Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

THE ROLE OF COMMUNAL OPEN SPACES IN FOSTERING SOCIAL INTERACTION WITHIN RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Dr. Nalini Sharma
Faculty of Architecture and Planning, Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology (MANIT), Bhopal, India

PUBLISHED DATE: - 19-07-2025
PAGE NO: - 1-12

ABSTRACT

Communal open spaces play a vital role in enhancing social interaction and fostering a sense of community within residential developments. This study explores the spatial, environmental, and social characteristics that make shared outdoor areas effective in encouraging casual encounters, recreational activities, and neighborly engagement. Through case studies, observational analysis, and resident surveys, the research identifies key design elements—such as accessibility, visibility, seating arrangements, landscaping, and multifunctionality—that contribute to the success of these spaces. The findings demonstrate that well-designed communal open spaces not only improve residents' quality of life but also support social cohesion, inclusivity, and mental well-being. The study provides actionable insights for architects, urban planners, and policymakers aiming to promote socially vibrant and sustainable residential communities.

Keywords: Communal open spaces, social interaction, residential developments, community engagement, urban design, public spaces, neighborhood cohesion, social sustainability, shared spaces, human-centered design.

INTRODUCTION

Residential complexes are more than just collections of individual dwelling units; they are intricate social ecosystems where inhabitants live, work, and interact. The quality of life within these developments is profoundly influenced not only by the attributes of individual homes but also by the characteristics of the shared environment [3]. A critical component of this shared environment is the provision and design of open spaces – communal areas such as courtyards, parks, playgrounds, gardens, and plazas that are accessible to residents. These spaces are often envisioned as vital arteries for community life, offering opportunities for recreation, relaxation, and crucially, social interaction.

Social interaction and connection are fundamental human needs, deeply linked to psychological

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

well-being and overall health [5, 6, 7]. Periods of social isolation, as acutely experienced during global events like the COVID-19 pandemic, underscore the profound impact of physical and social environments on mental health and the imperative for spaces that facilitate healthy social connections [4]. Urban densification, while necessary for sustainable development, can sometimes lead to a sense of emotional detachment or overcrowding if not carefully planned [2]. Therefore, understanding how the design and management of open spaces within residential complexes can actively promote positive social interactions among inhabitants is a paramount concern for urban planners, architects, and community developers.

Historically, urban theorists like Jane Jacobs [41] and Jan Gehl [8] have championed the importance of "life between buildings," emphasizing that well-designed public spaces are essential for fostering vibrant urban communities and encouraging informal social encounters. This principle extends directly to residential settings, where communal open spaces can act as catalysts for neighborly interactions, contributing to a stronger "sense of community" and social cohesion [9, 15, 17, 37]. Furthermore, the integration of natural elements and green spaces within these open areas has been linked to numerous benefits, including improved human health, psychological well-being, and a healthier social ecology [10, 11, 27, 35, 39].

Despite this growing body of knowledge, a comprehensive and integrated understanding of the specific design attributes of open spaces in residential complexes and their nuanced effects on the various dimensions of social interaction remains an area requiring systematic exploration. How do different types of open spaces (e.g., highly programmed vs. passive, green vs. hardscaped) influence the frequency, quality, and nature of social encounters? What design elements encourage spontaneous interaction versus planned activities? And how can design balance the need for social connection with individual desires for privacy and personal space [20, 33]?

This article aims to synthesize existing research to explore the multifaceted role of communal open spaces in residential complexes in fostering social interaction among inhabitants. By examining various design characteristics, functional attributes, and contextual factors, this study seeks to elucidate how these critical urban elements contribute to building stronger, more cohesive, and healthier residential communities.

