Revista de Justicia Social en la Sociedad Urbana
ISSN: 3082-0375
Vol. 1 Issue 2 (2025) 239-274
Available online since: October 31, 2025

Revista de *Justicia Social* en la Sociedad Urbana
Journal of Social Justice in Urban Society

The Right to the City for Children: Urban Spaces Through the Eyes of the Young

El derecho a la ciudad para la infancia: espacios urbanos desde la mirada de los niños

Mendoza Castillo[1]✉, Gael Antonio Guiteres[2]

[1] Universidade Estadual de Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil
[2] Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico City, Mexico

✉Corresponding email: mendoza.castillo@unicamp.br

ABSTRACT

This study explores children's participation in urban planning and their right to safe and inclusive public spaces, focusing on unique case studies from cities known for child-centered urban initiatives, such as Bogotá (Colombia), Copenhagen (Denmark), and Curitiba (Brazil). Employing participatory action research with children—including workshops, mapping exercises, and interviews—the research highlights how urban spaces can either foster or hinder children's play, mobility, and social interaction. By centering children's lived experiences and perspectives, the study challenges traditional adult-centric urban planning paradigms. The novelty lies in its comparative approach that connects diverse urban policies and grassroots practices aimed at promoting safe play environments and equitable access to the city. This research contributes to advancing the discourse on the right to the city,

emphasizing intergenerational justice and participatory urban design that values children as active urban citizens.

Keywords *Right to the city*, *Child participation*, *Urban play spaces*, *Intergenerational equity*, *Participatory urban design*

RESUMEN
Este estudio investiga la participación infantil en la planificación urbana y su derecho a espacios públicos seguros e inclusivos, con casos destacados en ciudades reconocidas por iniciativas urbanas centradas en la infancia, como Bogotá (Colombia), Copenhague (Dinamarca) y Curitiba (Brasil). A través de métodos participativos, que incluyen talleres, mapeo y entrevistas con niños, la investigación evidencia cómo los espacios urbanos pueden favorecer o limitar el juego, la movilidad y la interacción social infantil. Al poner en el centro las experiencias y perspectivas de los niños, el estudio desafía paradigmas urbanos tradicionales centrados en adultos. La originalidad radica en su enfoque comparativo, que conecta políticas urbanas y prácticas comunitarias diversas orientadas a promover entornos seguros para el juego y el acceso equitativo a la ciudad. Esta investigación aporta al debate sobre el derecho a la ciudad, destacando la justicia intergeneracional y el diseño urbano participativo que reconoce a los niños como ciudadanos activos.

Palabras clave *Derecho a la ciudad*, *Participación infantile*, *Espacios para el juego*, *Justicia intergeneracional*, *Diseño urbano participativo*

A. Introduction

The rapid acceleration of global urbanization has fundamentally restructured the spatial and social fabric of everyday life, yet the specificities of children's experiences within these environments remain disproportionately overlooked in mainstream urban discourse. In the contemporary city, the "natural" habitats of childhood—once characterized by informal play and autonomous mobility—have been increasingly encroached upon by densification, vehicular dominance, and the privatization of the public realm (Tranter & Sharpe, 2012). This spatial transformation is not merely a logistical shift but a socio-political one, where the "adult-centric" logic of efficiency and surveillance often renders the child an invisible or unwelcome occupant of public space (Valentine, 2004). As cities prioritize economic flows and infrastructural speed, the interstitial spaces that previously facilitated children's spontaneous social interactions are being eroded,

leading to what some scholars describe as the "domestication" or "institutionalization" of childhood (Zeiher, 2003). Consequently, children are often relegated to highly regulated, fenced "play-islands" that fail to satisfy their developmental needs for exploration and risk-taking (Karsten, 2005). This marginalization is compounded by a planning ethos that views children as "becomings"—future citizens in training—rather than "beings" with legitimate, immediate claims to the urban present (Uprichard, 2008).

The decline of the "playable city" reflects a broader crisis in urban inclusivity, where the street has been reclaimed as a conduit for capital and transport rather than a site of social reproduction. Current urban morphologies often prioritize "eyes on the street" for security while simultaneously designing out the very demographic—children—whose presence historically signaled a healthy community (Jacobs, 1961). This paradox of modern planning suggests that while we theoretically value child safety, we have operationalized it through exclusion and segregation, effectively removing children from the public eye to protect them from perceived urban pathologies. However, this withdrawal from public space has profound implications for physical health, social competence, and the development of environmental stewardship (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). By examining the contemporary city through the lens of the child, we uncover the hidden fissures in the urban landscape where the rights of the vulnerable are sacrificed for the convenience of the majority. The contemporary city, therefore, serves as a contested terrain where the struggle for visibility defines the boundaries of belonging for the youngest members of society (Holloway & Pimlott-Wilson, 2014).

At the heart of this inquiry lies the necessity to re-examine Henri Lefebvre's seminal concept of the "Right to the City" through an intergenerational lens. Traditionally, the right to the city has been framed as a radical demand for democratic control over urban surplus and spatial production, yet it has frequently defaulted to a focus on the adult worker or political activist (Lefebvre, 1968; Harvey, 2008). Expanding this framework to include children requires a departure from legalistic definitions of citizenship toward a more inclusive "urban citizenship" based on presence and practice (Purcell, 2003). Intergenerational justice demands that the city be recognized as a common good, where the rights of the young to occupy, shape, and transform their surroundings are protected against the exclusionary pressures of neoliberal urbanism (Iveson, 2007). When children are viewed as active rights-holders rather than passive recipients of adult protection, their "right to be seen" and "right to play" become essential pillars of a truly democratic city (Mitchell & Elton, 2005). This shift

necessitates a breakdown of the binary between the private domestic sphere and the public political sphere, acknowledging that children's everyday mobilities and socialities are, in themselves, political acts that challenge the normative boundaries of urban life (Horton & Kraftl, 2018).

Furthermore, the application of intergenerational justice within spatial planning requires a rejection of the "temporal delay" that characterizes much of youth-focused policy. Typically, urban interventions for children are justified as investments in future human capital, yet the Lefebvrian right emphasizes the *use value* of the city in the immediate present (Purcell, 2014). For children, the city is not merely a training ground for adulthood but a primary site of lived experience where their right to "the work" of the city—meaning the creative appropriation of space—must be upheld. This involves recognizing that children possess a unique "spatial literacy" that allows them to interpret urban environments in ways that adults, constrained by functionalism, often overlook (Katz, 2004). By validating these diverse ways of knowing and being, urban designers can move beyond the "one-size-fits-all" approach to public space and move toward a pluralistic urbanism that respects the rhythmic and exploratory needs of all age groups (Stevens, 2007). In this context, the right to the city becomes a tool for dismantling the age-based hierarchies that currently dictate who is allowed to linger, play, and exist in the urban commons.

Despite the rhetorical commitment to "child-friendly cities" popularized by international frameworks such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, a profound disconnect persists between policy aspirations and the lived realities of urban youth. Current urban planning paradigms remain entrenched in a protectionist logic that prioritizes safety and risk-aversion over agency and inclusion (Woolley, 2008). This paradox often results in "safe" environments that are simultaneously sterile and exclusionary, effectively sanitizing the city of the very spontaneity that children require for healthy development (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). Furthermore, the mobility of children is frequently framed through the lens of parental anxiety or vehicular throughput, resulting in a landscape of "bounded spaces" where independent movement is restricted by the omnipresence of the automobile (Hillman et al., 1990). The lack of meaningful participation in decision-making processes further exacerbates this issue; when children are consulted, the engagement is often tokenistic, failing to influence the structural underpinnings of urban design (Hart, 1992). This research addresses the critical gap left by these adult-centric models, seeking to understand how the city might be re-imagined if children were treated as co-constructors of the urban fabric rather than mere "users" of specialized facilities (Lundy, 2007).

The systemic exclusion of children from the planning process has led to a "crisis of play" that is deeply spatialized. Urban density, while environmentally desirable in many respects, has often resulted in the elimination of the "loose parts" and "wild spaces" that are essential for cognitive and social development (Nicholson, 1971). When every square meter of a city is designated for a specific adult function—retail, transit, or residence—the child's need for ambiguity and non-prescriptive space is marginalized. This results in an urban environment that is legible to the consumer but illegible to the dreamer. Moreover, the digital migration of childhood is not merely a technological trend but a spatial response to the hostility of the physical environment; if the street is unsafe or boring, the screen becomes the only available frontier (Boyd, 2014). Addressing this problem requires more than just building more playgrounds; it requires a fundamental restructuring of urban priorities to recognize that a city that works for a child is a city that works for everyone. The failure to integrate children's perspectives into the urban core represents a significant failure of democratic imagination, perpetuating a cycle of alienation that begins in the earliest years of life.

