SO-03 Cities designed for both sexes

The physical structure of a city is never a neutral backdrop to human activity. Rather, it is an active participant in shaping the social, economic, and physical realities of its inhabitants. Historically, urban planning and architectural design have operated under the assumption of a universal user—a demographic abstraction that, in practice, has closely mirrored the physiological needs, daily routines, and physical dimensions of an able-bodied, working-age male commuter. The resulting built environment has generated systemic, often invisible friction for individuals whose lives deviate from this historical baseline. Gender-sensitive urban planning, widely referred to in European policy as "gender mainstreaming" in spatial development, attempts to rectify this systemic asymmetry. It operates on the empirical premise that men and women, on average, navigate, utilize, and experience urban spaces differently due to a complex interplay of intersecting biological, behavioral, and socio-cultural factors.

This foundational report provides a rigorous, exhaustive examination of gender-sensitive urban planning. It synthesizes peer-reviewed primary literature, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and municipal outcome data to extract evidence-based design principles. To navigate the complex interplay between the built environment and its users without resorting to biological determinism, this analysis explicitly separates the evidence into three distinct layers: (1) physiology, representing measurable biological absolutes and biomechanical constraints; (2) behavior, representing statistical averages and overlapping distributions of daily routines; and (3) culture, representing variable socio-normative expectations, subjective fear, and aesthetic signaling.

Crucially, this analysis maintains a strict epistemological distinction between population-level averages and individual characteristics. The data presented herein describes statistical aggregates. While women, on average, perform a higher volume of unpaid care work or possess different baseline bladder capacities, individual men and women vary widely. An individual father acting as a primary caregiver will exhibit the exact same "female-typical" trip-chaining spatial patterns as a mother. Therefore, urban infrastructure must accommodate these statistical aggregates to eliminate systemic friction, but it must simultaneously avoid prescribing or enforcing rigid gender roles based on those averages.

The Three Layers of Urban Experience

To evaluate urban environments effectively, planners and researchers must untangle the biological from the social, mapping how different facets of human existence interact with concrete, transit networks, and public spaces.

The physiological layer encompasses absolute, measurable biological differences that interact with the built environment. This includes pelvic biomechanics, the physical realities of pregnancy, the physiological requirements of menstruation, baseline bladder capacities, and dimorphic differences in average height, reach, and upper-body strength. These are non-negotiable physical constraints that dictate ergonomic and infrastructural needs, independent of cultural context.

The behavioral layer captures how individuals move through and utilize the city. It is

characterized by overlapping statistical distributions rather than binary absolutes. While individual men and women vary, statistical aggregates reveal highly robust gendered patterns across global contexts. Because women, on average, undertake a disproportionate share of unpaid caregiving and domestic labor, they generate distinct spatial mobility patterns characterized by shorter distances, non-linear routes, off-peak travel, and the escorting of dependents.

The cultural layer encompasses the socio-normative, historically contingent expectations placed upon different sexes. It dictates who is expected to occupy public space, who feels subjectively safe within it, and how urban spaces are named, governed, and policed. Cultural norms shape the perception of space—such as the subjective fear of crime or harassment—which in turn dictates behavioral responses, such as spatial avoidance, even when objective risks may not align with subjective fears.

Layer 1: Physiology and the Built Environment

Queuing Theory, Spatial Equity, and Public Sanitation

The most quantifiable and arguably most neglected intersection of human physiology and urban design is the provision of public sanitation. Clara Greed, in her extensive work published in the *Town Planning Review* (2016, 2021), argues that public toilets are a foundational town planning issue directly impacting public health, sustainability, and urban mobility[1]. Historically, building codes and urban planners have relied on a paradigm of "spatial equality," providing an equal 1:1 ratio of floor space for men's and women's facilities. However, queuing theory and empirical observation demonstrate that spatial equality results in stark temporal inequality, known in the literature as a lack of "potty parity"[4].

Bovens and Marcoci (2020), in the journal *Behavioural Public Policy* (Volume 7, Issue 1, pp. 1-24), applied rigorous queuing simulations to public bathroom use to demonstrate the mathematical failure of the 1:1 ratio[6]. Their analysis of empirical data suggests that the average service time for female users is 178.9 seconds, compared to 118.4 seconds for male users[6]. This physiological and biomechanical discrepancy is driven by several compounding factors: the management of menstruation, the biomechanics of pregnancy, the necessity of more complex clothing removal, and a higher statistical likelihood of accompanying dependents (children or the elderly) who require physical assistance[8].

Furthermore, spatial equality masks a fixture inequality. Male restrooms typically accommodate a higher density of fixtures (a mix of urinals and cubicles) within the same square footage, vastly increasing throughput per minute[9]. When a queuing system operates near maximum capacity, even minor discrepancies in service time result in exponential increases in queue length. To achieve genuine temporal equity, building codes must abandon spatial equality and mandate asymmetrical fixture ratios, often calculated between 2:1 and 3.25:1 in favor of women[4].