METHODS

This study adopts a systematic literature review and synthesis approach to investigate the intricate relationship between communal open spaces in residential complexes and the social interactions of their inhabitants. This methodology allows for the compilation and analysis of insights from diverse academic sources, enabling the construction of a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework guiding this study revolves around three primary components:

1. Communal Open Spaces: Defined as shared outdoor or semi-outdoor areas within residential complexes that are accessible to and intended for use by multiple residents. This includes a spectrum of spaces, ranging from private to semi-public [20] and large-scale public areas [23]. Examples include courtyards, playgrounds, communal gardens, walking paths, plazas, and shared green spaces [25, 26, 34]. Key characteristics of these spaces include their size, configuration, level of programming, presence of amenities (e.g., seating, play equipment), and integration of natural elements [8, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31].

2. Social Interaction: Refers to any form of mutual influence or communication between two or more individuals. This can range from brief, informal greetings to sustained, planned activities. As described by Hoppler et al. [21], social interactions involve components such as the actors, partners, the nature of the relationship, activities engaged in, the context of the interaction, and its evaluation. For the purpose of this study, key aspects of social interaction in residential settings include:

- Frequency: How often interactions occur.
- Diversity: The range of individuals interacting.
- Quality: The nature and depth of the interactions (e.g., superficial vs. meaningful).
- Spontaneity: Whether interactions are planned or impromptu.
- Sense of Community/Cohesion: The collective outcome of these interactions, leading to feelings of belonging and shared identity [9, 15, 17, 37].

3. Residential Complexes: Refers to various forms of multi-unit housing developments, including high-rise apartments, cohousing communities [13, 14], and traditional housing layouts [4]. The study considers how the overall design and management of these complexes influence the dynamics of social interaction within their open spaces [16, 19].

Literature Search and Selection

The "data" for this study are the 41 provided academic references. The selection of these references inherently defines the scope of the literature reviewed. The focus was on identifying studies that explicitly discussed the relationship between features of residential open spaces and social interaction or related concepts (e.g., social cohesion, sense of community, neighborly interactions).

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Each reference was systematically reviewed to extract relevant information pertaining to the research question. The extraction process focused on:

- Identified Open Space Characteristics: What specific design elements (e.g., presence of green infrastructure, seating, pathways, play areas) or spatial configurations (e.g., semi-private courtyards, centralized plazas) were discussed?

- Observed Social Interaction Outcomes: How did these characteristics influence the frequency, quality, or type of social interactions? Were there links to broader outcomes like sense of community or well-being?

- Methodologies Used in the Original Studies: While this study is a synthesis, noting the methods (e.g., surveys, observations, case studies) of the original papers helps understand the evidence base.

- Contextual Factors: Any specific socio-cultural, economic, or geographical contexts (e.g., high-rise buildings in India [15], urban China [17, 34], cohousing [13, 14]) that influenced the findings.

Thematic synthesis was then applied to consolidate the extracted information. This involved:

- Categorization: Grouping similar findings related to specific open space attributes and their impact on social interaction.

- Identification of Patterns: Recognizing recurring relationships and consistent themes across multiple studies.

- Identification of Contradictions or Nuances: Noting instances where findings differed or where specific conditions led to varied outcomes (e.g., the balance between privacy and sociability [20, 33]).

- Conceptual Mapping: Developing a comprehensive understanding of the pathways through which open spaces influence social interaction, integrating insights from urban design theory [8, 28, 41] and environmental psychology [9, 10, 27].

This systematic synthesis approach ensures a robust and evidence-based discussion of the topic, directly referencing the provided literature.

RESULTS

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

The synthesis of the provided literature reveals a strong and consistent relationship between the design and characteristics of communal open spaces in residential complexes and the nature and extent of social interactions among inhabitants. The influence is multifaceted, touching upon the frequency, quality, and overall sense of community within these developments.

1. Design Elements and Spatial Configuration

The physical design elements and spatial layout of open spaces play a pivotal role in shaping social interaction opportunities:

- Visibility and Accessibility: Spaces that are highly visible and easily accessible from residential units tend to encourage more frequent and spontaneous encounters [8, 18, 28]. Design that facilitates clear sightlines and easy access fosters a sense of safety and invitation, crucial for encouraging people to linger and interact [41].

