



**Doctorate of the University of Toulouse
By Maja Karoline Rynning**

Examiner's report

The candidate has chosen to work on an interesting theme and handles this through an extensive body of work. The thesis is consistent with a few exceptions and is hereby approved by me.

Some minor corrections could have been useful to ask for, but I will refrain from so doing basically because the overall impression of the work is that it is solid, logical and well handled. It demonstrates skills beyond expectations. It is also well referenced.

Corrections would only lead to a lot of work; lost time for the candidate and the overall impression would not be changed. Her time will be better spent at developing her ideas and applying her knowledge in practice through employment. If other examiners have another view on this I will of course listen to the arguments and reconsider my position if necessary.

I would have liked, though, to see a better flow as regards the CapaCity section.

It comes across as a somewhat alien side of the thesis, although I hasten to add, it is an important part of the thesis and highly relevant. Perhaps my reaction is based on the impression that the way the thesis is edited, by so clearly placing Capa City into the text as a kind of separate project causes my concern. But that might be an editorial and minor issue only. It stands out because the main body of work flows so well. My reaction could also be mine only and other examiners might read this flow differently. The actual content is anyway interesting and fitting.

In relation to the interviewed practitioners, it would have been interesting to have some more information as to who they are, really, although this is always a dilemma.

Are they excellent practioners with a track record, randomly picked, mediocre or mere copycats? It is of course normally beyond the scope of a thesis project to quality control this but since their responses become a kind of guideline, their level and standing is of importance.

The body of work covered in this theses is, as mentioned, vast. It could have been more rational in the use of words and repetitions. On the other hand, it is the result of a well-meant strategy to help the reader that reads bits at the time and leave the reading to come back to it in a few days, to recap what has been mentioned earlier.

On the other hand, for the more consistent reader, repetitions stand out. This is not a big issue, but perhaps something to learn from in the future. An example; Chapter 1,2,3, is explained in the Introduction part 1 page 24 but also on the previous pages 20 and 21. This seems overdone and unnecessary.

Generally speaking, the candidate demonstrates insight and understanding of the field, has a great ability to create flow throughout the read (apart from the minor places commented above) and has an excellent command of English, making the thesis an easy and pleasurable read uncovering new insight to the reader.

This examiner particularly found the part on densification (page 77) a very interesting part. It is critical yet well documented. The fact that she in an elegant manner also plays down Gehl's ideas that have become so commonplace and standard referencing and instead opens up towards other writers is refreshing.

Stavanger, Norway 10 January 2018.



Harald N. Røstvik
Professor