A controversial but empirically supported alternative to asymmetric expansion is the implementation of gender-neutral facilities. Bovens and Marcoci's (2020) simulations demonstrate that desegregating bathrooms systematically reduces average waiting times[6]. By modeling different usage intensities (one-hour versus two-hour intervals) and occupancy-time

differentials, they found that waiting times for women go down invariably, while waiting times for men either decrease or increase only slightly, depending on the presence of urinals in the new layout[6]. While gender-neutral facilities are heavily framed in cultural discourse as an accommodation for transgender and gender-nonconforming populations, the operational data suggests they represent a systemic efficiency upgrade that optimizes throughput and minimizes wait times for the entire biological population[6].

Sanitation Design Paradigm	Core Mechanism	Queuing Outcome & Efficiency	Empirical Support
Traditional 1:1 Spatial Ratio	Equal floor space allocated to male and female facilities.	Highly inefficient. Results in chronic female queuing due to longer service times (178.9s vs 118.4s) and fewer fixtures.	Bovens & Marcoci (2020); Greed (2016)[2].
Potty Parity (Asymmetrical Ratios)	2:1 or 3.25:1 fixture ratio in favor of women.	Improves temporal equity. Equalizes wait times but requires larger overall spatial footprints in building design.	Banzhaf (1990); Greed (2021)[1].
Gender-Neutral / Desegregated	Universal access to fully enclosed, multi-stall cubicles.	Maximizes efficiency. Eradicates female queuing and drastically lowers overall wait times for the aggregate population.	Bovens & Marcoci (2020) simulations[6].

Ergonomics, Micro-Mobility, and Physical Activity

Urban infrastructure is frequently scaled to male anthropometric averages, creating a hostile physiological environment for those who deviate from the norm. The dimensions of public seating, the height of transit grab-rails, the presence of stairs without ramps, and the pacing of pedestrian crossing signals often fail to account for the biomechanics of pregnancy, individuals pushing strollers, or the slower average gait of female pedestrians and the elderly.

The International Physical Activity and the Environment Network (IPEN) Adult study (N=11,615 participants across 14 cities globally), published in *The Lancet Global Health* (2022) by Giles-Corti and colleagues, established robust curvilinear associations between urban design features and physical activity[11]. The study identified minimum thresholds for health: neighborhoods exceeding 5,700 people per square kilometer, 100 intersections per square kilometer, and 25 public transport stops per square kilometer were strongly associated with meeting sufficient physical activity criteria (≥150 minutes/week)[11].

However, systematic reviews by Giles-Corti et al. (2020) in the *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* indicate that realizing these health benefits requires an intersectional gender approach[12]. While built environment improvements (like connectivity and density) benefit all genders, females are disproportionately responsive to specific micro-infrastructural details. For women, the availability of high-quality public transport, physically separated and safe cycling lanes, and the immediate proximity of daily destinations are stronger determinants of physical activity than for men[12]. Conversely, men's physical activity is more strongly dictated by raw street network connectivity and the absence of dead-ends[12]. This divergence underscores that macroscopic planning (density) must be paired with microscopic ergonomic execution (curb cuts, stroller accessibility, perceived traffic safety) to capture the female demographic.

Layer 2: Behavioral Averages and Urban Mobility

The Mobility of Care and Trip Chaining

The concept of the "Mobility of Care" represents a fundamental paradigm shift in transportation planning and urban geography. Coined by urban planner Inés Sánchez de Madariaga in 2009, and expanded extensively in her 2013 book chapter in *Fair Shared Cities: The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe* (Routledge), the concept provides a rigorous framework for recognizing, measuring, and valuing the travel associated with unpaid caregiving and household reproduction[14].

Historically, transportation surveys captured travel through a purely economic lens, prioritizing "commuting" (travel for paid employment) and education. Care-related travel was chronically under-measured, categorized under vague, trivializing descriptors such as "other," "escorting," "shopping," or "leisure"[16]. Because traditional commuting is predominantly linear (home to work in the morning, work to home in the evening) and peaks at specific hours, global transit networks, road hierarchies, and fare structures have been overwhelmingly optimized for this pattern[16].

However, behavioral data reveals that female travel distributions overlap only partially with this commuter model. Because women perform the statistical majority of unpaid domestic and care labor globally, they are significantly more likely to engage in "trip chaining." This behavior involves stringing together multiple short, non-linear stops across a single journey (e.g., dropping a child at daycare, navigating to a medical appointment, purchasing groceries, traveling to a part-time job, and checking on an elderly relative before returning home)[14].