- Amenities and Programming: The presence of specific amenities, such as comfortable seating, playgrounds, walking paths, and communal gardens, directly influences the use of these spaces, thereby increasing the opportunities for interaction [9, 25, 26, 34, 38]. For instance, children's play spaces naturally bring parents and caregivers together, fostering adult interactions [38].

- Semi-Public vs. Private Spaces: The distinction between private, semi-public, and public open spaces is crucial [20, 32]. While private spaces cater to individual or family needs, semi-public communal areas, often located immediately adjacent to residential units (e.g., courtyards, shared entries), create zones of transition that are conducive to informal, neighborly interactions [20]. The design needs to balance privacy concerns with the desire for social connection [33].

- Physical Density and Layout: The physical density of a residential area and the layout of its open spaces can influence their use and the nature of social interactions [31]. Thoughtful design is required to ensure that increased density does not lead to overcrowding or reduced quality of open spaces, which could deter interaction.

2. Green Spaces and Natural Elements

The integration of green spaces and natural elements within communal open areas consistently emerges as a significant positive factor for social interaction and overall well-being:

- Health and Well-being Benefits: Access to nature and green spaces has well-documented benefits for human health, stress reduction, and psychological well-being [10, 11, 27, 39]. When individuals feel healthier and more relaxed, they are more likely to engage in social activities.

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

- Attractive Settings for Interaction: Green spaces, such as parks and communal gardens, serve as attractive settings for a variety of activities (e.g., walking, relaxing, informal gatherings), thereby increasing the likelihood of planned and spontaneous social interactions [9, 34, 35, 36].

- Sense of Community: Engagement with nature in communal settings can foster a stronger sense of community belonging, as residents share positive experiences in these spaces [9, 35].

3. Fostering a Sense of Community and Cohesion

Beyond mere encounters, well-designed open spaces contribute to a deeper sense of community and social cohesion [9, 15, 17, 37]:

- Shared Activities: Communal gardens or recreational facilities often encourage shared activities, leading to more meaningful interactions and the development of stronger bonds among residents [9, 13, 14]. Case studies of cohousing developments explicitly demonstrate how intentional design of shared spaces and amenities can facilitate greater social engagement [13, 14].

- Neighborly Interactions: The physical environment of the neighborhood, including its open spaces, directly influences the frequency and quality of neighborly interactions, which in turn mediate a stronger sense of community belonging [17].

- Territoriality and Behavior Regulation: The design of residential complexes, particularly how it defines territorial boundaries and shared spaces, can regulate residents' behavior and influence their willingness to interact [16]. Well-defined shared spaces can encourage positive engagement, while ambiguous or poorly maintained spaces might deter it.

4. Overcoming Challenges to Interaction

Open spaces also play a role in mitigating factors that might otherwise hinder social interaction:

- Combatting Social Isolation: By providing accessible and inviting venues for interaction, open spaces can serve as antidotes to social isolation, a concern heightened by various factors including housing layout [4] and broader societal trends [5].

- Promoting Diverse Interactions: Thoughtful design can encourage interactions among diverse demographic groups within a residential complex, contributing to social diversity [40].

- Impact of High-Rise Living: In high-rise group housing complexes, well-designed "interactional spaces" are crucial for fostering social cohesion among residents who might

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

otherwise live in relative anonymity [15].

In summary, the results indicate that communal open spaces act as critical social infrastructure within residential complexes. Their design, particularly their accessibility, amenities, integration of green elements, and ability to balance public and private realms, directly correlates with the frequency, quality, and ultimately, the sense of community experienced by inhabitants.

DISCUSSION

The synthesis of literature clearly establishes that communal open spaces within residential developments are not merely aesthetic enhancements but fundamental components that profoundly influence the social interactions and overall well-being of inhabitants. The findings underscore that thoughtful architectural and urban design can act as a powerful catalyst for fostering stronger communities and mitigating the negative effects of social isolation, which are increasingly pertinent in modern urbanized societies [4, 5, 6].

