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Abstract

The concept of Bikelash is a term that describes community opposition towards new cycle infrastructure. This aim of this study is investigating the otherwise undertheorized concept of bikelash as an implicit critique to techno-centric traffic planning. By using a phenomenological approach in identifying different lifeworld perspectives and perception of an incident of bikelash in Sweden. The study examines aspects of bicycle planning and underscore the importance in integrating a social and political understanding of bicycle planning by using the term bikelash. The study concludes that integrating a re-conceptualized collaborative approach to public participation can help to avert bikelash in planning and policy making. This is achieved by using a method consisting of on-street interviews to test the local communities for potential opposition for new bicycle lanes and integration of residents into the planning process.
Preface

The aim of this study is to participate to the development of sustainable cities. For myself, who grew up in Copenhagen where biking has always been a part of my life, getting around the city on a bike was fundamental. Eventually I moved to other cities and tried to live places where biking was something more out of the ordinary. I realized that biking, biking culture and biking infrastructure was not something given and that cities blessed with biking infrastructure benefitted with an important quality to life and a contributor to both social and environmental sustainability. When I eventually moved to Stockholm to study, I realized a great potential and a political and democratic incentive to promote bicycling. It was, however, strange to me that Stockholm was lacking so much behind in the development compared to Copenhagen and I experienced myself in situation where I was biking through Stockholm getting directly angry at the planning and lack of bicycle lanes, even in the center of the city. Stockholm hosts a great potential for more development of bicycle infrastructure and in a growing city with increasing pressure on the space in the inner cities more effort has to be put into the development. But what are some of the major obstacles for bicycle development in Stockholm and how can we overcome these in planning for sustainable urban development?
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Introduction

Sweden has been good at adapting towards being more environmentally sustainable in the energy sector. The independence from fossil fuels is overall increasing but the transport sector is continuously lagging behind and still accounts for 40% of Sweden’s greenhouse gas emission (GHG) (Åkerman, 2011). One of the major shares of this GHG is a result of use of motorized vehicles. While a total of 553.2 Kilo Tonnes (kt) of GHG (CO2-ekv.) was emitted by the transport of aviation in 2017, a total of 10385.8 of the emissions came from cars (statistikdatabasen.scb.se). Vehicle emissions remain the biggest in the transport sector due to the fact that it is a very common mode of private transport and everyday mobility. While biking has many benefits, both for public health, traffic safety and sustainable mobility, many have pointed out the issues related to private car use. Among these are social exclusion, reduced community interaction, air and noise pollution, traffic injuries, occupation or urban space, co2 emission, (Jain et al., 2001), congestions and resource consumption (Krizec, 2007).

Focusing on promoting biking as a mode of transport in Stockholm is a crucial part of sustainable development. Biking can both participate to lower emissions (Cykelredegørelse, 2018) and development of increased biking infrastructure will participate to an increase of social equity in cities (Litman, 2018). There is a need for simultaneously decreasing the use of private cars and promoting the use of bicycles in the cities (Cykelredegørelse, 2018). Bikes can offer a replacement for cars in an urban relation since they offer similar individual freedom and possibilities to transport goods or get people from A to B (Hasselqvist et. Al., 2016).

But the modal share of bicycling in Stockholm has been lowering since the 50’s, where biking was phased out as a transport mode in the cities. The Stockholm plan from 1952 was made with a focus on expanding the public transport system, improving the road capacity for cars and decreasing the bike traffic. This resulted in the demolicing of the old bicycle infrastructure in Stockholm (Colville-Andersen, 2018) More focus was put on developing the car infrastructure and the bike was left out. While the planning of Stockholm used more capital for developing car infrastructure, the bicycle was phased out both in planning and everyday use, and in 1970 nearly only 1 percent of traffic was expected to be bicycles (ibid).

However, the ambitions about planning for more bicycles have changed together with the shift in planning paradigms from post-modernist ideals up until today. Stockholm Stad’s bicycle plan have defined the ambitions about promoting bicycling in a vision for 2030 (Stockholm Stad Cykelpplan, 2012). The vision wishes to increase the share of rush-hour with 15% of the trips done by bike. This is done by implementing better infrastructure and facilities for bikes. Some of them are making bike traffic lights, wider commuter cycle lanes
and developing the existing cycle lane network connections (ibid). When planning for less cars and more bikes this means a change in prioritization of road space and here notions of cars vs. bikes becomes relevant.

Improving bicycle infrastructure is also a strategy to make cycling safer, e.g. by separating the different road users (Jackisch et. Al., 2015). Making more bicycle infrastructure is a matter of equality and safety. In an article by Todd Litmat (2017), the importance of transport equity is highlighted. Questioning the utilitarian focus on enhancing accessibility for private car users, he argues that it is both horizontally and vertically inequitable when driving is favored the way it is in our society. This when public spending is indirectly subsidizing driving in both construction of roadways, traffic services, parking subsidies, accident externalities and environmental impacts (ibid).

Also, the current practices of planning and development of bicycle infrastructure is mostly focused on techno-centric solutions (Wild et al. 2018). The general opinion is that building more proper biking infrastructure is the obvious solution in order to promote the biking modal share. But the development of best practice bicycle infrastructure has to be done in an optimal way with careful considerations to design. Mikal Colville-Andersen (2018) points out in the book Copenhagenize that insufficient bicycle infrastructure is criminalizing bikers and that cycling is getting a bad reputation in cities because cyclists will automatically claim the space that is needed for them to get from A to B. This increases the conflicts between bikes and others road users. His solution to the problem is to make better biking infrastructure with best standard design adapted to bicycle behavior. He argues against certain types of bicycle lane designs, like e.g. two-way bike roads. He also argues that car-drivers in general prefer to see more biking infrastructure to keep bicycles off the car lanes (Colville-Andersen, 2018). The basic argument is that if you built more bicycle infrastructure, more people will begin to bike. This approach to bicycle planning is also known as built-it-and-they-will-come.

While Mikael Colville-Andersen points out the importance of proper design of infrastructure, the basic problem from a planning perspective is not exclusively rooted in improper road design. A thesis study by Till Koglin (2015); Organization does matter, concludes that the organization of transport and urban planning divisions have an effect on the efficiency of bicycle planning. Koglin (2015) identifies a social-organizational difference between the planning departments in Stockholm and Copenhagen, where the knowledge and communication is not shared in the same way in Stockholm as it is in Copenhagen (Koglin, 2015). Consequently, a power structure in the organization in Stockholm will prevent the development of infrastructure that is effective and can properly promote biking through a well-planned design that meets the actual needs of cyclists. This is not just a question of merely making better cycling infrastructure. But it’s also a very process
orientated approach. Other literature suggests that the reason few people bike, is due to structural stories that bicycling is dangerous for kids or bicyclists are bad people (Freudal-Pedersen, 2015). An example of a structural story is “If you have kids, you need to have a car”. Freudal-Pedersen (2015) argues that residents’ behavior is determined by these structural stories and that there is a general perception that it is dangerous for kids to ride bicycles in the city. This instead makes residents choose cars, or other transport modes, despite the fact that the general moral perception is that biking is healthy and better for the environment (Freundal-Pedersen, 2015).

Several reasons can point towards the challenges for increasing biking in cities. These are either physical, organizational or sociological, and the problem expands across several fields of study. One aspect that most scholars agree upon is that developing proper bicycle infrastructure will help make cycling safer and insure more and better accessibility for those who bike. However, making new bicycle infrastructure is not always received positively. Wild et. al. refers to the concept of community opposition to bike lanes called “bikelash” (Wild et. al., 2018).

“Bikelash’ is the phenomenon that occurs after significant efforts and/or infrastructure have been made in order to allow cyclists easy transportation throughout a city. Any form of negative comment, news piece or campaign against biking falls under the ‘bikelash’ category,” (legendpower.com).

Investigating the narrative that has arisen in cities around the United States, the article ‘beyond “bikelash”; engaging with community opposition to cycle lanes (Wild et al. 2018), points out that this opposition can create big challenges in the planning and development of bicycle infrastructure. Incidents of bikelash can lead to abandoning or demolishing bicycle lane projects. Organized opposition can come from different groups that have a political motive, or it can come from business owners who assume that restrictions on car accessibility will affect their business negatively. Normally, bikelash comes in relation to annoyances from motorists when car parking or lane space is reduced and under certain circumstances turns into organized opposition in forms of campaigns and advocacy groups (Spotswood et al. 2015; Vivanco 2013 in Wild et al 2017). Wild et. al. argues that cycle lanes is challenging the existing power relations of traffic within the cities and therefore should not be treated as only physical infrastructure, but also a highly social element of the city landscape.

Dealing with societal conflicts that arises in relation to traffic planning can be foreign to the professionals who design the infrastructure. “Modern transport planning is still wedded to a rationalist, techno centric planning paradigm that leaves it ill-equipped to engage with the socio-political dimensions of mobility, including mobility conflicts like bikelash.” (wild et al., 2015:506) A direct criticism is here posed towards a techno centric planning paradigm which assumes that merely building more infrastructure will solve the problems. But this approach
to plan for bicycle infrastructure is not effective in engaging in socio-political dimensions of mobility (Wild et al. 2017). Dealing with bikelash as an academic term is highlighting the problems created by a “build-it-and-they-will-come” approach to bicycle development. The argument that all it takes for promoting bicycling in cities is to build bicycle infrastructure, can effectively be questioned when bikelash incidents indicates otherwise. If bikelash stands in the way of developing bicycle infrastructure, this can harm the overall development of the bicycle networks in cities. There is therefore a need to examine bikelash closer, since it is an expression of direct resistance to the development of bicycle infrastructure. We will take a look at an incident in Sweden that was similar to the bikelash incidents as they were first described in US.