Recent empirical measurements utilizing the Mobility of Care framework reveal massive effect sizes regarding the proportion of total urban travel dedicated to caregiving, rendering it equal

to or greater than employment commuting in several contexts:

Urban Context	Sample / Methodology	Care Mobility Findings	Source / Journal
Montréal, Canada	Regional Travel Survey Analysis	Caregiving accounted for 28% of all trips. Comprised 32% of women's daily trips versus 25% of men's.	Ravensbergen et al. (2023), *Transport Policy*[15].
Washington D.C., USA	ODX (Origin-Destination) Fare Card Data, Q1 2019	Women comprise 58% of all WMATA transit users. Identified a 10-15% higher female share in off-peak, chained transit trips.	Shuman et al. (2023), *Transportation Research Board*[14].
Belo Horizonte, Brazil	2012 Household Survey Reanalysis	~15% of all daily commutes are care-related. 18% of women's trips are for care versus 12% for men.	22nd RDT Analysis (2018)[22].
Bogotá, Colombia	Municipal Mobility Survey	Care trips represent 11.8% of all trips. Highly stratified by gender; lowest-income women travel most for care.	Murillo-Munar et al. (2023)[15].

The failure to account for trip chaining has severe economic and social consequences. Because transit fare structures often charge per boarding rather than offering time-based universal transfers, individuals who trip-chain face a systemic financial penalty[20]. Furthermore, transit routing that operates on a hub-and-spoke model (bringing suburban workers into a central business district) fails to serve the suburb-to-suburb or neighborhood-level routes required for

care mobility[20]. This forces caregivers—predominantly women—into a reliance on private automobiles if they can afford them, or consigns them to severe time-poverty and restricted economic opportunity if they rely on poorly routed public transit[23].

Public Space and the Micro-Architecture of Play

Behavioral divergence based on gender socialization is not limited to adults; it manifests prominently in how adolescents utilize public space. Observational studies conducted in Vienna by feminist planners and landscape architects, notably Eva Kail and Claudia Prinz-Brandenburg, identified a stark spatial inequity in municipal recreation: girls largely disappear from public parks after the age of nine, while boys of the same age become the dominant, assertive users[25].

The underlying mechanisms driving this disparity are a feedback loop of behavioral socialization and rigid infrastructural design. Traditional park designs frequently center around single-use, enclosed sports infrastructure, such as fenced football or basketball "cages" with only one entrance[26]. This architectural design creates a territorial monopoly for physically assertive, predominantly male groups. Extensive workshops and observational data indicated that young girls exhibited a strong behavioral aversion to crossing into or through these dominated spaces. They cited a subjective fear of being trapped in enclosed spaces with older, unfamiliar boys, as well as experiencing routine verbal or sexual harassment when attempting to share the space[26]. The design—a literal cage—amplified the social exclusion.

In response to these findings, the City of Vienna initiated a radical redesign of pilot parks, most notably Einsiedlerpark in the 5th district. The design interventions were grounded in disrupting male territorial monopolies and increasing spatial permeability. Fences around ball cages were opened on multiple sides to provide easy, multiple exit routes, reducing the psychological fear of entrapment[26]. Pathways leading through the park were widened and lighting was dramatically improved[26]. Crucially, alternative, non-gendered amenities—such as hammocks, sculptural seating platforms, volleyball nets, and badminton courts—were distributed along the pedestrian periphery to act as "quick attraction" elements[26].

The outcome data confirmed the hypothesis: these subtle architectural nudges successfully disrupted the spatial monopoly and significantly increased the dwell time of adolescent girls in the park[26]. This project provided empirical proof that spatial equality (simply providing a park for "everyone") is wholly insufficient if the micro-architecture inadvertently selects for a specific demographic's behavioral tendencies. These findings led to the establishment of binding gender-sensitive guidelines applied to all of Vienna's park designs since 2005[27].

Layer 3: Culture, Fear, and the Night-Time City

The Street Lighting Controversy: Objective Crime vs. Subjective Fear

The cultural layer of urban planning is heavily dominated by socio-normative expectations and the perception of safety. Women consistently report significantly higher levels of subjective fear in urban spaces, particularly at night. This fear is not a passive emotion; it acts as an active, restrictive barrier, limiting women's mobility, altering their transport choices, and curtailing their access to economic and social life after dark[28]. Enhancing street lighting is universally proposed

by citizens and politicians alike as the primary intervention to deter crime and reduce this fear. However, the empirical relationship between street lighting, objective crime rates, and subjective safety is the subject of intense, decades-long academic controversy.