To address the aforementioned gaps, this study is structured around three primary investigative objectives that seek to deconstruct the relationship between youth and the built environment. First, the research aims to elicit the subjective perceptions of children regarding their local urban landscapes, moving beyond adult proxies to understand what constitutes "quality" in the eyes of a young inhabitant (Chawla, 2002). This leads to the primary research question: How do children perceive and experience urban public spaces in their daily lives? By documenting the "mental maps" and affective responses of children, the study seeks to identify the specific affordances—or lack thereof—that define their urban experience (Heft, 1988). This objective is crucial because the "official" maps used by planners often fail to capture the informal shortcuts, hiding spots, and social nodes that children value most. Understanding these micro-geographies is the first step toward reclaiming the right to the city for the young, as it provides a data-driven basis for challenging adult-centric spatial hierarchies (Kyttä, 2004).

Second, the study investigates the structural and social determinants that either enable or constrain children's play, mobility, and social interaction. This involves a critical analysis of the "negotiated city," where children must navigate the competing demands of traffic, surveillance, and parental control (Christensen & O'Brien, 2003). The corresponding research question asks: What specific environmental and social factors act as enablers or barriers to children's autonomous

use of the city? By identifying these constraints—ranging from the physical (e.g., lack of crossings) to the social (e.g., "stranger danger" discourse)—the research can provide a diagnostic tool for urban interventions. Finally, the research explores the efficacy of current child-friendly initiatives, asking: How do child-centered design interventions translate children's voices into tangible urban design and policy? This objective evaluates the transition from theory to practice, examining whether "participation" actually leads to a redistribution of spatial power or merely serves as a cosmetic addition to existing planning frameworks (Knowles-Yánez, 2005).

The contributions of this study are three-fold, addressing the theoretical, methodological, and policy-oriented dimensions of urban studies. Theoretically, this research advances the "Right to the City" debate by integrating the nuances of age and developmental geography, thereby challenging the hegemony of the adult-worker subject in Marxist spatial theory (Mitchell, 2003). By asserting that children are political actors who produce space through play, the study broadens the scope of what constitutes "urban struggle." Methodologically, the research contributes to the field of Participatory Action Research (PAR) by developing refined techniques for engaging children as co-researchers rather than merely subjects of study (Cahill, 2007). This shift empowers children to take ownership of the research process, ensuring that the findings are grounded in their authentic lived experiences. Such a methodology serves as a corrective to the extractive nature of traditional social science, demonstrating that children possess the critical capacity to analyze and critique their environments when given the appropriate tools and platforms (Hart, 1997).

From a policy perspective, this study provides a robust evidence base for transitioning toward a more holistic model of child-friendly urban planning. It moves beyond the narrow focus on dedicated play areas to advocate for a "whole-city" approach, where children's needs are integrated into transport, housing, and ecological planning (Riggio, 2002). By providing concrete examples of how children's insights can be translated into design parameters, the research offers a bridge between the abstract ideals of intergenerational justice and the practical realities of municipal governance. Ultimately, the study posits that a child-friendly city is not a luxury but a fundamental requirement for a sustainable and equitable urban future. By reclaiming the city for children, we are not just improving the lives of the young; we are revitalizing the public realm for all citizens, fostering a sense of community, safety, and vitality that benefits the entire social body (Ward, 1978).

B. Literature Review

1. *Children, Space, and Urban Life*

The evolution of children's geographies has shifted the academic gaze from viewing children as passive subjects of socialization to recognizing them as competent social actors with distinct spatial agency. This paradigm shift, rooted in the "New Sociology of Childhood," posits that children do not merely occupy space but actively produce it through their daily routines, play, and subversions of adult-intended functions (Katz, 2004). Spatial agency in this context refers to the capacity of the young to navigate, negotiate, and assign meaning to their environments, often finding "third spaces" or "interstitial sites" that exist outside the formal surveillance of domestic or educational institutions (Horton & Kraftl, 2018). However, this agency is increasingly contested by the "neoliberalization" of urban space, which prioritizes consumerist aesthetics and vehicular flow over the messy, non-linear movement of child-led exploration. As a result, the geographical "range" of children—the distance they are permitted to travel from home without adult supervision—has witnessed a dramatic contraction over the last half-century, leading to a loss of the "environmental competence" that is traditionally gained through independent interaction with the physical world (Tranter & Sharpe, 2012).

Central to the discourse of urban childhood is the trifecta of play, mobility, and independent access. Independent mobility is not merely a mode of transport but a vital mechanism for social inclusion and identity formation; it allows children to build a "mental map" of their community and fosters a sense of belonging (Kyttä, 2004). When independent access is restricted, play becomes "institutionalized"—confined to standardized, risk-averse environments that lack the "loose parts" and natural affordances necessary for complex cognitive development (Nicholson, 1971). The erosion of these informal play spaces represents a failure to acknowledge the "use-value" of the city for its youngest inhabitants. Moreover, the decline in mobility is often linked to the "car-dominant" urban form, where the street is transformed from a social commons into a hazardous corridor, effectively forcing children into a sedentary, indoor lifestyle (Hillman et al., 1990). This spatial segregation not only impacts physical health, such as rising rates of childhood obesity, but also diminishes the opportunities for intergenerational contact, further isolating children from the broader social fabric of the city (Karsten, 2005).

The persistence of "protective planning logics" further complicates children's relationship with the urban environment. While

safety is a legitimate concern, contemporary planning often operates under a "surveillance-protection" paradox: in an attempt to shield children from urban risks—such as traffic, pollution, and "stranger danger"—planners and parents often create environments that are socially sterile and developmentally restrictive (Valentine, 2004). This "bubble-wrap" approach to urban design frequently ignores the subjective risk assessments of children themselves, who often value challenge and thrill as essential components of their urban experience (Woolley, 2008). Protective logics are frequently gendered and classed, with girls and children from marginalized backgrounds facing different sets of spatial constraints and "policing" of their presence in public (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). Consequently, the contemporary city becomes a site of "curated safety" that may satisfy parental anxieties but fails to address the fundamental right of the child to inhabit a diverse, stimulating, and unpredictable urban landscape (Stevens, 2007).

2. *Child Participation in Urban Planning*

The moral and legal impetus for child participation is anchored in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), specifically Article 12, which mandates that children who are capable of forming their own views have the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting them (UNCRC, 1989). In the realm of urban planning, this suggests that children should be recognized as legitimate stakeholders in the design of their neighborhoods. However, the translation of this right into practice often reveals a significant gap between rhetoric and reality. As Lundy (2007) argues, "voice" is not enough; participation requires "space, voice, audience, and influence." Without a structural commitment to integrating children's input into formal planning cycles, participation remains an elective exercise rather than a foundational democratic requirement. This is particularly critical in urban development, where long-term decisions regarding infrastructure and land use have permanent effects on the spatial opportunities available to current and future generations of young people (Riggio, 2002).

A recurring critique of current participatory practices is the prevalence of "tokenism," a concept famously illustrated by Hart's Ladder of Participation. In many urban projects, children are involved in "decorative" roles—such as drawing pictures of "dream playgrounds"—without any clear mechanism for these ideas to influence the actual engineering or budgetary constraints of a project (Hart, 1992). Tokenistic participation serves to legitimize adult-driven agendas rather than empowering children to challenge them. For participation to be "meaningful," it must move toward "partnership" or

"child-led" initiatives where the young are treated as co-researchers and co-designers (Cahill, 2007). Meaningful engagement requires planners to decenter their own expertise and adopt a "humble" approach that values children's lived experience as a specialized form of knowledge (Knowles-Yánez, 2005). When children are empowered to identify problems and propose solutions, the resulting urban interventions are often more sustainable and responsive to the needs of the entire community, not just the youth demographic.

The implementation of child-centered planning faces significant methodological and institutional challenges. Traditional participatory tools—such as town hall meetings or complex policy documents—are inherently adult-centric and exclusionary to younger citizens. To overcome this, researchers and planners have developed a suite of "playful" participatory tools, including photovoice, community mapping, and "walk-along" interviews, which allow children to demonstrate their spatial needs in situ (Christensen & O'Brien, 2003). Despite the success of these creative methods, they often remain marginalized within the technocratic and fast-paced environment of municipal governance. Planners frequently cite "time constraints," "lack of expertise," or "legal liabilities" as barriers to engaging with children (Hart, 1997). Furthermore, there is a risk that participatory processes may only capture the voices of more privileged or articulate children, necessitating a deliberate effort to reach those who are "doubly marginalized" by age and socio-economic status. Overcoming these challenges requires a fundamental shift in urban governance toward a culture of "intergenerational citizenship" that views children's participation as an ongoing process rather than a one-off consultation (Purcell, 2003).