Problem field
In 2016 Lidingö municipality published their plan to make a bicycle highway on one of the main connecting roads going to and from Stockholm. However, after the construction began, the project was met with a strong opposition from the local residents and the bicycle lane was demolished (svt.se, a). Common arguments from citizens were that it was expensive and unnecessary since they already had a functioning pedestrian/bicycle road on the road section. Other statements were posted on the local Facebook group and even bike commuters themselves thought it was a useless project since the bike highway was only covering a smaller part of their commute. It was also perceived as too expensive and inconvenient (svt.se b). The incident resulted in the resignation of an official who was involved in the project, and the community becoming sceptical towards the planners and politicians on Lidingö (klimatupplysningen.se).

The Lidingö incident can be defined as an example of bikelash and how local communities pose opposition to the planning of bicycle lanes due to restrictions of accessibility for cars and parking facilities. This is an example that emphasize that just making any type of cycle infrastructure will not immediately promote bicycling. At the same time, it is a symptom of neglect of socio-political aspects of transformations. Previous literature presented here has highlighted problems on what obstacles development of biking infrastructure can face. Based on the future potential for Stockholm and the incident on Lidingö, there is a need for research in relation to bikelash. A better understandings of the concept can participate to further solving problems similar to this, and contribute to the understanding of community opposition in planning practice.

Aim
The aim of this study is to expand and develop the understanding of bikelash in a Swedish context. To prevent the setback of bicycle development, a better understanding of bicycle infrastructure development has to be reached. By fulfilling this aim, the objective of the study is specifically to investigate the Lidingö bikelash case, using a phenomenological
approach to understand the different stakeholders’ perceptions of the case. Additionally, a second case study is made to investigate a secondary bicycle development project, and to explore the possibilities for developing a method that can be used in planning to prevent bikelash. The research questions can be formulated as followed.

1. How can bikelash occur and why?

2. What methods and measures should be employed in planning to prevent bikelash?

Answering these questions first leads to an understanding of a bikelash case in Stockholm. By investigating the bikelash incident on Lidingö, answers can be given to the question of how bikelash occurred, to increase the understanding of the concept. Following, an analysis is made to reflect upon why bikelash happened in this case. This will lead to a proposition of what can be done in planning to prevent bikelash from happening. Information will be collected about the management of the situation, how it happened, who was involved and what the role of the local community was, as well as what role the planning department played over the course of the incident. To provide answers to the second question, a field study at Spånga Station in Stockholm was conducted, attempting to test the opposition towards development of new future bicycle infrastructure. The objective of the field study is to involve citizens in a planning process and explore the potential for bikelash in a certain selected case. The field study was done to explore if and how a phenomenological approach to traffic planning and citizen participation can participate to the process in developing new bicycle infrastructure.
Bikelash

This study will focus on Stockholm and urban issues related to the development of biking infrastructure. The theory of origin of this study is bikelash, which centers around community opposition to new development of bicycle infrastructure (Wild et al., 2018). The study takes bikelash as a concept and contextualizes it to Swedish urban environment. This is relevant since there has been an example of bikelash on Lidingö in Stockholm, where a bikelash incident had a big negative impact on the development of the local bicycle infrastructure. Wild et al. (2017) investigates incidents of bikelash in different commonwealth cities and concludes that socio-political approaches to development of bicycle infrastructure is highly undertheorized. Also, little academic attention has been payed to the bikelash concept. Since bikelash also damages the trust in local politicians it can stop the development of infrastructure further. Therefore, it is a serious issue that poses a problem to the development and promotion of bicycling (Wild et al., 2017).
Theory

Phenomenology’s ontological contribution to bikelash

The study integrates phenomenological perspectives into planning and participates to the development of phenomenological research in traffic planning. Phenomenology approaches the subjectivity of individuals as the origin of the investigation. The aim is to describe the phenomenon as it appears for the subject. Phenomenology was developed in the beginning of the 20th century together with hermeneutics. The basic argument behind the philosophy as scientific approach is that everyone possesses knowledge that is developed through experiences by the subject. This individual experienced world can only be understood if we attempt to categorize and describe it through phenomenological reduction (Harste & Mortensen, 2013). This method is based on the notion that the researcher has to leave out all conceptions and expectations, and put a bracket around everything they know. The purpose is to document the total experienced world as it appears for the subjects. This experienced world is defined as the lifeworld. The researcher should therefore investigate these lifeworld perspectives and experiences as the phenomena and approach the problem with open curiosity (Jacobsen et al., 2010). This method is also called bracketing which is a way to put away presuppositions and prejudices about the subject (Kusenbach, 2012).

Using the phenomenological approach builds on a foundation of understanding the experienced world of subjects, also called the transcendental ego. According to Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), who was one of the main founders of phenomenological theory, conducting science as a natural matter and uncritical to the being of human nature would inevitably attribute to an inadequate understanding of subject-matters (Cairns & Embree, 2013). He did not point out that previous science was invalid, but instead attempted to add an extra dimension to the understanding of the world and of all the lifeworld as perceived phenomena for what he called the transcendental awareness. This concept refers to the notion that everybody possess knowledge about the world which is separated or outside of the natural world. Feelings and experiences are always included into the perceptions of the world as the world-belief (ibid). Knowledge itself is perceived as whatever knowledge an individual subject possesses and knowledge is intersubjective when shared between several individuals. Knowledge is seen as subjective and intersubjective when gained experience is taken over to be somebody else’s knowledge (Cairns & Embree, 2013). Since everybody, also including the researcher themselves, possesses their own ‘biased’ knowledge, investigating phenomena therefore requires the phenomenological scientific approach called bracketing. Here, all preconceptions from the researcher has to be set aside. Instead the lifeworld perspective and knowledge possessed by the subjective and intersubjective has to be documented (ibid). The concept of the lifeworld perspective refers to the perception of “world”. The world in this sense is not the physical world, but the perception of the world and the notion that something exists beyond the horizon and the core of the
perception (ibid). The method of bracketing also allows the researcher freedom to pose himself/herself critical to their own transcendental knowledge. But the researcher must always separate their own world-beliefs from the object of investigation and instead look at the world as something believed in by subjects. Bracketing is the ability to split and set aside beliefs in the world and acknowledge these as evidence about the believed world to use as a subject of investigation “One part of me lives in the natural attitude, another part, in the phenomenological attitude” (ibid: 9).

Using phenomenology, the subjective experiences and perceptions is here treated as the central source or data. Collecting the lifeworld perspectives and attempting to understand different perceptions from different stakeholders are among the main objectives. Since the practise of analysing bikelash occurs as a socio-political approach to bicycle and traffic planning, merging it with a phenomenological understanding of stakeholders becomes relevant. Investigating bikelash means, including stakeholders’ perspectives into the understanding of the process and its details. Focusing especially on phenomenological aspects of bikelash is underscoring the subjective and intersubjective social reproduction of reality. Bikelash can arise from several different groups of people and appear for different reasons (Wild et. al., 2017). Lifeworld perspectives can be revealed by focusing on the realities as they are perceived, extracted from individuals involved and affected by development of bicycle infrastructure. Phenomenology is used to explore and describe the phenomena as it appears for the stakeholders involved in the bikelash incident, and in the development of bicycle infrastructure. This approach towards collection and analysis of the data therefore refrain from imposing judgement or assign any final truth to the subjects of investigation. Connecting phenomenology with bikelash acknowledged the reality and validity of the lifeworld perspectives and attempts to integrate these into the understanding of traffic planning. The central phenomena for investigation is therefore in this relation the development cases of bicycle infrastructure. An objective of the study is to describe this phenomena from the lifeworld perspectives of the parties involved in the conflict to answer the question about how bikelash has developed in this context. This rather than “taking a side” in the incident as a conflict. Following, to answer the question of how bikelash can be prevented, the theory of citizen participation will be elaborated on and later used in an attempt to solve the problems that will be highlighted.

Citizen participation

The importance of citizen participation as a cornerstone in contemporary urban planning has been related to the importance of democratic development of cities and building cities and neighbourhoods for people. However, I will not focus on the democratic dimensions. Instead, I will use citizen participation in a context of sustainable development and prevention of bikelash in traffic and urban planning. There are many different approaches to citizen participation. Therefore also several different reasons for why participation should
be used in planning and what the outcome strives to achieve. Participation by citizens can both be used as a way to democratize planning processes as a political best practise, but it can also simply be used to gather sources of information about what is needed in a certain development context (Fagence, 1977). The intention of participation can therefore vary. But in the context of bikelash, citizen participation is used to include citizens and local communities in order to effectively develop bicycle infrastructure, while also preventing bikelash and resistance from communities.