The Pro-Lighting Paradigm and Meta-Analytic Support The strongest empirical evidence supporting street lighting as an objective anti-crime intervention originates from a highly influential Campbell Systematic Review conducted by criminologists Brandon Welsh and David Farrington (2008), updating an earlier 2002 analysis[30]. Analyzing 13 robust evaluation studies across the United Kingdom and the United States, their meta-analysis found that improved street lighting led to a statistically significant 20% reduction in crime in experimental areas compared to control areas. The overall Relative Effect Size was an Odds Ratio of 1.27 (95% CI 1.09–1.47, $p = 0.0008$)[30].

Crucially, Welsh and Farrington observed that nighttime crimes did *not* decrease more than daytime crimes following the installation of lighting. This led them to hypothesize that the mechanism of action was not merely "natural surveillance" (i.e., making it easier to spot offenders in the dark), but rather a sociological phenomenon termed "community pride." Under this theory, visible infrastructure investment by the municipality signals civic order, increasing community cohesiveness and informal social control, which depresses crime rates around the clock[30].

The Methodological Critique and Replication Failure Welsh and Farrington's findings have been heavily contested on methodological grounds. Statistician Paul Marchant (2004, 2005, 2013) published series of critiques arguing that the meta-analysis relied on flawed statistical foundations[31]. Marchant argued that the review failed to account for the spatial correlation of crime events—meaning crime is "clumpy" rather than randomly distributed (Poisson distribution). By ignoring over-dispersion and the effects of regression to the mean (since lighting is usually installed in areas currently experiencing an abnormal crime spike), Marchant argued the 20% reduction was a statistical artifact, not a causal effect[31].

More recently, a massive, highly powered interrupted time-series analysis by Steinbach et al. (2015), published in the *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, failed to replicate the crime-reduction hypothesis on a macro scale[35]. Analyzing 14 years of police and municipal data (2000–2013) across 62 local authorities in England and Wales, the researchers examined regions where municipalities had systematically *reduced* lighting (via switch-offs, part-night lighting, dimming, and white-light LED replacements) to save carbon and costs[35]. Assessing offenses most likely to occur at night (burglary, vehicle theft, robbery, violence, and sexual assault), Steinbach et al. found *no evidence* of an association between reduced street lighting and overall crime or night-time traffic collisions[35].

Reconciling the Controversy for Planners The stark divergence between Welsh & Farrington and Steinbach et al. highlights the distinction between highly localized, targeted interventions and macro-level municipal policies. While installing bright lights in a specific, neglected, high-crime alleyway may trigger a localized "community pride" effect and displace crime, aggregate changes to lighting levels across hundreds of square miles do not appear to dictate objective regional crime rates[31].

However, from a gender-sensitive planning perspective, objective crime data is only half the

equation. The *subjective fear of crime* exerts a measurable, crippling effect on women's mobility regardless of statistical crime probabilities[28]. Qualitative and mixed-methods studies consistently show that well-lit, socially active spaces foster comfort and trust, encouraging women to utilize public transit and engage in public life after dark[32]. Consequently, urban planners must decouple the two concepts: they must recognize that while street lighting may be an unreliable and contested tool for objective crime deterrence, it remains an absolutely critical, evidence-based intervention for facilitating subjective safety and ensuring spatial equity for women.

Applied Gender-Sensitive Urbanism: Paradigms and Case Studies

The Vienna Model: Three Decades of Gender Mainstreaming

The City of Vienna serves as the premier global case study for the rigorous, sustained implementation of gender-sensitive urban planning. Initiated in the early 1990s by planners such as Eva Kail, the movement began with a realization that the unpaid, invisible care work performed predominantly by women was a fundamental "blind spot" in traditional urban design[25].

The initiative gained political traction following a groundbreaking 1991 photography exhibition organized by Kail, titled "Who Owns Public Space – Women's Everyday Life in the City." By documenting the daily routines of diverse women, the exhibition rendered visible the spatial frictions they endured, sparking intense public debate[25]. This momentum led to the establishment of the City Women's Office in 1992, and later the Co-Ordination Office for Planning and Construction Geared to the Requirements of Daily Life in 1998[39]. A pivotal 1999 municipal survey quantified these frictions, proving that while men predominantly commuted linearly, women's routines were heavily varied and tied to local infrastructure[25].

Vienna formalized this approach through a "4-R" methodology: Representation (who is involved in planning), Resources (how budgets are distributed), Realia (the physical spatial outcomes), and Rights (legal frameworks and zoning regulations)[41]. The city codified this in the highly influential 2013 *Manual for Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Planning and Urban Development*, co-authored by Kail and Elisabeth Irschik, which established target group-specific requirement profiles and quality indicators for all new developments[42]. Over 60 pilot projects have been executed, fundamentally altering the city's built environment[25].

