenizing, and that they foster tensions between social groups' (Bytheway 2005:368). This is what sometimes feels like an invisible wall standing between the different age groups, because their respective space of action towards one another is diminished. The cultural segregation creates a feedback mechanism reinforcing institutional and spatial segregation to the point where we see utopian 'walled senior societies', like Sun City in the USA (Simpson 2015).

When one interacts with other people in one's everyday life, one automatically makes use of some typifications to locate the people one is interacting with. As we are walking down the street, it only takes one glance to swiftly categorize the people we see as to their gender, race, age and other indicators that make up their social identity (Goffman 1968:12). We have what Lyn H. Lofland would call 'categorical knowledge' about them (Lofland 1975:15). When we meet people, the ideas we have about younger or older people are immediately put into effect in the form of stereotypes, and we use them - unconsciously - to navigate social space (Berger &

Luckmann 1991:45). The discourse that exists about age in society becomes internalized and lays latent in our behaviour towards people in the respective categories. The typifications translate into some pre-arranged roles and expectations for how to act, as old or young, with the behaviour that belongs to that category, which will determine how we act in the situation (Goffman 1957:14). This is the base of another problem concerning age-segragation: Ageism. The stereotypical discrimination of people based on their age.

Our typifications about people in other ages become more and more anonymous the further away they are from our location in time and space. This means that if we in our everyday lives have no contact with for example the elderly, our typification of them will be based on abstractions. What Hagestad and Uhlenberg emphasize as problematic is that these face-to-face interactions are seldom able to occur due to the fact that there are very few places we actually meet people from other age groups. This underlines the importance of pushing the agenda of age-integrated urban space in general.

*Degrees of age-integration*

Good age-integrated urban space is able to bridge the cultural divide between age groups. But there are limits to what space can do. The famous Danish architect Jan Gehl worked with degrees of intensity in public encounters, namely Close Friendships, Friendships, Acquaintance, Chance Contact, and Passive Contacts (Gehl 2007:15). These also give us a basic understanding of the possible relations there can be between different age groups. Here it is important to underline that fully fledged friendships won't ever arise from simple spatial programming. But just the simple possibility of peaceful coexistence and shared use of space can go a long way towards age integration. In this way, the basic aim for designing age-integrated urban space is cohabitation. To create further age integration on several levels, there is a need to include social and local actors to create a framework that is not only material but also integrated into the everyday practices of the site. The meetings between ages can be problematic and different cultural luggage can create tension. But through tension, new understandings can arise. Or in the words of Richard Sennet with regard to two age groups: "Where modern community life can be said to fail the young is in its inability to lead them into a social matrix where they will have to learn to deal with other people." He continues to say that "these same city structures could confront as well older persons who have regressed to childish or adolescent indifference about the effect of

their acts on the people around them" (Sennet 1996:138). In this way, creating age-integrated areas in our city is an important step towards facilitating new understandings between different ages.

In a world where the general population is aging, it is extremely important to maintain an understanding across age groups. Otherwise, we will face severe problems in the social cohesion of our societies in the years to come, and an explanation for why social welfare for the elderly will become such a great demand on the public sector will need to be communicated to the general public.

*Best practice age-integrated area: The Elderly's City in Copenhagen*

As a final example of a well-functioning age-integrated area, we would like to point to a space from our own backyard in Copenhagen called 'The Elderly's City'. This is an old nursing home which has been interspersed with kindergartens and children's institutions. In one corner of the area, a green space with a playground and petting zoo creates a natural oasis in the city. This is combined with an urban garden for the elderly from the nursing home and creates a vibrant area where all age groups mingle and interact. Each of the different institutions also has a focus on creating age-integrated events where all users of the area are invited to participate. The space has many good qualities including creating a balance between openness and enclosures, acting as a nexus for many everyday routes, offering multiple primary uses and attractions which bring people about, as well as providing nice seating options. It is welcoming, cozy, and somehow familiar, and its organic spatial programming manages to integrate different age groups' needs for peace, aesthetics, play, and togetherness.