Different methods of citizen participation can be any kind of community consultation, like hearings, surveys, Interviews, action studies etc. Traditionally, citizen participation was a way to collect resources and propositions, for how towns should be developed. Among some of the first academic scholars to address benefits of public participation is Patrick Geddes (1854-1932). In cities in evolution (1915), Geddes wrote about citizen participation practise in town planning. Geddes strategy was to inform and educate residents about social and environmental aspects of the city, through using exhibitions and surveys attempted to forecast the material future (Geddes, 1949). The intention was to create more public awareness and learning (Fagence, 1977). This approach also considered increasing equality and acknowledged that anyone had the rights to have a voice in urban development questions. Also, Geddes poses a critique to the practise of town planning as being dominated by architects who had little expertise in town planning itself, despite their supposedly good designing skills (Geddes, 1949). He points out that citizen participation has been long neglected and that it is a needed resource in town planning(ibid).

Through history different methods of involvement of citizens have become a more debated topic, related to the ideology and purpose of political planning processes. More recent theories on citizen participation pose a critique to traditional citizen participation and its aim centred around utilitarian and economic objectives (Healey, 1998a). Instead, concepts like collaborative participation emerges with critiques to modernist planning and expert knowledge. The shift in paradigm of participatory planning focus more on concepts of sustainability and inclusion in the process of citizen participation, rather than planning cities with the objective to promote economic development. Here, the model of collaborative planning is relevant in relation to sustainable development, in a context that focuses on the culture of planning itself. Collaboration procedures, organisation and critique of bureaucratic practices are the focus of the collaborative model. It reevaluates the role of the citizens and how they should be integrated into policy making.

**Collaborative planning model**
The collaborative approach to planning poses a critique to expert driven planning practises. It states that integrating citizen into planning is not enough in itself, but the participation can be based on a collaboration model, using citizens’ ‘local’ knowledge as a resource. This
knowledge is based on a practical and everyday experience of a place, as opposed to expert knowledge gained from theory and analytic approaches (Healey, 1998b). The purpose and methods of past practises of citizen participation went under a debate in dealing with social and ecological challenges of society. The collaborative planning model poses a critique to utilitarian and neo-classical approaches to citizen participation in centralised city planning. It states that these models were based on a game, where different interest parties engage in a struggle to gain power over the decisions (Healey, 1998b). The collaboration aspect of the collaborative planning model, empathizes the processes within planning rather than providing a concrete outcome of what participatory planning should contain. It refers to collaboration between stakeholders and argues that it is crucial to include anyone who possibly could be affected by the policy. Whatever it is locally or globally, it is relevant to include anyone who might have a ‘stake’ in the matter (Healey, 1998b). The inclusionary process is here important in providing different interests from different stakeholders and facilitating mutual learning between these. The concept of stakeholders recognizes a large variety of different groups or individuals other than lobbying groups, in an attempt to dissolve power struggles between interest parties in policy processes. This is achieved by insuring a more communicative process and including different stakeholder’s positions about policy issues. Instead of treating the process as a conflict resolution of power struggles, collaborative planning focuses on mutual understanding and learning between different stakeholders (Healey, 1998a). It also suggests that planning and policy should insure infrastructure of facilitating the collaborative practices as a cultural part of policy processes and management. The model is a way to democratize participatory planning and it argues that involving several different stakeholders promotes trust in public authorities. This makes policies more likely to be accepted and creates a feeling of ownership among different stakeholders involved.

The theory of collaborative planning builds on an ideal of participatory planning that can turn out to be very different in practice. Since the model is based on learning and distribution of information, it is also important to consider that these elements come with an extra cost for policy makers. At the same time the benefit of what participation can give is uncertain (Lee et. al., 2012). Costs and delays can lead to participatory processes being bypassed. Meanwhile there is also a concern about however those who stand to defend the public interest will be biased by their own preconceptions and actually being able to distribute the power and manage power relations in the process (ibid). Insuring stakeholder inclusion and facilitating the interests of those who normally does not get included, is a matter of practise. These practises can be enabled or constrained by the institutional context of the policy processes (Healey, 1998a).

“But it is clear also that the evolution of ‘good practice' in collaborative planning is not just a matter of the capability and commitment of those involved in particular practices. Its possibility is encouraged or constrained by the institutional context. Some of this context is
rooted in local institutional histories, in the resources of relationships, arenas, discourses and trust which have built up over the years” (Healey, 1998; 16)

Special attention has to be payed towards facilitating an open forum where anyone can air their opinion and experience (Healey, 1998b). Developing an infrastructure in the institution for facilitating such communication and collaboration is a way to overcome problems about implementation practises of the collaborative model (Healey, 1998a).

**Collaborative approach to bikelash.**

Since the collaborative planning model focuses on collective development of the conception of space, this fits under the phenomenological approach to research. The collaborative planning model takes the aspect of collective social construct and built upon placemaking in this sense. This model considers the cityscape as *places* instead of *spaces* and rely on building cities based on local knowledge (Healey 1998b). The collaborative approach also connects to the critique that Wild et. al. (2017) directs towards techno-centric planning in *Beyond bikelash (2017).* Here it is it suggested that development of bicycle infrastructure is often left to traditional economic and civil engineering theory, leaving social mobility aspects out of consideration. Wild et. al. also focuses on the aspect that involving local retailers in neighbourhood design projects will help to minimize bikelash (Wild et.al., 2017).

Applying the collaborative planning model onto bikelash therefore suggests a connection. “Drawing stakeholders in from a range of points of view on issues enriches knowledge about them and their impacts and helps to develop the interconnections between the dimensions of issues, problems, and policies” (Healey, 1998b: 539)

By using the ideals of collaborative planning and stakeholder inclusion, we can analyse what role the residents in the bikelash incident of Lidingö have had. Collaborative planning expands the understanding of how and what citizen participation can contribute with and how it works as a cultural incorporation of participation and communication with residents. Further, the model of collaborative planning is used to test how the lifeworld perspectives and residents’ perceptions of bicycle lanes can participate to the planning process and attempt to prevent and incorporate both participation and lifeworld understanding of subjects into planning. The phenomenological perspective here relates to the communicative nature of collaborative planning, and an intersubjective approach in the academic analysis executed in this thesis. By relating lifeworld to the concept of local knowledge, this interconnects the concepts about integrating different perceptions about the phenomena.
Method

The study will be a qualitative study focusing on the perceived reality for the subjects involved. The frame is focusing on a phenomenological approach. “The main purpose of using qualitative methods is to understand the meaning for participants in the study of the events, situations and actions in which they are involved,...” (Tonon 2015:6). This understanding of the perspectives and meanings assigned to the world is the reality that the researcher tries to understand and phenomenology is one direction in the field of qualitative research (Tonon 2015).

Using qualitative data and phenomenology as scientific approach, this study is investigating a certain concept in a contextualized manner so that further problems can be identified and integrated into a planning contexts. The study connects the concept of bikelash with traffic planning and argue for a better understanding of the experiences and perceived phenomena for residents who are the subject of surrounding bicycle infrastructure developments. Here the study aims to contribute to the transition towards sustainable mobility and transport from a resident point of view, by identifying potentials for bikelash and incorporate this into planning strategies.

Literature search
Since the concept of bikelash remains very undertheorized, there was only 1 main source of academic literature. By googling the term “bikelash”, several news articles came up. The concept is created by public media and academic attention to this phenomenon is very new. However, other terms and concepts associated with this piece of literature would help to proceed with the literature search. Most searches were done in google scholar or the KTH library. “Bicycle infrastructure”, “Bicycling”, “Bikelash”, “Cycle lanes”, “Bicycle planning” was the most common searches used. Through some of the literature that was found using these searches, new terms and concepts was discovered. In relation to bicycle planning also “Parking management”, “Parking facilities”, “Traffic planning”, “Transport planning” and “Collaborative planning” emerged. Most used searches were “Bicycle infrastructure” or “Biking infrastructure”. The search “Transport planning” in the title provided more than 1.800 results in KTH library, while “Bicycle planning” provided 180 results, and “Bicycle infrastructure” only 78 results in the title, “Bikelash” only provided 4 results not exclusively only in the title. The search on “bicycle infrastructure” in the title with the word “opposition” in the article included only 3 results. This underscores that literature that links community opposition to bike lanes were very limited.
Data collection
The collection of data will be predominantly qualitative and consist of two steps linking the Lidingö case to another case of potential new development of biking infrastructure. First an investigation will be made of the Lidingö case in order to reveal details about the process and integrate phenomenological approaches into the understanding of the policy and planning. This information will be used to identify some of the main components of the bikelash incident on Lidingö and provide more detailed knowledge about bikelash. Secondly, additional on-street interviews will be used at a new selected case, potentially an area where new bicycle infrastructure has been planned for future development. These on-street interviews will be used to reveal oppositions or willingness towards development of biking infrastructure, or to identify potential bikelash. Also, it attempts to reveal what kind of conditions for restricting the car facilities and accessibility are acceptable in a situated case.

Investigating Lidingö case
By identifying details about the bikelash incident on Lidingö, bikelash as phenomenon can be understood better in a Swedish context. Bikelash can arise for several different reasons and consists of several different groups of opponents (Wild et. al., 2018). A document search has been done to find available information online, this include plans, articles or statements (see appendix list). Also, a search on facebook.com has been done. This for the purpose of collecting opinions about the incident and getting in contact with individuals who have been involved in the debate. Most relevant statements have been found on the local facebook.com group for Lidingö. Lastly, interviews were made with 3 people who had been involved in the process. Several perspectives from different people have to be collected in order to get a good representation of the spectrum of perspectives.