The flagship architectural realization of this philosophy is *Frauen-Werk-Stadt* (Women-Work-City) I & II, designed in the late 1990s by architect Franziska Ullmann and others[25]. Comprising 359 subsidized housing units, the complex was designed explicitly around the daily routines and safety needs of women. It integrated a kindergarten, a medical center, and commercial spaces directly on-site[25]. Apartments were organized around grassy courtyards to facilitate safe, easily supervised play for children from the kitchen windows, fostering social cohesion and radically reducing the time and geographic burden of care tasks[25]. Staircases and entrances were widened and well-lit to eliminate dark corners and accommodate strollers[39].

This paradigm was subsequently scaled up to the *Aspern Seestadt* project, one of Europe's largest brownfield urban expansion zones, intended to house 20,000 residents and create 20,000 jobs by 2028[45]. Vienna mandated that gender-sensitive criteria be embedded directly into developer competitions; architectural firms that failed to provide high-quality secondary spaces (stroller storage, communal areas) or safe lighting layouts were routinely denied public subsidies and contracts[25]. The 2024 EVA (Evaluierung aspern Die Seestadt Wiens) Report confirmed the efficacy of this approach. Resident satisfaction surveys revealed that 93% of inhabitants highly rate their quality of life, vindicating Vienna's commitment to "gentle urban renewal" and intensive, localized neighborhood management[47].

The 15-Minute City and Feminist Critiques

The "15-minute city"—a contemporary urban planning concept promoting neighborhoods where all essential human needs (work, retail, healthcare, education) are accessible within a 15-minute walk or bike ride—aligns closely with the goals of gender-sensitive planning. By decentralizing urban functions and prioritizing mixed-use zoning, the model inherently supports the non-linear trip chaining and localized mobility associated with caregiving[49].
However, feminist urban geographers, most notably Leslie Kern in her 2020 book *Feminist City: Claiming Space in a Man-Made World*, offer a vital, structural critique of the concept. Kern argues that without a rigorous intersectional lens (accounting for class, race, and disability alongside gender), proximity-based urbanism risks becoming an engine for gentrification that benefits only privileged, professional-class demographics[49].
If a 15-minute neighborhood is created through market forces alone, the local amenities (boutique grocers, private daycares, artisan cafes) become unaffordable to the working class. Consequently, low-income women—who perform the vast statistical majority of both paid and unpaid societal care work—are physically displaced to the urban periphery[52]. This displacement destroys their localized support networks and violently exacerbates their transit burdens, as they are forced to commute back into the 15-minute city to perform low-wage service and care labor[49]. A truly gender-equitable 15-minute city, Kern argues, requires robust social housing, strict anti-displacement policies, and the collective socialization of care infrastructure to ensure proximity is a right, not a luxury commodity[49].

Multi-Generational and Cooperative Housing Models

Addressing the intersection of gender and care also requires reimagining the internal architecture of domestic life. In Berlin, the *Baugruppen* (building groups) model of cooperative, self-managed housing has emerged as a powerful tool for social sustainability and feminist housing policy[54]. By bypassing traditional profit-driven developers, prospective residents form a legal entity to finance, design, and construct their own multi-unit dwellings, reducing delivery costs by 25% to 35% compared to the traditional market[55].
Crucially, the participatory design process of *Baugruppen* almost universally results in the inclusion of shared spatial resources—communal industrial kitchens, shared gardens, collective childcare spaces, and guest rooms[57]. This architectural arrangement facilitates intergenerational living and robust mutual aid. For women, the spatial proximity of support networks within a *Baugruppen* drastically reduces the physical isolation, financial strain, and

time-poverty associated with the traditional, highly privatized nuclear-family housing model[56]. It physically manifests the feminist goal of moving care labor out of isolated, unpaid private spheres and into a collective, socialized framework[49].

Extracted Design Principles and Evidence Base

The literature supports the following actionable, evidence-based design principles for gender-sensitive urbanism:

Design Principle	Target Mechanism	Evidence Base & Empirical Findings
Asymmetrical Toilet Fixture Ratios (Potty Parity)	Accounts for physiological/social differences in service times (female: 178.9s vs male: 118.4s).	Bovens & Marcoci (2020); Greed (2016). Equal floor space creates chronic temporal inequity. 2:1 ratios or gender-neutral facilities are required to optimize throughput[2].
High-Density, Mixed-Use Zoning	Reduces travel distances for non-linear "trip chaining" associated with care work.	Ravensbergen et al. (2023); Giles-Corti et al. (2022). Shorter distances and mixed land use correlate heavily with increased female active transport[11].
Permeable Playground Architecture	Eliminates single-exit "cages" to prevent territorial monopolies by aggressive user groups.	Vienna Park Studies (Kail). Opening fences and diversifying amenities disrupts male monopolies and significantly increases female adolescent dwell time[26].
Targeted Safety Lighting	Enhances subjective safety and facilitates mobility after dark, even if objective crime deterrence is debated.	Welsh & Farrington (2008); Steinbach et al. (2015). High-quality lighting fosters subjective comfort and increases female nighttime transit usage[28].
Integrated Housing	Visual connectivity from	*Frauen-Werk-Stadt*; Aspern

Layouts	domestic spaces to public courtyards; integrated ground-floor care amenities.	Seestadt. Reduces the physical burden of supervision; yields 93% resident satisfaction in surveyed cohorts[25].
Fare Structure Equity	Eliminates financial penalties for the multi-stop "Mobility of Care."	Shuman et al. (2023). Moving from per-boarding fares to time-based transfers prevents systemic taxation of caregiving travel[14].