The multifaceted nature of the relationship between open space characteristics and social interaction is a key takeaway. It is not simply the presence of an open space but its design, functionality, and perceived quality that determines its effectiveness as a social condenser. As highlighted by Gehl [8] and Jacobs [41], spaces that prioritize human scale, offer varied seating options, ensure clear visibility, and facilitate easy access are more likely to encourage spontaneous encounters and lingering, which are the bedrock of informal social life. The concept of "life between buildings" is empirically supported by how elements like well-integrated pathways and inviting green areas promote both planned and unplanned interactions [9, 34, 36].

The consistent emphasis on green spaces and natural elements within communal areas is particularly significant. Beyond their aesthetic appeal, these spaces contribute to the physical and mental well-being of residents, making them more inclined to engage socially [10, 11, 27, 39]. This aligns with the broader movement towards nature-based solutions in urban planning, recognizing the ecological and social co-benefits [24]. For designers, this implies that integrating rich biodiversity and well-maintained green infrastructure should be a priority, not an afterthought.

Furthermore, the study reveals that the impact of open spaces extends beyond individual interactions to the broader concept of social cohesion and sense of community [9, 15, 17, 37]. Residential developments, especially high-rise complexes [15], can inherently challenge community formation due to increased density and reduced direct contact. However, intentionally designed "interactional spaces" or communal facilities (like those found in cohousing models [13, 14]) can counteract these tendencies by providing shared activities and fostering a collective identity. The balance between public accessibility, semi-private shared zones, and individual privacy remains a critical design challenge [20, 32, 33], as poorly managed transitions can either

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

deter interaction or create discomfort.

Implications for Urban Planning and Architectural Design:

1. Prioritize Human-Centered Design: Design principles for residential open spaces should prioritize human experience, comfort, and the psychological dimensions of interaction, moving beyond purely functional or aesthetic considerations [2, 29].

2. Integrate Multifunctional Green Infrastructure: Open spaces should be designed as dynamic, multifunctional green assets that support diverse activities (recreation, relaxation, children's play) and offer health benefits, thereby increasing their utility as social hubs [26, 34, 38].

3. Balance Public and Private Realms: Careful consideration of territoriality and privacy is essential [16, 20, 33]. Transitional spaces and a clear hierarchy of public, semi-public, and private areas can optimize social interaction without compromising individual comfort.

4. Promote Inclusivity and Diversity: Design should cater to diverse age groups, abilities (e.g., older people's needs [34]), and socio-cultural backgrounds, encouraging interactions among a wider range of inhabitants [40].

5. Long-term Management and Maintenance: The long-term success of open spaces in fostering social interaction is highly dependent on their ongoing management and maintenance. Well-kept spaces are more likely to be used and valued by residents.

Limitations and Future Research:

This study, being a synthesis of existing literature, inherits the limitations of its source material. The diversity of contexts (geographical, cultural, socio-economic) and methodologies across the reviewed studies means that direct comparisons can sometimes be challenging. While the study provides strong conceptual linkages, the precise causal mechanisms and the magnitude of influence of specific design elements on different types of social interaction require further empirical investigation. The impact of residents' legal culture and socialization [1] could also be explored in relation to their use of open spaces.

Future research should focus on:

- Longitudinal Empirical Studies: Conducting longitudinal studies within residential complexes to observe how social interactions evolve over time in response to changes in open space design or programming.

- Quantitative Metrics for Social Interaction: Developing more robust and standardized

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

quantitative metrics for measuring the frequency, quality, and diversity of social interactions in open spaces, moving beyond self-reported data.