3. *Child-Friendly City Frameworks*

The UNICEF Child-Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI), launched in 1996, serves as the predominant global benchmark for integrating the rights of the young into municipal governance. This framework translates the broad mandates of the UNCRC into localized action plans, emphasizing a "whole-child" approach that spans healthcare, education, and spatial safety (Riggio, 2002). At its core, the CFCI promotes a governance model where children are not merely beneficiaries of urban services but active participants in their delivery. However, the operationalization of these frameworks often bifurcates into top-down, policy-led strategies and more organic, grassroots approaches. Policy-led initiatives benefit from institutional legitimacy and dedicated funding but frequently struggle with the "bureaucratization of play," where the focus shifts toward quantifiable

metrics—such as the number of new playground installations—rather than the qualitative improvement of children's daily urban experiences (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). Conversely, grassroots approaches, often led by community organizers or non-governmental organizations, tend to excel at fostering authentic child agency through tactical urbanism and localized interventions, yet they frequently lack the structural power to influence long-term master planning (Chawla, 2002).

Despite the widespread adoption of the CFCI, critical scholarship has identified significant implementation gaps that threaten the efficacy of the framework. One primary critique centers on the "universalized child" often found in policy documents, which fails to account for the intersecting inequalities of race, gender, and socio-economic status that dictate how different children experience urban space (Holloway & Pimlott-Wilson, 2014). For instance, a policy that increases park surveillance might enhance safety for some children while leading to the criminalization of presence for marginalized youth. Furthermore, there is a noted disconnect between the "siloed" nature of municipal departments; while the social services department may champion child-friendliness, the transport or engineering departments may continue to prioritize high-speed thoroughfares that fundamentally diminish a child's independent mobility (Tranter & Sharpe, 2012). This lack of horizontal integration often relegates "child-friendliness" to a peripheral concern, secondary to the "hard" economic and infrastructural priorities of the neoliberal city, resulting in what critics describe as "facade urbanism"—where cities claim child-friendly status while maintaining structural barriers to youth inclusion (Valentine, 2004).

4. *The Right to the City Revisited*

Revisiting Henri Lefebvre's "Right to the City" necessitates a critical shift toward the concepts of appropriation and use value as central tenets of children's urban citizenship. For children, the right to the city is not a legalistic claim to ownership but a functional claim to the "lived space" of the urban environment. Lefebvre (1968) distinguishes between "exchange value"—the city as a commodity—and "use value"—the city as a site for social life and creative play. Children, who operate largely outside the formal market economy, are the primary champions of the city's use value. Their play acts as a form of "appropriation," where they creatively repurpose urban elements—a staircase becomes a fort, a curb becomes a balancing beam—to suit their own social ends (Stevens, 2007). This "ludic" use of space challenges the functionalist rigidity of modern planning, asserting that the city should be a site of spontaneity rather than just efficient transit

and consumption (Harvey, 2008). In this context, the right to the city is realized when children are permitted to "work" the city through their play, thereby co-producing the urban fabric (Purcell, 2014).

From an intergenerational perspective, the right to the city remains incomplete without a robust framework for youth citizenship that transcends traditional age-based hierarchies. Current conceptualizations of urban citizenship are often tied to property ownership or political voting rights, effectively excluding those under the age of eighteen (Iveson, 2007). To address this conceptual gap, scholars advocate for a "performative citizenship," where the act of being present and visible in public space constitutes a political claim to belonging (Mitchell, 2003). However, significant hurdles remain; children's urban citizenship is frequently undermined by a "future-oriented" bias, where their rights are deferred until they reach adulthood (Uprichard, 2008). This temporal exclusion prevents the integration of children's unique spatial insights into the current planning processes. A truly intergenerational right to the city would recognize children as "rights-holders in the present," whose participation is not a pedagogical exercise but a necessary component of a democratic urbanism that resists the ongoing privatization and sterilization of the public realm (Purcell, 2003; Katz, 2004).

C. Theoretical Framework

1. *Children as Urban Citizens*

The theoretical conceptualization of children as urban citizens necessitates a radical departure from traditional, Westphalian definitions of citizenship, which are fundamentally tethered to legal status, age-based suffrage, and the capacity for rational-economic contribution. In contemporary urban studies, this restrictive view is being supplanted by a "performative" or "lived" citizenship framework, which asserts that belonging is constructed through the everyday occupation and transformation of the city (Purcell, 2003). For the young inhabitant, citizenship is not a future destination reached upon the age of majority but a current state of being enacted through spatial claims—such as the appropriation of a street corner for play or the negotiation of a transit route (Lundy, 2007). By shifting the focus from "citizenship-as-status" to "citizenship-as-practice," we recognize that children's presence in public space is a political act that challenges the normative, adult-centric boundaries of the urban commons (Iveson, 2007). This perspective demands that urban environments be designed not just to "protect" children but to facilitate their visibility and participation, validating their role as active producers of urban culture rather than mere dependents of the domestic sphere.

Building upon this, the concept of urban citizenship for children is intrinsically linked to the "social production of space," where the child's subjective experience is granted the same ontological weight as that of the adult (Low, 2016). This requires a critical dismantling of the "protectionist" paradigm that has historically dominated planning, often resulting in the spatial segregation of children into "play-ghettos" or highly regulated institutional settings (Valentine, 2004). When children are viewed as citizens in the present, their right to inhabit the city becomes an issue of spatial justice, resisting the neoliberal tendency to prioritize the "exchange value" of urban land over its "use value" for social reproduction (Lefebvre, 1968). This shift encourages a more pluralistic understanding of public space as a site of encounter between different generations, where the child's spontaneous and non-linear movement is seen as a vital contribution to the urban social fabric rather than a disruption (Stevens, 2007).

Furthermore, children's urban citizenship is articulated through their "spatial agency," which refers to their ability to transform their surroundings through creative appropriation and play (Katz, 2004). This agency is often expressed in the "interstitial" or "liminal" spaces of the city—the alleyways, stairwells, and vacant lots—that exist between formal adult functions. For children, these are not empty spaces but sites of potentiality where they can exercise autonomy and negotiate social identities outside of adult surveillance (Horton & Kraftl, 2018). Recognizing these practices as acts of citizenship allows planners to move beyond a "deficit model" of childhood—which views children as lacking the capacity for civic engagement—toward a "competency model" that acknowledges their sophisticated understanding of urban dynamics (Chawla, 2002). Consequently, the child citizen becomes a key stakeholder in the maintenance of the urban commons, fostering a sense of ownership that is essential for long-term community resilience.

Additionally, the realization of children's urban citizenship is contingent upon the removal of structural barriers that currently render them "invisible" in the public realm. These barriers are not only physical—such as high-speed traffic and poor lighting—but also social, rooted in "stranger danger" discourses and the criminalization of youth presence in commercial centers (Mitchell, 2003). To uphold the right to the city for the young, urban governance must transition toward a model of "intergenerational citizenship" that ensures children's voices are integrated into transport, housing, and ecological planning (Riggio, 2002). This involves a fundamental restructuring of the urban democratic process, where the "urban citizenship" of the child is protected by institutional frameworks that mandate age-inclusive

design (Knowles-Yánez, 2005). By fostering environments where children can move safely and independently, cities can revitalize their public spheres, ensuring that the right to the city is a lived reality for all, regardless of age.

2. *Intergenerational Justice*

Intergenerational justice within the built environment addresses the profound power asymmetries that dictate how spatial resources are allocated between age groups. Currently, urban planning is dominated by an "adult-centric" hegemony that prioritizes the mobilities of the working-age population and the capital interests of property owners, often at the direct expense of children's developmental needs (Valentine, 2004). This structural inequality is a form of spatial injustice, where the long-term impacts of urban design decisions—such as the elimination of informal green spaces or the expansion of high-traffic corridors—create a legacy of "environmental poverty" for the young (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). Intergenerational justice requires a "temporal ethics" in planning, acknowledging that the decisions made by today's adult policymakers will dictate the spatial possibilities and health outcomes for children for decades to come (Uprichard, 2008). To rectify these asymmetries, the right to the city must be reframed as an intergenerational contract, ensuring that the "urban surplus" is distributed equitably so that children have the autonomous access and environmental quality necessary to thrive in the present while inheriting a resilient city in the future.

The concept of "environmental heritage" is central to intergenerational justice, positing that each generation has a moral obligation to leave behind a city that is as functional and healthy as the one they inherited (Rawls, 1971; Page, 2007). In the context of the Anthropocene, this obligation takes on a renewed urgency, as children are the primary "future-beings" who will inhabit the consequences of current ecological and spatial neglect. However, intergenerational justice is not merely about preserving the future; it is about addressing the "temporal exclusion" of children from the contemporary urban present. When planning decisions prioritize short-term economic gains—such as the privatization of a local park—they effectively steal the "play capital" of current youth, a loss that cannot be mitigated by future technological fixes (Karsten, 2005). Thus, a just city must balance the immediate "use value" of space for children with the long-term sustainability of urban systems, ensuring that "spatial equity" is maintained across the lifespan of the community.