Summary of Robust Findings

1. Women perform the statistical majority of unpaid domestic and care labor globally, generating a spatial mobility pattern called the "Mobility of Care," which accounts for roughly 15% to 30% of all urban trips.
2. Care mobility is characterized by "trip chaining"—complex, non-linear, off-peak journeys—which are systemically penalized by transit networks and fare structures optimized for linear, peak-hour employment commuting.
3. Traditional public sanitation policies based on spatial equality (1:1 floor space) yield profound temporal inequality, as physiological and caregiving realities result in average female service times being roughly 50% longer than male service times (178.9s vs 118.4s).
4. Asymmetrical fixture ratios (potty parity) or fully gender-neutral, desegregated facilities are mathematically required to optimize throughput and eliminate chronic queuing.
5. Adolescent girls are systematically excluded from traditional single-use, enclosed sports infrastructure in public parks due to spatial monopolies by boys and the subjective fear of entrapment.
6. Minor architectural interventions—such as opening fences, widening paths, and providing non-gendered amenities—measurably increase female participation in public parks.
7. The objective efficacy of broad street lighting reductions on crime is highly contested (Welsh & Farrington vs. Steinbach et al.) and likely minimal at a macro scale; however, high-quality lighting remains an essential, evidence-based intervention for reducing women's subjective fear and ensuring spatial equity.
8. Collaborative housing models (e.g., Berlin's *Baugruppen*) that integrate shared communal spaces significantly offset the isolation, financial cost, and logistical burdens of unpaid domestic and elder care.
9. Proximity-based urbanism (the 15-minute city) supports care mobility but requires strict anti-displacement policies to prevent the gentrification and exclusion of low-income female caregivers.
10. Vienna's three-decade integration of gender mainstreaming into binding municipal

regulations proves that systemic, large-scale implementation of these principles is both politically viable and highly correlated with extreme resident satisfaction.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Street Lighting Paradox:** Does improved street lighting objectively reduce crime through "natural surveillance" and "community pride," or is this effect a statistical artifact inflated by localized studies ignoring spatial correlation? How should municipalities weigh the lack of macro-level crime reduction against the proven micro-level gains in women's subjective safety?
- **Gender-Neutral Sanitation Acceptance:** While queuing simulations mathematically prove that gender-neutral facilities optimize throughput and reduce wait times, user acceptance varies widely across different cultural contexts due to ingrained socio-normative concerns regarding privacy, safety, and hygiene.
- **The 15-Minute City and Gentrification:** Can the 15-minute city model be implemented through free-market urbanism without triggering gentrification that displaces the very low-income women who most rely on localized care networks to the urban periphery?
- **Data Granularity in Transit:** How can regional transit authorities effectively integrate the "Mobility of Care" into standard algorithmic ticketing and fare structures to avoid financially penalizing off-peak trip chainers?

Most Important Sources to Read in Full

1. **Sánchez de Madariaga, I. (2013).** "Mobility of Care: Introducing New Concepts in Urban Transport." In *Fair Shared Cities: The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe*. Routledge.
2. **Kern, L. (2020).** *Feminist City: Claiming Space in a Man-Made World*. Verso.
3. **Bovens, L., & Marcoci, A. (2020).** "The gender-neutral bathroom: a new frame and some nudges." *Behavioural Public Policy*, 7(1), 1-24.
4. **Greed, C. (2016).** "Taking women's bodily functions into account in urban planning and policy: Public toilets and menstruation." *Town Planning Review*, 87(5), 505-524.
5. **Welsh, B. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2008).** "Effects of improved street lighting on crime." *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 4(13).
6. **Steinbach, R., et al. (2015).** "The effect of reduced street lighting on road casualties and crime in England and Wales: controlled interrupted time series analysis." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 69(11), 1118-1124.
7. **Ravensbergen, L., Fournier, J., & El-Geneidy, A. (2023).** "Mobility of Care: An Exploratory Analysis in Montréal, Canada." *Transport Policy*.
8. **City of Vienna (2013).** *Manual for Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Planning and Urban Development*. Urban Development Vienna (MA 18). (Authored by E. Kail and E. Irschik).
9. **Giles-Corti, B., et al. (2022).** "Determining thresholds for spatial urban design and transport features that support walking to create healthy and sustainable cities: findings from the IPEN Adult study." *The Lancet Global Health*.