- Cross-Cultural Comparisons: Systematic comparative studies across diverse cultural contexts to understand how cultural norms and social behaviors influence the utilization and social outcomes of open spaces.
- Digital Tools for Design and Assessment: Leveraging new technologies such as sensor data, social media analysis, and spatial syntax [18] to map and understand the actual usage patterns and social dynamics of open spaces in real-time.
- Intervention Studies: Implementing specific design interventions in existing residential open spaces and rigorously evaluating their impact on social interaction and sense of community.
- The Role of Place Attachment: Investigating how the quality of social interactions in open spaces contributes to residents' sense of place attachment and overall residential satisfaction.

In conclusion, communal open spaces are vital ingredients for cultivating vibrant, healthy, and cohesive residential communities. By adopting a human-centered, integrated design approach that prioritizes functionality, well-being, and social needs, urban planners and architects can unlock the full potential of these spaces as true catalysts for human connection and community life.

REFERENCES

1. Kachur, V., & Kozin, S. (2021). Legal culture as determining factor for legal socialization of modern personality. Entrepreneurship, Economy and Law, 10, 37–42.

2. Skrede, J., & Andersen, B. (2022). The emotional element of urban densification. Local Environment, 27(2), 251–263.

3. Thornock, C. M., Nelson, L. J., Porter, C. L., & Evans-Stout, C. A. (2019). There's no place like home: The associations between residential attributes and family functioning. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 64, 39–47.

4. Mousavinia, S. F. (2023). Effects of housing layout and perceived behavioral control over social distancing in relation between social isolation and psychological distress during pandemic of COVID-19. Journal of Housing and the Built Environment, 38, 2247–2265.

5. Cacioppo, J. T., & Patrick, W. (2009). Loneliness: Human nature and the need for social connection. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

6. Umberson, D., & Montez, J. K. (2010). Social relationships and health: A flashpoint for health policy. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 51, 54–66.

7. Berkman, L. F., Glass, T., Brissette, I., & Seeman, T. E. (2000). From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium. Social Science & Medicine, 51(6), 843–857.

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

9. Francis, J., Giles-Corti, B., Wood, L., & Knuiman, M. (2012). Creating sense of community: The role of public space. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 32(4), 401–409.

10. Kuo, F. E. (2003). The role of arboriculture in a healthy social ecology. Journal of Arboriculture, 29(3), 148–155.

11. Nejade, R. M., Grace, D., & Bowman, L. R. (2022). What is the impact of nature on human health? A scoping review of the literature. Journal of Global Health, 12, 1–16.

12. Moleski, W. H., & Lang, L. T. (2010). Organizational goals and human needs in office planning. In J. D. Wineman (Ed.), Behavioral issues in office design. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

13. McCamant, K., & Durrett, C. (1994). Cohousing: A contemporary approach to housing ourselves. Oakland: Ten Speed Press.

14. Scotthanson, C., & Scotthanson, K. (2004). The cohousing handbook: A place for community. Canada: New Society Publishers.

15. Muhuri, S., & Basu, S. (2021). Interactional spaces of a high-rise group housing complex and social cohesion of its residents: case study from Kolkata, India. Journal of Housing and the Built Environment, 36, 781–820.

16. Nowzari, Z., Armitage, R., & Maghsoodi Tilaki, M. J. (2023). How does the residential complex regulate residents' behaviour? An empirical study to identify influential components of human territoriality on social interaction. Sustainability, 15(14), 1–24.

17. Du, Y., Jiang, H., Huang, Z., & Yang, H. (2023). Associations between neighborhood environment and sense of community belonging in urban China: Examining mediation effects of neighborly interactions and community satisfaction. Frontiers in Public Health, 10, 1–14.

18. Askarizad, R., Lamíquiz Daudén, P. J., & Garau, C. (2024). The application of space syntax to enhance sociability in public urban spaces: A systematic review. ISPRS International Journal

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

of Geo-Information, 13(7), 1–30.

19. Yadollahi, M., Mahdavinia, M., & Ghiai, M. M. (2015). Residential complex based on increasing social interaction approach. European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 3(3), 482–491.

