

SPATIAL JUSTICE BENCHMARKING WORKSHOP (2 HOURS)

Using the Five Fictional City Visions + the Citizen-Friendly SJ Evaluation Board

Tools: Vision statements, evaluation board printouts, sticky notes, markers, printed “leaked memos” (optional drama booster)

00:00–00:10 — Welcome & Introduction (10 min)

Facilitator script:

“Today we will explore how different visions of a city express (or fail to express) spatial justice. You will work in groups of five. Each group receives one fictional city vision. Your task is to read it, debate it, and evaluate it using the Spatial Justice Benchmarking Tool (citizen version).”

Show slide summarising the nine components

(from page 1 of the board: FAIR SHARE, FAIR ACCESS, FAIR ABILITY TO SHAPE SERVICES & SPACES, FAIR VOICE, FAIR PROCESSES, FAIR INSTITUTIONS, FAIR RIGHTS, FAIR SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITIES, FAIR RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY)

Remind participants:

“We are scoring the vision—not the city, not the plan, not the staff. Just what is written.”

00:10–00:15 — Group Allocation & Materials (5 min)

Each group receives:

- One city vision (Waterdam, Klompendam, Mosselbroek, Regelspoort, Ordewijk)
- The evaluation board (A3)
- Sticky notes
- Pens

(Optional: the leaked internal memo for dramatic effect)

00:15–00:30 — Silent Reading & First Impressions (15 min)

Participants silently read the assigned vision.

Prompt questions on screen:

1. What does this city seem to care about?
2. Who appears in the text, and who doesn't?
3. What assumptions are hidden behind the tone?
4. What contradictions do you notice?
5. What feels strong or promising?
6. What feels vague, missing, or suspicious?

Groups briefly share first impressions.

00:30–01:10 — Component-by-Component Scoring (40 min)

Each group moves through the nine components, scoring each from 1 (low) to 5 (high) as defined on the board ().

The facilitator should circulate and push groups with provocative questions such as:

DISTRIBUTIVE

- FAIR SHARE: Does the vision specify where benefits go? Or just nice words?
- FAIR ACCESS: Are transport or opportunities really accessible, or just “optimised”?
- FAIR ABILITY: Do residents have agency, or only consultation?

PROCEDURAL

- **FAIR VOICE:** Are people allowed to influence outcomes, or only give input?
- **FAIR PROCESSES:** Are institutions flexible, or hiding behind procedures?
- **FAIR INSTITUTIONS:** Is transparency claimed or demonstrated?

RECOGNITION

- **FAIR RIGHTS:** Are vulnerable groups named or erased?
- **FAIR SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITIES:** Are community networks acknowledged?
- **FAIR RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY:** Is diversity real, or an ornamental paragraph?

Encourage disagreement inside groups.
The point is debate, not consensus.

Groups write sticky notes for each component with:

- Why they scored the way they did
- What evidence in the text supports the score
- What is missing

01:10–01:25 — Plotting the Triangle (15 min)

Each group calculates the median for each dimension (distributive, procedural, recognition). Using a thick marker, they plot the scores on the radial diagram (page 2 of the board) and connect them into a triangle.

Facilitator commentary:

“Your triangle is a portrait of the city’s priorities. Where is it strong? Where is it weak? Is it balanced or lopsided?”

01:25–01:45 — Cross-Group Debate (20 min)

Groups pin their boards on the wall.

They walk around, comparing:

- Klompendam’s participatory excess
- Ordewijk’s soft authoritarianism
- Regelspoort’s bureaucratic fog
- Mosselbroek’s ambiguity
- Waterdam’s partial justice

Debate prompts:

1. Which city produced the most just triangle?
2. Which city hides injustice behind nice language?
3. Which dimension is most commonly ignored across all cities?
4. Which components sparked the greatest group argument?
5. Which visions are actually dangerous if taken at face value?

(Optional drama: hand out leaked memos and ask if scores still hold.)

01:45–02:00 — Plenary Reflection & Closing (15 min)

Final reflection questions:

1. What surprised you about your scoring?
2. Which justice dimensions were hardest to evaluate?
3. What is one thing that every real city should add to its vision?
4. How might this tool change the way you read planning documents?
5. Which fictional city reminded you a bit too much of reality?

Facilitator closing line:

“Spatial justice is not what cities say—it is what their words allow us to see, question, and demand.”