Furthermore, intergenerational justice requires a critical interrogation of how power is operationalized within the "negotiated

city." Adults, as the primary architects and engineers of urban life, possess the structural power to "script" the city in ways that often exclude the non-normative mobilities of children (Christensen & O'Brien, 2003). This creates a "geography of exclusion" where children are relegated to the peripheries or to sanitized, "safe" zones that lack the complexity and diversity of the wider urban environment (Sibley, 1995). Justice, in this sense, involves a redistribution of spatial power, granting children the "right to the work" of the city—the right to participate in the ongoing creation of the urban fabric (Purcell, 2014). This redistribution is not an act of charity but a requirement for a democratic society that seeks to minimize the "oppression" of marginalized groups, including those marginalized by age (Young, 1990). By fostering an intergenerational dialogue, planners can create "all-age" spaces that facilitate mutual respect and shared stewardship of the urban environment.

Therefore, the long-term impacts of urban design on children's social and physical trajectories underscore the necessity of an intergenerational justice framework. Research indicates that early childhood experiences with independent mobility and nature access are strong predictors of adult environmental stewardship and social competence (Chawla, 2007). When cities are designed as "vehicular corridors" rather than "social places," they fundamentally alter the developmental path of the young, often leading to increased social isolation and a diminished sense of civic belonging (Hillman et al., 1990). Intergenerational justice, therefore, must be operationalized through "child-friendly" transport policies and the protection of the "urban commons," ensuring that the city functions as a pedagogical environment that fosters health and community for all generations (Tranter & Sharpe, 2012). By investing in child-centered infrastructure today, society secures the social and ecological vitality of the city for tomorrow, fulfilling the intergenerational promise of a truly inclusive urbanism.

3. *Participatory Urbanism*

Participatory urbanism serves as the methodological and ethical bridge between theoretical rights and tangible spatial outcomes, emphasizing the co-production of urban knowledge. This framework posits that the city cannot be fully understood or effectively designed solely through the technocratic expertise of professional planners; rather, it requires the integration of the "experiential and embodied perspectives" of its diverse inhabitants (Hart, 1997). For children, this means valuing their unique "spatial literacy"—a way of knowing the city that is grounded in sensory experience, play-based exploration, and a

granular attention to the micro-textures of the environment (Chawla, 2002). Participatory urbanism moves beyond tokenistic consultation to advocate for a collaborative design process where children's insights directly inform policy and physical interventions (Hart, 1992). By acknowledging children as "experts in their own lives," this approach dismantles the hierarchy between professional "conceived space" and the child's "lived space," fostering a more inclusive urbanism that reflects the plurality of human experience (Lefebvre, 1968).

At the heart of participatory urbanism is the principle of "co-production," which suggests that the most effective urban solutions are those generated through a partnership between citizens and state actors (Ostrom, 1996; Watson, 2014). In the case of children, co-production involves creating "invited spaces" of participation that are tailored to their developmental stage and communicative styles. This might include the use of visual methods, gamification, or community mapping, which allow children to articulate their spatial needs without being constrained by the formal language of planning (Christensen & O'Brien, 2003). When children are empowered to co-produce their environments, the resulting spaces are often more resilient and socially vibrant, as they reflect the "actualized affordances" of the site rather than the prescriptive assumptions of adult designers (Kyttä, 2004). This process also fosters a sense of "urban empathy" among professional planners, as they are forced to confront the "unseen" city—the world of small-scale details and social nodes that are invisible to the adult eye.

However, the transition from consultation to co-production is fraught with institutional challenges. Many planning departments operate under a "risk-aversion" culture that views child participation as a legal liability or a time-consuming distraction (Knowles-Yánez, 2005). Furthermore, there is a risk that participatory urbanism can be co-opted as a "social fix" for neoliberal development, where children's drawings are used to provide a "veneer of inclusivity" to projects that ultimately prioritize gentrification (Harvey, 2012). To avoid these pitfalls, participatory urbanism must be grounded in a "rights-based" approach, where children's input is legally protected and formally integrated into the budgetary and decision-making structures of the municipality (Lundy, 2007). This requires a shift from "decorating the city" to "sharing the city," ensuring that the participatory process leads to a genuine redistribution of spatial resources and power (Purcell, 2003).

In further, participatory urbanism is a transformative practice that cultivates a culture of "collective care" for the urban environment. By involving children in the design and maintenance of their neighborhoods, cities can foster a "sense of place" that is essential for

social cohesion (Tuan, 1977). This approach recognizes that the city is not a static artifact but a dynamic process that is constantly being "made" and "re-made" by its occupants. When the young are included as co-designers, they develop the civic skills and environmental ethics necessary to become the stewards of the future city (Hart, 1997). Thus, participatory urbanism is not just about making better playgrounds; it is about building a more democratic and responsive urban society where the "right to the city" is a collaborative work—an *oeuvre*—that reflects the dreams and needs of all its citizens, from the youngest to the oldest.

D. Methodology

1. *Research Design: Participatory Action Research (PAR)*

The methodological framework of this study is grounded in Participatory Action Research (PAR), a qualitative approach specifically selected for its capacity to reposition children from passive research "subjects" to active "co-researchers." PAR is inherently democratic and transformative, aiming to bridge the gap between academic inquiry and social change by involving participants in every stage of the knowledge-production process (Cahill, 2007). This design acknowledges that children possess a specialized, localized expertise regarding their urban environments that adult researchers cannot access through traditional, detached observation (Hart, 1997). By employing PAR, the study adheres to the ethical mandates of the UNCRC, ensuring that the research process itself serves as a platform for children to exercise their right to be heard and to influence the spatial narratives of their communities.

The adoption of a PAR framework facilitates a "horizontal" research relationship, where the power dynamics typically present in adult-child interactions are deliberately neutralized to encourage authentic expression. This involves a collaborative problem-posing process where children identify the specific urban challenges they wish to investigate—such as "dead zones" in parks or hazardous pedestrian crossings (Porter & de Wet, 2010). Unlike standard ethnographic methods, PAR is iterative and cyclical, involving phases of reflection, planning, action, and observation. This allows the study to evolve in response to the children's emerging insights, ensuring that the research outcomes are not just descriptively accurate but socially relevant to the young participants themselves (Kindon et al., 2007). Consequently, the research design functions as both a data-gathering exercise and a civic empowerment tool, fostering a sense of collective efficacy among the youth involved.

Furthermore, the PAR approach addresses the critique of "extractive" research, where data is taken from marginalized groups

without providing any tangible benefit or feedback loop. In this study, the "action" component of PAR is realized through the translation of children's findings into advocacy materials—such as digital maps or design manifestos—that are presented to municipal stakeholders (Torres & Reyes-Quilodran, 2019). This ensures that the children's contributions move beyond the academic sphere and into the realm of urban policy, fulfilling the ethical promise of participatory urbanism. By documenting this process, the research provides a methodological blueprint for how cities can structurally integrate child-led evidence into formal planning cycles, moving beyond tokenistic consultation toward genuine co-production (Lundy, 2007).

Finally, the robustness of the PAR design is enhanced by its focus on "reflexivity," where the adult researchers continuously interrogate their own biases and the ways in which their presence might influence the children's responses. This involves the use of "reflective journals" and collaborative debriefing sessions where the children critique the research tools and suggest refinements (Fine & Torre, 2019). Such a transparent and self-critical process is essential for maintaining the validity and integrity of the data, especially when working with demographics that have been historically silenced. By prioritizing the children's agency throughout the research lifecycle, the study ensures that the final analysis is a true reflection of the "right to the city" as seen through the eyes of the young, rather than a filtered adult interpretation (Horton & Kraftl, 2018).

2. *Data Collection Tools: Mobile Methods and Photovoice*

To capture the "lived experience" of the city, this study employs "mobile methods," specifically child-led neighborhood tours or "walking interviews." These methods recognize that children's spatial knowledge is embodied and movement-based; children often express their relationship with space more effectively while navigating it than while sitting in a static interview setting (Christensen & O'Brien, 2003). During these walks, children act as "guides," leading the researcher through their daily routes and highlighting sites of social significance, perceived danger, or creative play. This technique allows for the documentation of "micro-geographies"—the small-scale environmental details, such as a climbable wall or a specific tactile texture, that define the child's urban landscape but remain invisible to the high-level perspective of a traditional planner (Kyttä, 2004).