Qualitative phenomenological research on social media platforms
In order to investigate some of the general experiences, about the bikelash incident on Lidingö, Facebook.com was used to track down and discover communities online. The use of social media to reach interview subjects and generate data should be subject to special considerations. Firstly, Facebook.com comments cannot statistically represent the entire populations of Lidingö or participate to knowledge that can be generalized about external relations outside the platform. Social media platforms, is however an expression of the experienced lifeworld perspectives from several individuals and will be effective in recovering statements and knowledge from local residents about the bikelash incident.

Residents will use social media platforms to express their opinions, which is an expression of a level of public engagement (Bonsón et. al., 2015). However, this also means that the platform is a media that represented and distributed some of the active and participatory oppositions against the bicycle highway. The Lidingö Facebook group mediated the
community that was against the bicycle highway. Therefore, it had an influence as a mediator for the opposition which was a big part of the bikelash and could be found on various social media platforms.

**Phenomenological interviews**

The study consists of several different types of interviews. The Lidingö case consisted of 3 different in-depths interviews with the purpose of collecting different perceptions of the incident from different people. These people represented some of the different oppositions of the episode as a conflict. The other types of interviews were on-street interviews that was conducted to approach the Spånga case in an attempt to test the method as a strategy for participation. Using phenomenology as an approach to interviewing means that the goal is to describe the lifeworld as it appears for the subjects are that interviewed, while restrain from applying any theoretical aspect into how the lifeworld is perceived. These perspectives as they are perceived for the subjects inevitably also have to be analyzed using the epistemological approach of phenomenology, that recognizes the interviewees lifeworld perspectives as real valid knowledge (Bevan 2014).

Using these phenomenological elements as experienced lifeworld perspectives in municipal planning can pose challenges. Working with local knowledge can be an opposition to the expert and theoretical knowledge and these different aspects do not necessarily cohere, or in cases will directly contradict each other. The processes within traffic planning and construction of road networks are not transparent and not necessarily easy to understand for individuals who are unfamiliar with planning processes. Therefore, integrating phenomenological aspects into policy processes, that deals with traffic planning, can be challenging. Professionals and politicians have to focus on the solutions itself and due to time or money constraints dealing with communities are often left out. Problems with NIMBYism can arise or just residents that have expectations that are unrealistic or expensive in a relation to constraints of planning. The phenomenological approach here attempts to define that gap when investigating Lidingö, where conflict arose due to an expression of desperation from to two opposites.

**The Lidingö Interviews**

The first type of interviews will be conducted as phenomenological factual interviews. The aim is to gather information about the qualitative lifeworld perspectives of the different parties involved in the Lidingö conflict. The purpose of these interviews is to gain an understanding of the phenomenological experienced realities for the subjects; which in this case roots in the conflict between the local residents and the municipality/planners. The interviews were conducted as a one directional dialogue where the role of the interviewer is to gather information about these lifeworld perspectives from the participants (Kvale &
Brinkman, 2009). Taking on the qualitative phenomenological interview, the approach has to be conducted with a conscious naive approach. In this situation, the aim is not to participate to a broader understanding for the participants themselves. This means that the interviews have to be conducted in a way that attempts to understand perspectives of the lifeworld rather than imposing new opinions or meanings onto the subjects. Instead the interviews are being conducted with a sensitive and interpersonal understanding (ibid) while trying not to affect the opinions of the interviewed subjects. Otherwise, the interview is following the standards of asymmetrical power relations in qualitative research interviews. This when the researcher/interviewer is leading the conversation in order to get the desired stories and opinions necessary (ibid:51). 3 people were interviewed this way. 2 as representatives for some of the pro arguments for the bicycle highway. One interview was done as a walk along because the interviewee wanted to show how the changes were. The interviews were all conducted on purpose in a setting chosen by the interviewee. This was done to insure a feeling of control and comfortability of the interviewees. A setting too formal or with an obvious procedural agenda could affect the answers. The respondents could potentially withhold some of their true perspectives or opinions, if they felt that the social situation would not appreciate or accommodate specific opinions. All 3 of the interviews were made either close to their home and work, or at the home and work.

Spånga: On-street interviews
The purpose of the on-street interviews is to test the local residents’ opinions of a new a bicycle road. The interviews aim to test if the change of distribution of road space and decreased facilities and accessibility for motorists will be perceived as negative. The interviews will function as a method for citizen participation to involve citizens into a potential policy process. The residents are shortly presented with the plan and details about the extends, design and cost of the project. The purpose of the interviews is to subject locals to the plans for a new development of a bicycle road. This will gain insights into what potential problems or benefits the residents experience themselves with the new development or with the existing space. Gathering local residents own opinions and spreading awareness of the new projects help to integrate locals into the process. The interviews will help to take the temperature on whatever the new project is generally accepted or if a new bicycle lane is needed and under what circumstances.

Methodological drawbacks from qualitative phenomenological interviews
Opinions based on a limited number of people, made using qualitative interviews, should be used carefully. In dealing with merely qualitative investigation methods we exclude the possibility of collecting a statistical representative sample in people at the location who would be pro or con to a new bicycle project. A smaller number of interviews could possibly also end up reflecting an incorrect representation of reality, e.g. Unusual and/or radical
perspectives could end up obtaining more meaning and taking the focus away from the general patterns of experience of lifeworld perspectives.

A method that could have further participated to the validity of the representation of the study would be qualitative sampling (Rapley 2014). However, that kind of method require much more time and resources to perform for a municipality. Sampling with qualitative analysis require bigger amounts of pre research about the topic and the demographics and would have to be done in a more formal arena, excluding the possibility of conducting the on-street interviews. The benefits of making a smaller number of interviews is however, that it takes fewer and less resources and effort to conduct. However, it is important to ensure and be aware of methodological drawback of the used method in this study, to prevent misinterpretations or drawing conclusions that are directly incorrect.

Also, quantitative methods would be better that qualitative methods to measure how many people had a positive or negative opinion about a certain case. The method used here can therefore not be seen as a representation of the entire population of Spånga, however a qualitative sampling method could be used for a bigger project if the time and resources allowed for it. The goal of the interviews is to measure the general approach towards a new bicycle lane and its design, but also to collect, concerns or about several components of the planning project in general, that planners or politicians haven’t considered.

The Spånga case on-street interview was a way to test a method for collecting the experienced lifeworld perspectives as a method to broaden the understanding for the planner, of the residents phenomenological experienced. The Spånga results should be considered as a methodological framework of making a new bicycle lane, where the components and approach to phenomenological interviews of residents in a situated context can be applied.
Cases; Spånga and Lidingö

Case 1: Bikelash on Lidingö.
The bikelash incident on Lidingö fits some of the main criteria for being a case of bikelash. The incident consisted of opposition of a very angry nature and it was directed both to the increase of lane space and reduction of parking, which is commonly reported in cases of bikelash. Wild et al. (2018) argues that it is certain groups that oppose to bike lanes, but in this case the opposition was spread throughout and across different segments and it was not rooted in a specific opposition to bicycling as a concept, instead the opposition was directed to the specific design of the road leading to restrictions on traffic accessibility, parking spaces and speculations about mysterious intentions from the planners and politicians. The objections for new bicycle lanes can come from different segments and consists of different reasons. The incident can be summarized as following:

8th of June 2016 - A decision was made to contract an entrepreneur to fulfill the work of constructing a cycle lane on Norra Kungsvägen and Källängsvägen in the autumn 2016 (appendix 1,8).

October 2016 – After the construction started the case received a lot of media attention and some from the opposition spoke about incorrect decision-making (appendix 1,3,6,11).

17th of October 2016 – A decision was made to pause the construction because of strong opposition from citizen on the facebook group and on the local newspage “Lidingösidan” (appendix 1,2).

21st of November 2016 – It was revealed that the road Norra Kungsvägen will be restored to its original state and the bicycle highway project had been abandoned. Instead a bus lane would be prioritized. The bicycle lane constructed on Källängsvägen will remain (appendix 14)

First, the decision was made to make a main bicycle highway, and an entrepreneur was hired to investigate the possibilities and make an assessment of the cost and outcomes. There was no opposition to the decision in the local council and the decision was made in the summer 2016 to start the construction immediately. Some council members were absent due to holiday. Two different scenarios were made as proposals for the new bike highway. The first scenario would be an expansion of the existing bicycle/pedestrian path where new asphalts could be added alongside the existing track to expand the capacity on the path (appendix 10). The other scenario was to take a part of the emergency lane of the road and turn it into a new bicycle lane adding a fence to create a barrier for the car-lane. This last option was the cheapest one, because it did not require a lot of construction of
new asphalt which is more expensive (appendix 8). Option no.2 was selected because it was cheaper and would provide most capacity for bicycles. This solution was then accepted by the municipal council.

The construction of the new bicycle lane started in the autumn 2016, but after it had been ongoing for some months, the opposition started to take shape. Articles were published about the new bicycle highway. The new ongoing constructions affected many local people directly in their daily commute to work (Lidingösidan.se). People expressed their dissatisfaction with the project. One politician who was particularity dissatisfied with the decision from the beginning published several articles and spoke out against the project. He expressed his concerns for safety, decreased accessibility for cars and that the solution was expensive (appendix 3).