Implications for living together

Recognizing that women historically and currently perform the statistical majority of unpaid care work is an empirical observation; however, asserting that urban spaces should be

designed to solidify, isolate, or enforce this dynamic is a naturalistic fallacy. The goal of gender-sensitive urban planning is not to permanently enshrine women as isolated caregivers, but to acknowledge the physical and logistical reality of care work and eliminate the infrastructural friction that penalizes whoever performs it.

For couples, families, and organizations, living together optimally requires an environment that does not structurally exhaust the individual managing domestic logistics. When neighborhoods are designed with decentralized amenities, permeable safety infrastructure, equitable sanitation, and efficient micro-mobility, the absolute spatial and temporal burden of care is lowered. This infrastructural support makes it practically feasible for care responsibilities to be equitably distributed between sexes, ultimately allowing societies to transition from rigid, geography-enforced gender roles toward a flexible, shared model of human cohabitation. Human behavior adapts to the contours of the built environment; by designing a city that accommodates the logistics of care, we engineer a society where caring is a viable, shared endeavor.

Works cited

1. From the guttermost to the uttermost and back | Town Planning Review, https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/doi/abs/10.3828/tpr.2021.51
2. Taking women's bodily functions into account in urban planning and, https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/doi/10.3828/tpr.2016.35
3. Taking women's bodily functions into account in urban planning and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308665844_Taking_women's_bodily_functions_into_account_in_urban_planning_and_policy_Public_toilets_and_menstruation
4. Beyond “Potty Parity”: Public Toilets, Gendered Time Costs, and, https://www.mdpi.com/2075-471X/15/3/55
5. Potty Parity in Perspective: Gender and Family Issues in Planning, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/32965156_Potty_Parity_in_Perspective_Gender_and_Family_Issues_in_Planning_and_Designing_Public_Restrooms
6. The gender-neutral bathroom: a new frame and some nudges, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/behavioural-public-policy/article/genderneutral-bathroom-a-new-frame-and-some-nudges/C6CDCA42BAEBCE684B243EB9773A771C
7. Potty Parity | Management Science - PubsOnLine, https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/mnsc.2021.04075
8. Gender Inequality in Public Toilets from the Perspective of Urban, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386991043_Gender_Inequality_in_Public_Toilets_from_the_Perspective_of_Urban_Feminist_Theory
9. User Preferences on Toilet Features and Layout: Observations from, https://www.mdpi.com/2075-5309/16/5/919
10. Gender neutral toilet standards guideline recommendations based, https://journal.lppmunindra.ac.id/index.php/Jurnal_Desain/article/download/23125/7314

11. Determining thresholds for spatial urban design and transport, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35561724/
12. Effects of the built environment on physical activity: a systematic, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7697377/
13. Effects of the built environment on physical activity - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33246405/
14. (PDF) Inferring Mobility of Care Travel Behavior From Transit Origin, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365260630_Inferring_Mobility_of_Care_Travel_Behavior_From_Transit_Origin-Destination_Data
15. examining the mobility of care in Washington, DC, USA - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/sustainable-cities/articles/10.3389/frsc.2024.1379958/pdf
16. Mobility of care: Introducing new concepts in urban transport, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286377551_Mobility_of_care_Introducing_new_concepts_in_urban_transport
17. Fair Shared Cities - The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe (Z-Lib, https://www.scribd.com/document/709797329/Fair-Shared-Cities-the-Impact-of-Gender-Planning-in-Europe-Z-lib-io
18. Mobility of Care: An Exploratory Analysis in Montréal, Canada, https://uttri.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2022/05/Mobility-of-care-Ravensbergen-et-al-2021.pdf
19. "Mobility of Care" – Ines Sanchez de Madariaga - UN-Habitat, https://unhabitat.org/mobility-of-care-ines-sanchez-de-madariaga
20. Does Public Transport Planning Consider Mobility of Care ... - MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/17/12/5466
21. Publications - MIT JTL-Transit Lab, https://mobility.mit.edu/publications/
22. mobility patterns by gender and the mobility of care in belo horizon, https://22rdt.riodetransportes.org.br/trabalhos/trabalhos/1290294.pdf
23. Understanding the Role of Public Transportation in Supporting the, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/16/3/1288
24. Closing Gender Gaps in Transport - World Bank Documents, https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099512412082314620/pdf/IDU0a9d235b00e11b040f00ad80077fcc4d1ef74.pdf
25. How Vienna Designed A City for Women, https://wafmag.org/2018/12/how-vienna-designed-a-city-for-women/
26. Article_More Girls To Parks! Case Study of Einsiedler Park, Vienna, http://www.wpsprague.com/research-1/2017/1/6/more-girls-to-parks-case-study-of-einsiedler-park-viennamilota-sidorova
27. Claiming our turf. Making spaces safe through inclusive urban design., https://www.open.ac.uk/blogs/design/claiming-our-turf-making-spaces-safe-through-inclusive-urban-design/
28. Gender-sensitive urban planning, https://www.journalcswb.ca/index.php/cswb/article/download/465/1374/8003
29. (PDF) Urban inclusivity through a gender lens: A scoping review, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/414490448_Urban_inclusivity_through_