**Conclusion**

In this paper, we have tried to frame some of the problems concerning age segregation in general and how urban design can help address these problems specifically. We have given theoretical examples on how age can be understood and how age segregation permeates society in an institutional, spatial, and cultural sense. We have then provided concrete empirical examples of how this issue can be dealt with from our everyday practice as an urban design office. We suggest creating cross-departmental municipal projects with a focus on creating age integration inspired by Danish Integrated Areal Renewals. To counter the age ghettos of spatial segregation,

we suggest creating adjacent age-integrated areas to soften the boundaries and open the areas to other age groups. When designing public space within age-segregated areas, we have discussed the difference between designing for universal age groups and culturally specific generations, pointing to different ways this can be undertaken. Last but not least, we have addressed the nature of cultural segregation and pointed to how the creation of interaction and friendships across the span of years requires more than just urban space. It is our hope that this article will help create a framework for discussing the important problems that age segregation creates in our cities and how we can solve them in the future by designing cities with people.

**Literature**

Bradley, Harriet 1996: *Fractured Identities – changing patterns of inequality*. UK: Polity Press.

Bytheway, Bill 2005: "Ageism and age categorization" in *Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 61, No. 2*, pp. 361-374. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

Christensen, Tom & Per Lærgreid (2011): "Complexity and Hybrid Public Administration" in *Public Organizational Review 11:407-423*.

Gehl, Jan 2007: *Livet mellem husene [Life between buildings]*. København: Arkitektens Forlag.

Goffman, Erving 1968:*Stigma –Notes on management of spoiled identity.*London: Penguin Press.

Gubrium, Jaber F., James A. Holstein & David R. Buckholdt 1994: *Constructing the life course*. USA: General Hall inc. New York.

Hagestad, Gunhild O. & Peter Uhlenberg 2005: "The Social Separation of Old and Young: A Root of Ageism" in *Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 61, No. 2,*pp. 343-360. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

Keller, Margit and Veronika Kalmus (2009): "What makes me cool? Estonian tweens' interpretative repertoires" in *Young Consumers vol. 10 no. 4*, pp. 329-341. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Lewinter, Myra (2008): *Aldring. Sociologisk set. [Ageing in a sociological perspective]*. Publisher, Samfundslitteratur: Copenhagen.

Lofland, L. H. (1975): *A World of Strangers: Order and Action in Urban Public Space*. New York: Waveland Press.

Lundby, E. (2011): "Consumer research on tweens: putting the pieces together" in *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers, 12(4): 326-336*. DiVA.

Mannheim, Karl 1998: "The Sociological Problem of Generations" in *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. UK: Taylor & Francis Books, side 163-195.

Olsen, T. V., Skammelsen, T., Borchmann, I. H., & Boye, A. M. (2011). *Vedkommende Byrum: Om brugere byrumspræferencer og byfornyelse [Apealing Urban Space: About users, urban space preferences and urban renewal]*. Copenhagen: Ministry of city, housing and rural districts.

Simpson, Deane (2015): *The Young-old: Urban Utopias of an Aging Society*. Lars Müller Publishers.

Stentoft, Jan, Per Vagn Freytag and Lisa Thoms (2015): 'Portfolio management of development projects in Danish municipalities' in *International Journal of Public Sector Management Vol. 28 No. 1*, pp. 11-28. Emerald Group Publishing.

Technical and Environmental Administration, Urban Design Department (2012): *INTEGRATED URBAN RENEWAL - District development in Copenhagen*. Muncipality of Copenhagen. Availble by contacting bydesign@tmf.kk.dk.

The Danish Ministry of Housing (2016): *Generationsintegration i byen of forstaderne [Generationalintegration in the city and the suburbs]*. The Danish Ministry of Housing. To be published, ultimo 2016.

Wolfgang, Preiser & Korydon H. Smith (2011): *Universal design handbook*. The MacGraw-Hill Companies: United States of America.