Shortly after, another bicycle plan was revealed, on a neighbor road called Källängsvägen. This project was implemented and remained despite a lot of resistance form the local community. The plans of Norra Kungsvägen and Källängsvägen are somewhat separated but will still be analyzed in the same relation since they are timewise and location wise very close and somewhat viewed as one project, “Cykelprojektet 2016”
Figure 1. The construction of the bike highway on Norra Kungsvägen. Source: Appendix 6
Several different Facebook comments and articles stated similar arguments against the bicycle project. A petition to stop the project was made collecting signatures. The pictures above illustrate how the new bike road is taking space from the existing car road forcing cars to wait for the bus to load and making the driver field narrower. The accessibility for cars had been restricted a significant amount compared to before and the temporary ongoing construction (see figure 4) was increasingly restricting the car accessibility. For the cars to speed down the passage, it created potential traffic conflicts between cars going in opposite directions. Many citizens experienced this as highly unsafe and unsettling which further participated to the negative mention about the new bike highway (appendix 8).

Case 2: The Spånga bicycle plan

A specific location was selected in conditions similar to Lidingö. Many projects of developing and improving bicycle lanes are continuously on going in Stockholm, but one particular case in Spånga station was selected for this case. This case was a plan that at the moment was under development and just about to start construction. The plan was published on Stockholm Stad’s webpage¹ and the project had been announced in the local newspaper.

¹ https://vaxer.stockholm/projekt/ny-cykelbana-forbi-spanga-station/
This particular case was selected because the area shared similar demographical composition and has many villas, like Lidingö. Most importantly, Moderaterna is the political majority in both municipalities (valresultat.svt.se). This party is characterized by having a more conservative and right-wing policy which can also be one of the groups who often object to bicycle infrastructure (Wild et. al., 2017).

The interviews were conducted on the location with the purpose to reach anyone who had a relation to the place or frequently visited the area. This, to reach the people that will be mostly afflicted by potential changes. The inclusion of anyone who this plan was relevant to, would be most effectively done on the location. Also, the visual and conceptual understanding for the interviewees about the subject is easier when it is relatable and visible, which can well be done because of the benefit of an on-street-location of the interviews.

The interviews were personal face-to-face semi-structured interviews on the street, using standardized interview guidelines (see page 16). Interviews with people using different types of traffic modes would be insured. Using both motorists, bicyclist and pedestrians the general attitudes towards new bicycle infrastructure development would be collected. Also, a negative approach from a majority of people on the location will in that context reveal that there is a potential for bikelash. Additionally, the interviews will reveal what kind of traffic conflicts people experience between bicycles and other modes. This can motivate either resistance or acceptance of new biking infrastructure.

The interviews also have the same phenomenological qualitative approach as the first set of interviews, but the question here is aimed towards a completely different subject. Limitations to this interview approach can be biased response of the interviewers, and answers afflicted by the social interaction with the respondent (Albaum & Smith, 2012). The semi structured interviews, is a way to cover a certain topic that is predetermined, but also leave room for other issues or topics to be revealed. In this way, the topic or issues can be changed and given room for flexibility for the researcher to explore relevant new topics that arise (Gideon & Moskos, 2012). Relevant topics and perspectives that has been revealed from the first round of interviews from Lidingö will be included in the standardized interview questions. Similar subjects, issues and concerns is transferred and used to form the semi-structured interview questions. The drawback from this semi structured approach is that the conversations can get off topic and detail or standard data that was necessary will potentially be left out, leaving gaps in the data available.
Interview design of on-street interviews

1. Short introduction of the interviewer and the purpose of the interview.

2. Do you live around here?
   Do you come here often?
   Do you use car, bike, train bus or several of these?

3. Stockholms Stad is renovating this road? Did you know about this?
   They will make the car lane narrower and build an extra bicycle lane. The renovation will result in 700 meter of bike lane from here to the crossing at Spångavägen. It will cost 17 million to make the expansion?
   The renovation will result in a narrower road, so that means that it is going to be harder to drive here and the flow of cars will be less effective, but it will also make better and safer road for bikes and pedestrians.

   What do you think about this?

   Do you think it is necessary to make this project? Do you think it is a good idea?

4. What do you think about bikes? And more bike and bike lanes in our area?

5. Where would you prefer to get this kind of information about projects in your neighborhood?
   - Articles and media
   - Stockholm’s website
   - Social media, Facebook, Instagram, YouTube etc?

First the interviewees relation to the place would be determined. Whether they had a relation to the place or was just randomly passing by. People encountered who had never been on the location before and did not live in the area was therefore not included.
Secondly, they would be asked about their preferred transportation mode. A focus was put on selecting people who would either bike or come with motorized vehicles, but also people coming from busses or the train station was interviewed. Then they would be introduced to the plan, using visualizations and referring to the space around. Visualizations from the plan was brought to the location on order to show the interviews the intentions of the plan and better be able to make them relate to the change. Showing them a visualization of the location and extension of the new road, as well as a conceptualization of the distribution of road space taken from the plan. 2-3 visualizations were used. Interviewees were asked their opinion about this plan, when emphasizing on aspects of decreased flow for cars and
increased accessibility for bicycles. They were also asked about their opinion to the expenses of the project and their general attitudes towards development of bicycle infrastructure and bicycling. Lastly, they were asked about where they would gain information about this, or if they would be willing to participate.

Figure 3, Source: Spånga plan (appendix 7)
The first visualization approximately shows the area of change where the municipality had planned to build. The second picture attempts to illustrate where there is a lack of connection for bikes. The point is here that the pink area illustrated on picture no. 2, is the area where bikes need to drive onto the car lane in order to pass by Spånga centrum. The third picture attempts to illustrate where the bikes are intended to go after the renovation is done.
Results and Analysis

Results from Lidingö

When investigating the Lidingö bikelash case, it was discovered that people have expressed different versions of the story with prioritization and concern for different issues and aspects. When involving different stakeholders and including the different views on the incident, some of the experienced and perceived concerns about the development are revealed. Including these perspectives can help shed a light on the main concerns about new bicycle lanes. By including different versions of the perceived realities and investigate what happened between the different parties will also show more about the planning process and how residents, planners, politicians and entrepreneurs have been a part of the process. The phenomenological perspective of the experienced lifeworld plays a role in how the citizens in particular have perceived the process and will help to understand in detail what went wrong. Additionally, the phenomenological approach will reveal what elements were the center of the incident and if the perspectives of residents were considered in the planning process. The pro and contra arguments will be elaborated in relation to what is identified as important or less important issues in the argumentation for or against the development of the bicycle lane on Norra Kungsvägen and Källängsvägen.

The contra arguments
One resident (person A) explained how the bicycle road that was made on Källängsvägen had resulted in a removal of many of the parking spaces. It was a problem because people needed to park in front of their houses. The resident explained that there was already a walking/biking path leading down to the school and connecting to Norra Kungsvägen. There was then no need for this new bicycle lane along Källängsvägen when there was already an existing path (see figure 6). Besides, this new plan was very expensive. It would take away parking spaces and there was already an existing path that bikes could use. The bike lane that was constructed on Källängsvägen was not demolished after the bikelash incident but remained after the bikelane on Norra Kungsvägen was reset. The resident expressed that there was no logic behind the construction of the bike lanes and that the people who made this decision did not understand the actual local needs. Not many people were using the path that was already there and it was not a problem for those who did use it. The existing path is fine like it is and it seems like nobody thought this process through. Why would you spend so much money and restrict car traffic to make a bike lane which was already there before? The resident expressed suspicion of the municipality. Something “rotten” was clearly going on and there had been no communication or statements from the public about the project, either before or during the incident in 2016. The resident expressed confusion about the purpose of the project and also pointed out that there had been a mysterious truck parked constantly at the location.
Other statements from Facebook.com also confirmed the same concerns from several different residents:

“Imagine how easy it would have been just to take from some of the grass areas on both sides of the existing bicycle road, how you are pouring out our tax money, I have no belief in you anymore” (Facebook.com, 27:08:2016).

“They took more than 1/3 of the road for this, I can just imagine the accidents that will happen with these railings” (Göran Tegnér, Appendix 6)

“Why don’t we expand the existing bicycle/pedestrian road? It can be broadening 3 more meters and there would still be space for 2 lanes for cars and busses and the BUSSSTOP!” (Göran Tegnér, Appendix 6)

“Completely unnecessary when there is already a bicycle path. Waste of tax money” (Facebook.com, 06:02:2019).

“Imagine that you close off 2 car lanes in one direction on Essingeleden only for bicycles, that’s how many of us on Lidingö experience it, it is the main road on the north side of the islands”! (Facebook.com, 06:02:2019).
“Like somebody wrote it was a half-measure. It was probably 800m long in total, split in two parts. The first part was from the valley and up towards Källängen. By the Källängscrossing you would need to take the normal bicycle path, for then turn onto the bicycle highway for 500 meters and then again to turn back onto the regular bicycle path. I normally ride my bike on that path, but my total route to Ropsten is 7km. It feels like it’s only for show with those minor 800m. Like somebody also wrote. There is already a bicyclepath behind which I probably rather would see become broader like the one a bit further ahead towards Ropsten” (Facebook.com, 06:02:2019).