a_gender_lens_A_scoping_review
30. The Impact and Policy Relevance of Street Lighting for Crime, https://www.crimrxiv.com/pub/wl9zqxga/download/pdf
31. The effect of lighting on crime counts - White Rose Research Online, https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/176452/1/fotios%20robbins%20farrall%202021%20crime%20ambient%20light.pdf
32. Effects of Improved Street Lighting on Crime - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344498919_Effects_of_Improved_Street_Lighting_on_Crime
33. Measuring the Effects of Improved Street Lighting on Crime, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31424641_Measuring_the_Effects_of_Improved_Street_Lighting_on_Crime_A_Reply_to_Dr_Marchant
34. The potential impact of reduced street lighting on crime and fear of, https://www.sakraplatser.abe.kth.se/wp-content/uploads/sites/60/2020/07/10.4324_9780429352775-24.pdf
35. Switching off street lights at night does not increase car crashes and, https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/newsevents/news/2015/reduced_street_lighting_does_not_increase_crime.html
36. The effect of reduced street lighting on road casualties and crime in, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4680141/
37. Streetlights Might Not Make You Safer - Pacific Standard, https://psmag.com/news/streetlights-might-not-make-you-safer/
38. The Security of Light: Streetlights and Criminal Darkness, https://paulmullins.wordpress.com/2016/06/23/the-security-of-light-streetlights-and-criminal-darkness/
39. Gender Mainstreaming in Vienna's Urban Planning | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/150113404/Gender-Implementation-in-Vienna
40. (PDF) Who owns public spaces? The trailblazer exhibition on, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360661418_Who_owns_public_spaces_The_trailblazer_exhibition_on_women's_everyday_life_in_the_City_of_Vienna_1991
41. Tour 2 - Gender mainstreaming - C:lab Vienna Report, https://docs.burohappold.com/clab-vienna/gender-mainstreaming/
42. Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Planning and Urban Development, https://afakneswiah.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/b008358.pdf
43. Frauenwerkstatt - Wien - Ullmann, https://www.ullmannf.at/frauenwerkstatt.html
44. Housing and Neighborhood Design - Gendered Innovations, https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/case-studies/urban.html
45. aspern - the seestadt of vienna - Wohnfonds Wien, https://www.wohnfonds.wien.at/media/Website%20PDF-INFO%20Downloads/English%20Information/aspern_seestadt_2019_english-pdf.pdf
46. Fair Shared Cities – Vienna´s Gender Planning Approach, https://www.ipop.si/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Eva_Kail_presentation.pdf
47. aspern Seestadt sets new benchmarks with “EVA Report”, https://www.aspern-seestadt.at/en/press/post/aspern-seestadt-sets-new-bench

marks-with-eva-report
48. Understanding people-centered planning practice in Europe, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02697459.2024.2312341
49. Are 15-Minute Cities Feminist Cities? - Gender Policy Report, https://genderpolicyreport.umn.edu/are-15-minute-cities-feminist-cities/
50. Gender Equity Creating Feminist Cities - Goethe-Institut, https://www.goethe.de/prj/zei/en/art/22955268.html
51. Looking at the city from a gender perspective | PCA–STREAM, https://pca-stream.com/en/contents/looking-at-the-city-from-a-gender-perspective/
52. Learnscapes Programme 2023 - Floating University Berlin, https://floating-berlin.org/programmes/learnscapes/learnscapes-programme-2023/
53. What makes a city feminist? - CityMonitor, https://www.citymonitor.ai/analysis/what-makes-a-city-feminist/
54. This is a really exciting use of the co-op model for housing, https://www.facebook.com/groups/345237152705801/posts/414089422487240/
55. Baugruppen: the German model of cohousing and its constitutive, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337934813_Baugruppen_the_German_model_of_cohousing_and_its_constitutive_variables
56. Feminist Housing Policy: Socializing Living Space, Democratizing, https://berlinergazette.de/feminist-housing-policy-socializing-living-space-democratizing-care/
57. (PDF) Kick-starting Cohousing for Older People: Literature Review, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346744119_Kick-starting_Cohousing_for_Older_People_Literature_Review
58. The re-emergence of self-managed co-housing in Europe, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277934800_The_re-emergence_of_self-managed_co-housing_in_Europe_A_critical_review_of_co-housing_research