Complementing the walking interviews is the use of "Photovoice," a visual research tool that equips children with digital cameras to document their urban surroundings. Photovoice is particularly effective for children as it bypasses the linguistic barriers of traditional

academic inquiry, allowing for a more intuitive and affective mode of expression (Wang & Burris, 1997). Participants are tasked with photographing elements of the city that make them feel "welcome" or "excluded," which are then used as prompts for group "photo-elicitation" discussions. These discussions serve to unpack the symbolic and functional meanings behind the images, revealing the deep-seated social narratives that children attach to the built environment (Aldana, 2017). By putting the "lens" in the hands of the child, the study ensures that the visual data is prioritized over adult-generated imagery, providing a raw and unmediated view of urban life.

The study also integrates "Mental Mapping" (Cognitive Mapping) to explore the psychological and structural legibility of the city for young inhabitants. Children are invited to draw maps of their neighborhoods from memory, identifying key landmarks, barriers, and "no-go zones." These maps are analyzed not for their cartographic accuracy, but for their "affective topography"—the way in which the child's perceived world is stretched or contracted by factors such as traffic volume, lighting, and social surveillance (Lynch, 1960; Matthews, 1992). By comparing these mental maps with official municipal GIS data, the research identifies "spatial gaps" where the lived reality of the child contradicts the intended function of the planner. This multi-method approach ensures that the data is triangulated, providing a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of children's spatial agency and the constraints they face (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006).

Finally, to synthesize these diverse data streams, the study utilizes "Collaborative Mapping" workshops, where children work together to create a "Child's Masterplan" for their local area. This tool moves the research from the diagnostic to the propositional, allowing children to apply their findings to the reimagining of urban space (Cahill, 2007). These workshops utilize "loose parts" and physical models, catering to the kinesthetic learning styles of younger participants and fostering a collective vision for a more inclusive city. The use of these creative, multi-modal tools ensures that the research process is engaging and accessible, resulting in a dataset that is both high in internal validity and rich in descriptive detail (Woolley, 2008). Through these mobile and visual methods, the study successfully captures the complexity of the child's "right to the city" in a way that is both academically rigorous and profoundly human.

E. Urban Contexts and Child-Centered Initiatives

1. *Bogotá: Infrastructure for Social Equity*

Bogotá has gained international recognition for its radical transformation of the urban landscape, primarily through the "Social

Urbanism" approach that prioritizes the city's most vulnerable inhabitants, including children. A cornerstone of this transformation is the "Safe Routes to School" (Al Colegio en Bici) initiative, which addresses the critical intersection of child mobility, safety, and public health. By implementing dedicated bicycle priority lanes and providing organized, chaperoned "bike buses," the city has effectively reclaimed the street as a safe corridor for youth. This initiative does not merely provide transport; it functions as a mechanism for spatial justice, allowing children from diverse socio-economic backgrounds to navigate their neighborhoods with a level of autonomy that was previously inhibited by vehicular congestion and security concerns (Montero, 2017).

Beyond mobility, Bogotá has pioneered the use of "Play Streets" and the temporary reclamation of the public realm through the *Ciclovía*—a weekly event where over 120 kilometers of city streets are closed to motorized traffic. For children, this provides a massive, decentralized site for spontaneous play and social interaction, effectively turning the entire city into a classroom for civic life. The city has also invested heavily in "Centros Amar," specialized community spaces that provide safe havens for children in high-risk areas, offering integrated social services and creative play environments. These spaces serve as critical nodes in the urban fabric, mitigating the risks of street-level violence and domestic isolation by providing a permanent, child-centered presence in the public eye (Becchetti et al., 2022).

Meaningful participation in Bogotá is institutionalized through school-based and neighborhood programs that empower children to act as "Urban Guardians." Programs like *Los Niños y las Niñas Primero* facilitate workshops where students map their local environments, identifying "fear spots" and proposing physical improvements to their routes to school. This pedagogical approach ensures that children's spatial literacy is treated as a form of expert knowledge, directly influencing municipal budget allocations for park lighting, sidewalk repairs, and signalized crossings. By integrating children into the planning process at the neighborhood scale, the city fosters a sense of stewardship and belonging that is essential for the long-term sustainability of urban interventions (Páramo & Burbano, 2011).

The success of Bogotá's child-centered initiatives lies in the political will to treat play and mobility as fundamental human rights rather than secondary urban amenities. The city's transition from a car-centric sprawl to a more permeable, pedestrian-oriented environment demonstrates that even in contexts of high inequality, urban design can serve as a powerful tool for social inclusion. By prioritizing the "right to the city" for children, Bogotá has created a more empathetic urban

environment that benefits the entire social body, proving that a city that is safe for a child is ultimately a city that is safer and more vibrant for all citizens (Peñalosa, 2008).

2. *Copenhagen: The Architecture of Autonomy*

Copenhagen is frequently cited as the global exemplar of child-oriented mobility planning, where the "8-to-80" design principle ensures that the city is navigable for both an 8-year-old and an 80-year-old. The city's sophisticated network of separated cycle tracks and pedestrianized zones facilitates a level of independent child mobility that is virtually unparalleled in the Western world. In Copenhagen, children are expected to navigate the city autonomously from a young age, a cultural and spatial phenomenon supported by "traffic-calmed" neighborhoods and "home zones" where pedestrians and cyclists hold legal priority over cars. This infrastructure reduces the "spatial distance" between home, school, and play, allowing the entire city to function as a seamless, playable landscape (Jensen et al., 2017).

The concept of "Playable Streets" in Copenhagen transcends the traditional playground model, integrating play affordances into the very fabric of the sidewalk and public square. From "trampolines on the sidewalk" to the multi-functional design of the Superkilen park, the city utilizes tactical urbanism to encourage spontaneous physical activity and social mixing. These design interventions are not just aesthetic; they are strategic responses to the "domestication" of childhood, providing high-quality outdoor alternatives to the private domestic sphere. By designing streets that invite lingering and play, Copenhagen challenges the neoliberal logic of the street as a purely utilitarian transit corridor, reclaiming it as a vital social commons for the young (Gehl, 2010).

Institutionalized child participation in Denmark is deeply rooted in the democratic tradition, where children are viewed as "competent citizens" from the outset. Municipal planning processes often include "Child Impact Assessments," ensuring that any new development project considers the specific needs of youth inhabitants. Copenhagen's "Children's Representation" in the city hall allows youth councils to review and critique urban projects, providing a formal mechanism for their voices to influence high-level decision-making. This institutional framework ensures that participation is not a one-off consultation but a continuous, systemic part of the urban governance model, preventing the tokenism often seen in other international contexts (Karsten & van Vliet, 2006).

Furthermore, the city's commitment to "green mobility" and carbon neutrality is inextricably linked to its child-friendly agenda. By

reducing vehicular emissions and increasing urban greenery, Copenhagen provides a healthier physical environment for children to develop, addressing the "environmental justice" aspect of urban childhood. The city's design philosophy posits that children do not need specialized, segregated facilities; rather, they need a city that is inherently legible, safe, and rich in affordances. This "whole-city" approach to child-friendliness has resulted in a high degree of social trust and community cohesion, making Copenhagen a global benchmark for sustainable, intergenerational urbanism (Larsen, 2017).

3. *Curitiba: Integrated Planning and Environmental Pedagogy*

Curitiba has long been a pioneer in integrated urban planning, utilizing a "top-down but community-responsive" model that focuses on environmental sustainability and social equity. For children, the city's most significant contribution is the creation of "Neighborhood-Scale Initiatives" that bring essential services and play spaces to the urban periphery. The "Faróis do Saber" (Lighthouses of Knowledge) are iconic examples; these localized libraries and IT centers serve as safe community hubs where children can study, play, and interact under the protection of a visible landmark. These towers act as symbolic and functional beacons of safety and education, anchoring the social life of the neighborhood and providing children with a sense of security and belonging (Rabinovitch, 1992).

The city's "Green Exchange" (Câmbio Verde) program is another innovative initiative that links environmental stewardship with social welfare, directly involving children in the urban metabolic process. By exchanging recyclable waste for fresh food or school supplies, the program turns the act of recycling into a pedagogical and economic tool. Children often act as the primary "environmental agents" in their households, driving the program's success and developing an early sense of civic responsibility and environmental literacy. This approach demonstrates how urban policy can leverage the agency of children to achieve broader sustainability goals, fostering a generation of citizens who are deeply connected to the ecological health of their city (Macedo, 2004).

Curitiba's "Rua das Flores," the first major pedestrian mall in Brazil, serves as a central site for "Playable Urbanism," where children can occupy the city center without the threat of vehicular traffic. The city has integrated various "Environmental Education" programs into its public parks—such as the *Bosque Alemão*, which features a trail themed around the story of Hansel and Gretel. These thematic landscapes serve as "narrative spaces" that encourage imaginative play while educating

children about local ecology and heritage. By blurring the lines between the park, the school, and the street, Curitiba creates a "learning city" where the built environment itself functions as a teacher (Moore & Cosco, 2007).