A politician (Person B) who was in the major party Moderaterna on Lidingö, was leading the discussion against the bicycle lanes. B argued that they have nothing against cycle lanes or cycling itself and they successfully built many bicycle lanes on Lidingö. This one in particular bike lane was unnecessary since there was already a path at that road and that a new cycle lane would restrict car and bus traffic. B also argued that some of the opposing politicians in Moderaterna were on holiday when the decision was made and that the decision was made too quickly around the opposing votes. B stated in a publication that statistics of travels on Lidingö revealed that there are 10,000 travelers a day with bus, while there is only about 500 bicycles pr. day. Therefore, it is way more logical to make a separate bus lane on Norra Kungsvägen, than using the space for a bicycle lane. Much more people take the public transport than bike. Morning congestions were also restricting the bus and car traffic. The construction of the bicycle path was participating to the congestions even further (Figure 4 & 5).

Another resident pointed out the fact that bicycling is not for everybody and many people cannot bike to work due to either long distances, weather or physical enable to bike. The winter weather in the region is simply not for biking and instead public transport should be prioritized. This situation feels like the municipality is enforcing people to bike, which is undemocratic (Appendix 16).

People who advocated against the bicycle lanes had a variety of different arguments of why the bicycle highway was a bad project. Most of the arguments against the bicycle lane was based on an expression of no actual need for a new bicycle highway. Even people who claimed to cycle expressed dissatisfaction with the way it was planned. Many also expressed that the construction was too big a hindrance for the existing traffic compared to the usefulness it would provide. Also, the project was expensive and the money spent by the municipality could have been used on other things that was more useful. The amount of people who biked compared to the amount of people who took the bus was minor, so the money should be spend on optimizing the bus routes and making a separate bus lane instead of a bicycle highway. Since the traffic flow was compromised at Norra Kungsvägen, the bicycle highway was delaying the busses and the car traffic, which was an illogical
prioritization of resources and space. Also, not a significant amount of bicycle commuters would use this new bike lane and it took parking spaces away along Källängsvägen, which was perceived as a great inconvenience for those who lived there. The bicycle road took away the barrier of parking cars that would protect the kids walking to the school. Also, many argued that there was already a path where bicycles could drive which meant that constructing a new one and spending space and money on it was pointless. And all of this only for a bicycle highway that would be 800 meter long. It seemed to be a lot of money and effort to something that did not have a very big effect.

The proactive arguments
Previously, the main concerns about the bicycle lane on Norra Kungsvägen and expressions of resistance have been elaborated on. This section will cover some of the experiences from those who planned and built the bicycle road and statements that were defending the policy in the local political debate that rose after the construction and conflict began. The experiences from various people contained either a statement for or against the project. However, the opposing parties were mainly parted into either those who objected to the removal of the parking spaces on Källängsvägen, or those who was concerned about the constructions of bicycle lanes on Norra Kungsvägen. The parties in favor of the bicycle lane project were; one of the planners who was working on the project, one former politician from Miljöpartiet, the assessment plan made by a Swedish consultancy (Tyréns) and comments from residents expressed in a meeting summary. Most information about the parties in favor of the bicycle lane has been gathered from the two interviews where more specific elaborating questions could be asked about the incident. The interviewees will be referred to as person C and Person D.

A planner working in as a traffic planner at Lidingö municipality explains how the process evolved from the municipal planning departments point of view. The planner (person C) explained how the project started with the municipality wanting to build a bicycle road at the certain location on Norra Kungsvägen. According to them, there was a lot of unused space on the road section. They had help from the company Tyréns, and a study was conducted to explore the possibilities for a bicycle lane. Consequently, 2 different alternatives were developed. The first alternative would require that the current bikepath/pedestrian path would be expanded and divided into bike path and pedestrian path, while the second alternative was to take some of the existing emergency car lane and turn that into a new bike path. The second option was then chosen after consulting the local council and there was no, or only very little, political opposition to it. So, the project was approved. “We saw a possibility to make this really wide bike path, without really having to make really big investments” (Appendix 8, p.1). Person C points out that there were not many people who knew about the project before it started and there was no real
communication between the citizens and the planners. “We just planned it, because we thought, this is what we think is best, and then we just did it” (ibid, p.2).

After the construction started, this opposition rose and eventually the road section was reset back to its original version. News articles and social media distributed the local attention about the bicycle lane in a very negative way. Person C states that social media was a big part of what happened and since they had no resources in communication, it grew to a scale that they could not handle “With social media stuff, it just quick like somebody starts and then it just grows. And it grows like beyond your control” (appendix 8, p. 6).

Person C says that everything was misunderstood and that there were rumors, which was not true. Even though they took some space from the road, one could argue that it was still a good road and you could still drive fast. The decision to draw back the project and reset the road was made by the politicians and the major party Moderation after the pressure of a lot of negative attention. “So, I mean, we have a conservative majority. But they were the ones who made the decision in the first place. So, they were not against the project. They were just against the project when you know the shit hits the fan” (appendix 8, p.5).

Person C does not understand why people were so upset and pointed out two reasons why they think people were upset about the bicycle road; 1. People were confused and scared of the change, they felt unsafe driving on the construction site and 2.; It was very ugly and it changed the landscape a lot, with the fence dividing the car lane and bicycle path. Person C stated it was partly the design that met opposition. But also, just an element of change. “Doing any biking projects here now, it’s much harder to get public approval for this. Everybody is really skeptical about this kind of thing” (appendix 8, p. 6). After the interview was done, Person C talked about how more communication and management of social media is needed to handle this kind of incident. Person C points mostly towards social media and the community for being a distributor of the negative speculations and that extra resources are needed to handle social media and influence the reputation of ongoing projects.

Person D was a member of the opposition in the government on Lidingö at the time of the bikelash incident in 2016. Person D was personally involved in the episode and was one of the few who publicly defended the bicycle lane project. As a politician of the Swedish environmental party (Miljöpartiet), person D was interested in defending and promoting initiatives like the bicycle lane in the interest of an environmental policy. Person D states that the existing bike lane at the time was very narrow and provided only limited space for both bicycles and pedestrians. The path was not good to bike on since there were people with kids and dogs and this was not an optimal path for bike commuters who drives faster. It was important in person D’s opinion to get a direct and faster bicycle lane for bike commute and transportation instead of the existing one that goes through the school. “the
bicycle has to be a transport vehicles, not just Sunday bicycling” (appendix 5, p.1). Person D also points out the problems with the speed limits. High speeds on the road was a problem, so narrowing the road was done to the improve traffic safety. Person D informs that there was a mother who stood at the crossing to guard the traffic, voluntarily because of the traffic danger. Concerning the parking space problem at Källängsvägen, parking could be directed somewhere else. Few cars parked at the school so there was good parking space really close to the apartments where the parking was removed.

Person D informs that there were two wings within Moderaterna. The ones who likes environmental initiatives, like bicycling, and the ones who did not. Moderaterna were the ones who agreed on the plan, but they got cold feet when the public outrage began. Person D states that nobody wanted to become unpopular so they did not defend or explain the reason behind the plan when the opposition started. People on Facebook got violently upset. There were a lot of false rumors, “I think it happened because it was a conservative municipality and because of the political climate. It was not many people who were upset, but they were expressive about it. It was probably only 10 people who were leading the objections” (appendix 5, p.5) Lastly, Person D expressed that they felt prosecuted by some of the residents who were strongly against the plan. They had to get police protection, received threats and were instructed by the police not to open any unknown packages received to their address.

Statements
After the outrage, the planning department published a statement about the bicycle lane on Källängsvägen as a response to the petition against the plan (appendix 13). Since there were some questions from the public towards the announcement about a bicycle lane, a statement was made to explain about the development. In the statement, it was elaborated very shortly that the bicycle lane was constructed for security purposes and that parking facilities would be directed to the nearest school. The statement rejected the petitions and shortly argued that moderations had been made to the speed limits and that this construction was just a way to adjust the environment to that. The statement also argued that the short passage between the houses was not a safe way to tread as a pedestrian. Narrowing the car lane was a way to make it safer for children going to school, hence the speed limit moderations. Lastly, the statement responded to a question about how the city had informed about the bicycle lane on Källängsvägen. An explanation was made that information had been spread to the Facebook page and webpage of the municipality and that they had been in contact with the principal of the school and sent information letters to the parents from school. Also, they had put up signs on the location to inform about the constructions.
The final outcome of the incident

While the bicycle road on Källängsvägen remained, the bicycle highway on the main road, Norra Kungsvägen, was demolished after the bikelash incident. The incident led to mistrust in the local municipality and the planning department. This mistrust was expressed further when a new bicycle plan came out in 2017. The new plan about constructing better bicycle accessibility on the Lidingö bridge, was marked by the public sepsis towards the technical council and local politicians. The traffic planner (Person C) states that a lot had changed since then and that ‘now we do things differently’. It also that it became harder to just implement anything new that had to do with bicycle lanes. There was more negative public attention towards new projects (appendix 8, p.5). Person D explains that they received threats and other negative attention from the community directed towards their family.