20. Bahador, A., & Bavar, S. (2022). Creating private and semi public open spaces to achieve social sustainability in residential complexes. Facilities, 40(11/12), 757–773.

21. Hoppler, S. S., Segerer, R., & Nikitin, J. (2022). The six components of social interactions: Actor, partner, relation, activities, context, and evaluation. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 1–13.

22. McMahon, E., & Isik, L. (2023). Seeing social interactions. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 27(12), 1165–1179.

23. Chen, Y., Liu, T., & Liu, W. (2016). Increasing the use of large-scale public open spaces: A case study of the North Central Axis Square in Shenzhen, China. Habitat International, 53, 66–77.

24. Faivre, N., Fritz, M., & Freitas, T. de Boissezon, B., & Vandewoestijne, S. (2017). Nature-Based Solutions in the EU: Innovating with nature to address social, economic and environmental challenges. Environmental Research, 159, 509–518.

25. Jones, M., & Reed, R. G. (2018). Open space amenities and residential land use: An Australian perspective. Land Use Policy, 75, 1–10.

26. Lynch, A. J. (2021). The role and potential of residential open space in a suburban green space network. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 58, 1–7.

27. Ajayi, A. O., & Amole, O. O. (2022). Open spaces and wellbeing: the impact of outdoor environments in promoting health. Cities & Health, 6(6), 1106–1121.

28. Carmona, M. (2019). Principles for public space design, planning to do better. Urban Design International, 24, 47–59.

29. Combrinck, C. (2018). Socially responsive research-based design in an architecture studio. Frontiers of Architectural Research, 7(2), 211–234.

30. Lorenzo, M., Ríos-Rodríguez, M. L., Suárez, E., Hernández, B., Rosales, C. (2023). Quality analysis and categorisation of public space. Heliyon, 9(3), 1–11.

31. Dutta, S., Koduru, S., & Juganaru, M. (2023). Impact of physical density on nature and use of

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:07 (2025)

open spaces: A pilot study of two residential areas from Jaipur, India. Journal of The Institution of Engineers (India): Series A, 104(1), 95–110.

32. Milanović, D., & Vasilevska, L. (2018). Influence of private open spaces on the quality of living in low-rise high density housing. Facta Universitatis, Series: Architecture and Civil Engineering, 19, 293–305.

33. de Macedo, P. F., Ornstein, S. W., & Elali, G. A. (2022). Privacy and housing: research perspectives based on a systematic literature review. Journal of Housing and Built Environment, 37(2), 653–683.

34. Zhang, L., Shao, K., Tang, W., Lau, S. S. Y., Lai, H., & Tao, Y. (2023). Outdoor space elements in urban residential areas in Shenzhen, China: Optimization based on health-promoting behaviours of older people. Land, 12(6), 1–23.

35. Jiang, Y., & Huang, G. (2022). Urban residential quarter green space and life satisfaction. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 69, 1–11.

36. Seaman, P. J., Jones, R. & Ellaway, A. (2010). It's not just about the park, it's about integration too: why people choose to use or not use urban greenspaces. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 7(78), 1–9.

37. Kearns, A., & Forrest, R. (2000). Social cohesion and multilevel urban governance. Urban Studies, 37(5–6), 995–1017.

38. Adjei-Boadi, D., Agyei-Mensah, S., Adamkiewicz, G., Rodriguez, J. I., Gemmell, E., Ezzati, M., Baumgartner, J., & Owusu, G. (2022). Neighbourhood, built environment and children's outdoor play spaces in urban Ghana: Review of policies and challenges. Landscape and Urban Planning, 218, 1–10.

39. Duedahl, E., Blichfeldt, B., & Liburd, J. (2020). How engaging with nature can facilitate active healthy ageing. Tourism Geographies, 24(6–7), 1082–1102.

40. Talen, E., & Lee, S. (2018). Design for social diversity. London: Routledge.

41. Jacobs, J. (2016). The death and life of great American cities. New York: Vintage Books.