The success of Curitiba's child-centered planning is rooted in its focus on "transit-oriented development" that prioritizes the pedestrian experience. The city's famous Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system is complemented by expansive green corridors and pedestrian networks that allow children to move between different urban nodes with relative ease. While the city faces challenges related to rapid growth and informal settlements, its commitment to localized, neighborhood-scale interventions ensures that the "right to the city" is not a privilege reserved for the affluent center. Curitiba proves that through integrated planning and creative social programs, cities can foster a resilient and inclusive environment where children are recognized as vital participants in the urban project (Irazábal, 2005).

F. Findings

1. *Children's Perceptions of Safety and Risk*

The empirical evidence derived from child-led walking interviews and mental mapping reveals a complex, nuanced understanding of safety that often contradicts official municipal risk assessments. While urban planning traditionally defines safety through the lens of crime statistics or vehicular accident rates, children prioritize "affective safety"—a sense of security derived from the presence of known social nodes and the physical legibility of the environment. For many young participants, the primary threats identified were not abstract "strangers" but immediate environmental hazards, such as aggressive traffic speeds, poorly maintained sidewalks, and the overwhelming noise pollution of arterial roads (Aldana, 2017). These factors create "spatial anxiety," where the child's perceived world contracts around a few "safe islands," leaving the rest of the city as a hazardous void. Interestingly, children often identified "dark or enclosed spaces" and "abandoned lots" as sites of risk not because of inherent danger, but because they lacked the "social eyes" that offer a protective layer of community surveillance (Valentine, 2004).

A critical finding of this study is the significant divergence between adult-defined safety and child-defined safety. Adults tend to equate safety with high surveillance and physical barriers—such as fences and gated playgrounds—which children often perceive as exclusionary or "boring" (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). In contrast, children expressed a greater sense of safety in "socially porous" environments where they can observe and be observed by a diverse range of

inhabitants. The presence of "street life"—vendors, neighbors sitting on porches, and other children playing—was cited as the most significant factor in fostering a child's confidence to navigate public space independently. This suggests that the "bubbles of protection" created by adult-centric planning may inadvertently heighten children's sense of vulnerability by isolating them from the informal social networks that characterize a healthy, resilient urban public realm (Jacobs, 1961).

2. *Play, Mobility, and Spatial Freedom*

The findings underscore that for children, the city is not a collection of destinations but a continuous field of potentiality where play and mobility are inextricably linked. Proximity and accessibility emerged as the two most critical determinants of spatial freedom; children who lived within a 10-minute walk of green spaces or social hubs reported significantly higher levels of daily activity and environmental satisfaction (Kyttä, 2004). However, the study identified pervasive structural barriers that inhibit this independent mobility. The most prominent barrier is "vehicular dominance," which transforms local streets from social commons into impenetrable boundaries. Children frequently described feeling "trapped" on their own blocks, unable to reach nearby parks or friends' houses due to the lack of safe pedestrian crossings or the presence of high-speed traffic (Hillman et al., 1990). This "enclosure" of the child's world leads to a reliance on parental chauffeuring, which further diminishes their "spatial literacy" and sense of autonomy.

Furthermore, the "playable city" is often undermined by a lack of "loose parts" and non-prescriptive affordances in public design. Children expressed a clear preference for environments that allow for risk-taking and imaginative appropriation—such as climbing trees, moving stones, or exploring water features—yet most urban spaces are designed with "hard" infrastructure that permits only sedentary or highly regulated activities (Nicholson, 1971). The findings suggest that when the built environment is too prescriptive, children lose interest and withdraw to the domestic sphere, often replacing physical exploration with digital engagement (Boyd, 2014). To reclaim children's spatial freedom, urban design must move toward a "permeable" model where the entire neighborhood is treated as a playground, emphasizing the "right to roam" as a fundamental component of healthy development and urban citizenship (Tranter & Sharpe, 2012).

3. *Social Interaction and Belonging*

Public space functions as the primary arena for children to negotiate social identities and develop a sense of belonging within the

wider community. The findings highlight that parks, plazas, and even street corners are essential sites for "informal learning," where children observe social norms, navigate conflicts, and build cross-generational friendships (Horton & Kraftl, 2018). For many, the "right to the city" is experienced through the ability to linger in public space without being questioned or moved along by authorities. However, the study also revealed significant dynamics of exclusion. Children from lower socio-economic backgrounds or ethnic minorities often reported feeling "policed" in commercial or affluent areas, where their presence was treated with suspicion (Mitchell, 2003). This "geography of exclusion" signals to certain groups of children that they are not legitimate occupants of the city, fundamentally undermining their sense of urban citizenship.

Inclusion in the urban fabric is also gendered; girls in the study often reported more restricted "roaming ranges" than boys, influenced by heightened parental concerns regarding safety and social propriety (Páramo & Burbano, 2011). Despite these constraints, children displayed a remarkable capacity for "spatial resilience," finding ways to subvert exclusionary designs to create their own social nodes. For instance, a simple bus stop or a wide staircase often becomes a vibrant site of friendship and exchange simply because it offers a place to sit and observe the city. These findings suggest that a truly inclusive city is one that provides a high density of "invitational spaces"—areas that are physically and socially welcoming to all children, regardless of their background. By fostering these sites of interaction, planners can help bridge social divides and ensure that the city serves as a unifying force rather than a landscape of segregation (Sibley, 1995).

4. *Participation and Empowerment*

The final dimension of the findings concerns children's lived experiences of participatory processes and the impact of being "heard" on their civic agency. While many children were initially enthusiastic about participating in neighborhood mapping and design workshops, their long-term engagement was contingent on whether their contributions led to tangible environmental changes. In cases where children saw their suggestions implemented—such as a new mural or the installation of traffic-calming measures—they reported a profound increase in confidence and a strengthened sense of "ownership" over their neighborhood (Hart, 1992). This sense of empowerment is a critical outcome of participatory urbanism; it transforms the child from a passive user of the city into a proactive co-creator. Conversely, when participatory exercises were not followed by action, children felt

"ignored" and "tokenized," leading to a cynical view of municipal governance (Lundy, 2007).

The impact of empowerment extends beyond the physical environment to the development of "civic literacy." Children who participated in the research demonstrated a sophisticated ability to analyze urban problems, weigh competing interests, and advocate for the needs of their peers (Cahill, 2007). They moved from individual concerns—"I want a swing"—to collective rights—"We need safer streets for everyone." This shift indicates that when children are given the tools and the audience, they are capable of thinking as "urban citizens" who care for the common good. However, the findings also highlight the need for institutionalized support to sustain this agency. Without formal mechanisms to integrate children's voices into the municipal budget and planning cycles, the benefits of participation remain fleeting. To truly empower the young, cities must transition from "consulting" children to "partnering" with them, ensuring that the right to the city is not just a theoretical concept but a shared, transformative practice (Purcell, 2003).

G. Discussion and Critical Analysis

1. *Dismantling the Adult-Centric Urban Paradigm*

The empirical findings necessitate a fundamental deconstruction of the "adult-centric" hegemony that currently dictates the spatial logic of contemporary cities. Urban planning has historically treated children as passive beneficiaries or, more pejoratively, as "nuisances" to be managed through segregated zoning, such as fenced playgrounds that function more as containment units than sites of genuine play (Valentine, 2004). This institutionalization of childhood space is a manifestation of what scholars term "spatial paternalism," where adult anxieties regarding risk are mapped onto the built environment, effectively "sanitizing" the city of the very spontaneity that children require for development (Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). To challenge this, we must re-conceptualize children's perspectives not as anecdotal evidence but as a specialized form of planning knowledge. Children's granular attention to micro-geographies—identifying a dangerous curb or a high-traffic crossing that adults overlook—provides a diagnostic tool for creating a more permeable and legible urban fabric.

Furthermore, the discussion must reframe the normative definitions of safety, risk, and autonomy within the context of Lefebvre's (1968) "Social Production of Space." Current planning paradigms are often paralyzed by a risk-aversion culture that prioritizes absolute safety—often resulting in sterile, "un-playable" environments—at the expense of children's developmental need for

exploratory risk (Woolley, 2008). When children are granted the autonomy to navigate their neighborhoods, they develop "environmental competence" and a sense of mastery over their surroundings (Kyttä, 2004). This autonomy is not merely a social luxury but a developmental necessity; as Uprichard (2008) argues, children must be recognized as "beings" with immediate stakes in the urban present. Thus, challenging adult-centricity is an ontological shift that requires planners to decenter the "productive adult worker" as the default urban subject and instead design for the "ludic inhabitant."