Previously different perspectives have been elaborated concerning the incident with the demolishment of the bicycle road on Norra Kungsvägen on Lidingö and the construction of the bicycle road on Källängsvägen. The actors involved either had a pro or a contra position in relation to the incident. Several different statements from both the pro and contra positions have been explored, and some components point towards that the incident developed into a rivalry. How the incident was experienced was very different from the pro and the contra side, but it is apparent that there were misconceptions from both sides. While some of the arguments against the project expressed no concern for the current bicycle lane, the pro parties expressed a safety concern about speed limits and inefficient capacity of the existing bicycle lane. Simultaneously, the pro parties stated that there was enough parking in the area around Källängsvägen and it would be no problem to park as a resident in the area. This while the contra expressed a serious concern for the parking that was removed. Also, the option that was chosen by the technical council for the plan was the decision that was the cheapest. Meanwhile, the contra expressed that the solution was both too expensive and at the same time also stated confusion about why the existing path was not just expanded. The pro expressed a very high importance for development of bicycle infrastructure in relation to environmental issues while the contra felt overruled by the outcome of the bicycle project. Either side also expressed a severe confusion about the position of the other side. The pro side did not understand why the con were so upset about the project and resetting the road to its original state was even more expensive.
Simultaneously, the con expressed conspiracies about the intentions of the planners and politicians, since there seems to be nothing positive about the change.

The findings highlight a gap in the communication there have been both before and after the process of the plan and project. It is clear that many misconceptions about the project developed during the incident and both the pro and the contra expressed confusion about the conflicts and the arguments of the opposing positions. The different conception can be seen as a difference in lifeworld perspective. While the pro focused on the environmental
aspects and safety issues from a more expert based perception of the project, the con
focusing on aspects from a perspective of local knowledge and how local people were
affected by the change (Healey, 1998a). Also, person C states that it was not many people
who were upset about the bicycle plan, somewhat around 10 people seemed to be the core
of the debate (appendix 5, p.1). Meanwhile, person A stated that a couple of hundred
signatures specifically against the plan at Källängsvägen. The phenomena under subject of
investigation is how the incident progressed and it can be concluded that the difference in
the phenomena as it appears for the different parties were severe.

The assessment plan made by the consultancy company (appendix 9 & 10) only included
physical aspects of the constructions. It assessed different alternatives and chose the costs
and benefits for each alternative, also how each design was related to accessibility for
different modes. The plan does not mention anything about including residents or assessing
what alternatives would be most optimal for the residents. Neither does it state any risks of
opposition. The assessment plan measures the benefits for each mode in meters and the
criteria for space. This plan excludes any measure of how the experienced use of the space
is perceived. Person C stated that only a few people knew about the plans before they were
implemented and there was a general conception that there was no political question about
the plans and the plans were implemented without consultation with the public. It was only
published on the Lidingö municipality’s page. The information given to the public was
limited and the public participation was non-existing.

The way the urban issues were received and portrayed by the key persons indicates a gap
between conceptions of the incident as a phenomenon. A difference in weight had been put
on phenomenological elements such as safety issues, speed limits, monetary expenses, the
importance of bicycle roads, the importance of public transport, parking spaces and
accessibility for motorized vehicles. This difference was not accounted for when the plan
was initially conducted, and it highlights a lack of understanding for the local knowledge and
an absence in including residents in traffic planning.

The bikelash incident can from a phenomenological perspective be explained as:

1. A difference in how the importance of bicycle lanes are perceived.
2. A lack of understanding in the local knowledge and needs of local residents in the
   initial plan
3. Lack of communication and distribution of information about the development of
   the plan

Previously elaborations have been made on how bikelash can develop in a context of
Stockholm in Sweden. It has been determined how bikelash can develop, how it progressed
and what were the main components of bikelash as a conflict. The results here indicate that
the planners and the municipality did not anticipate the reactions from the public. This type of reactions does not often occur and minor changes of the traffic when planning for motorized traffic rarely receive the same type of negative attention or end up as a subject of outrage at the same level, as when planning for bicycle roads. Like argued by Wild et. Al. (2017) the outrage occurs because of disruptions to the existing order of different traffic modes. Planning for bicycling therefore have to take this bikelash into consideration and should distinguish between how to plan for motorized traffic and how to plan for bicycle infrastructure. From this knowledge we can attempt to understand how bikelash can be prevented, in relation to the example of bikelash that have been analyzed.

Resolving bikelash with the Integration of citizen participation and phenomenological research.

Since both the pro and the con sides experienced misconception, miscommunication and the incident developed into a more hot-headed conflict, a process of integrating mutual understanding and communication could avert some negative consequences. A difference in lifeworld perspectives is an expression of lifeworld knowledge and experience and this can’t be changed or averted much alone. However, planners can better attempt to understand and integrate local knowledge into plans. Meanwhile residents can be better informed about the initiatives that are planned for. A process pf participation can be used for gaining political support, legitimacy and citizen development (Bryson & Quick, 2012). The collaborative planning model is here an opportunity to both understand local knowledge and lifeworld perspectives but also integrate residents into the process and informing them of the plan and rationale behind. In particular changes in parking tends to meet opposition, but if people learn and understand new solutions, this can help to make them understand benefits (Litman, 2018). Understanding and accommodating these lifeworld perspectives as local knowledge from residents, is crucial in plans with potential for developing conflicts (Healey, 1998b). User convenience and careful determination of the parking shortage is to be considered (Litman, 2018). This was not done in the case of Lidingö, where the effects of changes were underestimated. But, including residents in the projects this small a size as the Lidingö projects, can both be expensive and difficult. The benefits of a participation process would be unclear and the outcome could be limited (Lee et. al., 2012). However, the case of Lidingö in Sweden, the reasons for the bikelash was a combination of factors, but overcoming this in planning would require a type of participation that could test the local environment for possible resistance or willingness towards a new potential plan.

Conclusions here have highlighted misconception from both the pro and the contra sides, the lack of communication between these, together with a lack of understanding of the concerns of the local residents and their knowledge from the planner perspectives. These factors emphasize that the plan on Lidingö could have been presented and communicated
to the local residents to a larger extend. The physical configuration of the distribution of different traffic types should have been better elaborated. Using the collaborative planning approach in relation to citizen participation would require facilitation and mutual learning. It would also require incorporation of organizational culture in the policy development process, that can insure these collaborative aspects between stakeholders (Healey, 1998a). However, when it comes to smaller local projects as the bike lane on Lidingö, it is somewhat limited how many stakeholders can be included in the process. The traditional collaborative planning model is developed for bigger policies and complex issues with multiple stakeholders. Therefore, the collaboration aspects in the case of the particular bikelash incident on Lidingö would have to be re-conceptualized. Since the incident was majorly a conflict between the policy and planning departments, and the local community, a collaborative approach would be executed with a focus on the relation between the officials and the public (Bryson & Quick, 2012).

The benefits of on street interviews.

From the experiences in understanding bikelash in Swedish and by the results of investigating Lidingö, the question is left of how a collaborative approach can be executed. The Lidingö incident was based on a very small and minor project, where participation was almost never used. Extensive participation processes would be costly in both time and money. However, strategies can be used in attempting to include residents into the process.

Due to lack of time and funds, a full experiment of how to ensure a collaborative planning approach in municipalities could not be made, as this process could take years. Instead a test field study was made by using on-street interviews in relation to a new bicycle project. The aim of the test study is to determine under what circumstances residents are acceptant or opposing to a new bicycle plan. By using a phenomenological approach. The main purpose of a participatory process in relation to bikelash would be to test out the general attitude towards a new project and its components. This has to be done presenting details of the plan like e.g. the design, the conduction and expenses of the new plan. In the Lidingö bikelash incident these were central topics that affected the opposition to the bicycle project. The public has to be able to see the usefulness and it should be easy to argue that it is worth the expenses. Some of the important issues that were identified at Lidingö were

1. Safety issues,
2. Speed limits,
3. Monetary expenses,
4. The importance of bicycle roads.
5. The importance of public transport, parking spaces and accessibility for motorized vehicles.
These issues should therefore be respectively included in assessment of a participatory processes in relations to new bicycle infrastructure plans. From experiences from the Lidingö case we can argue that a level of participation even in a smaller project should be done in an evaluation or assessment plan if the plans are somehow aiming to cut down on facilities for cars such as parking spaces or with of the road. One easy and efficient way to find the people that the changes would be relevant to, would be to simply to go to the location. On the location that are subject to changes, residents can be presented to the plan in any way that can either visualize or conceptualize the components that are most important. By exposing the interviewees directly to some of the issues that arose during the Lidingö incident, the purpose would be to extract statements or perceptions that can translate their experienced lifeworld perspectives in relation to a new bike lane development.

**Spånga Station**

The interviews were conducted as described in the section about on-street interviews (p.19).

**Interpretation of results:**
Interviewees have been sorted into different categories of their specific opinion about the bicycle project.

1. People who expressed *very positive* opinion about the bike road
2. people who think it is good but is not very strongly *positive*.
3. People who have very *little or no opinion*
4. Those who are *both positive and negative* but with an otherwise unclear statement about either.
5. People who are *negative* or a bit negative
6. people who are *strongly negative*.