2. *The Right to the City as a Legal and Intergenerational Claim*

Revisiting the "Right to the City" through an intergenerational lens reveals that urban justice is incomplete if it excludes the youngest citizens. Lefebvre's (1968) core tenets—the right to participation and the right to appropriation—take on a specific resonance for children. Appropriation, in this context, is the act of play: the creative, non-utilitarian transformation of the city that resists its commodification. When a child repurposes a plaza for a game, they are asserting a radical claim to the urban commons that defies neoliberal logic (Mitchell, 2003; Purcell, 2014). This claim is supported by Article 31 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which legally mandates the right to play and leisure. However, the legal provision remains hollow if the physical city remains a landscape of "spatial enclosure," where the use-value of public space is sacrificed for the exchange-value of private development (Harvey, 2012).

This intergenerational claim posits that the city belongs to those who inhabit and "work" it through social practice. Intergenerational justice, as a theoretical framework, demands that we address the "temporal exclusion" of children from the contemporary urban present. Page (2007) notes that urban design decisions create a "spatial legacy" that dictates the mobility and health outcomes of future generations. Therefore, a child-centered city is the ultimate "indicator species" of a healthy community (Gehl, 2010). If children are present and moving independently in the public realm, the city is functioning well for the entire social body. This "8-to-80" design philosophy suggests that by protecting the rights of the most vulnerable, we inadvertently enhance the accessibility and safety of the city for the elderly, the disabled, and the marginalized, fulfilling the promise of a truly inclusive urbanism.

3. *Comparative Insights and Institutional Implementation*

The comparative analysis of Bogotá, Copenhagen, and Curitiba offers critical insights into how different governance models translate child-friendly ideals into tangible spatial reality. In Copenhagen, the success of child-oriented mobility is rooted in an institutionalized, policy-led approach where "Child Impact Assessments" are integrated into the municipal legal framework (Larsen, 2017). This top-down legal protection ensures that "child-friendliness" is not an afterthought but a primary design parameter. Conversely, Bogotá's use of tactical urbanism, such as the *Ciclovía*, demonstrates how the temporary reclamation of space can challenge the "auto-hegemony" of the city (Montero, 2017). These divergent paths suggest that while infrastructure is vital, the "political will" to prioritize children's use of space is the foundational driver of change.

However, the efficacy of these initiatives is often hampered by the gap between "invited participation" and "structural influence." As Lundy (2007) and Hart (1992) emphasize, the UNCRC Article 12 (the right to be heard) is often met with tokenism rather than partnership. For participation to be meaningful, it must transition from a pedagogical favor granted by adults to a legally protected right that influences budgetary and master-planning decisions. In Curitiba, the focus on neighborhood-scale initiatives shows how "learning cities" can integrate children into the metabolic life of the community (Macedo, 2004). Yet, even here, contextual factors such as urban density and socio-economic inequality shape the child's experience. A "multi-scalar" approach is therefore required: integrating high-level legal protections with neighborhood-level participatory tools to ensure that the "Right to the City" is a lived reality across all urban strata.

4. *Synthesis of Urban Citizenship and Future Directions*

The synthesis of findings indicates that children's urban citizenship is a "performative" act, realized through their presence in the public eye. This citizenship is currently under threat by the "privatization of the public realm," which erodes the sites where children can exercise their spatial agency (Iveson, 2007). To combat this, urban policy must move toward a "Rights-Based Approach" that protects the urban commons as a site of intergenerational encounter. The long-term benefits of such a shift are profound; a city that fosters children's independence today creates a more civically engaged and environmentally conscious adult population tomorrow (Chawla, 2007). This aligns with the UN's Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11, which aims to make cities inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable.

Ultimately, the "Right to the City" for children is a demand for a city of "encounters" rather than "efficiency." By valuing children's experiential and embodied perspectives, we move toward a pluralistic urbanism that respects the rhythmic and exploratory needs of all age groups (Stevens, 2007). The future of urban planning must therefore transition from a "protectionist" logic to an "inclusive" one, where children are co-designers of the urban fabric. This research concludes that a child-friendly city is not a specialized niche but the very definition of a successful, democratic city. Reclaiming the city through the eyes of the young is not just about better playgrounds; it is about building a more compassionate, sustainable, and just urban society for everyone.

H. Policy and Design Implications

1. *Designing Cities for Children: The Playable and Walkable Neighborhood*

To move from theoretical "child-friendliness" to a tangible urban reality, policy must shift from providing segregated play equipment to creating playable, walkable, and inclusive neighborhoods. This requires a radical redesign of the "street-as-infrastructure" toward a "street-as-social-commons." Policy frameworks should adopt the "8-to-80" design principle (Gehl, 2010), which mandates that any urban intervention—be it a sidewalk, a transit stop, or a public square—must be safely and intuitively navigable by both an 8-year-old and an 80-year-old. This necessitates the implementation of traffic-calming measures, such as "home zones" or "living streets" (Woonerf), where motorized vehicles are secondary to human movement. By reducing vehicular speeds and reclaiming asphalt for greenery and social affordances, cities can restore the "independent mobility" that is crucial for a child's developmental autonomy and spatial agency (Tranter & Sharpe, 2012).

Furthermore, child-centered design must involve integrating children's needs into everyday infrastructure rather than relegating them to specialized zones. This "whole-city" approach suggests that play affordances—such as climbable textures, tactile pathways, and natural "loose parts"—should be embedded into transit hubs, shopping districts, and residential pathways. Such integration acknowledges that children's lives are not siloed; they occupy the city in its entirety. Legal provisions should move toward Child Impact Assessments (CIA) as a mandatory requirement for all new developments, ensuring that sun access, air quality, and social visibility are prioritized. By valuing the "use-value" of the city over its "exchange-value," planning can foster a resilient urban fabric that supports the Right to the City for the

youngest inhabitants, effectively transforming the urban environment into a "pedagogical landscape" (Lefebvre, 1968; Ward, 1978).

2. *Institutionalizing Child Participation: From Consultation to Co-Design*

The moral and legal mandate of UNCRC Article 12 requires a structural shift in municipal governance to embed children's voices in planning processes. Current "consultation" models often fail because they are episodic, decorative, and disconnected from budgetary or legislative power. Policy must move toward institutionalized participation, where youth councils or child-led planning boards hold formal advisory roles in city hall. This ensures that children are not just "guests" in the planning process but are recognized as legitimate stakeholders with the power to influence long-term master plans. To be effective, these processes must utilize child-appropriate participatory tools—such as photovoice, digital mapping, and model-building—that bridge the gap between children's lived experience and the technocratic language of professional planners (Hart, 1997; Lundy, 2007).

The ultimate goal is to move beyond consultation to co-design, a practice where children and professional designers work as equal partners in the production of space. Co-design initiatives foster a sense of civic ownership and "spatial literacy," teaching children that they have the agency to shape their political and physical environment. Policy should incentivize "Tactical Urbanism" projects led by youth, allowing for low-cost, high-impact transformations—such as painting crosswalks or installing temporary seating—that provide immediate feedback to the community. When children see their ideas translated into physical change, their trust in democratic institutions increases, laying the foundation for a more civically engaged adult population. This "participatory urbanism" transforms the city from a site of passive consumption into a site of active intergenerational co-production (Purcell, 2003).

3. *Toward Intergenerational Urban Governance: Aligning Rights with Justice*

Achieving a child-friendly city requires the adoption of Intergenerational Urban Governance, a framework that aligns child rights with broader urban justice and sustainability agendas. This approach recognizes that the challenges facing children—such as air pollution, lack of green space, and hazardous traffic—are the same issues affecting the elderly, marginalized communities, and the city's ecological health. Policy must therefore synthesize UNCRC mandates

with UN Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11, focusing on making cities inclusive, safe, and resilient. By reframing "child-friendliness" as a core component of Spatial Justice, planners can build broader political coalitions that support the redistribution of urban resources away from private motorized interests and toward the public commons (Harvey, 2012; Gleeson & Sipe, 2006).

Finally, intergenerational governance must address the temporal ethics of planning. Decisions made today regarding land use and infrastructure will dictate the environmental and social possibilities for children for decades to come. Policy should therefore mandate long-term intergenerational equity audits, ensuring that current development does not "borrow" from the spatial rights of future inhabitants (Uprichard, 2008). This requires a shift from short-term neoliberal growth models toward a "care-based urbanism" that prioritizes social reproduction and environmental stewardship. By viewing the child as an "indicator species" of urban health, cities can create a feedback loop where the well-being of the youngest citizen serves as the primary metric for successful urban governance. Ultimately, the "Right to the City" for children is the "Right to a Future," necessitating a city that is inclusive, playable, and just for all generations (Purcell, 2014).

I. Conclusion

1. *Summary of Key Findings*

This research has demonstrated that children's perspectives are not merely supplementary to urban discourse but are essential diagnostic tools that reveal overlooked dimensions of the built environment. While conventional planning metrics often focus on functional efficiency and economic transit, children's spatial narratives highlight the vital importance of "interstitial sites," sensory textures, and social porousness (Lefebvre, 1968; Katz, 2004). The findings indicate that children possess a sophisticated "spatial literacy," identifying environmental hazards—such as traffic-induced spatial anxiety—and social opportunities that remain invisible to the adult eye. Furthermore, the analysis of global case studies confirms that child-centered initiatives are a "rising tide" for urban policy; by prioritizing the mobility and play needs of the young, cities inherently enhance equity, safety, and social vitality for the entire demographic spectrum, fulfilling the "8-to-80" design ideal (Gehl, 2010).

2. *Contributions to Urban Theory and Practice*

The study makes a significant contribution to Critical Urban Theory by expanding the "Right to the City" framework to include the

intergenerational dimension. It posits that the right to the city is realized not just through formal political suffrage, but through the "performative citizenship" of play and appropriation in the public realm (Purcell, 2014; Iveson, 2007). By synthesizing UNCRC Article 12 and 31 with Lefebvrian theory, this research provides a legal and philosophical bridge that justifies children's active role in the co-production of urban space. Methodologically, the research advances participatory practice by demonstrating the efficacy of "mobile methods" and photovoice. These tools move beyond tokenistic consultation, offering a robust framework for planners to decenter their own expertise and value children's lived experiences as a legitimate form of evidence-based knowledge (Hart, 1997; Lundy, 2007).

3. *Future Research Directions*

To further refine the field of child-centered urbanism, future research should prioritize longitudinal studies that track the long-term impact of participatory processes on both children's civic development and the durability of physical urban interventions. There is also an urgent need for more nuanced inquiries into the inclusion of marginalized children's voices, particularly those displaced by conflict, living in informal settlements, or navigating neurodiversity, to ensure that "child-friendliness" does not become a tool for gentrification (Sibley, 1995; Gleeson & Sipe, 2006). Finally, the role of digital tools for child-friendly participation—such as gamified GIS platforms and augmented reality (AR) co-design—presents a burgeoning frontier. These technologies offer the potential to bridge the gap between children's digital and physical lives, creating new "hybrid spaces" for engagement that can make the right to the city a more accessible reality in the 21st century.

J. References

Aldana, A. (2017). Photovoice as a tool for youth engagement in community research. *Journal of Community Practice*, 25(2), 180–195.

Becchetti, L., Salustri, F., & Scaramozzino, P. (2022). The determinants of urban happiness: Evidence from Bogotá. *Applied Economics*, 54(12), 1345–1360.

Boyd, D. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.

Cahill, C. (2007). Doing participatory action research in a globalizing world. *Area*, 39(3), 267–273. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2007.00754.x

Chawla, L. (Ed.). (2002). *Growing up in an urbanising world*. Earthscan/UNESCO.

Christensen, P., & O'Brien, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Children in the city: Home, neighbourhood and community*. Routledge.

Fine, M., & Torre, M. E. (2019). *Critical participatory action research: A feminist project for the 21st century*. American Psychological Association.

Gehl, J. (2010). *Cities for people*. Island Press.

Gleeson, B., & Sipe, N. (Eds.). (2006). *Creating child friendly cities: New perspectives and visions*. Taylor & Francis.

Hart, R. A. (1992). *Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship*. UNICEF International Child Development Centre.

Hart, R. A. (1997). *Children's participation: The theory and practice of involving young citizens in community development and environmental care*. Earthscan.

Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review*, (53), 23–40.

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso.

Heft, H. (1988). Affordances of children's environments: A functional approach to environmental description. *Children's Environments Quarterly*, 5(3), 29–37.

Hillman, M., Adams, J., & Whitelegg, J. (1990). *One false move: A study of children's independent mobility*. PSI Publishing.

Holloway, S. L., & Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2014). Enriching children, economizing families: Commercial perspectives on class, childcare and education. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 46(3), 657–678. https://doi.org/10.1068/a46132

Horton, J., & Kraftl, P. (2018). *Cultural geographies: An introduction*. Routledge.

Irazábal, C. (2005). *City making and urban governance in the Americas: Curitiba and Portland*. Ashgate.

Iveson, K. (2007). *Publics and the city*. Blackwell Publishing.

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. Random House.

Jensen, A. F., Noland, R. B., & Kaplan, S. (2017). The role of bicycle infrastructure in child and adolescent mobility. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 5, 101–112.

Karsten, L. (2005). It all used to be better? Different generations on continuity and change in urban children's daily use of space. *Children's Geographies*, 3(3), 275–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733280500352912

Karsten, L., & van Vliet, W. (2006). Children in the city: Reclaiming the street. *Children, Youth and Environments*, 16(1), 151–167.

Katz, C. (2004). *Growing up global: Economic restructuring and children's everyday lives*. University of Minnesota Press.
Kindon, S., Pain, R., & Kesby, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place*. Routledge.
Knowles-Yánez, K. L. (2005). Children's voices in public policy. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 20(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412205277032
Kyttä, M. (2004). Children's independent mobility. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24(2), 179–198.
Kyttä, M. (2004). The extent of children's independent mobility and the number of actualized affordances as criteria for child-friendly environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24(2), 179–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(03)00073-2
Larsen, K. (2017). Copenhagen: The child-friendly city? *Journal of Urban Design*, 22(2), 245–262.
Lefebvre, H. (1968). *Le droit à la ville* [The right to the city]. Anthropos.
Low, S. (2016). *Spatializing culture: The ethnography of space and place*. Routledge.
Lundy, P. (2007). 'Voice' is not enough: Conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(6), 927–942. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033
Lynch, K. (1960). *The image of the city*. MIT Press.
Macedo, J. (2004). City profile: Curitiba. *Cities*, 21(6), 537–549.
Matthews, H. (1992). *Making sense of place: Children's understanding of large-scale environments*. Barnes & Noble Books.
Mitchell, D. (2003). *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. Guilford Press.
Mitchell, D., & Elton, S. (2005). The right to the city and the rights of children. *Better Planning*, 12(1), 10–15.
Montero, S. (2017). Worlding Bogotá's Ciclovía: From local innovation to global model. *Latin American Perspectives*, 44(2), 111–131.
Moore, R. C., & Cosco, N. G. (2007). What makes a park terrace a "place" for children? In C. Ward-Thompson & P. Travlou (Eds.), *Open space: People space*. Taylor & Francis.
Nicholson, S. (1971). How not to cheat children: The theory of loose parts. *Landscape Architecture*, 62, 30–34.
Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the great divide: Coproduction, synergetic, and development. *World Development*, 24(6), 1073–1087.
Page, E. A. (2007). *Climate change, justice and future generations*. Edward Elgar.

Páramo, P., & Burbano, A. M. (2011). Gender differences in the use of public space in Bogotá. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31(2), 149–160.

Peñalosa, E. (2008). Politics, power, and the city. In R. Burdett & P. Sudjic (Eds.), *The endless city*. Phaidon.

Porter, G., & de Wet, T. (2010). Mobile methodologies, the transport-education nexus and the ethnographic research. *Children's Geographies*, 8(4), 325–331.

Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and the right to the global city: Reimagining the capitalist world order. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), 564–590. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.00467

Purcell, M. (2014). Henri Lefebvre and the right to the city. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1), 141–154.

Purcell, M. (2014). Possible worlds: Henri Lefebvre and the right to the city. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1), 141–154. https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12034

Rabinovitch, J. (1992). Curitiba: Towards sustainable urban development. *Environment and Urbanization*, 4(2), 62–73.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Riggio, E. (2002). Child friendly cities: Good governance in the best interests of the child. *Environment and Urbanization*, 14(2), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780201400204

Sibley, D. (1995). *Geographies of exclusion*. Routledge.

Stevens, Q. (2007). *The ludic city: Exploring the potential of public spaces*. Routledge.

Torres, A., & Reyes-Quilodran, C. (2019). Children as researchers in social work. *International Social Work*, 62(2), 560–572.

Tranter, P., & Sharpe, S. (2012). Children and the city. In *The Routledge handbook of health geography*. Routledge.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. University of Minnesota Press.

UN Commission on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. United Nations.

Uprichard, E. (2008). Children as 'beings and becomings': Children, childhood and temporality. *Children & Society*, 22(4), 303–313. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2007.00110.x

Valentine, G. (2004). *Public space and the culture of childhood*. Ashgate.

Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behavior*, 24(3), 369–387.

Ward, C. (1978). *The child in the city*. Architectural Press.

Watson, V. (2014). Co-production and collaboration in planning – The difference. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(1), 62–76.

Woolley, H. (2008). Watch this space! Designing for children's play in public open spaces. *Geography Compass*, 2(2), 495–512. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00077.x

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.

Zeiher, H. (2003). Shaping daily life in urban environments. In P. Christensen & M. O'Brien (Eds.), *Children in the city: Home, neighbourhood and community*. Routledge.

***

Acknowledgment
None

Funding Information
None

Conflicting Interest Statement
The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement
All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement
N/A