The results have been interpreted to reflect the actual statement of the plan for Spånga and biking in general. Some people were positive towards biking, but not positive towards this particular project. One lady is negative to bikes, but think that it is a good idea to make a bike road. Other people are positive to bikes, but think it is not good to develop bike lanes here. The questions for the interviews were formulated in an attempt not to focus too much on the respondent opinion, but instead present the plan and the intention of the plan to them and collect their description or experienced attitude towards the new bicycle project as it was presented. The interviewees were presented with the plan and asked their general position to the components of the plan. People were asked about their opinion in an attempt to collect their experienced lifeworld perspective. However, asking for opinion can result in biased answers. When respondents were asked their specific opinion, they might
choose one statement rather than state their neutrality or actual experience. Therefore, their general attitude or levels of enthusiasm were also noted down during the interviews. Selecting the interviewees approximate age was done using different age groups. A few interviewees told their ages themselves, but since their age and gender is less important to the results of the study the question did not needed to be asked. Instead the respective age group was merely guessed based on their appearance. The answers of the interviews were noted by hand after the interview was done. Each interview would take between 5-10 minutes.

**Negative**
Several people were negative to the plan overall when the heard about the expenses of the plan. When confronted with the plan they would be positive, but as soon as the cost of the plan was mentioned, they changed their opinion to being skeptical. Several stated that; “We should rather use the money for other things”. One person was generally negative towards the plan but stated that “the planners can do what they have to do”. A majority of those who were interviewed were positive to bicycle infrastructure and bicycles in general, but as soon as the drawbacks of the plan were explained, or when the cost of the plan was revealed, they would express opposition to the plan itself. Some people were negative to the fact that the plan would mean less space of cars, arguing things like “it’s already really hard to drive here, and if you have issues with physical mobility like I have, then it is a problem if you can’t drive around” or “we need the space for the cars”. One person stated that there was not a lot of space in the city for bikes so bicycle lanes should be made in adaption to the place, like maybe on the countryside it would be easier because there was more space.

Some interviewees pointed out that there were not that many people who biked around here and that it was easy to bike on the pavement or the road. Some people stated that biking was dangerous or that it didn’t seem like a problem because bicycles could just bike on the pavement. One person stated that their opinion about the plan would depend on how the outcome would turn out compared to how much monetary expenses was used. Very few people were strongly against the plan but most people who expressed negative perspectives were either skeptical to the cost or the restriction on road space for cars.

**Positive**
Most people who were interviewed at the bicycle rack were positive to the plan. People who biked expressed more need for a bicycle lane and could agree upon the fact that there was a problem with bike accessibility. Some were very positive, while others were a bit positive. Most people thought it was worth the money and were positive to bicycles in general. Some people stated that it was really important to invest in new bicycle infrastructure and that it did not mean anything that the plan was going to compromise accessibilities for cars or that it was expensive. Some people were concerned about the
busses and how the plan was going to affect the bus stops. One person stated that she was positive towards the plan because the traffic in the area felt really unsafe and the place was hectic. Most people were positive to the plan because they would agree with the fact that there was no bike lane and that the current situation was perceived as dangerous, or they were positive because of a general conception that bicycling is good for the environment.

Important learnings from on-street interviews
- People believe and trust planners in that area.
- Several people don’t have strong opinions and show interest in the matter.
- Many people are positive towards biking in general, but don’t see it particularly necessary to build more bicycle lanes in their domain.
- That most people think the plan was necessary and saw a need for it.
- Most concerns against the development was the fact that the plan was too expensive or that is compromised car accessibility.
- Several people stated that if they wanted to get more information about this, social media would be very useful to reach them.

The findings of the on-street interviews proved to be a way to identify major concerns and oppositions there potentially could be against new bicycle infrastructure. The field study and method, by approaching people and appealing to their experience and opinion about a new development, shed a light on what shapes the potential opposition. In the case of Spånga, a majority was positive towards to new plan. However, with such a small sample of interviews it remains unclear whatever the entire segment of travelers at Spånga are pro or con towards the plan. Important learnings were that those who were negative, mostly either expressed a concern related to the cost of the plan or a concern for taking away space for the cars. This similar to the opposition that was formed at Lidingö in 2016. Other learnings were that there was also a positive approach to bicycling in general even from parties that were against the specific plan for Spånga, which proves a level of NIMBYism.

Potential arguments used for the bicycle road can be used in negotiating conditions around the development in a planning process. The statements from the residents themselves who are pro bicycling, can be used to prevent development of a negative narrative and negative attention. However, concerns and needs that are expressed here should be taken very seriously and modified into the plan if possible. Opposing statements should always be used to modify the plan if the opposition is in majority. The on-street interviews have shown to be a method in Investigating and understanding arguments and lifeworld’s perspectives to answer directly to the concerns in relation to the plans. Participations method can help identify creative solutions (Litman, 2018) or alternative solutions. Such on-street interviews can serve as a part of the assessment plan of the initial project, providing information about the needs and concerns of residents. The interviews can also be used to choose between
proposed alternative solutions or develop new solutions by pointing out important aspects and needs and incorporating local knowledge into the proposed plans. Most importantly the interviews serve as a way to check temperature of political environment and asses the possibilities for accepting a new project or identify risks of potential bikelash.

Another central aspect is also that few people knew about the Spånga plan. Even though the plan had been published on the Stockholm Stads webpage and there had been an article about it in the local newspaper only 2 people out of 35 had heard about the changes. This could be seen as a symptom of a lack of distribution of information to the public by the municipality. This was the same case with Lidingö, where most people only got aware of the changes when they were already being implemented (appendix 8, p.2). Whatever or not this contributed to the outrage is unknown, but if some opposition had shown before the construction had begun, moderations could have been made in the plan and the consequences could have been less severe. This highlights an importance in communication with the citizens, which is also a criterion for participation, as a rug in the ladder of participation (Arnstein 2019).
Conclusion

The approach to this study has been phenomenological in the way of including the lifeworld perspectives and focusing on the comparative dimensions of different lifeworld perspectives. This helps to include a diverse spectrum of concerns from different stakeholders, by bracketing knowledge and seeking to discover the experienced and perceived notions of the urban space. The understanding of residents’ perspectives on issues related to the bikelash helped to recover details about the process. Using a phenomenological approach to analyze the bikelash incident led to the conclusion that a collaborative strategy to citizen participation can help to avert bikelash and optimize the development in a way to accommodate local residents needs and wants. The on-street interviews are a way to insure phenomenological approach to collaborative planning in a context of preventing bikelash.

However, the results from Spånga is not an attempt to make a definite plan over what planners should do to prevent bikelash in any case. Instead it’s an execution of one method that approach residents in a local informal environment and insures the inclusion several perspectives and opinions that can be used in the plan itself or as a part of a public participation strategy. Focusing on the lifeworld perspectives is important in relation to bikelash, when attempts is made to include any perspective there could be about benefits or drawback from the plan. Wild et. Al. argues that experts and planners have to move beyond the assumption that cycling infrastructure is apolitical and merely something physical, instead attempting to understand diverse mobility cultures and knowledge that cycle lanes disrupt existing power relations (Wild et.al.). In relations to this, this study concludes that understanding the social dimensions is crucial in preventing bikelash. This can be done by extracting the local knowledge and insuring to plan whatever there is an actual need for and what is acceptable in the particular case.

Furthermore, planners should be developing an infrastructure for citizen participation, to engage and empower residents in local questions and issues. More should have been done on reaching out to communities, meditate information in ways that are relevant and more accessible for citizens. Collaborating with locals and include local knowledge. This can be done either online or on-street, or in other ways. Officially publishing and displaying local opinions will communicate the public that considerations for local concerns have been taken into account. Planners can use relevant existing arguments to promote new bicycle projects and presenting the plan and defending conflict issues. Here, ensuring a better infrastructure of participation and communication with the community will make facilitation of mutual learning between opposite parties effective.
The objective for the planners is not to take a side, like it was done in the Lidingö incident. Instead planners and policymakers can attempt to understand and collect different perspectives by using the phenomenological approach. Here it is beneficial to differentiate between the bracketed knowledge and own knowledge experience. Planners and policymakers can engage in intersubjective development of knowledge through better collaborative planning. Also, using the lifeworld perspective as a measure for what people act upon and attempt to identify the experiences and perceived issues or needs related to concepts such as bicycle infrastructure and accessibilities for cars.
Reflection

The outcome of this thesis is determined by the use of certain methods and approaches to the problem and choices of theoretical framework. Two main theories were used. First theory about collaborative planning was used and in addition to this, theory about phenomenological research. Different approaches could have been made in order to get different results. The methodological choice of this thesis has intentionally directed the outcome towards a sociological and political understanding of development of bicycle infrastructure. However, a method of using online surveys as gathering of information and phenomenological perspectives could have contributed with a more elaborate and statistically accurate representation of how people perceived the project on Lidingö. The same could have been done in the case study of Spånga bicycle plan. However, the on-street interview method was a way to ensure that more people would respond and also secure several age groups beyond those who are online. On-street interviews could have been made on Lidingö to gather more information or maybe even different information about the incident. These methods could have given different results, when it is possible that some more neutral perceptions about the bicycle lane on Norra Kungsvägen also existed. Maybe even some completely third-party opinions which are unknown.

Other relevant methods to use in relation to bikelash could have been a social constructivist or discursive method to analyze the material collected. A discursive approach would have focused on the social constructed realities and the discourses expressing certain positions in relation to the different discourses. This approach would likely had provided different results, suggesting that a certain discourse would be dominating in setting the political agenda and reproducing a negative narrative about bicycle infrastructure. Here the solution of collaborative planning would still be relevant.
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